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1.0 Objective
The Midtown (previously KW Hospital) review area was evaluated by City Planning Staff in conjunction with other municipal documents and consultation to create this secondary plan. This plan applies new land use designations and zoning regulations which reflects direction from the City, Region, Province and other external agencies.

1.1 Location Map
2.0 Considerations

2.1 Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) – Midtown Study Area

The PARTS Plans were conducted to ensure the City of Kitchener’s station areas are developed in stable ways that support local transit and add value to communities. The studies completed thus far include recommendations for the following: Land use; Engineering infrastructure; Pedestrian and cycling connection enhancements; Transportation demand management measures; Public realm and streetscape improvements in surrounding areas; Road and parking implications; Community infrastructure; and, Public art opportunities.

The PARTS Midtown Plan was intended to be a guiding document with its goals and strategies to be implemented through an Official Plan Amendment, a Secondary Plan, a Zoning By-law Amendment, and updates to the Urban Design Manual. The Preferred Plan (Land Use Map) developed through this process acted as a guide for the Midtown Secondary Plan. Incorporation of new land use designations and zones with updated regulations were considered in conjunction with the existing conditions and uses of properties, and their existing permissions and special policies and regulations. Any deviation between the Preferred Plan and the draft Midtown Secondary Plan was done through Staff review and public comment and consultation to achieve the best land use planning suited to the existing and future development of the community.

2.2 Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

The City of Kitchener undertook RIENS in hopes to develop a clear and fair process for approving development projects in established neighbourhoods. Typically development proposals are considered based on the size and impact on the surrounding area, and the zoning by-laws and urban design standards in place. The intent of the recommendations of this study was to further ensure that new development blends and is compatible with the neighbourhood.

2.3 Urban Design Guidelines (UDG)

The Urban Design Manual is a guide for the development community, residents, special-interest groups, city council and staff for details on our city’s urban design guidelines and standards. The recent update of Part A of the Urban Design Manual was approved on September 9, 2019 by council as part of the Community and Infrastructure Services Committee agenda. The guidelines were last updated in 2000
and Kitchener has since seen rapid change and intensification throughout the city, triggering a desire to ensure that the guidelines reflect the evolving expectations for the design of buildings and public spaces.

Urban Design staff held a public design charrette for the Midtown neighbourhood on May 15, 2019. The intent of the charrette was to directly speak to and address residents’ concerns and identify opportunities for better design in their community. These neighbourhood specific guidelines will be brought forward for approval as part of the Secondary Plans for each neighbourhood. Upon approval of the secondary plan for this neighbourhood, the neighbourhood specific design guidelines will be added as part of the area specific guidelines for Central Neighbourhoods. The guidelines for this neighbourhood are below.

2.4 Cultural Heritage Landscape Study and Implementation

The CHL Study was undertaken to determine how to best creatively conserve the historical integrity and early development pattern of our city, while encouraging new growth. Identifying historic places that blend the built and natural environment that have key ties to the events, people and activities that form the shape of our city were accounted through an inventory detailing these CHLs. A comprehensive summary of the findings and recommendations of this study for CHLs within the Midtown neighbourhood is below.
Introduction

Our cultural heritage resources provide a link to the past and are an expression of the City’s culture and history. They contribute in a significant way to Kitchener’s identity and unique character, and help instill civic pride, foster a sense of community and a sense of place. The conservation of cultural heritage resources also contributes to making our neighbourhoods a more interesting and appealing place to live, work and play.

The Province of Ontario, through the Provincial Policy Statement (a planning document that provides policy direction on matters of Provincial interest related to land use planning and development), requires that municipalities conserve significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs).

With this in mind, the conservation of cultural heritage resources has been an important consideration in work undertaken by the City as part of the comprehensive planning review of the Midtown Secondary Plan area. This work, which culminates in updating the policies and land use planning framework of the Midtown Secondary Plan, aims to encourage development and growth in a manner that is respectful of cultural heritage and contributes to making the neighbourhoods within this area unique and distinctive.

Built Heritage Resources

Built heritage resources are buildings and structures that may have either design/physical, historic/associative, or contextual heritage value. The designation and listing of heritage property on the Municipal Heritage Register is an important tool in the City’s efforts to conserve its built heritage resources.

Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act provides the strongest heritage protection available for conserving heritage resources, and allows a municipality to control proposals for demolition and alteration through a heritage permit system. While a “listed” property is afforded a more limited measure of protection, the City can require studies such as a heritage impact assessment and/or a conservation plan to guide the consideration of new development and identify measures to avoid or mitigate negative impacts to significant cultural heritage resources and attributes.
Currently, there are 16 built heritage resources within the Midtown Secondary Plan boundary and included on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register. Of these 16 properties, 1 is formally protected through a heritage designation under the Ontario Heritage Act, and 15 properties are “listed” as non-designated properties. Current designated and listed heritage properties within the Midtown Secondary Plan boundary are identified on Map 2.

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

While the City has long maintained a heritage register of significant built heritage resources, efforts to identify and conserve significant cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs) is a relatively new undertaking. In 2014, an inventory of 55 significant cultural heritage landscapes in Kitchener was established. Cultural heritage landscapes are defined in the Provincial Policy Statement as a geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples of cultural heritage landscapes include, but are not limited to, parks, main streets, cemeteries, trailways, industrial complexes, and neighbourhoods.

Within a cultural heritage landscape, there are often buildings, structures, landscape features and other attributes that collectively illustrate a historical theme. Themes considered to be significant are those that are essential to understanding the evolution of a City and that underpin its identity. The Kitchener CHL Study concluded that several established residential neighbourhoods that maintain a high degree of heritage integrity and are representative of the planning concepts and housing styles of the period in which they were developed, are worthy of being conserved.

The 2014 Kitchener CHL Study identifies the Gildner Green Neighbourhood and Gruhn Neighbourhood, Mount Hope Cemetery, Union Boulevard, Iron Horse Trail and Canadian National Railway Line as significant cultural heritage landscapes within the Midtown Secondary Plan area. Sections of other cultural heritage landscapes identified in the 2014 CHL Study are also located within the Midtown Secondary Plan boundary. These include a very small area of the Westmount Neighbourhood (East and West) CHL; part of the Warehouse District CHL; and a portion of the Mt. Hope/Breithaupt Neighbourhood CHL (see Map X). Consideration of these three latter CHLs will be addressed in future studies and will not form part of the CHL work being undertaken with the Midtown Secondary Plan.

The Gildner Green and Gruhn Neighbourhoods are two of the 12 established residential neighbourhoods of considerable value and significance identified in the study. The **Gilder Green** and **Gruhn Neighbourhoods** are representative of early, stable inner-residential neighbourhoods and are associated with the establishment of the rubber industry and subsequent urban
residential development in Kitchener in the early 20th century. The Gildner Green and Gruhn Neighbourhoods are important in maintaining the distinct character of the area and illustrate historic significance as turn of the century working class neighbourhoods.

**Mount Hope Cemetery** is the oldest active cemetery in the City with records dating back to the late 1700s. The cemetery is representative of the shift from early pioneer cemeteries and is associated with the Picturesque and Romantic movements in landscape design. The landscape is directly associated with individuals significant to the community who have been interred within the cemetery. The landscape is visually tied to the surrounding Mount Hope neighbourhood, supporting and evolving with the character of the area for over 150 years.

The various parts of Union Street are historically important because they were and remain, in part, the boundary between the cities of Waterloo and Kitchener. The oldest part of the street centres on King Street where late 19th century and early 20th century homes and institutions straddle the streetscape. The western portion, **Union Boulevard**, travels through the Westmount Neighbourhood.

Part of the Trans Canada Trail, the **Iron Horse Trail** represents a significant part of Kitchener and Waterloo’s heritage. The Iron Horse Trail today provides a scenic and historic route linking the two cities.

The **Canadian National Railway** through Kitchener was initially constructed as part of the Grand Trunk Railway. At Confederation (1867), the Grand Trunk Railway was the largest railway system in the world. The railway dramatically changed Kitchener, and today is much as it has always been since its mid-19th century construction. Commuters and visitors travelling to Kitchener see a combination of industrial and commercial districts and residential neighbourhoods from the rail line.

*Pages from 2014 Kitchener CHL Study on Gilder Green and Gruhn Neighbourhoods, Mount Hope Cemetery, Union Boulevard, Iron Horse Trail and Canadian National Railway Line*
L-NBR-12 Mi-Hope/Breahaupt Coldenr & Gruhn Neighbourhood

DESCRIPTION:
One of the things which can make a neighbourhood unique is consistency and integrity of its original purposes. The street pattern is based on the Mi-Hope Breahaupt Coldenr and Gruhn Neighbourhood is a simple grid plan. The streets are at right angles to each other. The lack of steep grades meant that homes were not restricted to the grade of the street front, and yards relatively flat. While most patrons are usually fixed, the quality of a residential neighbourhood can be determined by its long-term viability. In many neighborhoods in Kitchener, such as the Mi-Hope Breahaupt Coldenr and Gruhn Neighbourhood, houses were built as a result of the Great Depression. Many of these houses were constructed in 1939. Houses constructed in this period in Kitchener were consistently built at a cost that was too low, but very few changes were made over the next 60 years. The quality of the materials in this area in their construction, of brick with wood trim, of their design, which lead themselves to small and modern style families with substantial change and which, although variable within a range of styles, created a comfortable and pleasant environment for residents moving to nearby factories. This neighbourhood, the second in Kitchener, was built for families working in nearby factories built in virtually the same time and so the homes were within easy walk of the workplace. Public buildings in the form of a school, constructed in 1932, a church, built in 1932, and otherwise are all contemporary with the factories and homes. The result is a fairly high density area that has a consistent visual character, which is evident in the quality of construction of the houses, residents could feel a part of their neighborhood. Key issues for future development activity are to respect all existing and to renovate. While in this area is a limited range of design typical of the period, with minor variations in the form of porches, window placement, and roof design. The layout and spacing of the homes is very consistent, thus allowing an overall visually satisfying composition with a variety of the details. An approach that has become increasingly common in planning requirements is the past decades. The typical in two to three floors, vary in size and style, but residential use is evident in the lack of change that most have undergone over the past 60 years. As well, several buildings have been added over the years. This quality of an area is not evident in the lack of change that most have undergone over the past 60 years. As well, several buildings have been added over the years. This quality of an area is to the Mi-Hope Breahaupt Coldenr and Gruhn Neighbourhood, created a consistent appearance not to the Mi-Hope Breahaupt Coldenr and Gruhn Neighbourhood, created a consistent appearance.

L-CPE-1 Mount Hope Cemetery

DESCRIPTION:
The City of Kitchener operates many municipal cemeteries at the present time, including: Woodland Cemetery, Mount Hope Cemetery, Fairview Cemetery, West Bayview Cemetery, Woodside Cemetery, and Wasaga Beach Cemetery. Mount Hope Cemetery is the older settling with several different burial techniques used throughout the area. The original cemetery was located in the area of what is now known as Mount Hope Cemetery. There is an area of the cemetery that has been used for various purposes over the years. The area was originally a part of the Mount Hope Cemetery. The Cemetery was annexed, land sold to local property owners, and it was used for a variety of purposes. The area was later used for a variety of purposes. The area was later used for a variety of purposes.

LOCATION:
Located southeast of the Village of Mi-Hope Breahaupt Coldenr and Gruhn Neighbourhood.

Within the Described Boundary, There are:
- Designated Properties: 0
- Listed Properties: 0

ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL: YES

HISTORIC THEMES:
- Early/Middle-Period Residential Settlement
- Mid-17th Century
- 18th Century
- 19th Century
- 20th Century
- 21st Century

LANDSCAPE TYPE: Cemetery

KEY MAP:
**DESCRIPTION:**
The various parts of Union Street are functionally important because they were and remain, in part, the boundary between the City of Watertown and Webster. Currently, the combined street maintains the City on an unaligned alignment terminating in the west at the Webster Golf and Country Club and in the east just beyond Lafayette Street. The entire part of the street remains on King Street where late 19th and early 20th Century homes and institutions stud the landscape. It is from this portion of the street that it derives its name, Union Street, because it is here, first the two sides were then joined in the first part of the 19th Century. The western portion, Union Boulevard travels through the Webster neighborhood. The Webster Improvement Company extended the streets northward through the neighborhood between 1912 and 1913. The western part of the street was upgraded and used after World War II. The street was part of a farm that lined onto Bridgeport Road. The Union Street that passes through Webster Park, it can through a combination of the thoroughfare. The middle portion of Union to the City of Watertown and was developed in the 40s, 50s and 60s. The alignment of Union again reflects the same continuous street pattern characteristic of Webster Township. The vertical alignment rises and falls with the gently rolling topography of north east Webster. The exception to this is the alignment through Webster Park which is a hollow but does deliberately as part of the design of the neighborhood to add character to the planned community. Highlights along the street include an interesting section through Webster Park where it transitions the former townlands; the high point of land west of the street, the Grand River Hospital and life institutional campuses, the divided lanes through the Webster neighborhood terminating in the Webster Golf and Country Club.

**Landscape Type:** Transportation Corridor

**Archaeological Potential:**

**LOCATION:**
Located on crossing from Farm Road to Webster Road.

**Historic Themes:**
Transportation, Urban Development

**Within the Described Boundary, there are:**
- Designated HCDs: 2
- Designated Properties: 0
- Listed Properties: 0

---

**DESCRIPTION:**
The Iron Horse Trail is a significant part of the Webster Trail. It is the best known of the Putnam & Locke Street Electric Railway. The trail was built in 1902 by John Putnam of Hamilton and became operational on August 15th, 1905. The route started at the entrance to Webster and ran through Putnam Junction, Waverly, and some institutions. It was located on the Union Street in Watertown. It was operated under the name of the Putnam & Locke Street Electric Railway and shortly after when it was eliminated with the Putnam & Locke Street Railway. It was situated on the Grand River Railway in Webster. It was founded by the Grand River Railway (GRR) in Webster. The Putnam & Locke Street Railway was sold to the Grand River Railway in 1900 and the GRR took over the operation in 1905. The same year the Putnam & Locke Street Railway was closed. The trail was eventually closed in 1935. Today, the pedestrian trail runs west from the corner of grape, Granger Road and Gree Bridge Road in Watertown. The Iron Horse Trail not only connects downtown Webster to the putting golf course, it also connects Central Park to Webster Park. The Iron Horse Trail became a reality in 1990 when both Webster & Watertown formed a partnership to purchase the abandoned rail line and preserve it as an important part of the historic of both cities. The Iron Horse Trail today provides a scenic and historic view linking the two cities. The trail is maintained jointly by the City of Webster and the City of Watertown.

**Landscape Type:** Transportation Corridor

**Archaeological Potential:**

**LOCATION:**
Located on the alignment of the former Putnam & Locke Street Electric Railway. Webster's southern boundary road of Webster in Portage Park. The Key Map is below.
A Phased Approach to CHL Conservation

Taking stock and identifying the cultural heritage resources that are important to a community is a critical first step in any conservation strategy. For each CHL identified in the 2014 CHL Study, the study provides a description of the landscape; establishes a preliminary boundary of interest; identifies the historical integrity, and cultural and community values associated with the landscape; and finally, describes the character defining features of the CHL.

While the Study does not in itself protect CHLs, it serves as the first of three phases of work involved in establishing appropriate CHL conservation strategies for each landscape, as follows:

**Phase 1** – Establish an inventory of Significant CHLs and identify priority CHLs for further study and analysis.

**Phase 2** – Conduct fieldwork, analysis and property owner engagement in identifying heritage attributes and a preferred conservation strategy for select CHLs.

**Phase 3** – Implementation and management of a preferred CHL conservation strategy or strategies.

Phase 1 noted above is complete. Priority CHLs have been identified including the Gildner Green and Gruhn Neighbourhoods, Mount Hope Cemetery, Union Boulevard, Iron Horse Trail, and...
Canadian National Railway Line CHLs. Phase 2 is in progress for select priority CHLs. This includes work undertaken by City Planning staff in arriving at the cultural heritage policies included in this Secondary Plan. The timing associated with the third and final phase of the City’s CHL conservation strategy is in part dependent upon the nature and complexity of the strategies recommended for each CHL. Strategies affording the best protections are typically those governed by Provincial legislation such as the Ontario Heritage Act (e.g. heritage designation and listing of heritage property), and the Planning Act (e.g. Secondary Plan policies, assignment of appropriate land use and zoning, implementation of neighbourhood design guidelines).

Fieldwork and Analysis

Under a contract awarded by the City of Kitchener, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. and Dillon Consulting Ltd. carried out a Cultural Heritage Landscape Implementation (CHLI) study and report for the Midtown Secondary Plan area. The Midtown CHLI study and report undertaken by the consulting team involved the following:

- Historical research and a descriptive summary of previous work and the overarching legislative and policy framework for CHLs;
- Field survey, including confirmation of the presence of heritage attributes and CHL boundary delineation;
- Evaluation of significance, drafting Statements of Significance, and identification of heritage attributes adapted from the 2014 Kitchener CHL Study; and
- Conservation recommendations relating to each CHL boundary.

The full CHLI study and report can be retrieved from the City’s website under the Neighbourhood Planning Review page for the Midtown Secondary Plan.

Review of Land Use & Zoning

The consulting team reviewed existing land use designations and zoning assigned to property as part of the CHLI study, and identified where land use and associated zoning could conflict with CHL conservation interests (e.g. permitting a form of development that may not achieve an appropriate transition in scale with the existing historic low-rise character on certain residential streetscapes). This information was then considered in assigning land use designations which balance opportunities for growth and development with heritage conservation objectives.

Public Engagement & Comments
Information on resources and attributes of cultural heritage value or interest within the CHLs located in the Midtown Secondary Plan was made available to property owners and the public both online (on the City’s Neighbourhood Planning Review webpage) and at a public information meeting held in April 2019.

Specifically, information panels on existing (designated and listed) cultural heritage resources; attributes contributing to the CHL/neighbourhood character; and examples of planning legislative tools to achieve a level of conservation were made available for review and discussion.

Panels from April 18, 2019 Open House

Recommendations to address cultural heritage interests within the Midtown area

The CHLI Study involved a review of local policies and plans including the City’s Official Plan and Zoning By-law, the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Midtown and Central Plans, and the K-W Hospital Secondary Plan. Beyond the existing protections embedded in the City’s policies, plans and zoning, and the suggested policy consideratios, other measures are recommended to address the potential impacts identified and to ensure the conservation of cultural heritage resources.

Refinement of Boundaries
Based on the review of the cultural heritage resources examined as part of the consulting team’s analysis of the cultural heritage landscapes located within the Midtown Secondary Plan area, modifications to both the Gildner Green Neighbourhood and Gruhn Neighbourhood cultural heritage landscapes is proposed.

The rationale for the refinement of the Gildner Green Neighbourhood boundary is to capture and better reflect the areas of the landscape that have conserved the residential historic form and context of the neighbourhood.

The rationale for the boundary expansion of the Gruhn Neighbourhood is to capture more of the surrounding neighbourhood context and better reflect the conserved character and context of the residential streetscape. The larger boundary of the Gruhn Neighbourhood cultural heritage landscape allows for a more cohesive, less fractured conservation of the neighbourhood.

Map 1 shows the existing and revised boundaries of the Gildner Green and Gruhn Neighbourhood CHLs located within the Midtown Secondary Plan area.

*Gildner Green Neighbourhood Revised CHL Boundary (shown in red)*
Measures to be considered in the Midtown Secondary Plan

- Establish area design guidelines that support cultural heritage conservation objectives.

Area specific design guidelines applying to the Midtown Secondary Plan and to be considered in guiding and reviewing development and other Planning applications, should support and be consistent with heritage conservation interests and objectives. This would include adding design guidelines to encourage new development to reflect the desirable aspects of the established character of the Gildner Green Neighbourhood and Gruhn Neighbourhood, including front porches, gabled roofs, detached rear garages, and use of brick as the dominant building material.

These area specific design guidelines are also applicable to areas adjacent to Mount Hope Cemetery and Union Boulevard to help guide future infill development, streetscape element improvements, and the preservation of existing character within these CHLs.

Recommend undertaking of Strategic Conservation Plan for Mount Hope Cemetery

One of the additional conservation measures recommended in the CHLI Study is to undertake a Strategic Conservation Plan for the Mount Hope Cemetery. The purpose of a Strategic
Conservation Plan is to guide the development, conservation, maintenance and management of this cultural heritage resource. This may be undertaken as part of a Master Plan and include a heritage tree inventory to determine heritage tree designations within the cemetery, and sensitive planning, evaluation and design of the PARTS Midtown Plan feature of cycling paths through the cemetery.

- **Identify Property of Specific CHL Interest, where a Heritage Impact Assessment may be required for CHL conservation**

Currently, as part of the assessment of proposed development impact on built heritage resources, and as referenced in the Provincial Policy Statement under the Planning Act, the City may require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for planning applications potentially impacting a cultural heritage resource located on property that is designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, and on property located adjacent to protected (designated) heritage property. The City’s Official Plan also states that the City may require the submission of a HIA for development, redevelopment and site alteration that has the potential to impact an identified cultural heritage landscape.

It is recommended that within the Midtown Secondary Plan area, that the City have the ability to require a HIA for planning and development applications having the potential to impact property identified as being of specific CHL interest. Such properties are identified on Map 2 and include the following:

- Protected heritage property designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- Property “listed” on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register under Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- Property identified as being of cultural heritage interest and recommended for listing on the Municipal Heritage Register (until such time as a decision is made by Council on listing the property); and
- Property located adjacent to protected and listed heritage property.

Where development is proposed on property that is of specific CHL interest but not designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, then such HIA can be expected to be scoped and limited in review to assess visual and contextual impact.

**Measures to be considered under the Official Plan**

- Union Boulevard should be designated under the City’s Official Plan as a heritage corridor.
- The Iron Horse Trail should be designated under the City’s Official Plan as a heritage corridor.
• Gildner Green Neighbourhood, Gruhn Neighbourhood, Mount Hope Cemetery, Union Boulevard, Iron Horse Trail, and Canadian National Railway Line to be identified on Map 9 in the Official Plan as Cultural Heritage Landscapes.

Measures to be considered under the Ontario Heritage Act

• Existing built heritage resources designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and listed as non-designated property on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register shall be conserved.

• The following additional property is identified as being of cultural heritage interest and should be further reviewed and considered for listing on the Municipal Heritage Register through the City’s 4-step listing process:
  o 40 Linwood Avenue/175 Moore Avenue (Mount Hope Cemetery).
### 3.0 Process Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td>Staff begins Neighbourhood Planning Reviews and commences the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan. This review incorporates the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017/18 - May 2018</strong></td>
<td>Staff prepare material with relation to specific neighbourhood character topics to present to the public for feedback about what works well within their community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| April 18, 2019 | **Public Open House #1**  
  Staff present information in an open house setting with the draft land use designations and zones for the neighbourhood. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit any further comments by comment form or through e-mail following the meeting. |
| April 2019 – December 2019 | Public comments are received and reviewed by Staff. Updated draft maps for land use and zoning are finalized. Final recommendations for this secondary plan will be brought forward to council in Fall/Winter 2019. |
| September – October 2019 | Internal City Staff review of all draft secondary plan policies and mapping. |
| October 11, 2019 | All property owners within the Secondary Plan area are sent notice of a Statutory Public Meeting. |
| December 9, 2019 | **Public Information Meeting #2**  
  Staff present all draft maps for six secondary plans, including land use and zoning maps for Midtown. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit final comments by comment form or e-mail following the meeting. |
| December 2019 | Staff conduct a final review of all secondary plan maps with public comments received and prepare a report for council. Final draft maps are finalized. |
| **Spring 2020** | **Secondary Plans Report to Committee/Council** |
4.0 Public Consultation Materials for Open House #1

Notice of Open House
Staff Presentation
Information Panels/Maps
Handout
Cultural Heritage Landscape Implementation Summary
Scanned Sign In Sheets
Scanned Comment Forms
Public Comments Received by Email
March 28, 2019

Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

RE: Public Open House – Neighbourhood Specific Secondary Plan Review
K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan
Process of Applying Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations

The City would like to formally invite you to participate in the Neighbourhood Planning Review of the City’s Secondary Plans. We are commencing the review of the K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan and in the process of applying new Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations. See location map below for the boundary of this study area.

A Public Open House is scheduled as outlined below:

**WHEN:** Thursday, April 18, 2019
6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. (Drop-in format)
Brief Staff Presentation to Provide Background and Describe Process - 6:45 pm
**LOCATION:** Victoria Park Pavilion - 80 Schneider Ave
An updated land use framework within the City’s Secondary Plan areas was deferred as part of the review of our new 2014 Official Plan. The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters. The Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study. The City is now reviewing the Secondary Plans and in the process of applying new Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations.

As a result of the background studies and work that has been done, a small portion of lands from Map 3 – Land Use in the City’s Official Plan are proposed to be merged with the new K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan.

Draft Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations have been applied to the properties in the boundary of the study area for your consideration and review at the Open House scheduled for April 18th, 2019.

Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you on April 18th, 2019!

Information shared at the Open House will be made available online (posted on the project website after the meeting). If you are unable to attend this meeting, you are welcome to view the posted materials and provide your input through the project website: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR or to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Yours truly,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner – Policy

c. Brandon Sloan, Manager, Long Range and Policy Planning
   Alain Pinard, Director of Planning
   Councillor Debbie Chapman
   Councillor Sarah Marsh
Neighbourhood Specific Planning Review
Proposed K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan

Open House
April 18, 2019
Agenda and Format

6:30 p.m.  Arrival, Sign-in

Rotating around room with individual opportunity to review the panels, write down information and ideas and discuss project review with staff

6:45 p.m.  Overview Presentation

Rotating around room with individual opportunity to review the panels, write down information and ideas and discuss project review with staff

8:30 p.m.  Conclusion – Thank you for attending

Have a great night!
Background

- The Secondary Plans were deferred as part of the new Official Plan (2014)
  - Station Area Planning – PARTS Midtown Plan and PARTS Central Plan
  - Urban Design Guidelines
  - Cultural Heritage Landscape Implementation Study
  - RIENS Study
Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study – PARTS Midtown Plan

B.1 Land Use Plan

Following the creation, evaluation and public review of various Alternative Scenarios, a Preferred Scenario evolved and was refined based on a series of technical considerations and feedback. The Key Directions and Strategies from the Land Use and Built Form, Mobility and Public Realm sections culminated in this final Land Use Plan. A description of the key characteristics, potential building heights and built form density for each of the different land use designations are provided on the opposite page.

This Land Use Plan helps achieve the vision and objectives for the PARTS Midtown area and it provides a wide range of uses at densities that can be transit/LRT-supportive, which will help contribute to a healthy and complete community. These land uses will be implemented through the City’s Official Plan and Zoning By-law and may require some site-specific treatment related to uses or built form/density.

Map Legend

- Study Area Boundary
- Focus Area Boundary
- ION Line & Stops
- Mixed-Use High Density
- Mixed-Use Medium Density
- Mixed-Use Low Density
- Commercial
- Innovation Employment
- Institutional
- Established Low-Rise Residential
- Low Rise Residential
- Medium Rise Residential
- High Rise Residential
- Parks
- Open Spaces
- Active Frontage
- Site Specific Policy Area
PARTS Midtown Plan – Public Realm Framework

KEY DIRECTIONS

1. Enhance the King Street streetscape.
2. Introduce an urban square as part of the redevelopment of the King / Union parking lot.
3. Introduce streetscape improvements to enhance the character of Glasgow Street.
4. Improve & enhance the Park Street experience.
5. Enhance the KW Collegiate & Vocational School playing fields as a broader community asset.
6. Encourage the provision of new park and trail connections south of Glasgow Street.
7. Incorporate opportunities for stormwater management LID in all new parks and public spaces.

The Public Realm Framework Map Legend

- Study Area Boundary
- Focus Area Boundary
- ION Line & Stops
- King Street Streetscape
- Park Street Streetscape
- Glasgow Street Streetscape
- Existing Park Space
- Proposed New Park Space
- Existing Open Space / Cemetery
- Proposed New Open Space
- Waterloo Region District School Board Playing Fields
- Existing Street Tree Locations
- Proposed Street Trees

Scale (approx.): 400m
KEY DIRECTIONS

1. Introduce a new street and block pattern northeast of King Street.
2. Improve the cycling network and enhance connectivity between existing trail systems.
3. Reinforce Glasgow Street's role as a connective street.
4. Develop a parking strategy.
5. Transform Mount Hope Street Into A Complete Street.

The Mobility Framework Map Legend

Study Area Boundary
Focus Area Boundary
ION Line & Stops
Proposed Streets
Proposed Lanes
Active Transportation Network (existing)
Active Transportation Network (proposed)
Pedestrian Connection (proposed)
Trucks/Servicing Route
Bike Share Station (proposed)
Indicates areas where the provision of bike share facilities over time could help to support travel between the LRT station and destinations within the station area.

Shared Parking (proposed)
Indicates potential areas for future structured shared parking considerations.

Priority Crossings
Indicates areas where intersection improvements such as enhanced markings and reduced curb radii should be directed to enhance the safety of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the street.
Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study – PARTS Central Plan

5.0 Preferred Plan

Land Use Map

Urban Growth Centre
- City Centre District
- Civic District
- Innovation District
- Market District
- Innovation Employment
- Institutional
- Mixed Use
- High Density
- Medium Density
- Low Density
- Residential
- High Rise
- Medium Rise
- Low Rise
- Park
- Natural Heritage
- Two-Zone Policy Area (Floodplain)
- Iron Horse Trail
- Site-Specific Policy Area
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For reference: do not scale.
Identification of 55 Cultural Heritage Landscapes across the City
Cultural Heritage Landscape Implementation

[Map showing various areas and boundary lines, including study area boundary, Kitchener Western Plan Boundary, and ARA.]
• In a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans through a process called a Neighbourhood Specific Planning Review
• The implementation of various studies; i.e. PARTS, CHLS, RIENS
• Now reviewing the existing K-W Hospital Neighbourhood Secondary Plan
Secondary Plan (1994 Official Plan)
Proposed Boundary
Proposed Changes to Map 3 – Land Use
### Land Uses Visualization

#### Low Rise Residential with specific policy area
- **DESCRIPTION:** Same as low rise residential land use, however specific policy area may limit some of the dwelling types that will be permitted and will limit the number of units in a dwelling to 2 units. Consideration will also be given to further regulating garages, building height and density. Analysis to be completed to confirm the properties to which the specific policy area will apply.

#### Low Rise Residential
- **DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** low density housing types, including single detached dwellings, duplex dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, and where appropriate and compatible, other low density dwelling types such as street townhouse dwellings and small-scale multiple dwellings.
- **FSR:** maximum of 0.6
- **MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT:** 3 storeys (4 if onto a Regional Rd or City Arterial St)

#### Medium Rise Residential
- **DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** medium density housing types including townhouse dwellings in a cluster development, multiple dwellings, and special needs housing.
- **FSR:** minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 2.0
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** 8 storeys

#### High Rise Residential
- **DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** high density multiple dwellings and special needs housing to achieve a high intensity of residential use.
- **FSR:** minimum of 2.0 / maximum of 4.0
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** none

#### Institutional
- **DESCRIPTION:** These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature.
- **RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** secondary and post-secondary educational facilities, long-term care facilities, social, cultural, and administrative facilities, small-scale institutional uses compatible with surrounding uses such as public and private elementary schools, libraries, day care centers, and places of worship.

#### Open Space
- **DESCRIPTION:** These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.
- **RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation, Community Facility and Cemeteries

#### Mixed Use
- **DESCRIPTION:** Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.
- **RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** retail, office uses, daycare, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.
- **FSR:** minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 4.0
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** None

#### Mixed Use with specific policy areas
- **MAXIMUM NON-RES. GROSS FLOOR AREA:**
  - for SP. 2: 7,500 sq.m.
  - for SP. 3: 10,000 sq.m.
- **FSR:**
  - for SP. 2 & 3: minimum of 0.6 / a maximum of 2.0
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:**
  - for SP. 2: 24 m.
  - for SP. 3: 32 m.
  - for SP. 4: 18 m.
  - for SP. 5: 24 m closer to residential areas and unlimited height fronting King St
  - for SP. 7: 18 m closer to residential areas and unlimited height fronting King St

#### Innovation Employment
- **DESCRIPTION:** Recognizes a growing demand for employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers’. Predominantly office and high-tech manufacturing.
- **RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** creative production industries, artisan’s establishment, studio (art and music), craftsman shop, live/work space, shared facilities, galleries, studios, office space for creative professionals, and retail sales associated with production of goods and materials.
- **FSR:** minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 2.0
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** 6 storeys
Proposed Zoning
# Proposed Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a limited range of low density dwelling types in low rise areas.</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling, Second Dwelling Unit, Hospice, Small Residential Care Facility</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>3.4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling, Second Dwelling Unit, Semi Detached Dwelling, Street Townhouse Dwelling, Fourplex, Hospice, Small Residential Care Facility</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>The site specific may limit height and FSR depending on property context and heritage attributes (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling, Second Dwelling Unit, Semi Detached Dwelling, Street Townhouse Dwelling, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Multiple Dwelling, Lodging House, Hospice, Small Residential Care Facility, Large Residential Care Facility</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas.</td>
<td>Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Multiple Dwelling, Lodging House, Hospice, Large Residential Care Facility</td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Office, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-7</td>
<td>Accommodate high density dwelling types and a range of complementary non-residential uses in high rise residential areas.</td>
<td>Multiple Dwelling, Lodging House, Hospice, Large Residential Care Facility</td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Health Office, Office, Personal Services, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 2.0 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics
- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations
# Proposed Non-Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>INS-1</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses intended to serve surrounding residential communities</td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Auditorium, Cemetery, Community Centre, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Health Office, Hospice, Place of Worship, Residential Care Facility, Elementary School</td>
<td>4 Storeys (Max. height – 14 metres)</td>
<td>Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INS-1 (Sp. 8)</td>
<td>Uses allowed in INS-1 plus Commercial School, Multiple dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Research and Development Establishment, and Restaurant (permitted only as accessory to a Community Facility or a Cultural Facility). Shared/reduced parking rates to be studied through a future site specific study. Uses permitted in existing buildings and/or any approved additions/modifications only</td>
<td>Auditorium, Cemetery, Community Centre, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Funeral Home, Health Office, Hospice, Place of Worship, Residential Care Facility Large, Secondary School, Health Clinic, Health Office, Hospital, Post-Secondary School, Social Service Establishment</td>
<td>A base shall be required for buildings greater than 14 metres in height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INS-2</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses that are intended to serve a region and/or city-wide population</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Commercial Entertainments, Commercial School, Community Facility, Computer, Electronic, Data Processing or Server Establishment, Craftperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Print Shop, Research and Development, Restaurant, Retail, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services, Large Residential Care Facility, Payday Loan Establishment, Post-Secondary School</td>
<td>8 Storey</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>MIX-4 (Sp.2)</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Uses allowed in MIX-2 plus Large Residential Care Facility, Payday Loan Establishment, Post-Secondary School</td>
<td>10 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (Sp.3)</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (Sp.4)</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings at a high density within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-3</td>
<td>Max. height – 18 metres</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (Sp.5 &amp; 7)</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-3</td>
<td>Unlimited height fronting King St. and limited height to 18 or 24 metres closer to residential areas</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation Employment</strong></td>
<td>MIX-4 (Sp.6)</td>
<td>Accommodate the employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers.’</td>
<td>Church on Green is MIX-4 with site specific to have minimum 25% institutional use in existing building</td>
<td>6 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>Accommodate comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system</td>
<td>Outdoor active recreation, outdoor passive recreation and cemeteries</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics
- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations
Overview of Information Provided this Evening – Your Feedback and Comments

- Sign-In and General Information
- Neighbourhood Planning Review Process
- Existing and Proposed Land Use and Zoning
- PARTS, Zoning Details and Urban Design
Process/Next Steps

• Work has begun on the review of the K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan
• This is the first Open House/Engagement Session on the preliminary work
• Will collect and consider the comments and feedback from the Open House materials
• Urban Design Charrette – May 2019
• Revisions to the land use designation and zoning
• Further consultation/engagement
• Committee/Council consideration late Fall 2019?
FOR ONGOING AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION on this project or to provide written comments at any time, please view the City’s website at: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR

Email comments to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca

or contact the Project Manager
Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Project Manager/Senior Planner
519-741-2200 x7765 (TTY:1-866-969-9994)
tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
## K-W Hospital/Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan – Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Description / Range of Permitted Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Low density housing types, including single detached dwellings, duplex dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, and where appropriate and compatible, other low density dwelling types such as street townhouse dwellings and small-scale multiple dwellings. FSR: Maximum of 0.6 MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 3 storeys (4 if onto a Regional Rd or City Arterial St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rise Residential</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Medium density housing types including townhouse dwellings in a cluster development, multiple dwellings, and special needs housing. FSR: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0 MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 8 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise Residential</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: High density multiple dwellings and special needs housing to achieve a high intensity of residential use. FSR: Minimum of 2.0 / Maximum of 4.0 MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION: These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature. RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Secondary and Post-Secondary Educational Facilities; Long-Term Care Facilities; Social, Cultural, and Administrative Facilities; small-scale institutional uses compatible with surrounding uses such as Public and Private Elementary Schools, Libraries, Day Care Centers, and Places of Worship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION: These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner. RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation, Community Facility and Cemeteries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION: Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building. RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Retail, Office Uses, Day Care, Health Office/Clinic, Personal Services, Religious Institutions, Commercial Entertainment, Restaurants, Studio, Artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential. FSR: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 4.0 MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Employment</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION: Recognizes a growing demand for employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers’. Predominantly office and high-tech manufacturing. RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Creative Production Industries, Artisan’s Establishment, Studio (art and music), Craftmans Shop, Live/Work Space, Shared Facilities, Galleries, Studios, Office Space for Creative Professionals, and retail sales associated with production of goods and materials. FSR: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0 MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 6 storeys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Proposed Residential (RES) Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a limited range of low density dwelling types in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Residential Uses" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Residential Uses" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Residential Uses" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site specific may limit height and FSR depending on property context and heritage attributes (TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Residential Uses" /></td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Office, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-7</td>
<td>Accommodate high density dwelling types and a range of complementary non-residential uses in high rise residential areas.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Residential Uses" /></td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Health Office, Office, Personal Services, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 2.0 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
### Proposed Non-Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>MIX-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings at a high density within the City's Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan's Establishment, Brewpub, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Community Facility, Day Care Facility, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Craftsperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Payday Loan Establishment, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Post-Secondary School, Print Shop, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Retail, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIX-4 (SP.2)</strong></td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>8 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIX-4 (SP.3)</strong></td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>10 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIX-4 (SP.4)</strong></td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>Max. height – 18 metres</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIX-4 (SP.5 &amp; 7)</strong></td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>Unlimited height fronting King St. and limited height to 18 or 24 metres closer to residential areas</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIX-4 (SP.6)</strong></td>
<td>Church on Green is MIX-4 with site specific to have minimum 25% institutional use in existing building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>INS-1</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses intended to serve surrounding residential communities.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan's Establishment, Cemetery, Community Facility, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Elementary School, Funeral Home, Health Office, Hospice, Large Residential Care Facility, Place of Worship, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment</td>
<td>4 Storeys (Max. height – 14 metres)</td>
<td>Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INS-1 (SP. 8)</strong></td>
<td>Uses allowed in INS-1 plus Commercial School, Multiple dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Research and Development Establishment, and Restaurant (permitted only as accessory to a Community Facility or a Cultural Facility). Shared/reduced parking rates to be studied through a future site specific study. Uses permitted in existing buildings and/or any approved additions/modifications only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INS-2</strong></td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses that are intended to serve a region and/or city-wide population.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan's Establishment, Cemetery, Community Facility, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Elementary School, Funeral home, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hospital, Large Residential Care Facility, Place of Worship, Post-Secondary School, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment</td>
<td>A base shall be required for buildings greater than 14 metres in height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation Employment</strong></td>
<td>EMP-7</td>
<td>Accommodate the employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers’.</td>
<td>Creative Production Industries, Artisan's Establishment, Studio (Art and Music), Craftsman Shop, Live/Work Space, Galleries, Studios, Office Space For Creative Professionals, High-Tech Manufacturing, Retail Sales associated with High-Tech Manufacturing</td>
<td>6 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>Accommodate comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system.</td>
<td>Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation and Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.
* Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
Heritage Attributes
Gildner Green Neighbourhood

- Well-maintained residential structures representing a significant range of architectural styles dating from the early 1900s (i.e. Edwardian, Tudor Revival)
- Attractive and consistent public realm linked by the streetscapes, mature trees and the urban cross section with grass boulevards
- Early 20th century street pattern characterized by a simple grid with some slightly radiating streets, including Wood, Gildner and Glasgow Streets
- Public street trees and private front yard trees (images 1 and 2)
- Two-lane paved secondary roads (image 2)
- Common housing design characteristics (front porches, front gable and centre gable roofs, detached rear yard garages, brick and stucco cladding) (images 3-5)
- Houses set on an angle to one another on the streets that radiate from the grid pattern (image 4)
- Gildner Green Park (image 6)
- Views (images 4, 7-9)
- Gently rolling topography
- Primarily two to two-and-a-half storey residential structures
- Consistent street edge with shallow front yard and exterior side yard setbacks
- Consistent lot sizes and coverage of residential properties

1 2 3
4 5 6
7 8 9
Heritage Attributes
Gruhn Neighbourhood

- Many well-maintained modest residential structures representing a significant range of architectural styles dating from the early 1900s (i.e. Edwardian, Tudor Revival)
- Attractive and consistent public realm linked by the streetscapes, mature trees and the urban cross section with grass boulevards
- Street pattern characterized by roadways radiating diagonally from Glasgow Street
- Gently rolling topography
- Primarily one-and-a-half to two-and-a-half storey residential structures
- Grouping of five similar one-and-a-half storey properties on Gruhn Street (image 1)
- Calvary Memorial United Church (image 2)
- Public street trees and private front yard trees (image 3)
- Views (images 4-6)
- Two-lane paved secondary roads (image 6)
- Common housing design characteristics (front porches, front gable and centre gable roofs, detached rear yard garages, brick or appearance of brick cladding) (image 7)
- Public park (image 8)
- Concrete sidewalks pressed with street names (image 9)
- Consistent street edge with shallow front yard and exterior side yard setbacks
- Consistent lot sizes and coverage of residential properties
Heritage Attributes
Mount Hope Cemetery

- Pre-European settlement landform
- Mature trees exceeding 100 years old
- Gravesites of early pioneers and influential citizens
- Stone entrance gates (images 1 and 2)
- Views from outside the cemetery of entrances toward the cemetery (images 1 and 2)
- Metal perimeter fencing (image 3)
- System of drives and pathways with Romantic and Picturesque movement influences (image 4)
- Views within the cemetery to mature trees and gravestones (images 5 and 6)
- Maintenance building (former cemetery office building) (image 7)
- War memorials (image 8)
- Collection of gravestones (image 9)
Heritage Attributes

Union Boulevard
- Curvilinear alignment
- Gently rolling topography
- Grand River Hospital and Sunlife Financial institutional campus
- Centre grass boulevards
- Decorative street lamps
- View looking south down Union Boulevard
- View looking north up Union Boulevard

Canadian National Railway Line
- Industrial and commercial districts and residential neighbourhoods along the rail line
- Varied mixture of vegetation and open space along alignment
- Historic alignment of the Canadian National Railway Line

Iron Horse Trail
- Alignment along former right-of-way of the original Preston and Berlin Railway
- Connection of Victoria Park and Waterloo Park
- Vegetation
- Preservation of views of original rail corridor
- Trail signage
- Remnant commemorative railway infrastructure
**Official Plan:** A long-term planning document, which contains policies and plans related to land use for a 20-year time horizon for the city as a whole. The Official Plan gets direction from and must conform to Provincial and Regional policies. A new Official Plan for the City was approved on November 19, 2014.

The Secondary Plans were deferred as part of the approval of the 2014 Official Plan to allow for the completion of background studies that would provide direction regarding appropriate land use and policy framework in the Secondary Plan areas.

**Secondary Plans:** Are contained in the City’s Official Plan and contain land use policies and mapping which provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city.

These plans guide the use of land such as where housing, commercial businesses, institutional uses and parks should be located and provide policies for new development or redevelopment.

The KW-Hospital Secondary Plan is just over 25 years old and needs to be updated. To help implement new directions from the Province, Region, City and other agencies, we are evaluating and updating the existing Secondary Plans to create new ones.

**Urban Design Guidelines:** As part of the Neighbourhood Secondary Planning process that is currently underway for the KW-Hospital area, City staff will be developing a set of neighbourhood specific urban design guidelines in addition to the draft urban design guidelines for ‘Residential Infill in Central Neighbourhoods’.

These guidelines will address things like building placement, suggested setbacks, garage location/projections, landscaping, building design and massing, and other aspects of design and place making unique to the neighbourhood.

**Zoning By-law:** Establishes and regulates the use of land by implementing the policies of our Official Plan and the Urban Design Guidelines, including:

- Permitted use of land;
- Height and location of structures;
- Lot size;
- Density of development; and,
- Parking requirements.

**Background studies supporting KW-Hospital Secondary Plan:**

- Planning Around Rapid Transit Station - PARTS Midtown and Central Plan: These Plans reviewed the following, in and around the stations stops (Completion date: December, 2017):
  - Lands uses;
  - Mobility;
• Public Realm; and,
  • Technical considerations and Implementation.

• Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS) (Completion date: December, 2014):
  o Provided a working inventory of the City of Kitchener’s cultural heritage landscapes which serves as a planning tool in the assessment and management of these resources as the community changes and evolves.

• Cultural Heritage Implementation Study (CHLI) within K-W Hospital area (Completion date: March, 2019):
  o The study looked at Cultural Heritage Landscapes located within the KW Hospital Secondary. Plan to identify heritage attributes and recommend conservation measures to preserve neighbourhood character and the identified heritage attributes.

• Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS) (Completion date: February, 2017):
  o The report looked at the planning approval process for development in established neighbourhoods.
  o The report contained recommendations to support appropriate and compatible infill.

Next Steps:

• Preparing land use and zoning maps based on the recommendations from the background studies and reports
• Presenting proposed Land Use and Zoning for public feedback (April 8th, 2019)  
  We are here
• KW-Hospital Secondary Plan Urban Design Charrette (May, 2019) will provide:
  o An opportunity for public to visualize the proposed build form due to upcoming changes; and,
  o A direction for zoning by-law and built form.
• Consider public feedback, technical reports and make changes accordingly
• Finalize land use, zoning and related polices and present it to the council
• More information can be found on the City’s website https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR
• Feedback and comments can be emailed here secondaryplans@kitchener.ca
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74 Gruhn Ave Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Herbert St.</td>
<td>N9A 3R6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64 Gilmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84 York St</td>
<td>N2G 1T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513 Kirkhead</td>
<td>NA0X9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>780 51 Cherry Hill Pl. Fergus</td>
<td>N1W 3T9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 BRAUN St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298 Park St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SIGN-IN SHEET

**KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**  
April 18, 2019

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>540 Brimmans Centre Drive, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 2H2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Gildner St, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 1N1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>330 Park St, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 1N1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133 Elm Ridge Drive</td>
<td>N2N1J 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 Glasgow Street</td>
<td>N2G 2R8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Highview Pl, Kit</td>
<td>N2N 1W8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Alfred St Kit</td>
<td>N2H 3R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139 Union St E, Waterloo</td>
<td>N2J 1C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2186 Lonsdale Rd.</td>
<td>NOB 1M0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>471 Braun</td>
<td>N2H 3R3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89 Wood St</td>
<td>N2G 2H7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 Mary St</td>
<td>N2H 3R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86 Glasgow St</td>
<td>N2G 2G7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>385 Duke St LD</td>
<td>N2H 3Y4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tedparkinson98@gmail.com">tedparkinson98@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>N2H 3M7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:allwardrop@gmail.com">allwardrop@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>N2H 5Z9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Pine St</td>
<td>N2H 527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>456s50 e</td>
<td>N2H 164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 Agnes Street, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 2M9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 Aberdeen St, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 5R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93 Water St</td>
<td>N2G 1S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Mary St</td>
<td>N2H 3P9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>269 UNION BLVD KIT</td>
<td>N2M 2S9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Pine St.</td>
<td>N0H 2G7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 MT. Hope St.</td>
<td>N2G 2J5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Eden Ave Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 1W1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Louisa St, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2H 5L8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Gladstone, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 2G6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298 Park St. Kitchener</td>
<td>N2H 3V9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>Phone Number*</td>
<td>E-mail Address*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Braun St.</td>
<td>N2H 3R8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66 Braun St.</td>
<td>N2H 3R4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89 Griffin St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137 Walter St.</td>
<td>N2G-1S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199 Strange St.</td>
<td>N2G-1R7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>286 Strange St.</td>
<td>N2G-1R6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>172 Strange Street</td>
<td>N2G 1R6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53 Shanley St.</td>
<td>N2H 5V7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 Mary St., Kitchener</td>
<td>N2H 3R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110 Strange St., Kitcher</td>
<td>N2G 1R3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 Aikin Ave</td>
<td>N2C 2N2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>524 Kingsley W</td>
<td>N2G 1G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 Louis St.</td>
<td>N2H 5J8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Howard St., Kit</td>
<td>N2H 3R6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77 Wellington S</td>
<td>N2G 2E6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SIGN-IN SHEET

**KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**  
**April 18, 2019**

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 Gildner Street, Kitchener</td>
<td>N3G 2H4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124 Walter St</td>
<td>N2G 1S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>507 Park St</td>
<td>N2G 1N8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MHBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MHBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>304 Park St.</td>
<td>N2G 1N1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>209 Carnegie Ave</td>
<td>N420C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C/O Grand River Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84 GRUHN ST. Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 1S6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298 Park St. Kitchener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 DOMINION ST</td>
<td>N2G 2G2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 MARY ST.</td>
<td>N2H 3R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 Gzheimer ST</td>
<td>N2G 2H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 Victoria St S, Suite 201</td>
<td>N2G 4Y9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 Shawley</td>
<td>N2H 5WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 York St.</td>
<td>N2G 1T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133 Walters St</td>
<td>N2G 153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
Write your additional comments here:

Where the medium rise building at the end of Brown St, we put a park. Green spaces needed!

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 41 Barry St
Email: [Redacted]
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

SOUNDS GOOD

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

I'M FINE WITH IT.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

I CAN'T THINK OF ANYTHING AT THE MOMENT. I LIKE THE WAY IT IS.
Write your additional comments here:

Parkland where the parking lot on Pine St. is located would be nice. I like that idea. I don't want any mid-high rises in this area. I'm OK with mid-rise mixed use on King by the LRT. Cafes and boutique shops would be nice.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 60 HERBERT ST, KITCHENER N2H 3R6
Email: [Redacted]
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?  
   Reasonable and well thought out. Love green space on Pine St.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?  
   Well done!

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
   Preserve neighbourhood communities by incorporating green space.
Write your additional comments here:

Love the plan for Pine St and expansion of soccer field to create park space. Given the development of King St. and lack of park space in the neighborhood this green space is a welcome addition. Shoppers, students, hospital visitors, and patients would use the space. Love, love, love!

I was concerned that the intensification would disregard the need for green space. That was not case! Bravo!

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 55 Pine St, Kitchener, ON N2H 5Z7
Email: [Redacted]
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Hello,
I am a property owner/manager at 800 King St W. I noticed that the plan reduces our current floor space ratio from 4:1 down to 2:1. This reduces the amount of buildable space by half, and therefore makes it far less likely that the space would be developed. The FSR should stay at 4:1, especially since the plan proposes a mid-rise building/zoning in the back of our parking lot. The Midtown Midtown Lots at 648 King St W are 6 floors very close to 2 floor houses (beside and across the street). Also, a tall structure at 800 would not have shadow impact on houses around it. Restriction should be by height, not by reducing FSR.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 135 Union St. E, Waterloo, N2J 1C4
Email: [Redacted]
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   The proposed uses seem to be in keeping w. the current neighborhoods.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   Keeping the actual re-zoning to the major streets - Part -
   Glasgow, Green. Kink is good but there seems to be a need to have some depth down the side streets. Wood,
   Gildner, Mt. Hope, Erbwen.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?
   Not an expert ... some thinking required to answer more intellectually.
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

How do we change our zonings from R3 to institutional adjacent to labours institutional zonings?

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Blank]
Mailing Address: 3 Gildner St.
Email: [Blank]
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

Agree with the proposed land use designations and preservation of R6-3 low density areas

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

Zoning seems reasonable to preserve existing architecture from intensification, CTH designation also helps with this plan as it was what drew us to the neighborhood

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

- Strictly regulate parking lot density for surface parking ie Sun Life, Catalyst
- Have a public consult on Heritage guidelines
- Have a public consult on Streetscape to establish neighbourhood master plans & incorporate neighbourhood associations
- Ensure architecturally significant structures such as Air Bags/Offices of Sacred Heart & ElectraOne are maintained & not fallen to ruin through disrepair or vagrancy/graffiti abandonment

KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

Looking for clarification on proposed use of Glasgow as "Connecting" road & impact on Traffic density and amenity.

Also looking for clarification on Glasgow Streetscape plan and effect on traffic calming, Boulevard sizes, road speed limit (should be 40 due to pedestrian crossings for Salithis & Iron Horse), limiting truck access, etc.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: 

Mailing Address: 86 Glasgow Street

Email: 

KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   
   Park space for neighborhood use on Pine St is excellent!

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   Keep higher buildings along King St and green space with residential zone.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighborhood character?

   If park space is not an option, then keep it low residential housing.
I really like the additional green space that is planned for Pine St. (between Mary and Herbert) that is the current location of a parking lot.

Keeping the multi-use/multi-story buildings at the King St. frontage is a good plan as well as it keeps the Mary/Pine/Herbert St. residential community relatively unaffected by large buildings, respecting the adjacent heritage area. Our neighborhood is very close-knit and a wonderful community in an inner-city environment. I very much value the addition of park space for us to use, as could people at the hospital.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 34 Pine St, Kitchener N2H 5Z9
Email: [Redacted]
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   
   I think they look good.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   
   I am satisfied with the zoning. I like the idea of mixed use around the LRT so there can be more little shops, cafes, repurposing old buildings with residences and offices.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?
   
   Not sure.
Write your additional comments here:

I like the green space plans for the parking lot and football field on Pine St. I think removal of all the fencing would be nice so we could all use it.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 54 Pine St, Kitchener, ON, N2H 6A1
Email: [Redacted]
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

I LIKE THE PROPOSAL OF GREEN SPACE ON PINE ST

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

MIXED COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS WOULD GET MORE PEOPLE USING THE AREA ON FOOT
I like the Mary St extension plan with the Pine St parking lot conversion to green space. With the development of the sports field to a multi-use park, I see these items as a huge benefit to the community.
Good morning Brenda,

Thanks for your interest and participation in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review process.

We have logged you feedback and will be considered moving forward.

Also, we have included your contact information on our notification list to keep you informed of any upcoming project announcements.

If you have any question or would like to discuss the review process or background key studies, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,
Preet

From: Brenda Shantz
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2019 9:03 PM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Subject: KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1 Comment Form

1. Land Use Designations

Medium Rise Residential land use would affect us the most, since it is located directly across from our driveway on Linwood and adjacent to Mt Hope Cemetery.

Mixed Use (with specific policy areas) is just meters away, directly across Central Fresh Market's parking lot from our front door. We currently see KCI from our front windows.

I would appreciate more discussion regarding what new business and residential spaces would tend to look like.

2. Zoning - Low Rise Residential

I feel that a provision needs to be maintained to allow us to build a triplex on our residential property, if we choose to in the future.

When we looked into purchasing our home in 1999, we consulted and received confirmation of this from the City of Kitchener.

I would also like to discuss a second proposal to build 3 townhouse units within our deep lot, with access to doors / windows facing Mt Hope Cemetery and Linwood Ave. Windows with a southern exposure towards Braun and King would also allow more light.
If Medium Rise Residential buildings are being zoned directly across from our driveway on Linwood, I would appreciate if consideration would be given to construct buildings facing north and south. This would allow for some open space for parking etc, without obstructing our view of the wonderful sunsets that we have been accustomed to for 20+ years.

I would appreciate more discussion re what building styles, height and setbacks would look like.

3. Considerations for Future
Development to be Compatible with Existing Neighbourhood Character

This is a well-established neighbourhood near the heart of our city. I have always enjoyed its proximity to downtown Kitchener and Uptown Waterloo. There are always people walking their dogs, riding their bikes, taking their kids to the parks, etc.

I would love to see an outside space created where people can gather, relax with friends and enjoy some outdoor activities.

Additional Comments:

When new Zoning and Land Use proposal(s) for our Neighbourhood were initiated between 2012 to 2015, my husband was going through aggressive cancer treatment. I did not attend any meetings at that time, since my family was my #1 priority.

Shortly after we purchased our home in 1999, we visited the Land & Title office to determine how long ago the house was built. Records went back as far as the 1860's. However, we were also advised that our double brick house could possibly be even older than that.

Considering that our house is almost 160 years old, I am once again concerned about any future construction in our Neighbourhood causing structural issues due to vibration.

When construction began in 2011 to upgrade Braun St infrastructure and the LRT construction on King St in front of KCI followed soon after, we began to notice our parging foundation was compromised both inside and outside. We now have several cracks in the corners of every room in our house. Concrete steps from our basement walkout to the back yard and driveway area have also cracked and shifted.

Also since this construction time frame, we have experienced squirrels, mice and most recently over the winter a new family of rats inhabit our home. This was never an issue prior to the construction.

I am hopeful that care will be taken to minimize any future setbacks in our homes during this new phase of progress.

------------------------------------------

Thank you for providing us with this opportunity to share our ideas and concerns.
I look forward to attending more Public Open Houses in the near future to discuss the many opportunities our community has to offer.

Sincerely,

Brenda Shantz
Good morning,

Thank you for your interest and providing your feedback on the K-W Hospital Secondary Plan. We have logged your feedback and will be considered moving forward.

We have included your contact information on our notification list to keep you informed of any upcoming project announcements.

If you have any question or would like to discuss the review process or background key studies, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,
Preet
Finally, there is no indication of how traffic from the new developments will be managed - whether directed onto King Street directly or with access to Wellington and possibly greatly increased volume on the residential streets. Ideally traffic will be forced onto a major artery like King Street. If traffic from the intensified areas, especially Station Park, has direct access to Walter/Wellington/Agnes, traffic calming measures will be needed on these and other side streets as there has already been an increase in volume and aggressive driving.

23 Dominion Street

**From:** Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca <Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca>

**Sent:** May 7, 2019 11:13 AM

**To:** Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca; SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca

**Subject:** Public Open House information material for K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan

Good morning Neighbourhood Residents and Community Members,


Here is the link to the information presented in the open house: [https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/kw-hospital-midtown.aspx](https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/kw-hospital-midtown.aspx)

Please note that the comments are due by May 17, 2019. Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Preet

**Preet Kohli**, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
Dear Ms. Malone-Wright:

RE: K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan – 800 King Street West
OUR FILE 19121A

We are writing on behalf of the owner of the property municipally addressed as 800 King Street West in the City of Kitchener (the subject lands). The subject lands currently contain a three storey commercial building and associated surface parking, with approximately 230 parking spaces at the rear of the building.

The subject lands are located within the Study Area of the K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan.

The subject lands are currently designated ‘Mixed-Use Corridor’ in the 1994 Official Plan, and are located within the K-W Hospital Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan designates the subject lands ‘Mixed Use Corridor’. The subject lands are also zoned ‘High Intensity Mixed Use Corridor MU-3’, and have not yet been incorporated as part of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law (CRoZBy) review process.

Background

The subject lands and overall Study Area is part of an existing Secondary Plan area which was deferred as part of the City’s Official Plan Review in 2014 to allow for other studies to be completed.

Since 2014, the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) plans have been completed to inform the land use direction and policy framework for the areas around the ION LRT stations. Other studies that have been completed include the Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study.
It is our understanding that these studies have informed the land use and policy direction for the K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood.

Pre-consultation and Proposed Development

A pre-consultation meeting for the subject lands was held on October 9, 2018. At the pre-consultation meeting, the PARTS plan was discussed and it was identified that the front portion of the property has been identified as ‘High Density Mixed Use’ and the rear portion has been identified as ‘Medium Rise Residential’.

In our opinion, the ‘Medium Rise Residential’ designation for a portion of the site is not consistent with the existing ‘Mixed-Use Corridor’ Official Plan designation or the MU-3 zone, which contemplate intensive, transit supportive development, including multiple dwellings with a maximum floor space ratio (FSR) of 4.0. The owner wishes to develop the entire site in accordance with the current Official Plan and Zoning By-law permissions.

The PARTS plan also contemplates a more formal connection to Braun Street and the King Street entrance of the subject lands. We believe that this could be considered through the ultimate redevelopment proposal for the site, as well as many of the additional comments received in the pre-consultation meeting related to design and transportation.

Next Steps

It is our opinion that the entire property should be designated ‘High Density Mixed Use’ to allow for the current development permissions on the site to continue. We believe that the concerns related to access, setbacks, design and parking identified in the pre-consultation meeting can be appropriately mitigated through the design of the site and building.

We would like to request a meeting with you to discuss the next steps of the Secondary Plan process, and the proposed development. Please kindly contact the undersigned with some available times at your earliest convenience. We look forward to working with you through this process.

Yours truly,

MHBC

Pierre J Chauvin MA, MCIP, RPP     Stephanie Mirtitsch, BES, MCIP, RPP
Partner         Planner
Good morning

Thank you for your interest and providing your feedback on the K-W Hospital Secondary Plan. We have logged your feedback and will be considered moving forward.

We have included your contact information on our notification list to keep you informed of any upcoming project announcements.

If you have any question or would like to discuss the review process or background key studies, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,
Preet

Hello

Please find attached my feedback form on the secondary plan.

As noted, I find the use of MIX-4 bordering on low rise residential without clear setback/massing/transition requirements inappropriate. It seems more reasonable to apply lower height restrictions on locations like the badminton club, along Walter and Wellington streets and behind properties on Agnes Street. According to the Planning Around Rapid Transit Station report, different intensities of mixed use are intended to aid in facilitating the transition between high and low intensity use. The KW-Hospital Secondary plan fails to implement appropriate transitions through the use of different intensities of Mixed Use zoning. All properties that designated Mixed Use and are adjacent to low rise residential should be MIX 1.

There also seems to be very little green space designated to accommodate the increased population density. A green way along the train tracks, increased setbacks to maintain the treed streetscape and clearer guidance on how proposed developments could incorporate green space would all be welcome additions. I think a trail connection from the Iron Horse to the transit hub was discussed - this seems like the best time to try and implement it.
Finally, there is no indication of how traffic from the new developments will be managed - whether directed onto King Street directly or with access to Wellington and possibly greatly increased volume on the residential streets. Ideally traffic will be forced onto a major artery like King Street. If traffic from the intensified areas, especially Station Park, has direct access to Walter/Wellington/Agnes, traffic calming measures will be needed on these and other side streets as there has already been an increase in volume and aggressive driving.

23 Dominion Street

From: Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca <Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca>
Sent: May 7, 2019 11:13 AM
To: Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca; SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca
Subject: Public Open House information material for K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan

Good morning Neighbourhood Residents and Community Members,


Here is the link to the information presented in the open house: https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/kw-hospital-midtown.aspx

Please note that the comments are due by May 17, 2019. Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
With the absence of defined transition requirements, it appears that the zoning could be staggered to provide more clearly defined transitions, ie MIX-4 or high rise residential should not be adjacent to low rise residential with no defined transition requirements, especially in confined areas where transition and unlimited height will be at odds (ie Mt Hope/York/Union, between Walter and King, OSC property).

Land use seems to be generally appropriate - mixed use or innovation seem like reasonable uses adjacent to residential. High rise residential or mixed use with no height limit and no defined transition do not seem appropriate.

With the absence of defined transition requirements, it appears that the zoning could be staggered to provide more clearly defined transitions, ie MIX-4 or high rise residential should not be adjacent to low rise residential with no defined transition requirements, especially in confined areas where transition and unlimited height will be at odds (ie Mt Hope/York/Union, between Walter and King, OSC property).

What are your comments about the zoning?

What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?
Provide continuous strip of open space along train tracks from Belmont to King to facilitate a trail connection from the Iron Horse trail to the transit hub instead of routing commuters through side streets and Cherry Park.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Blank]
Mailing Address: 23 Dominion Street, Kitchener, ON, N2G2G2
Email: [Blank]
Good afternoon,

Thank you for your interest in the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review process and for your feedback.

Your comments are appreciated! They have been logged and will be considered moving forward in the review process.

We have also ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any questions or additional comments, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

See attached comment document.

--
Juanita Metzger
Website | Instagram | LinkedIn | Twitter | Flickr
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   - parcel at the end of Braun Street would be better suited as low rise residential
   - love the addition of park space at the end of Mary & Herbert

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?
   - consider appropriate transition between mixed use areas where it meets low rise residential
   - ensure that parcels of Mount Hope neighbourhood already included in Cultural Heritage Landscape are recognized as such on all maps, as is the Mount Hope Cemetery; including Moore Ave street scape as it does fall within the boundary --> triangle of land including Braun, Andrew/Shanely to Moore, King, and Breithaupt that is designated as R3 and should also indicate its Cultural Heritage Landscape recognition.
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

- it would be helpful to know if/where the proposed zoning differs/agree with the zoning approved in the PARTS Midtown plan and RIENS. It would be helpful for people to know how their previous engagements have been included into the existing plans
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: ____________________________________________________________

Mailing Address: 217 Waterloo Street

Email: ____________________________________________________________
Good afternoon

Thank you for your interest in the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review process and for your feedback.

Your comments are appreciated! They have been logged and will be considered moving forward in the review process.

We have also ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any questions or additional comments, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

Tina,

Apologies for not getting this to you by May 10--I was only told that the plan was available online last week.

My family and I live at 67 Agnes Street, and so our back and side yards are adjacent to the land that is being proposed for mixed use development. Our primary concern is that any new development include an adequate transition between the current two-story residential houses in the neighbourhood and new buildings. For example, could the plan could include height restrictions along the low-rise residential boundary so that the current character (as described in the plan) would not be diminished?
Secondly, I am surprised that the plan does not include a vision (or expectation) for more green spaces. In fact, we would be losing significant shared green space currently enjoyed by many on the Ontario Seed Company property, while adding a significant number of new residents to the neighbourhood.

Thank for facilitating input into this design process.
Good afternoon,

Thank you for your interest in the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review process and for your feedback.

We have logged your comments and they will be considered moving forward in the review process.

We have also ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

---

Good day,

Please find below our feedback on the KW Hospital / Midtown Secondary Plan. The first point relates to the property we personally own at 93 Walter St., and the remainder relates to the broader community that we have been living and raising kids in for the past six years.

1. The property at 93 Walter Street is currently zoned R6 (with restriction) and we would like to keep it that way. The property is in a unique position on the edge of the Downfield Park (open space) and across from King Edward school; and would be well-suited for some sort of community facility, artist establishment, or studio space as described in the proposed RES-6 designation. Although it is currently used as a single-family dwelling, we
purchased this property with full knowledge of this unique zoning in a rapidly developing area and would like to keep such options open for the future.

2. The proposed Open Space at the corner of Park and Glasgow is a welcome idea. It is currently a dangerous corner with low visibility for drivers, and treacherous for pedestrian crossings of which there are many. I know more than one family on the south / west side of Park who do not allow their children to walk to school because of that intersection. A “scramble style” traffic light system has also been discussed at community gatherings and would be well supported by the residents.

3. Perhaps a design issue, but the sidewalks going south / west along Glasgow need to be widened and/or installed. Anyone traveling from the east side of this planning area must cross the road three times to access the businesses at Catalyst137. If one is traveling with a stroller or mobility device this issue is compounded by the utility poles and narrowness of the one sidewalk on the west side of Glasgow.

4. Connecting the neighbourhoods on either side of King Street needs to be prioritized as the LRT begins operation. One of the main pedestrian routes goes through the Downfield Park, crossing Walter at the (recently installed) crosswalk, through the King Edward schoolyard, and across King at Andrew Street (where there is currently no crossing). Despite there being traffic lights only a block away, many people still j-walk for ease of access to everything from the cemetery / medical building area to the Central Fresh grocery store.

5. With the construction of the Midtown Lofts we lost a full block of ground floor retail on King and would like to see something that prevents more of this in the future.

6. For the large Mixed Use area in the south / east corner of the planning area, would it be possible to add in some Open Space in order to maintain some of the existing green-space provided by the OSC property, and provide a meaningful buffer and/or corridor between the residential neighborhood and the surrounding areas?

7. The mixed-use designation on lower Walter Street is also a concern. There are a number of historic homes across from the OSC property and it would be a shame to lose them.

Thank you for your consideration.

93 Walter St.
Good afternoon

Thank you for your interest in the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review process and for your feedback.

We have logged your comments and they will be considered moving forward in the review process.

We have also ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

I recently examined the proposed secondary plan for my neighbourhood (I live on Agnes St). It has been challenging to determine which plan applied to our neighbourhood in light of the many development initiatives emerging in the midtown and hospital area. From the most recent proposed secondary plan, it makes sense to expand the neighbourhood’s boundary to include the lands of 607 King Street, Ontario Seed and the KW Badminton Club. This is also helpful for us when trying to understand the full impact of intensification on the neighbourhood, which will be significant.

While it is good to see that the elementary school green space off of Walter Street, referred to
locally as downfield, has been designated green space in the proposed land use plan, the current plan indicates that the neighbourhood will lose a de facto green space that is on the property of Ontario Seed. This is currently a large open space used by many in the community for dog walking and summer relaxation. In the proposed plan this property is zoned as mixed use with zone of MIX4. I understand that with each development the city receives funds that are allocated to green space/parkland which may or may not be used with in the neighbourhood under development. The city needs to increase future/new green space in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan, specifically within the lands now included in the neighbourhood boundaries. In this case it makes sense for the city to review this zoning and consider buying the Ontario Seed space to convert it to permanent green space. This will be necessary to provide amenities to the increased population in this neighbourhood and the surrounding downtown area.

I am concerned about the development intensification the current proposed plan would allow on the Ontario seed lands. I do not know what the zoning regulations for MIX4 are, but I assume that it allows for greater intensification than other MIX designations. Great care should be taken to plan the transition between residential homes on Agnes street and the planned intensification that is encroaching into the neighbourhood from the downtown intensification. MIX 4 does not permit such transitional zoning and this needs to be revised.

Ontario Seed is just one example of areas where M4 zoning is adjacent to low rise residential in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan. According to the Planning Around Rapid Transit Station report, different intensities of mixed use are intended to aid in facilitating the transition between high and low intensity use. The KW-Hospital Secondary plan fails to implement appropriate transitions through the use of different intensities of Mixed Use zoning. All properties that designated Mixed Use and are adjacent to low rise residential should be carefully reviewed to maintain the integrity of neighbourhoods, which includes appropriate setbacks and green space. If the Ontario seed property is zoned for development, it should be zoned for low rise residential on the property that fronts Walter street and on the land that is adjacent to the rear yards of the homes on Agnes. This is not counter to the policy of intensification. It maintains a balance of housing stock in the neighbourhood and attracts families to the neighbourhood, giving them an opportunity to live in the downtown core. It provides suitable homes and neighbourhoods for children and families.

The city has committed to the protection of established neighbourhoods. But this plan indicates that homes on Walter between Agnes and Wellington will be zoned for intense redevelopment. Reducing low rise residential land use is not in the interest of healthy neighbourhoods. It reduces the housing stock that meets the needs of families and threatens the viability of the schools. Low rise residential zoning on the west side of Wellington and both sides of Walter near Wellington would protect the neighbourhood and provide an important transition between the intensification planned for downtown, the transit hub and the former Six-O lands.

The Station Park project, the developments along Victoria between King and Park and the Bram yard properties, provide plenty of space for intensification. Intensification in the KW Midtown area should be less ambitious because of the impact on existing residential streets. Also, limiting the focus to one neighbourhood plan also does not reflect the overall intensification that will occur across the downtown region, the increased traffic and the increased population that will need some kind of green space for recreational activities, dog walking and to promote general wellbeing. The current plan does not provide for adequate
green space for an increasing population, and worse it actually takes out informal green space already being used by the community. Moreover, the secondary plan for the Hospital area gives a false impression of available green space, since it suggests the playing field for the KCI high School and the cemetery are green spaces akin to parks. While these areas are used for people to walk through, they are not recreational spaces or parks, and suggesting they are is misleading. There is already a shortage of green space in this community, which will become more acute as the population increases with planned intensification. Rather than removing green spaces, we need to create more. This lack of green space and the lack of transitions between residential homes and the surrounding areas where intensification is planned are a concern, and I request more careful and considerate planning is needed to address these concerns. I look forward to further opportunities to provide feedback and discuss the proposed plans for my neighbourhood.

Thank you

42 Agnes St Kitchener
Good afternoon

Thank you for your interest in the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review process and for your feedback.

We have logged your comments and they will be considered moving forward in the review process.

We have also ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Subject: KW Hospital - Midtown

Hello, here is my feedback on the draft secondary plan for the KW Hospital - Midtown area.

I'm happy to see Mt. Hope Cemetery included as a cultural heritage landscape. I would like to see this designation extended to include the Moore Ave streetscape from Peltz to Wellington. This unique street has historically significant buildings including Sacred Heart Church, convent and school, as well as a wealth of mature trees on both sides of the street that create a canopy overhead. This is complimented by century homes built in the same era as the Sacred Heart buildings.

As a resident of Moore Ave, I was originally drawn to the neighborhood because of the heritage look of the area and the pedestrian friendly location. Moore Ave gets heavy
pedestrian traffic in part because it is a beautiful street to walk on.

In conclusion, I would like to see a cultural heritage designation for this beautiful and historic street linked to the Mt. Hope Cemetery.

Sincerely,

84 Moore Ave
Good Afternoon

Thank you for your interest in the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review process and for your feedback.

We have logged your comments and they will be considered moving forward in the review process.

We have also ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2019 11:55 AM

Hello,

I hope you are well.

Please find attached a feedback form. If you are unable to decipher from my handwriting or the scan.

Thanks for your efforts in community engagement.

21 Dominion St, Kitchener, ON N2G 2G2
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before May 10th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   I am in support of mixed use, however, I am concerned about the zoning of the parking lot at Dominion Park and Agnes as mixed use. There is no transition or set back and 15' from my opinion is too dramatic for a residential street.

   (Low rise residential)

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

   I support the mixed 4 zoning of the Badminton Club and Ontario Seed.

   The lot at Dominion Park - Agnes is too small and close to single detached homes to be an effective design for human-centered scale.

   Thank you for your hard work and willingness to engage residents.

KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:


Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name:

Mailing Address: 21 Dominion St, Kitchener

Email:

KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Hello Yasmine,

Thank you for your interest in the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review process and for your feedback.

We have logged your comments and will be considered in the review process.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994

Hello Preet,

Here are my comments.

Thank you,

Yasmine Shamsie
Associate Professor and Graduate Coordinator
Department of Political Science
Wilfrid Laurier University
75 University Avenue West
Waterloo, ON
Canada
N2L 3C5
MAP your future in Political Science at Laurier!
Learn more at: http://wlu.ca/programs/arts/graduate/applied-politics-map
From: Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca <Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca>
Sent: May 7, 2019 11:13:35 AM
To: Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca; SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca
Subject: Public Open House information material for K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan

Good morning Neighbourhood Residents and Community Members,


Here is the link to the information presented in the open house: https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/kw-hospital-midtown.aspx

Please note that the comments are due by May 17, 2019. Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
I see that some space has been designated as green space. My concern is that the cemetery not be viewed as the only “green space”. It is lovely but the neighbourhood lacks parks. With medium density housing planned at the end of Braun St., I feel we need more green space to accommodate an increased population. The redevelopment of the KCI field is rather vague. What would that entail exactly? Is that owned by the city? If the school board owns it, would it not want to sell that piece of land to developers to maximize profit?

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

The zoning seems fine. I am not opposed to intensification as long as green space is created to match the intensified population.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

I am a resident of Braun St. At the moment, commuters use the street to get to a parking lot at the end of the street. They drive too fast, racing to their lot, treating the street as a a city street rather than a residential one. If an apartment building is indeed built at the end of the street, as proposed, there will be even more traffic as these new residents aim to access their parking. Moreover, if Braun is extended to connect with the street that goes up to the Central Market street light, we will also have the traffic from people bypassing King. My suggestion would be to place 3 large speed humps on Braun to discourage speeding and its use as a King street bypass.
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: _______________________________________________
Mailing Address: __________________________________________
Email: _______________________________________________
Good afternoon Gwen,

Thank you for your interest in and for attending the first meeting on the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review.

We very much appreciate receiving your comments/feedback on the information that was presented at the Open House and these comments will be considered moving forward through the review process.

We have ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

Thank you again for your participation in the Secondary Plan Review process. If you have any additional comments or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Gwen Wheeler
Sent: Thursday, May 02, 2019 12:08 PM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Subject: KW-Hospital Secondary Plan

I attended the April 18th open house. Here are my comments.

I was glad to see that the boundary for the neighbourhood expanded to include the lands of 607 King Street, Ontario Seed and the KW Badminton Club. This makes good sense and is helpful when trying to understand the full impact of intensification on the neighbourhood.

The neighbourhood is subject to significant intensification, because of these lands.

While it is good to see that the elementary school green space off of Walter Street, referred to locally as downfield, has been designated green space in the proposed land use plan, the
neighbourhood will lose a de facto green space that is on the property of Ontario Seed. This is currently a large open space. This property is proposed as mixed use with zone of M4. I understand that with each development the city receives funds that are allocated to green space/parkland which may or may not be used with in the neighbourhood under development. I strongly urge the city to increase future/new green space in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan, specifically within the lands now included in the neighbourhood boundaries.

The maps for the secondary plan fails to include the stretch of street that fronts the Badminton club at 69 Agnes. There is an island of land bordered by Dominion, Agnes and Park, currently used as a parking lot. In the proposed plan, this land is zoned M4SP3. This is an obvious location for a green space. A new park on Park Street - an antidote to *They paved paradise and put up a parking lot*. It addresses a number of pressures the neighbourhood faces as intensification changes this area. It will

- support a walkable community
- contribute to the urban forest - many trees in the neighbourhood will be lost as a result of intensification, this is already happening
- provide a transition from the houses on Dominion Street and new development of the lands which are currently the KW Badminton Club
- put green space planning in the hands of the city rather than developers
- use the money from developers locally

Illustration

It is good to see that single family homes on the Walter Street north of Agnes have been protected. However, homes will be lost on Wellington, Walter near Wellington and Park Street. While it is obvious that the proposed secondary plan has a single focus on intensification, the city has committed to protection of established neighbourhoods. Reducing low rise residential land use is not in the interest of healthy neighbourhoods. It reduces the housing stock that meets the needs of families and threatens the viability of the schools. I would like to see low rise residential zoning on the west side of Wellington and both sides of Walter near Wellington.

The Ontario Seed property is designated MIX4. My understanding is that currently there are no zoning regulations for MIX4 similar to the ones proposed for MIX 1-3. My assumption is
that MIX4 allows for greater intensification than other MIX designations. Because the Ontario Seed property is adjacent to properties zoned low density residential it should be MIX 1.

Ontario Seed is just one example of areas where M4 zoning is adjacent to low rise residential in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan. According to the Planning Around Rapid Transit Station report, different intensities of mixed use are intended to aid in facilitating the transition between high and low intensity use (page 22). The KW-Hospital Secondary plan fails to implement appropriate transitions through the use of different intensities of Mixed Use zoning. All properties that designated Mixed Use and are adjacent to low rise residential should be MIX 1.

The Ontario seed property should be zoned for low rise residential on the property that fronts Walter street and on the land that is adjacent to the rear yards of the homes on Agnes. This is not counter to the policy of intensification. It maintains a balance of housing stock in the neighbourhood and attracts families to the neighbourhood, giving them an opportunity to live in the downtown core. It provides suitable homes for children.

The parking lot on Dominion Street on the west side of Park is proposed as Innovative Employment. My concern is that this zoning is defined using stories rather than height. From the BB3 development residents learned not to assume that a story is the same for residential zoning as it is for other land use designations. This is also an issue for the MIX 4 SP.3 zoning. All zoning designations should have maximum height restrictions.

The Station Park project, the developments along Victoria between King and Park and the Bram yard properties, provide plenty of space for intensification. Intensification in the KW Midtown area should be less ambitious because of the impact on existing residential streets.

Gwen Wheeler
Good afternoon

Thank you for your interest in and for attending the first meeting on the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review.

We very much appreciate receiving your comments/feedback on the information that was presented at the Open House and these comments will be considered moving forward through the review process.

We have ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

Thank you again for your participation in the Secondary Plan Review process.

If you have any additional comments or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

The new structure along behind Central Ave will overpower, lower elevation, small homes on Braun.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

Concerned about zoning of Braun St reduced to R3. Street needs to retain all R5 or increase to R6 as Braun will be surrounded by R6 at the end of street & behind on Central Ave S. Andew St. is a good functional division from R3.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

Because Braun St. is a bit of an anomaly amongst the rest of R3, Braun home owners should have option to redevelop without actual developer swooping in to reap benefits.

The coverage of a lot at 55% needs to be higher to encourage infill along Braun St.

Neighbours in these homes would use a facilitator to be able to discuss viable options for their properties along Braun St.
Feasibility of a laneway at the back of properties on Beam. That currently butt up to 3-story townhomes. To create separation to enable Beam owners to develop housing at the end of their deep lots, so that access can be via a laneway/musse, and parking for infill is off main street.
Good afternoon

Thank you for your interest in and for attending the first meeting on the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review.

We very much appreciate receiving your comments/feedback on the information that was presented at the Open House and these comments will be considered moving forward through the review process.

Yes I recall our conversation at the Open House and in particular your request to have your property at 3 Gildner Street designated and zoned ‘Institutional’ rather than ‘Low Rise Residential’.

We have ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

Thank you again for your input and participation in the Secondary Plan review.

If you have any additional comments or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: [E-mail Address]
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 11:05 AM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Request for Zoning Change

Thank you again for the valuable information and guidance obtained from the open house held on April 18 at the Victoria Park pavilion.

I was advised at the time to follow up with the design team and to formally request a zoning change to our property (currently zoned Low Rise Residential RES - 3).
It is our desire to have the zoning changed to that of Institutional to join the existing properties that front Park Street at 399, 403 and 407 Park Street respectively.

To aid in your decision I have attached a site sketch that was provided to us at the time of purchase.

Should you require any additional information please contact me at [redacted] and remain,

Yours sincerely,
Hi Gwen,

Thank you for your question on the proposed Innovation Employment Zone Category.

This is a new land use designation and zone category in the City of Kitchener that was recommended as part of the PARTS Central work and approved plan.

We are still working on the specifics of the land use policies and zoning regulations but I have included the excerpts that were presented at the Open House that provide the framework and direction for the new land use designation and zone category.

There is an early indication of built form expressed in amount of building area that can be built on the lot and maximum building height. It is anticipated that setbacks in this zone category will be similar to setbacks in our other employment zones and may be dependent on adjacency to other land use designations.

Should you have any additional questions or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: noreply@esolutionsgroup.ca [mailto:noreply@esolutionsgroup.ca] On Behalf Of Gwen Wheeler
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 8:10 AM
To: Internet - Building
Subject: KW Hospital Secondary Plan

Can you tell me the zoning regulations for Innovation Employment High Density 3. I believe this is the proposed zone which is currently a parking lot on the property bordered by Park, Dominion, Strange and railway tracks. I would like to know for example the set backs and maximum building height.


This email was sent to you by Gwen Wheeler through https://www.kitchener.ca.
Good morning.

Thanks for your participation in the KW-Hospital Secondary Plan and the feedback. We have logged it in and will be considered moving forward.

We have your contact information and will inform you when we upload the panels on the City’s website.

Thanks again,
Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994

-----Original Message-----
From: 
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 1:47 PM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Cc: Preet Kohli <Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Zoning and density RE: KW-Hospital Secondary Plan Urban Design Charrette

Hello KW- Hospital Secondary Plan Urban Design Charrette Kitchener

I am sending you this email because the city wants to change the zoning criteria in my area. I am at 56 Louisa St. I have a 25 x 24 foot garage that I would like to be able to build a single 600sq. foot apartment on top of. My lot has parking for 4 cars and it is on, the garage is detached and located on the alley. This would be a good fit for increasing the density without compromising the integrity and be unobtrusive to the neighbourhood. My proposal would not go past the already determined height of 18 feet but it would be nice to go to 20 feet if at all possible. My property would have 4 separate parking spots, 2 inside the garage, 1 beside the garage off the alley and one in front off of Louisa St.

There is a property on Braun St. That the city allowed to put 2 apartments on top and it is 30 feet tall.

Thanx and have a great day!

56 Louisa St.
Kitchener

PS In the future it would be nice if their was a contact name included in the proposal.
From: Tina Malone-Wright
To: Secondary Plans
Cc: Victoria Grohn
Subject: RE: Midtown secondary plan feedback
Date: Friday, May 3, 2019 3:05:47 PM
Attachments: image019.png, image020.png, image021.png, image022.png, image023.png, image024.png, image025.png, image026.png, image027.png

Good afternoon

Thank you for your interest in and for attending the first meeting on the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review.

We very much appreciate receiving your comments/feedback on the information that was presented at the Open House and these comments will be considered moving forward through the review process.

In particular I will review your comment as it relates to the triangle of land including Braun Street, Shanley, Moore, King, and Breithaupt and its inclusion as part of a cultural heritage landscape with our Heritage Planning staff working with me on the Secondary Plan Review.

We have ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any additional comments or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Secondary Plans
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 2:40 PM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Midtown secondary plan feedback

Good Afternoon
Thanks for the open house last week. I appreciate the time you have spent.

The Plan seems to be getting down to the fine strokes.

One little detail I would like to mention:
The triangle of land including Braun Street, Shanely, Moore, King, and Breithaupt I think should be shown as part of a cultural heritage landscape. The rest of the Midtown
neighbourhood was recognized as a cultural heritage landscape in your previous study. I want to make sure that little triangle isn't lost in the paperwork as the secondary plan moves forward. It seems to me to be a pretty easy fix.

Overall I like the plan but I realize that some of these changes will be years into the future for us as development continues to take hold in the neighborhood.

Thanks again for engaging with the neighborhood.

217 Waterloo Street Kitchener
Good afternoon,

Thank you for your interest in and for attending the first meeting on the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review.

We appreciate receiving your comments/feedback on the information that was presented at the Open House and these comments will be considered moving forward through the review process.

We have ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any additional comments or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 4:35 PM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Comments on Midtown proposed secondary plan rezoning

Hi this is [redacted] from 65 Shanley street.

Thanks for the open house. It’s good to see that the prosed new plans largely overlap with the PARTs plan. I just have a few areas of concern/comments:

1) The triangle of land including Braun, Andrew/Shanely to Moore, King, and Breithaupt that is designated as R3 on the new maps is NOT designated as part of a cultural heritage landscape, and it should be. Our neighbourhood was recognized as a cultural heritage landscape in your study. It contains the Sacred Heart Parish campus, and the built environment has the same recognized characteristics (historic homes, regular built form, local vernaculars well preserved, mature street trees) as the rest of the area, as described in your report. The areas of these historic neighbourhoods closest to the major arterials are most in need of protection. It seems it was an administrative issue (that our fragment was contained in the Central heritage assessment) that kept us from having that recognition in the Midtown plan. I trust this issue can be remedied.

2) I wonder if we need something like “Residential 3.25”. I understand the city’s motivation in maintain highly restrictive zoning in stable neighbourhoods, but this prevents healthy densification efforts that can preserve our built form, such as allowing tri-plexing or companion/laneway/coach house units. R4 would probably attract developers wanting to demo and rebuild, but perhaps owners could be allowed to opt-in for the level of up-zoning that I describe above. Our property values are growing, and if the future zoning restrictions are clear, in my view there is potential for more high-quality subdivision of existing homes (such as recently done on Wellington, Shanley near Waterloo, Agnes, and the SE corner of Shanley and Moore). This maintains the affordability of the neighbourhood and allows us to accommodate more residents without less desirable developments such as Midtown Lofts.

3) Many people had questions not addressed directly by your boards: what version of R zoning they were rezoned to, exactly what zoning was changing (you can do a GIS overlay for this), and exactly where your proposal deviated

124
from PARTS (again a GIS overlay). Hopefully you can make this information available.

4) The sycamore tree on Agnes just West of King, which is at least 200 years old, need heritage designation, as those lands are going to be re-zoned as mixed use. Please head off any surprise tree demolition by taking a look at this tree now. It is the largest and one of few remaining healthy deciduous trees in the area.

thanks,
## 5.0 Public Comments and Staff Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Details</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | 563 Killbeau Court  
Written: April 18, 2019 | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments  
1. The new street and townhomes behind Central Meat will overpower lower elevation homes on Braun.  
2. Concerned about zoning of Braun St reduced to R3! Street needs to retain R-5 or increase to R-6 as Braun Street will be surrounded by R6 & Mix at end of street and behind on Central Meat side. Andrew St. is a good junctional division from R3.  
3. Because Braun St. is a bit of an anomaly amongst the rest of R3, Braun homeowners should have option to redevelop without actual developers swooping in to reap benefits.  
The coverage of lot at 55% needs to be higher to encourage infill along Braun St. Neighbours in these homes should use a facilitator to be able to discuss viable options for their properties along Braun St.  
4. Feasibility of laneway at the back of properties on Braun, that currently butt, up to 3 storey townhomes, to create separation at the end of their deep lots, so that access can be via a laneway/muse and parking for infill is off main street.  
There are no plans to extend Linwood Avenue at this time.  
The RES-3 zone will allow similar uses to the R-5 zone. Homeowners are not excluded from developing their own properties.  
The 55% lot coverage allows for an appropriate amount of building envelope, landscaping, parking, and amenity area.  
Homeowners are welcome to obtain assistance from a professional planner in consultation with the property owners along Braun Street.  
The PARTS Plan recommended a connection at through the Central Fresh property. This could be explored at the time development applications are received. | |
| 2 | 6 Herbert Street  
Written: April 18, 2019 | 1. Sounds Good  
2. I'm Fine with it.  
3. I can’t think of anything at the moment. I like the way it is.  
4. Parkland where the parking lot on Pine St. is located would be nice. I like that idea. I don’t want any mid-high rises in this area.  
I'm ok with mid-rise mixed use on King by LRT. Cafes and boutique shops would be nice.  
Thank you for your comments. | |
| 3 | 55 Pine Street  
Written: April 18, 2019 | 1. Reasonable and well thought out. Love green space on Pine st.  
2. Well done!  
3. Preserve neighbourhoods and communities by incorporating green spaces.  
4. Love the plan for Pine St. and expansion of soccer field to create park space. Given the development of King St. and lack of park space in the neighbourhood. This green space is a welcome addition. Shoppers, student, hospital visitors, and patients would use the space. Love, Love, Love!  
I was concerned that the intensification would disregard the need for green space. That was not case!  
Bravo!  
Thank you for your comments. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4  | 800 King Street West | **Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
**Question 2:** What are your comments about the zoning?  
**Question 3:** What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments** | I am property owner/manager at 800 King St. W. I noticed that the plan reduces our current FSR from 4 to 2. This reduces amount of buildable space by half, and therefore makes it far less likely that the space would be developed. The FSR should stay at 4, especially since the plan proposes a midrise buildings/zoning in the back of our parking lot. The Midtown lofts at 640 King St. W. are 6 floors and very close to 2 floor houses (beside and across the street). Also, a tall structure at 800 would not have shadow impact on houses around it. Restrictions should be by height, not by reducing FSR.  
There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high rise residential, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. The property is proposed to be split designated and zoned but will maintain a 4.0 FSR along the King Street portion of the lands. |
| 5  | 3 Gildner Street | 1. The proposed uses seem to be in keeping with the current neighbourhoods  
2. Keeping the actual re-zoning to major streets – Park, Glasgow, Green, King is good but there seems to be a need to have some depth down the side streets – Wood, Gildner, Mt. Hope, Gruhn  
3. How do we change our zoning from R3 to institutional – adjacent /abuts institutional zoning. | Thank you for your comments. This property addressed as 3 Gildner Street is currently designated and zoned for low rise residential uses. The CHL Study recommended that the properties across the street addressed as 4, 6, and 10 Gildner Street be redesignated as Low Rise Residential from Institutional. This will maintain the established character of the streetscape. It is not recommended that this property be redesignated and zoned to Institutional. |
| 6  | 86 Glasgow Street | Agree with the proposed land use designations and preservation of RES-3 Low density areas.  
Zoning seems reasonable to preserve existing architecture from intensification. CHL designation also helps with this plan as it was what drew us to the neighbourhood.  
Strictly regulate parking lot density for surface parking i.e. Sunlife, Catalyst  
• Have public consult on Heritage Guidelines  
• Have public consult on streetscape to establish neighbourhood master plans and incorporate neighbourhood associations.  
• Ensure architecturally significant structures as such Air Boss, Dominion Offices, Sacred Heart & Electrohome are maintained and not fallen to ruin through despair or vacancy/graffiti abandonment.  
Looking for clarification on proposed use of Glasgow as ‘connecting’ road and impact on traffic intensity and amenity.  
Also looking for classification on Glasgow Streetscape plan and effect on traffic calming, boulevard, street road speed limit (should) be 40! Due to pedestrian crossing for Sunlife and Ironhorse, limiting truck access etc. | The City's property standards by-law regulates vacant designated heritage properties to ensure they are maintained. The neighbourhood specific urban design guidelines are being developed through neighbourhood consultation and will include recommendations to address heritage significance.  
The City of Kitchener is consulting with the public on lowering speed limits in residential areas and recommendations are projected to go to Council in the fall. Glasgow Street is classified as a City Arterial Street in Map 11 of the City of Kitchener’s Official Plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Written: Apr 18, 2019</td>
<td>1. Park space for neighbourhood uses on Pine St. is excellent! 2. Keep higher buildings along King St and Green Space with the residential zone. 3. If park space is not an option, then keep it low residential housing. 4. I really like the additional green space that is planned for Pine St (between Mary and Herbert) that is the current location of a parking lot. Keeping the multi-use/multi-storey buildings at the King St. frontage is a good plan. As well as it keeps the Mary/Pine/Herbert St. residential community in an inner city environment. I very much value the addition of park space for us to use, as could people at the hospital.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Written: Apr 18, 2019</td>
<td>1. I think they look good 2. I am satisfied with the zoning. I like the idea of mixed-use around the LRT, so there can be more little shops, cafes, re-purposing old buildings with residences and offices. 4. I like the green space plans for the parking lot and football field on Pine St. I think removal of all the fencing would be nice so we could all use it.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Written: Apr 18, 2019</td>
<td>1. I like the proposal of green space on Pine St. 3. Mixed Com-Res buildings would get more people using the area on foot. 4. I like the Mary St. extension plan with the Pine St. parking lot conversion to green space. With the development of sports field to a multi-use park. I see these as a huge benefit to the community.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Written: Apr 18, 2019</td>
<td>Where the medium rise buildings at the end if Braun St. are put a park. <strong>Green spaces needed!</strong></td>
<td>Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>65 Shanley Street Written: April 19, 2019</td>
<td>Thanks for the open house. It's good to see that the proposed new plans largely overlap with the PARTs plan. I just have a few areas of concern/comments: 1) The triangle of land including Braun, Andrew/Shanley to Moore, King, and Breithaupt that is designated as R3 on the new maps is NOT designated as part of a cultural heritage landscape, and it should be. Our neighbourhood was recognized as a cultural heritage landscape in your study. It contains the Sacred Heart Parish campus, and the built environment has the same recognized characteristics (historic homes, regular built form, local vernaculars well preserved, mature street trees) The triangle of land is recognized in the CHL Study as a CHL. This CHL will be evaluated as part of the broader area and will be considered at a later date. The neighbourhood is similar to the other neighbourhood CHLs identified. The new RES-3 zoning as is proposed to be modified is consistent with similar neighbourhoods in this secondary plan area. At the time the RES zones were applied for the Open House we did not have a RES zone that permitted three units so Staff determined that applying the lesser zone would be more appropriate to reflect the</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12 | 217 Waterloo Street  
Written: April 22, 2019 | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | as the rest of the area, as described in your report. The areas of these historic neighbourhoods closest to the major arterials are most in need of protection. It seems it was an administrative issue (that our fragment was contained in the Central heritage assessment) that kept us from having that recognition in the Midtown plan. I trust this issue can be remedied.  
2) I wonder if we need something like “Residential 3.25”. I understand the city’s motivation in maintain highly restrictive zoning in stable neighbourhoods, but this prevents healthy densification efforts that can preserve our built form, such as allowing triplexing or companion/laneway/coach house units. R4 would probably attract developers wanting to demo and rebuild, but perhaps owners could be allowed to opt-in for the level of up-zoning that I describe above. Our property values are growing, and if the future zoning restrictions are clear, in my view there is potential for more high-quality subdivision of existing homes (such as recently done on Wellington, Shanley near Waterloo, Agnes, and the SE corner of Shanley and Moore). This maintains the affordability of the neighbourhood and allows us to accommodate more residents without less desirable developments such as Midtown Lofts.  
3) Many people had questions not addressed directly by your boards: what version of R zoning they were rezoned to, exactly what zoning was changing (you can do a GIS overlay for this), and exactly where your proposal deviated from PARTS (again a GIS overlay). Hopefully you can make this information available.  
4) The sycamore tree on Agnes just West of King, which is at least 200 years old, need heritage designation, as those lands are going to be re-zoned as mixed use. Please head off any surprise tree demolition by taking a look at this tree now. It is the largest and one of few remaining healthy deciduous trees in the area.  
Thanks for the open house last week. I appreciate the time you have spent. The Plan seems to be getting down to the fine strokes. One little detail I would like to mention: The triangle of land including Braun Street, Shanely, Moore, King, and Breithaupt I think should be shown |

| | | | existing built form of the neighbourhood. Staff are reviewing the RES-3 zone for inclusion of a three unit residential use in accordance with Bill 108. The existing and proposed zoning was available on the maps displayed at the Open House and on the City of Kitchener website. Heritage tree designation is a recommended additional conservation measure in the CHL Implementation report. Staff will review the feasibility of this conservation tool.  
Thank you for your comments. The triangle of land is recognized in the CHL Study as a CHL. This CHL will be evaluated as part of the broader area and will be considered at a later date. The neighbourhood is similar to the other neighbourhood CHLs identified. The new RES-3 zoning as is proposed to be modified is |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|    |                  | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | as part of a cultural heritage landscape. The rest of the Midtown neighbourhood was recognized as a cultural heritage landscape in your previous study. I want to make sure that little triangle isn't lost in the paperwork as the secondary plan moves forward. It seems to me to be a pretty easy fix.  
Overall I like the plan but I realize that some of these changes will be years into the future for us as development continues to take hold in the neighborhood. |
| 13 | 56 Louisa Street  
Written: April 23, 2019 | I am sending you this email because the city wants to change the zoning criteria in my area. I am at 56 Louisa St. I have a 25 x 24 foot garage that I would like to be able to build a single 600sq. foot apartment on top of. My lot has parking for 4 cars and it is on, the garage is detached and located on the alley. This would be a good fit for increasing the density without compromising the integrity and be unobtrusive to the neighbourhood. My proposal would not go past the already determined height of 18 feet but it would be nice to go to 20 feet if at all possible. My property would have 4 separate parking spots, 2 inside the garage, 1 beside the garage off the alley and one in front off of Louisa St. | consistent with similar neighbourhoods in this secondary plan area. |
| 14 | Written: April 24, 2019 | Can you tell me the zoning regulations for Innovation Employment High Density 3. I believe this is the proposed zone which is currently a parking lot on the property bordered by Park, Dominion, Strange and railway tracks. I would like to know for example the set backs and maximum building height. | Staff are reviewing permitted uses and regulations in the RES-3 zone and it is anticipated that the zone will allow for more housing options such as detached second dwelling units in appropriate locations subject to all zoning regulations being met. This direction is supported by new Bill 108. |
| 15 | Written: May 2, 2019 | I attended the April 18th open house. Here are my comments. I was glad to see that the boundary for the Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for |

130
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1:</strong> What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2:</strong> What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3:</strong> What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighbourhood expanded to include the lands of 607 King Street, Ontario Seed and the KW Badminton Club. This makes good sense and is helpful when trying to understand the full impact of intensification on the neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The neighbourhood is subject to significant intensification, because of these lands. While it is good to see that the elementary school green space off of Walter Street, referred to locally as downfield, has been designated green space in the proposed land use plan, the neighbourhood will lose a de facto green space that is on the property of Ontario Seed. This is currently a large open space. This property is proposed as mixed use with zone of M4. I understand that with each development the city receives funds that are allocated to green space/parkland which may or may not be used with in the neighbourhood under development. I strongly urge the city to increase future/new green space in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan, specifically within the lands now included in the neighbourhood boundaries. The maps for the secondary plan fails to include the stretch of street that fronts the Badminton club at 69 Agnes. There is an island of land bordered by Dominion, Agnes and Park, currently used as a parking lot. In the proposed plan, this land is zoned M4SP3. This is an obvious location for a green space. A new park on Park Street - an antidote to They paved paradise and put up a parking lot. It addresses a number of pressures the neighbourhood faces as intensification changes this area. It will • support a walkable community • contribute to the urban forest - many trees in the neighbourhood will be lost as a result of intensification, this is already happening • provide a transition from the houses on Dominion Street and new development of the lands which are currently the KW Badminton Club • put green space planning in the hands of the city rather than developers • use the money from developers locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is good to see that single family homes on the Walter Street north of Agnes have been protected. However, homes will be lost on Wellington, Walter near Wellington and Park Street. While it is obvious that the proposed secondary plan has a single focus on intensification, the city has committed to protection of established neighbourhoods. Reducing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process. The island of land on Agnes Street is proposed to be designated in accordance with the property at 69 Agnes Street. The Ontario Seed property is currently designated and zoned general industrial. This is privately owned property. At such time as development applications are received for this parcel Staff can review the ability of this parcel to provide a parkland dedication in the form of land. Staff have reviewed the properties along Walter Street south of Agnes and recommend 66 and 70 Walter Street be designated Low Rise Residential and zoned RES-3 to assist in maintaining the existing character of the Walter Street streetscape at the corner of Agnes Street. The properties at 44 to 60 Walter Street should maintain the Mixed Use land use designation to support the recommendation from the PARTS Central Plan as these properties would be most impacted by adjacent mixed use developments and should also be redeveloped as such. There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. The Ontario Seed property was identified in the PARTS Central Plan as a significant opportunity to achieve and contribute to the density goals of the Growth Plan in the station area while maintaining the established neighbourhood’s existing character. It would not be appropriate to split designate the Ontario Seed property and create an additional transition condition along Walter Street and frustrate the ability of this property to redevelop with an appropriate mixed use built form that would be sympathetic to the existing low rise development on Agnes Street. For the purposes of the Open House building height was expressed in storeys to assist with the visualization of height. Building height will be expressed in metres in the Zoning By-law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 1:</strong> What are your comments about the land use designations? <strong>Question 2:</strong> What are your comments about the zoning? <strong>Question 3:</strong> What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? <strong>Additional Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    |                   | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments |                          |
| 16 | 21 Dominion Street  
Written: May 7, 2019 | I am in support of mixed use+ intensification. However, I am quite concerned about the zoning of the parking lot at Dominion, Park and Agnes as Mixed use 4. There is no transition or setback and 18 metres in my opinion is too dramatic boarding a residential street. (Low rise residential).  
I support the mixed-4 zoning of the Badminton Club and Ontario Seed.  
The lot at Dominion Park + Agnes is too small and close to single detached homes to be an effective, design for human centered scale.  
Thanks for your hard work and willingness to engage residents. | The triangular piece of land at the corner of Agnes Street and Park is in the same ownership as 69 Agnes and is intended to be designated the same as the property at 69 Agnes Street to support a consolidated development. The MIX-4 zoning is proposed to have a site specific policy to limit the allowable height of development to ensure compatibility with adjacent low rise development. |
| 17 | Braun Street  
Written: May 7, 2019 | I see that some space has been designated as green space. My concern is that the cemetery not be viewed as the only “green space”. It is lovely but the neighbourhood lacks parks. With medium density housing planned at the end of Braun St., I feel we need more green space to accommodate an increased population. The redevelopment of the KCI field is rather vague. What would that entail exactly? Is that owned by the city? If the school board owns it, would it not want to sell that piece of land to developers to maximize profit?  
The zoning seems fine. I am not opposed to intensification as long as green space is created to match the intensified population  
I am a resident of Braun St. At the moment, commuters use the street to get to a parking lot at the end of the street. They drive too fast, racing to their lot, treating the street as a a city street rather than a residential one. If an apartment building is indeed built at the end of the street, as proposed, there will be even more traffic as these new residents aim to access their parking. Moreover, if Braun is extended to connect with the street that goes up to the Central Market street light, we will also have the traffic from people bypassing King. My suggestion would be to place 3 large speed humps on Braun to discourage speeding and its use as a King street bypass. | Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints.  
The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process.  
At the time of site plan approval the appropriate location for vehicular access is determined to ensure the least impacts to residential streets.  
It is agreed that additional traffic can result from intensification however, it is hoped that eventually there is a modal shift and the residents will utilize alternative means of transportation. |
| 18 | 84 Moore Avenue  
Written: May 8, 2019 | I'm happy to see Mt. Hope Cemetery included as a cultural heritage landscape. I would like to see this designation extended to include the Moore Ave streetscape from Peltz to Wellington. This unique street has historically significant buildings including Sacred Heart Church, convent and school, as well as a wealth of mature trees on both sides of the street | Moore Avenue is part of the Mt. Hope Breithaupt CHL as identified through the 2014 CHL Study. This CHL will be evaluated as part of the broader area and will be considered at a later date. The neighbourhood is similar to the other neighbourhood CHLs identified within the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? Additional Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>93 Walter Street</td>
<td>1. The property at 93 Walter Street is currently zoned R6 (with restriction) and we would like to keep it that way. The property is in a unique position on the edge of the Downfield Park (open space) and across from King Edward school; and would be well-suited for some sort of community facility, artist establishment, or studio space as described in the proposed RES-6 designation. Although it is currently used as a single-family dwelling, we purchased this property with full knowledge of this unique zoning in a rapidly developing area and would like to keep such options open for the future. 2. The proposed Open Space at the corner of Park and Glasgow is a welcome idea. It is currently a dangerous corner with low visibility for drivers, and treacherous for pedestrian crossings of which there are many. I know more than one family on the south / west side of Park who do not allow their children to walk to school because of that intersection. A “scramble style” traffic light system has also been discussed at community gatherings and would be well supported by the residents. 3. Perhaps a design issue, but the sidewalks going south / west along Glasgow need to be widened and/or installed. Anyone traveling from the east side of this planning area must cross the road three times to access the businesses at Catalyst137. If one is traveling with a stroller or mobility device this issue is compounded by the utility poles and narrowness of the one sidewalk on the west side of Glasgow. 4. Connecting the neighbourhoods on either side of King Street needs to be prioritized as the LRT begins operation. One of the main pedestrian routes goes through the Downfield Park, crossing Walter at the (recently installed) crosswalk, through the King Edward schoolyard, and across King at Andrew Street (where there is currently no crossing). Despite there being traffic lights only a block away, many people still j-walk for ease of access to everything from the cemetery / medical building area to the Central Fresh Plan boundary. The new RES-3 zoning as is proposed to be modified is consistent with similar neighbourhoods in this secondary plan area.</td>
<td>The property is currently zoned R-5 129U which restricts the use of the property to two dwelling units. The new proposed zoning will be similar to the existing zoning. In order to address concerns related to sidewalk infill, the City of Kitchener sidewalk infill policy identifies processes and establishes a priority ranking system. The primary goal of this policy is to improve the sidewalk infill process as a whole, while creating a sustainable and accessible transportation network within the City of Kitchener. King Street is a Regional road and City Staff support safe pedestrian crossings where an opportunity exists. The proposed mixed zoning along King Street will provide many opportunities for retail and commercial uses. Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process. The Ontario Seed property is currently designated and zoned general industrial. This is privately owned property. At such time as development applications are received for this parcel Staff can review the ability of this parcel to provide a parkland dedication in the form of land. Staff have reviewed the properties along Walter Street south of Agnes and recommend 66 and 70 Walter Street be designated Low Rise Residential and zoned RES-3 to assist in maintaining the existing character of the Walter Street streetscape at the corner of Agnes Street. The properties at 44 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 20 | 42 Agnes Street  
Written: May 10, 2019 | **Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
**Question 2:** What are your comments about the zoning?  
**Question 3:** What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments** | Walter Street should maintain the Mixed Use land use designation to support the recommendation from the PARTS Central Plan as these properties would be most impacted by adjacent mixed use developments and should also be redeveloped as such.  
Grocery store.  
5. With the construction of the Midtown Lofts we lost a full block of ground floor retail on King and would like to see something that prevents more of this in the future.  
6. For the large Mixed Use area in the south/east corner of the planning area, would it be possible to add in some Open Space in order to maintain some of the existing green-space provided by the OSC property, and provide a meaningful buffer and/or corridor between the residential neighborhood and the surrounding areas?  
7. The mixed-use designation on lower Walter Street is also a concern. There are a number of historic homes across from the OSC property and it would be a shame to lose them.  
I recently examined the proposed secondary plan for my neighbourhood (I live on Agnes St). It has been challenging to determine which plan applied to our neighbourhood in light of the many development initiatives emerging in the midtown and hospital area. From the most recent proposed secondary plan, it makes sense to expand the neighbourhood’s boundary to include the lands of 607 King Street, Ontario Seed and the KW Badminton Club. This is also helpful for us when trying to understand the full impact of intensification on the neighbourhood, which will be significant.  
While it is good to see that the elementary school green space off of Walter Street, referred to locally as downfield, has been designated green space in the proposed land use plan, the current plan indicates that the neighbourhood will lose a de facto green space that is on the property of Ontario Seed. This is currently a large open space used by many in the community for dog walking and summer relaxation. In the proposed plan this property is zoned as mixed use with zone of MIX4. I understand that with each development the city receives funds that are allocated to green space/parkland which may or may not be used with in the neighbourhood under development. The city needs to increase future/new green space in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan, specifically within the lands now included in the neighbourhood boundaries. In this case it makes sense for the city to review this zoning and consider buying the Ontario Seed space to convert it to permanent green space. This will be necessary to provide amenities to the increased population in this neighbourhood and the surrounding downtown area.  
The Ontario Seed property was identified in the PARTS Central Plan as a significant opportunity to achieve and contribute to the density goals of the Growth Plan in the station area while maintaining the established neighborhood’s existing character. It would not be appropriate to split designate the Ontario Seed property and create an additional transition condition along Walter Street and frustrate the ability of this property to redevelop with an appropriate mixed use built form that would be sympathetic to the existing low rise development on Agnes Street. Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process. The Ontario Seed property is currently designated and zoned general industrial. This is privately owned property. At such time as development applications are received for this parcel Staff can review the ability of this parcel to provide a parkland dedication in the form of land. There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? | | I am concerned about the development intensification the current proposed plan would allow on the Ontario seed lands. I do not know what the zoning regulations for MIX4 are, but I assume that it allows for greater intensification than other MIX designations. Great care should be taken to plan the transition between residential homes on Agnes street and the planned intensification that is encroaching into the neighbourhood from the downtown intensification. MIX 4 does not permit such transitional zoning and this needs to be revised.  
Ontario Seed is just one example of areas where M4 zoning is adjacent to low rise residential in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan. According to the Planning Around Rapid Transit Station report, different intensities of mixed use are intended to aid in facilitating the transition between high and low intensity use. The KW-Hospital Secondary plan fails to implement appropriate transitions through the use of different intensities of Mixed Use zoning. All properties that designated Mixed Use and are adjacent to low rise residential should be carefully reviewed to maintain the integrity of neighbourhoods, which includes appropriate set backs and green space. If the Ontario seed property is zoned for development, it should be zoned for low rise residential on the property that fronts Walter street and on the land that is adjacent to the rear yards of the homes on Agnes. This is not counter to the policy of intensification. It maintains a balance of housing stock in the neighbourhood and attracts families to the neighbourhood, giving them an opportunity to live in the downtown core. It provides suitable homes and neighbourhoods for children and families.  
The city has committed to the protection of established neighbourhoods. But this plan indicates that homes on Walter between Agnes and Wellington will be zoned for intense redevelopment. Reducing low rise residential land use is not in the interest of healthy neighbourhoods. It reduces the housing stock that meets the needs of families and threatens the viability of the schools. Low rise residential zoning on the west side of Wellington and both sides of Walter near Wellington would protect the neighbourhood and provide an important transition between the intensification planned for downtown, the transit hub and the former Six-O lands. |
| # | Commenter Details | Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? | Staff Response |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | The Station Park project, the developments along Victoria between King and Park and the Bram yard properties, provide plenty of space for intensification. Intensification in the KW Midtown area should be less ambitious because of the impact on existing residential streets. Also, limiting the focus to one neighbourhood plan also does not reflect the overall intensification that will occur across the downtown region, the increased traffic and the increased population that will need some kind of green space for recreational activities, dog walking and to promote general wellbeing. The current plan does not provide for adequate green space for an increasing population, and worse it actually takes out informal green space already being used by the community. Moreover, the secondary plan for the Hospital area gives a false impression of available green space, since it suggests the playing field for the KCI high School and the cemetery are green spaces akin to parks.  
While these areas are used for people to walk through, they are not recreational spaces or parks, and suggesting they are is misleading. There is already a shortage of green space in this community, which will become more acute as the population increases with planned intensification. Rather than removing green spaces, we need to create more. This lack of green space and the lack of transitions between residential homes and the surrounding areas where intensification is planned are a concern, and I request more careful and considerate planning is needed to address these concerns. I look forward to further opportunities to provide feedback and discuss the proposed plans for my neighbourhood. | The parcel at the end of Braun Street was identified in the PARTS Central Plan as a significant opportunity to achieve and contribute to the density goals of the Growth Plan in the station area while maintaining the established neighbourhood’s existing character.
There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high rise residential, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. The triangle of land is recognized in the CHL Study as a CHL. This CHL will be evaluated as part of the broader area and will be considered at a later date. The parcel at the end of Braun Street would be better suited as low rise residential -love the addition of park space at the end of Mary & Herbert -consider appropriate transition between mixed use areas where it meets low rise residential -ensure that parcels of Mount Hope neighbourhood already included in Cultural Heritage Landscape are recognized as such on all maps, as is the Mount Hope Cemetery, including Moore Ave street scape as it does fall within the boundary --> triangle of land including Braun, Andrew/Shanely to Moore, King, and Breithaupt that is designated as R3 and should also indicate its Cultural Heritage Landscape recognition. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td>- it would be helpful to know if/where the proposed zoning differs/agree with the zoning approved in the PARTS Midtown plan and RIENS. It would be helpful for people to know how their previous engagements have been included into the existing plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>67 Agnes Street</td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td>The neighbourhood is similar to the other neighbourhood CHLs identified. The new RES-3 zoning as is proposed to be modified is consistent with similar neighbourhoods in this secondary plan area. The proposed land use and zoning that was shown at the Open Houses reflect the PARTS Plans, the CHL studies and recommendations in RIENS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: May 11, 2019</td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td>There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23 Dominion Street</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>Staff have reviewed the properties along Walter Street south of Agnes and recommend 66 and 70 Walter Street be designated Low Rise Residential and zoned RES-3 to assist in maintaining the existing character of the Walter Street streetscape at the corner of Agnes Street. The properties at 44 to 60 Walter Street should maintain the Mixed Use land use designation to support the recommendation from the PARTS Central Plan as these properties would be most impacted by adjacent mixed use developments and should also be redeveloped as such. There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: May 16, 2019</td>
<td>- My family and I live at 67 Agnes Street, and so our back and side yards are adjacent to the land that is being proposed for mixed use development. Our primary concern is that any new development include an adequate transition between the current two-story residential houses in the neighbourhood and new buildings. For example, could the plan could include height restrictions along the low-rise residential boundary so that the current character (as described in the plan) would not be diminished? Secondly, I am surprised that the plan does not include a vision (or expectation) for more green spaces. In fact, we would be losing significant shared green space currently enjoyed by many on the Ontario Seed Company property, while adding a significant number of new residents to the neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- I find the use of MIX-4 bordering on low rise residential without clear setback/massing/transition requirements inappropriate. It seems more reasonable to apply lower height restrictions on locations like the badminton club, along Walter and Wellington streets and behind properties on Agnes Street. According to the Planning Around Rapid Transit Station report, different intensities of mixed use are intended to aid in facilitating the transition between high and low intensity use. The KW-Hospital Secondary plan fails to implement appropriate transitions through the use of different intensities of Mixed Use zoning. All properties that designated Mixed Use and are adjacent to low rise residential should be MIX 1. There also seems to be very little green space designated to accommodate the increased population density. A green way along the train tracks, increased setbacks to maintain the treed streetscape and clearer guidance on how proposed developments could incorporate green space would all be welcome additions. I think a trail connection from the Iron Horse to the transit hub was discussed - this seems like the best time to try and implement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td>It. Finally, there is no indication of how traffic from the new developments will be managed - whether directed onto King Street directly or with access to Wellington and possibly greatly increased volume on the residential streets. Ideally traffic will be forced onto a major artery like King Street. If traffic from the intensified areas, especially Station Park, has direct access to Walter/Wellington/Agnes, traffic calming measures will be needed on these and other side streets as there has already been an increase in volume and aggressive driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td>1. Land use seems to be generally appropriate - mixed use or innovation seem like reasonable uses adjacent to residential. High rise residential or mixed use with no height limit and no defined transition do not seem appropriate. 2. With the absence of defined transition requirements, it appears that the zoning could be staggered to provide more clearly defined transitions, i.e., MIX-4 or high rise residential should not be adjacent to low rise residential with no defined transition requirements, especially in confined areas where transition and unlimited height will be at odds (i.e., Mt Hope/York/Union, between Walter and King, OSC property).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td>4. Provide continuous strip of open space along train tracks from Belmont to King to facilitate a trail connection from the Iron Horse trail to the transit hub instead of routing commuters through side streets and Cherry Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>66 Braun Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: May 17, 2019</td>
<td>1. Medium Rise Residential land use would affect us the most, since it is located directly across from our driveway on Linwood and adjacent to Mt Hope Cemetery. Mixed Use (with specific policy areas) is just meters away, directly across Central Fresh Market's parking lot from our front door. We currently see KCI from our front windows. I would appreciate more discussion regarding what new business and residential spaces would tend to look like. 2. Zoning - Low Rise Residential, I feel that a provision needs to be maintained to allow us to build a triplex on our residential property, if we choose to in the future. When we looked into purchasing our home in 1999, we consulted and received confirmation of this from the City of Kitchener. I would also like to discuss a second proposal to build</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. Multiple dwellings are required to go through the site plan process where building elevations, landscape plans and urban design considerations including shadow impacts are reviewed. Staff advised that the zone categories and uses are still under review. At the time the RES zones were applied for the Open House we did not have a RES zone that permitted three units so Staff determined that applying the lesser zone would be more appropriate to reflect the existing built form of the neighbourhood. Staff are reviewing the RES-3 zone for inclusion of a three unit residential use in accordance with Bill 108. There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td>3 townhouse units within our deep lot, with access to doors / windows facing Mt Hope Cemetery and Linwood Ave. Windows with a southern exposure towards Braun and King would also allow more light. If Medium Rise Residential buildings are being zoned directly across from our driveway on Linwood, I would appreciate if consideration would be given to construct buildings facing north and south. This would allow for some open space for parking etc, without obstructing our view of the wonderful sunsets that we have been accustomed to for 20+ years. I would appreciate more discussion re what building styles, height and setbacks would look like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td>compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td>3. Development to be Compatible with Existing Neighbourhood Character This is a well-established neighbourhood near the heart of our city. I have always enjoyed its proximity to downtown Kitchener and Uptown Waterloo. There are always people walking their dogs, riding their bikes, taking their kids to the parks, etc. I would love to see an outside space created where people can gather, relax with friends and enjoy some outdoor activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>4. When new Zoning and Land Use proposal(s) for our Neighbourhood were initiated between 2012 to 2015, my husband was going through aggressive cancer treatment. I did not attend any meetings at that time, since my family was my #1 priority. Shortly after we purchased our home in 1999, we visited the Land &amp; Title office to determine how long ago the house was built. Records went back as far as the 1860’s. However, we were also advised that our double brick house could possibly be even older than that. Considering that our house is almost 160 years old, I am once again concerned about any future construction in our Neighbourhood causing structural issues due to vibration. When construction began in 2011 to upgrade Braun St infrastructure and the LRT construction on King St in front of KCI followed soon after, we began to notice our parging foundation was compromised both inside and outside. We now have several cracks in the corners of every room in our house. Concrete steps from our basement walkout to the back yard and driveway area have also cracked and shifted. Also since this construction time frame, we have experienced squirrels, mice and most recently over the winter a new family of rats inhabit our home. This was never an issue prior to the construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>49, 51 and 53 Pine Street</td>
<td>Phone call conversation on June 6, 2019 to advise that the property owner objects to the proposed RES-3 Zone. The property is currently zoned R-5 and at a minimum the existing zoning should be retained, particularly in close proximity to the LRT stop.</td>
<td>Staff advised that the zone categories and uses are still under review. At the time the RES zones were applied for the Open House we did not have a RES zone that permitted three units so Staff determined that applying the lesser zone would be more appropriate to reflect the existing built form of the neighbourhood. Staff are reviewing the RES-3 zone for inclusion of a three unit residential use in accordance with Bill 108.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>399, 403 and 407 Park Street</td>
<td>Thank you again for the valuable information and guidance obtained from the open house held on April 18 at the Victoria Park pavilion. I was advised at the time to follow up with the design team and to formally request a zoning change to our property (currently zoned Low Rise Residential RES-3). It is our desire to have the zoning changed to that of institutional to join the existing properties that front Park Street at 399, 403 and 407 Park Street respectively.</td>
<td>Staff have reviewed the properties and determined that an institutional zoning would not be appropriate for these properties given their size and locations, despite their adjacency to an institutional property. Low rise residential land use and zoning will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Just a brief note with some points I have been wanting to share. I believe that the current zoning, and perhaps Midtown re-zoning, are creating incentives that will not achieve your goals. 1) Incentives now strongly favour tear-downs and duplexing in established, cultural heritage landscape areas. This is happening now. Solution: Either immediately re-zone to include companion and laneway units and allow at least triplexing of homes existing home OR put a moratorium on tear-downs of structurally sound home that are representative of the style of the identified cultural heritage landscape. What is happening: Developers are buying Century homes on larger lots, demolishing the homes, and building duplexes. In many cases these have the option for ground-floor rentals, resulting in possible 4 units on the land. Most often every mature tree is destroyed in the process, as well as the irreplaceable heritage-value home. This is what happened at 156 Waterloo. There is another Century house on Wilhelm surrounded by fences, awaiting likely a similar fate, and another recent example on Wellington.</td>
<td>Thanks Dawn for your always insightful comments. So that you are aware, with Bill 108, we are no longer able to use the bonusing approach to try and achieve some of the community benefits (such as the climate change ones you indicated). We are re-evaluating. Our intent remains to deliver the secondary plan updates, new zoning, design guidelines, etc to Council by the end of this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fue to the current zoning bylaws, the market does not allow bids for alternative uses that would also intensify the neighbourhood - purchase and restoration/updating of the existing homes, with building of a rear-yard or other secondary residential units - which do not need to be attached to the existing unit. Laneway units would be options on many properties. This option could be much more economical, as it does not require new construction for at least one unit (the original house, which could also be duplexed). It is also much better from a climate-change perspective, because new construction is very, very costly from an environmental perspective, and the existing large trees have a strong climate mitigation impact. 2) The current Midtown re-zoning plan is not likely to lead to a pleasant built environment that contributes to climate emergency goals. What is happening: Here, I'm confused. Floor space ratios were presented at the neighbourhood open house. I submitted comments on those. But later, I read that density bonusing was being developed. Some of the bonusing strategies seem very promising to contribute to intensification and climate change goals - trees and green infrastructure, family-sized units, affordable housing, etc. But, to work right, you need to set the initial target lower than the FSR the market wants to build, and is acceptable from a design perspective. It's identical from an economic perspective to a carbon market. The &quot;cap&quot; has to be low enough to make developers take up the policy incentives. What IS happening is that current construction along the corridor is failing to meet many important goals that density bonusing could address. Solution: Midtown re-zoning should be done at an initial lower height with density bonusing required to achieve the heights presented to the public at the open house. 3) Generally, we need to act now - or the re-development will be done, and it will be too late. ION is in place. Investors are responding now. KW is one of the few &quot;hot&quot; housing markets in the country. The city has developed some great visions, but is we wait until the policies are implemented to put them in place, it will be too late. Can you imagine if Council had said, yes we believe there is a climate crisis, but we need to wait 11 years to take action? We need to act now on these issues - even if it means putting current applications on hold until policies have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Staff Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>caught up. Now, we all have another shared reason to act now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We need to ensure that our intensification goals are aligned with our climate emergency goals. I fully understand that many aspects of the problem (the concrete oven between Victoria and Union on King that makes taking transit a trying experience, even for the true believers) are in the hands of the Region. But the secondary plan is still in the hands of the City - please act now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Justification and Summary

General Justification:

- Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process.
- Appropriate site specific policies for Mixed Use were applied to lands along the corridor based on parcel size and adjacency to other land use designations. Low Rise, Medium Rise, and Medium to High Rise Mixed Use policies were applied to this secondary plan.

Site Specific Justification:

- 800 King Street West: Concerns were expressed about this property have zoning to permit a 4 FSR. Staff have determined that a 4.0 FSR can be accommodated with limited impacts to the adjacent Low Rise Residential Limited properties given the new transition provisions outlined in the Zoning By-law. Following consultation and Staff review of 3D modelling and new policies it has been determined that a split land use designation as was proposed in the first draft was not appropriate for this property. This property is now proposed to have a Mixed Use designation and be zoned as MIX-4 along the King Street West frontage and MIX-3 along the Linwood Avenue frontage at the rear of the property.
- 3 Gildner Street: Suggestions received to deviate from the PARTS Plan and redesignate this Low Rise Residential Property to Institutional. Staff considered comments and determined that the Low Rise Residential Limited Office designation was most appropriate for this property and the same was applied to 5 Gildner Street and 7 Gildner Street.
- 49, 51, 53 Pine Street: Concerns were expressed with zoning moving from R-5 to RES-3. Property owner wished to zone the property RES-5 to protect existing permissions. Staff determined that RES-3 was most appropriate for these properties and reflects the current permissions of the existing built form and recently updated provincial regulations.
- 100 Walter Street: Currently zoned as R-8 655R, and proposed to be designated Medium Rise Residential and zoned RES-6 to reflect the existing built form and permissions for the property.
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1.0 Objective

The Victoria Park Secondary Plan was adopted by City Council in May 1994 and was approved by Regional Council in May 1995. Given this secondary plan is nearly 25 years old, City Planning Staff evaluated the existing secondary plan, in conjunction with other municipal documents and consultation to create an updated version. This plan applies new land use designations and zoning regulations which reflects direction from the City, Region, Province and other external agencies.

The Victoria Park review involves the area containing the existing Victoria Park Secondary Plan, a portion of the Victoria Street Secondary Plan and a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan. This new area is proposed to become the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan.

1.1 Location Map
2.0 Considerations

2.1 Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) – Central Station Study Area

The PARTS Plans were conducted to ensure the City of Kitchener’s station areas are developed in stable ways that support local transit and add value to communities. The studies completed thus far include recommendations for the following: Land use; Engineering infrastructure; Pedestrian and cycling connection enhancements; Transportation demand management measures; Public realm and streetscape improvements in surrounding areas; Road and parking implications; Community infrastructure; and, Public art opportunities.

The PARTS Central Plan was intended to be a guiding document with its goals and strategies to be implemented through an Official Plan Amendment, a Secondary Plan, a Zoning By-law Amendment, and updates to the Urban Design Manual. The Preferred Plan (Land Use Map) developed through this process acted as a guide for the Victoria Park Secondary Plan. Incorporation of new land use designations and zones with updated regulations were considered in conjunction with the existing conditions and uses of properties, and their existing permissions and special policies and regulations. Any deviation between the Preferred Plan and the draft Victoria Park Secondary Plan was done through Staff review and public comment and consultation to achieve the best land use planning suited to the existing and future development of the community.

2.2 Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

The City of Kitchener undertook RIENS in hopes to develop a clear and fair process for approving development projects in established neighbourhoods. Typically development proposals are considered based on the size and impact on the surrounding area, and the zoning by-laws and urban design standards in place. The intent of the recommendations of this study was to further ensure that new development blends and is compatible with the neighbourhood.

2.3 Urban Design Guidelines (UDG)

The Urban Design Manual is a guide for the development community, residents, special-interest groups, city council and staff for details on our city’s urban design guidelines and standards. The recent update of Part A of the Urban Design Manual was approved on September 9, 2019 by council as part of the Community and Infrastructure Services Committee agenda. The guidelines were last updated in 2000 and Kitchener has since seen rapid change and intensification throughout the city, triggering a desire to ensure that the guidelines reflect the evolving expectations for the design of buildings and public spaces.

Urban Design staff held a public design charrette for the Victoria Park neighbourhood on February 20, 2019. The intent of the charrette was to directly speak to and address
residents’ concerns and identify opportunities for better design in their community. These
neighbourhood specific guidelines will be brought forward for approval as part of the
Secondary Plans for each neighbourhood. Upon approval of the secondary plan for this
neighbourhood, the neighbourhood specific design guidelines will be added as part of the
area specific guidelines for Central Neighbourhoods.
2.4 Cultural Heritage Landscapes Study and Implementation

The Victoria Park neighbourhood is a designated heritage district under the Ontario Heritage Act. The CHL Study was undertaken to determine how to best creatively conserve the historical integrity and early development pattern of our city, while encouraging new growth. Identifying historic places that blend the built and natural environment that have key ties to the events, people and activities that form the shape of our city were accounted through an inventory detailing these CHLs. A comprehensive summary of the findings and recommendations of this study for CHLs within the Victoria Park neighbourhood is below.
Introduction

Our cultural heritage resources provide a link to the past and are an expression of the city’s culture and history. They contribute in a significant way to Kitchener’s identity and unique character, and help instill civic pride, foster a sense of community and sense of place. The conservation of cultural heritage resources also contributes to making our neighbourhoods a more interesting and appealing place to live, work and play.

The Province of Ontario through the Provincial Policy Statement (a planning document that provides policy direction on matters of Provincial interest related to land use planning and development), requires that municipalities conserve significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs).

With this in mind, the conservation of cultural heritage resources has been an important consideration in work undertaken by the City as part of the comprehensive planning review of the Victoria Park Neighbourhood. This work, which culminates in updating the policies and land use planning framework of the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, aims to encourage development and growth in a manner that is respectful of cultural heritage and contributes to making the neighbourhood unique and distinctive.

Built Heritage Resources

Built heritage resources are buildings and structures that may have either design/physical, historic/associative or contextual heritage value. The designation and listing of heritage property on the Municipal Heritage Register is an important tool in the City’s efforts to conserve its built heritage resources.

Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act provides the strongest heritage protection available for conserving heritage resources, and allows a municipality to control proposals for demolition and alteration through a heritage permit system. While a “listed” property is afforded a more limited measure of protection, the City can require studies such as a heritage impact assessment and/or a conservation plan to guide the consideration of new development and identify measures to avoid or mitigate negative impacts to significant cultural heritage resources and attributes.

Of the properties located within the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan boundary, roughly 344 are located within the Victoria Park Area Heritage Conservation District and are considered designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. An additional 8 properties are individually designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; and 6 properties are currently “listed” on the Municipal Heritage Register.
Map 2 appended to this report identifies the location and status of built heritage resources within the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan boundary.

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

While the City has long maintained a heritage register of significant built heritage resources, efforts to identify and conserve significant cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs) is a relatively new undertaking. In 2014, an inventory of 55 significant cultural heritage landscapes in Kitchener was established. Cultural heritage landscapes are defined in the Provincial Policy Statement as a geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples of cultural heritage landscapes include but are not limited to parks, mainstreets, cemeteries, trailways, industrial complexes, and neighbourhoods.

Within a cultural heritage landscape, there are often buildings, structures, landscape features and other attributes that collectively illustrate a historical theme. Themes considered to be significant, are those that are essential to understanding the evolution of a City and that underpin its identity. The Kitchener CHL Study concluded that several established residential neighbourhoods that maintain a high degree of heritage integrity and are representative of the planning concepts and housing styles of the period in which they were developed, are worthy of being conserved.

The 2014 Kitchener CHL Study identifies the Victoria Park Neighbourhood as a significant cultural heritage landscape, and is one of 12 established residential neighbourhoods of considerable value and significance identified in the study. In addition to the Victoria Park Neighbourhood the 2014 CHL Study also identifies Victoria Park itself, Jubilee Drive, part of the Iron Horse Trail, and a portion of the CN Railway line as CHLs within the Victoria Park Neighbourhood area. A portion of the Warehouse District CHL identified in the 2014 CHL Study is also located with the revised Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan boundary (on the west side of Victoria Street North), but does not form part of the CHL considerations in this Secondary Plan and will be addressed as part of a future study.

Victoria Park is considered unique among Kitchener neighbourhoods, in part because the neighbourhood features a traditional pattern of nineteenth century urban development, with a mixture of factories, factory owner’s houses and worker’s housing located in close proximity to each other. At its core is Victoria Park, which opened in 1896 and is designed in the romantic landscape style. The park is considered one of the most elegant parks in Canada, and together with the surrounding neighbourhood, contributes significantly to Kitchener’s civic and historic identity.
A Phased Approach to CHL Conservation

Taking stock and identifying the cultural heritage resources that are important to a community is a critical first step in any conservation strategy. For each CHL identified in the 2014 CHL Study, the study provides a description of the landscape; establishes a preliminary boundary of interest; identifies the historical integrity, and cultural and community values associated with the landscape; and finally, describes the character defining features of the CHL.

While the Study does not in itself protect CHLs, it serves as the first of three phases of work involved in establishing appropriate CHL conservation strategies for each landscape, as follows:

**Phase 1** – Establish an Inventory of Significant CHLs and identify priority CHLs for further study and analysis.

**Phase 2** – Conduct fieldwork, analysis and property owner engagement in identifying heritage attributes and a preferred conservation strategy for select CHLs.

**Phase 3** – Implementation and management of a preferred CHL conservation strategy or strategies.

Phase 1 noted above is complete. Priority CHLs have been identified including the Victoria Park Neighbourhood CHL. Phase 2 is in progress for select priority CHLs. This includes work undertaken by City Planning staff in arriving at the cultural heritage policies included in the Secondary Plan. The timing
associated with the third and final phase the City’s CHL conservation strategy is in part dependent upon the nature and complexity of the strategies recommended for each CHL. Strategies affording the best protections are typically those governed by Provincial legislation such as the Ontario Heritage Act (e.g. heritage designation and listing of heritage property), and the Planning Act (e.g. Secondary Plan policies, assignment of appropriate land use and zoning, implementation of neighbourhood design guidelines through site plan control).

The Victoria Park Area Heritage Conservation District

On May 16, 1997, the Ontario Municipal Board approved By-law 96-91, designating the Victoria Park area as a heritage conservation district under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, and formally adopting the Victoria Park Area Heritage Conservation District Plan (VPAHCD Plan). The boundary of the VPAHCD is illustrated on Map 2 attached to this report, and generally encompasses the rear of the properties fronting Victoria Street South to the west, Joseph Street to the north, Benton Street to the east, and the Iron Horse Trail to the south.

The VPAHCD Plan contains policies and guidelines aimed at conserving the significant architecture and landscapes which are unique to the Victoria Park area. Specific guidance is provided on conserving and enhancing the historic buildings in the heritage district, to ensure character defining features and attributes are conserved when changes are proposed. New building construction, alterations, additions and demolition may require issuance of a heritage permit. Guidelines and policies also apply to the conservation of public spaces such as Victoria Park itself and to streetscape features.
While development has been vigorous on all sides of the heritage district given the proximity of the area to the downtown; the district has remained relatively intact with its Victorian architecture, streetscapes and romantic landscape style civic park. The number, authenticity and condition of the district’s early buildings and landscapes remains significant, a testament perhaps to the value and effectiveness of the heritage conservation district as a conservation tool.

Since 1997, the area that has seen the most significant change is along Queen Street South, which is considered to be a mixed use transit corridor and where new mid to high rise buildings have been constructed. The heritage conservation district plan acknowledges that higher density development and intensification along Queen Street South can be expected, but states that the conservation of historic
buildings is a primary goal, and that property owners are encouraged to work with existing historic buildings, altering, adding to and integrating them into new development.

The Victoria Park Neighbourhood Cultural Heritage Landscape

The 2014 Kitchener Cultural Heritage Landscape Study identifies the Victoria Park Neighbourhood as a significant cultural heritage landscape (CHL). As a continuing landscape that has evolved over time, heritage conservation districts are considered to be a type of CHL. While the Victoria Park Neighbourhood CHL boundary identified in the 2014 study encompasses the entire VPAHCD boundary, it also includes lands beyond the heritage district boundary south of the Iron Horse Trail, including property located on Homewood Avenue, Brock Street, and the north sides of Highland Road West and West Avenue. Residential development south of the Iron Horse Trail is generally more varied in building style and of more recent vintage compared with the VPAHCD (dates from first half of the 20th century rather than the latter part of the 19th century); however the streetscapes share many of the same characteristics. Mature street trees line the streets; lot sizes are deep; existing development contributes to creating a consistent street edge; and residences feature common attributes including front porches, primarily brick construction, and no or detached rear garages.
**Review of Land Use & Zoning**

City planning staff reviewed and considered preliminary land use designations assigned to property as part of the Secondary Plan review. This included using computer modeling to examine how development permitted within certain land use categories, such as the proposed mixed use areas along Victoria Street South, may impact existing low rise residential areas located within the heritage district. Land use categories and regulations have been applied to balance opportunities for growth and development where appropriate, while respecting heritage conservation objectives and minimizing potential impacts on designated heritage property.

---

**Public Engagement & Comments**

Information on resources and attributes of cultural heritage value or interest within the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan study area was made available to property owners and the public both online (on the City’s Neighbourhood Planning Review webpage) and at public information meetings. Specifically, information panels on existing (designated and listed) cultural heritage resources; attributes contributing to the CHL/neighbourhood character; and examples of planning and legislative tools to achieve a level of conservation, were made available for review and discussion. Feedback received on cultural heritage matters primarily centered on concerns regarding compatibility of proposed land use and zoning with existing historic development; built form transition between possible mid-rise development and existing low-rise residential areas; and related potential impacts on long views across and beyond Victoria Park.
Recommendations to address cultural heritage interests within the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan Area

Having examined the cultural heritage value and attributes of the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan area, and having considered the feedback and input received from property owners and the public through the Secondary Plan process, the following measures are recommended to be applied to address cultural heritage interests and objectives.

Measures to be considered under the Ontario Heritage Act

- Existing built heritage resources designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and listed as non-designated property on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register shall be conserved. This includes most notably, continuing to apply the Victoria Park Area Heritage Conservation District Plan policies and guidelines as a means of conserving Part V designated heritage property.

Measures to be considered in the Official Plan

- The Victoria Park Neighbourhood CHL, Victoria Park, Jubilee Drive, Iron Horse Trail CHL, and Canadian National Railway Line CHL should be identified on Map 9 in the Official Plan as Cultural Heritage Landscapes.

Measures to be considered in the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan

- Establish area design guidelines that support cultural heritage conservation objectives.

  While much the of Secondary Plan area is afforded a measure of heritage protection through the designation and regulation of property located within the Victoria Park Area Heritage Conservation District, the entire secondary plan area would benefit from establishing separate area design guidelines that would form part of the City’s Urban Design Manual. Such guidelines would serve to complement the existing heritage district policies and guidelines, addressing issues not necessarily regulated in the VPAHCD Plan, such as improving pedestrian connectivity and movement. The urban design guidelines could also encourage development within low rise areas outside of the heritage district boundary south of the Iron Horse Trail, to follow the VPAHCD Plan guidelines as a means of conserving similar existing heritage characteristics and streetscape qualities (e.g. front porches, gabled roofs, use of brick, etc.).

- Recommend undertaking a Master Plan for Victoria Park

  While the VPAHCD Plan has done well to help guide conservation efforts within Victoria Park itself, the policies and guidelines included in the district plan were drafted over 20 years ago. The park has seen tremendous growth since the mid-1990s, in the number of patrons who visit and use the park; in the type of events and festivals celebrated in the park; and in the amount of new development that has been constructed within view of the park. This has led to increased interest and requests for new facilities, services and pressure for change.

  The current VPAHCD Plan policies and guidelines, while aimed at addressing existing built features and the park’s Romantic landscape ideals, are not equivalent to having a current actionable
Master Plan in place. A Master Plan for Victoria Park could provide more detailed direction on such matters as better connecting the park with the surrounding neighbourhood, streets, commercial areas and trails; long term building and facilities planning; identifying areas to remain unchanged and areas where change may be accommodated; and defining in more detail significant views and vistas to be conserved to, from, and within the park boundary (e.g. to the Clock Tower or to Lang Smoke Stack from the park).

- **Identify Property of Specific CHL Interest, where a Heritage Impact Assessment may be required for CHL conservation**

Currently, as part of the assessment of proposed development impact on built heritage resources and as referenced in the Provincial Policy Statement under the Planning Act, the City may require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for planning applications potentially impacting a cultural heritage resource located on property that is designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, and on property located adjacent protected (designated) heritage property. The City’s Official Plan also states that the City may require the submission of a HIA for development, redevelopment and site alteration that has the potential to impact an identified cultural heritage landscape.

Most of the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan area is located within or adjacent the VPAGCD boundary (considered to be protected heritage property) where the City may already require a HIA for planning and development applications. However, the Victoria Park Neighbourhood CHL boundary extends beyond the boundary of the VPAGCD (e.g. property located south of the Iron Horse Trail). As a result, a policy should be included in the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan clarifying that there is also interest in potentially requesting that a HIA be undertaken for development on property that is considered to be of specific CHL interest. Such properties are identified on Map 2 and include the following:

- protected heritage property designated under Part IV and/or Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- property “listed” on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register under Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- property located adjacent protected and listed heritage property.

Where development is proposed on property that is of specific CHL interest but not designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, then such HIA may be scoped and limited in review to assess visual and contextual impact.
Victoria Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan and Cultural Heritage Landscape Boundaries
### 3.0 Process Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 2016</strong></td>
<td>Staff begins Neighbourhood Planning Reviews and commences the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017 - May 2018</strong></td>
<td>Staff prepare material with relation to specific neighbourhood character topics to present to the public for feedback about what works well within their community. Draft land use and zoning maps are created for this neighbourhood to be presented to the public for feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **December 4, 2018**| **Public Information Meeting #1**  
Information panels were presented in an open house format with Staff present to answer questions about the proposed land use and zoning for the neighbourhood. 
Public were asked to answer questions interactively using stickers regarding neighbourhood character topics including: front porches; garages; built form transition; building design, materials and colours; setbacks; and, terminating vistas. 
Public feedback collected through a “dot-mocracy” exercise and by written submissions following the meeting. |
| **November 2018 – December 2019** | Public comments are received and reviewed by Staff. Updated draft maps for land use and zoning are finalized. Final recommendations for this secondary plan will be brought forward to council in Fall/Winter 2019. |
| **September – October 2019** | Internal City Staff review of all draft secondary plan policies and mapping. |
| **October 11, 2019** | All property owners within the Secondary Plan area are sent notice of a Statutory Public Meeting. |
| **December 9, 2019** | **Public Information Meeting #2**  
Staff present all draft maps for six secondary plans, including land use and zoning maps for Victoria Park. The public have the opportunity to as staff questions and submit final comments by comment form or e-mail following the meeting. |
| **December 2019** | Staff conduct a final review of all secondary plan maps with public comments received and prepare a report for council. Final draft maps are finalized. |
| **Spring 2020**    | **Secondary Plans Report to Committee/Council**                                                                                         |
4.0 Public Consultation Materials

4.1 Open House #1
   Notice of Open House
   Information Panels/Maps
   Scanned Sign In Sheets
   Scanned Comment Forms
   Public Comments Received by Email
To: Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

RE: Public Open House – Neighbourhood Planning Review
New Victoria Park Secondary Plan
Process of Updating and Applying Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations

The City would like to formally invite you to participate in the Neighbourhood Review of the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan and updated zoning. It is scheduled as follows:

Date/Time: Tuesday, December 4th, 2018, 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm (Drop-in)
Location: Victoria Park Pavilion – 80 Schneider Avenue

The boundary of this new secondary plan would combine the Victoria Park Secondary Plan with a portion of the Victoria Street Secondary Plan and Mill Courtland Woodside Park (see location map below).

An updated land use framework within the City’s Secondary Plan areas was deferred as part of the review of our new 2014 Official Plan. The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters. A ‘Secondary Plan’ is a more detailed land use and policy document that forms
part of the Official Plan, and is used by the City to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city.

The Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study. The City is now in a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans.

We are getting into the details of land use, zoning, heritage conservation, and urban design.

We want to canvass your opinions on the preferred land uses, and understand your opinions on the character that you would like to see in your neighbourhood. This will help us determine what regulatory tools should be implemented to protect these features. These tools can include traditional planning tools like zoning regulations and urban design guidelines, and/or other tools such as heritage listings and designations. A portion of the new Secondary Plan is already designated as a Heritage Conservation District and identified as a significant Cultural Heritage Landscape.

The Public Open House will include a number of stations to provide an opportunity to discuss and share your input with the City planners on the land uses proposed for the new Secondary Plan and the character that you would like to see in the secondary plan area.

Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you!

Help guide the implementation of land use, zoning, heritage conservation and urban design in your neighbourhood by attending our public open house on December 4th!

Information shared at the meeting will also be available online (posted on the project website after the meeting). If you are unable to attend this meeting, you are welcome to provide your input through the project website: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR or to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Yours truly,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner – Policy

c. Brandon Sloan, Manager, Long Range and Policy Planning
   Alain Pinard, Director of Planning
   Janette MacDonald, Community Engagement Consultant
   Erin Power, Communications & Marketing Associate
   Councillor Debbie Chapman
### Victoria Park Secondary Plan – Land Use Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range of Permitted Uses</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Maximum Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Low density housing types including Single Detached Dwelling, Duplex Dwelling, Semi-Detached Dwelling, Street Townhouse Dwellings, Cluster Townhouse Dwellings, low-rise Multiple Dwellings and special needs housing.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>3 storeys or 11 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Same as Low Rise Residential, however specific policy area will limit the number of units in a multiple dwelling to three units. Consideration will also be given to further regulating building height and density. Analysis to be completed to confirm the properties to which the specific policy area will apply.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, personal services, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses and residential uses.</td>
<td>Minimum of 2.0 / Maximum of 4.0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use with specific policy area</strong></td>
<td>Same as Mixed Use, however specific policy area will limit to medium intensity form of development.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use with specific policy area</strong></td>
<td>Same as Mixed Use, however specific policy area will limit to medium intensity form of development.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Heritage Conservation</strong></td>
<td>These natural heritage features are intended to be protected and/or conserved for their ecological functions. Natural heritage features can include provincially or locally significant wetlands, valleys, woodlands, threatened or endangered species habitat, and lands subject to natural hazards or flooding. No new development is permitted in these areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed Residential (RES) Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>RES-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a limited range of low density dwelling types on smaller lots in low rise areas.</td>
<td>[Diagram of Single Detached Dwelling, Second Detached Dwelling, Hospice, Small Residential Care Facility]</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
<td>3 storeys Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td>[Diagram of Single Detached Dwelling, Second Detached Dwelling, Semi Detached Dwelling, Street Townhouse Dwelling, Fourplex, Hospice, Small Residential Care Facility]</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>The site specific may limit height and FSR depending on property context and heritage attributes (TBD)</td>
<td>3 storeys Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td>[Diagram of Single Detached Dwelling, Second Detached Dwelling, Semi Detached Dwelling, Street Townhouse Dwelling, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Multiple Dwelling, Lodging House, Hospice, Small Residential Care Facility, Large Residential Care Facility]</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COM-1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodate complementary commercial uses within residential neighbourhoods in Community Areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RES-6</strong></td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas.</td>
<td>[Diagram of Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Multiple Dwelling, Lodging House, Hospice, Large Residential Care Facility]</td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Office, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
# Proposed Non-Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>MIX-1</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a low density residential uses.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan's Establishment, Brewpub, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Commercial Facility, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Craftsperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Print Shop, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Retail, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>4 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6  Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-2</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a medium density.</td>
<td>Uses allowed in MIX-1 plus Large Residential Care Facility, Payday Loan Establishment, Post-Secondary School</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 1.0  Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a medium density.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan's Establishment, Brewpub, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Community Facility, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Craftsperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Large Residential Care Facility, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Payday Loan Establishment, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Post-Secondary School, Print Shop, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Retail, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>10 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 1.0  Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings at a high density within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Same as MIX-3</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>Min – 2.0  Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>OSR-1</td>
<td>To provide a comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system.</td>
<td>Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation and Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>To provide a comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system.</td>
<td>Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation and Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Heritage Conservation</strong></td>
<td>NHC-1</td>
<td>To protect and/or conserve natural heritage features and their ecological functions.</td>
<td>Existing Agriculture and Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EUF-1</td>
<td>Recognize existing uses within a floodway or floodplain.</td>
<td>Existing uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
Heritage designation is a tool that municipalities use to protect heritage property. It recognizes the importance of a property to the local community; protects the property’s cultural heritage value; encourages good stewardship; and promotes knowledge and understanding about the property.

Heritage District designation has its interest in the protection and enhancement of groups of properties, streets, and open spaces that collectively give an area its special character. It involves the preparation of a Heritage Conservation District Plan which contains policies and guidelines on alterations, additions, new construction, demolition, and on the care and maintenance of heritage attributes. Individual property designation involves the adoption of a designating bylaw and provides a description of the property; a statement of cultural heritage value or interest; and a description of heritage attributes.

If an owner of a designated property that is individually designated or located within a Heritage Conservation District wishes to make alterations that affect heritage attributes, then the owner must apply for a Heritage Permit from the City.

Listing on the Municipal Heritage Register

Listing is a tool that municipalities use to identify properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest to the municipality. It recognizes the importance of a property to the local community; provides interim protection from demolition; and, enables the City to require a Heritage Impact Assessment and a Conservation Plan with the submission of a Planning Act application, such as a Site Plan. Unlike a designated property, listing does not provide formal protection under the Ontario Heritage Act. Owners are not required to apply for a Heritage Permit to alter the heritage attributes of their property.
The Province of Ontario has identified the conservation of cultural heritage resources including CHLs, as an area of Provincial Interest to be considered under the Planning Act and through the Provincial Policy Statement (2014). The Region of Waterloo Official Plan requires that Area Municipalities designate (identify) Cultural Heritage Landscapes in their official plans and establish associated policies to conserve CHLs.
In 2014, the City of Kitchener embarked on the first phase of a multi-phased effort to identify and conserve the City’s significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs). The first phase involved taking an inventory, and resulted in City Council approving the Kitchener Cultural Heritage Landscape Study which identifies 55 significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes, including several established residential neighbourhoods.

The City is now beginning its second phase of work, aimed at further identifying the attributes which contribute to making certain CHLs significant, and engaging with property owners on appropriate measures to address the conservation of those attributes and CHLs.
TOOLS TO PROTECT NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER

Planning Act Tools

• Official Plan / Secondary Plan Policies
• Zoning By-law Regulations
• Urban Design Guidelines

Heritage Act Tools

• Heritage Designation (District & Individual Property)
• Listing of Individual Properties
**Built Heritage Resources**

means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal community. Built heritage resources are generally located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or included on local, provincial and/or federal registers.

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).

**Heritage Act Tools**

- Heritage Conservation Easement Agreements
- Designation of Individual Properties (Part IV)
- Designation of Groups of Properties (Part V – Heritage Conservation District)
- Listing of Individual Properties
- Heritage Funding (Grants and Tax Refunds)

**Planning Act Tools**

- Official Plan/Secondary Plan Policies
- Community Improvement Plans
- Zoning By-law Regulations
- Subdivision Agreements
- Demolition Control
- Site Plan Control
- Urban Design Guidelines

**Other Tools**

- Corridor Management Plans
- Park Management Plans
- Stewardship Activities
- Public Education
- Commemoration and Interpretation
**Listed Non-Designated Properties**

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can list non-designated properties of cultural heritage value or interest on the Municipal Heritage Register. Listing is the first step the City should take to identify properties that may warrant some form of recognition, conservation and/or protection. Listing provides interim protection from demolition by increasing the amount of time the City has to process a demolition permit under the Ontario Building Code (generally from 10 to 60 business days) to provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the property merits formal designation. Listing also enables the City to ask for Heritage Impact Assessments and/or Conservation Plans with the submission of a complete Planning Act application.

**Designated Properties**

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can pass by-laws to formally designate properties of cultural heritage value or interest. Formal designation is one way of publicly acknowledging a property's heritage value to the community. Designation also helps conserve important properties for the enjoyment of present and future generations by ensuring that changes are managed in a way that respects the heritage values. This includes protection from demolition. The City has designated approximately 85 individual properties and 4 heritage conservation districts.
Zoning is used to regulate:
- Use of land;
- Location of buildings and structures;
- Types of buildings permitted and their associated uses; and
- Lot dimensions, parking requirements, building heights and setbacks from the street/lot lines.

WHAT IS A SITE SPECIFIC PROVISION?
Site specific provisions are added to the base zone to provide additional regulations. Some examples are as follows:
- Garage permissions and location
- Size and location requirements for front porches
- Height limits

WHAT IS AN URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINE:
Urban Design Guidelines establish the objectives, priorities and expectations for urban design in Kitchener. The guidelines apply to projects across the City and address such things as building types, streetscapes and the public realm. The manual is used by City staff and the development industry in the review and approval of specific types of development applications, such as official plan amendments, zone by-law, site plan control and minor variance applications. The guidelines are inherently flexible and negotiable and do not have the same regulatory power as other tools such as the Zoning By-law.
EXAMPLES OF ZONING REGULATIONS

Achieving a Consistent Building Setback

Any new (or additions to) single detached, semi-detached or street townhouse dwellings required to have a setback from a street that is based on the average setback of the two neighbouring properties.

A tolerance of 1 metre from the average setback has been incorporate into the regulation to provide flexibility. This regulation is in place already in Central Neighbourhoods (REINS Areas).

Garage Projections & Permission

Garage projections & permissions can be implemented using of zoning regulations and/or urban design guidelines

Sample Urban Design Guideline: Where the existing streetscape does not contain street facing garages, only detached recessed garages should be permitted.
**Neighbourhood Planning Review**

**City of Kitchener**

**NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER**

### HOW IMPORTANT IS IT THAT THE CITY REGULATE ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Features / Focal Points</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e. protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Design, Materials &amp; Colours</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e. protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POTENTIAL CONSERVATION TOOLS IDENTIFIED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Character Element</th>
<th>Potential Conservation Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Plan Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porches</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Form Transitions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design, Materials, Colours</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Features / Focal Points</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Neighbourhood Planning Review

## Neighbourhood Character

### How Important Is It That the City Regulate...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Should not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Porches</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e. requires front porches on all new low-rise infill developments?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates garages (i.e. setback, location on lot etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Form Transition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e. requires new development to respect existing built form?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e. requires that buildings form a consistent street edge?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>Phone Number*</td>
<td>E-mail Address*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>379 Queen St. S.</td>
<td>N2C 1W6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133 Foxboro Dr. BADEN</td>
<td>N3A 3X2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 ROLAND ST.</td>
<td>N2G 1K5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 Schneider Ave</td>
<td>N2G 1K7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158 Benton</td>
<td>N2G 3H8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 THEREZA N</td>
<td>N2G 1M1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60 Oak St. fit 924 123</td>
<td>N2C 1L3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 Schneider Ave.</td>
<td>N2G 1K8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SIGN-IN SHEET

**Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**

**December 4, 2018**

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63 Hains Ave, Kitchener, N2G 1Z7</td>
<td>N2G 1Z7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>775 Queen St S, Kitchener, N2M 1A5</td>
<td>N2M 1A5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Michael St., N2M 1A5</td>
<td>N2G 1F8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Richmond Rd</td>
<td>N2G 1Z1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 Brock St.</td>
<td>N2M 1K3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>166 Dill St.</td>
<td>N2G 1L1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93 David St</td>
<td>N2G 1Y1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93 David St</td>
<td>N2G 1Y1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104 WATER ST. S.</td>
<td>N2C 1Z5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69 Brock St.</td>
<td>N2M 1X2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600 PARK ST.</td>
<td>N2G1M3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Oak St</td>
<td>N2G 1L3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1020 King St. E., Kitch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 Strange St.</td>
<td>N2G1P8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 HEINIS</td>
<td>N2G 1Z5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 S - 221 Queen ST. S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
# SIGN-IN SHEET

Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1  
December 4, 2018

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 Monteagle Crs</td>
<td>N2N 1N1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Highland Rd W</td>
<td>N2M 3B6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69 Bruce St</td>
<td>N2M 1K2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 Strange St.</td>
<td>N2G 1P8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/6 - 310 Quay St S</td>
<td>N2G 1K2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Margaret</td>
<td>N2H 4H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124 Water St S</td>
<td>N2G 1Z5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 WATER ST. S.</td>
<td>N2G 1Z5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164 David Street</td>
<td>N2G 1Y5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176 David St.</td>
<td>N2G 1Y5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Victoria Park Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before January 11, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
The information does not seem straightforward. It would be beneficial to fully articulate what these changes will mean and why these changes will benefit the community. Much of the information seems superfluous; it’d be nice to get the straightforward goods.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: 
Mailing Address: 184 DAVID STREET
Email: 

Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Victoria Park Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before January 11, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

   It looks to me like you are trying to keep within the current style or theme of the neighborhood

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   Am pleased with the zoning as shown

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighborhood character?

   Smart building design
Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: ______________________________
Mailing Address: ______________________________
Email: ______________________________

Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Victoria Park Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before January 11, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

Simpler graphics & explanations of the impacts of the changes are required. Background into is good but too much of it and it isn’t relevant to the impact of change.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

Information on planning steps and opportunities for public input should be provided. Is this the last chance for public input? Seems like a done deal.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

Avoid another planning debacle like the Drewlo Iron Horse Tower.

Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

THE DESIGN FOR RESIDENTIAL INFILL PANELS AND HOST WAS QUITE GOOD.

THE PLANNING PANELS DID NOT ADEQUATELY CONVEY THE PURPOSE AND DIFFERENTIATE THE PROPOSED CHANGES AND IMPACTS.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]
Thanks, Gail. Received.

Brandon Sloan
Manager, Long Range & Policy Planning | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 x7648 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | brandon.sloan@kitchener.ca

From: Gail Pool
Sent: Sunday, May 12, 2019 6:34 PM
To: Dayna Edwards <Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca>; Brandon Sloan <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Draft Secondary Plan

Hi Dayna and Brandon,

At the impetus of Melissa Bowman I contacted a few residents of Victoria Park to consider the draft secondary plan. We used a map to outline some of the areas we felt needed to be examined in more detail (please see attached document). I was unable to follow up at the end of March and was not sure if the document reached you.

I realize that the process is well underway, but I hope that there is still time for you to consider our thoughts.

Sincerely,

Gail Pool
Victoria Park Secondary Plan Map Exercise

Note: This exercise was done after the community meeting by a few Victoria Park residents.

Figure 1. Map of Victoria Park Secondary Plan

1. Theresa backing onto Michael is at risk. The area may be subject to erosion of low rise residential since it is close to the Innovation District and there are several large developments on Victoria.
2. This area is excluded from the Victoria Park Plan. Will it be an area for expansion of high rise (10+)?
3. Currently low rise, subsidized housing is scheduled to be high rise
4. Area outside the VPHCD could be developed into high rise. Lots are deep and suited for development being near the trail and park.
5. Area of the current bus depot is identified in the Urban Design Manual Downtown, Part A, p. 10 as having 5 high rise buildings. Yet there has been very positive interest in making Gaukel a pedestrian walkway (no cars) once the bus station is moved.
6. This triangle is wild and often wet. There needs to be more parkland for the vastly increased numbers of downtown residents.
7. The creek runs in this area and there is a wild footpath to Victoria Street. Could this not be improved so the pedestrians and bike users are not at risk of falling into the creek?
8. The building currently on David is a four storey building that fits nicely into the neighbourhood with several trees on its grassy frontage. This is a design that planners should consider, as opposed to flat roofs with no greenery. It would have been better to shift the parking area back from the street (Figure 1).
9. There is no crosswalk on Queen anywhere between Courland and Highland. That cuts off the entire neighbourhood to the South of Queen.

10. Jubilee drive did not exist once. With increased traffic along Park, there is a tendency for cars to race through despite a 40kph limit sign before entering Jubilee and a 30 kph limit on Jubilee. Water street also suffers from those racing to get from Courtland to downtown or Weber, Victoria East and King. Perhaps speed bumps could be added here. Alternatively: a) we made Water Street a deadend or b) we return Jubilliee Drive to parkland, which would make it a much better place to visit.

11. There is heritage lighting on several streets around the park, but not on Water between Joseph and the park. One wonders why this street, a gateway to the park, has no such lighting.
Hi Dave,

Thank you for your email and your comments on the Victoria Park Secondary Plan. Further to Brandon’s email I can provide some more information as it relates to the PARTS Central Plan and work on the Victoria Park Secondary Plan.

You are correct in that these lands were identified in the PARTS Central Plan for High Density Mixed Use.

I have provided a link to the Neighbourhood Planning Review page on the City’s website for more information on this review.

https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR

I can summarize the information that was presented at the Open House as follows:

The lands are shown on the proposed land use plan as “Mixed Use” without a Site-Specific Policy. See below.
The Panel below illustrates what we meant by Mixed Use without a site-specific, i.e. the types of uses and built form. The intent is to apply a zone category to implement this.

Unfortunately, it appears that a proposed MIX-3 was labelled on the property whereas this should have been a MIX-4 to correctly implement the land use designation that was shown on the proposed land use plan at the same meeting.
Moving forward, the lands should be recommended for Mixed Use with a MIX-4 Zone. We anticipate bringing the updated Victoria Park Secondary Plan and Zoning-By-law to a Committee/Council meeting for approval in the late Fall of this year.

A proposal which does not meet the policies and regulations of this intended land use designation and zone category will require site-specific Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment Applications.

Hopefully this clarification and information is helpful in future discussions for these lands.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Brandon Sloan <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, April 03, 2019 11:47 AM
To: 'Dave Galbraith' <dave.galbraith@ibigroup.com>
Cc: Alain Pinard <Alain.Pinard@kitchener.ca>; Douglas W. Stewart <douglas.stewart@ibigroup.com>; Katie Anderl <Katie.Anderl@kitchener.ca>; Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>; Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>; Tim Donegani <Tim.Donegani@kitchener.ca>; Dayna Edwards <Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca>
Subject: RE: New Victoria Park Secondary Plan - Implications on Park and Victoria Block

Thanks Dave for reaching out and connecting on this. We appreciate it. 40 storeys is definitely way too much for the context of that site so we should get together to further work towards what is appropriate. No doubt you will be considering the inevitable public process. We do have our tall building guidelines in place; however, you are correct that we are in process of updating the Secondary Plan, zoning, design, etc so in the near future is ideal.

I suggest we will work through the file planner, Katie on the next steps and get back to you.

Brandon Sloan
Manager, Long Range & Policy Planning | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 x7648 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | brandon.sloan@kitchener.ca

From: Dave Galbraith <dave.galbraith@ibigroup.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 03, 2019 10:12 AM
To: Brandon Sloan <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca>; Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Good morning Brandon and Tina -

I hope you are doing well. As you may know, we met with City staff yesterday to discuss a proposed development at the properties known as 186, 190 and 200 Victoria Street, Kitchener with and on behalf of our client [redacted] who owns the 186-190 Victoria Street portion of the lot and who undertaking his due diligence review of the 200 Victoria Street portion of the site. has been working with the current owner of the site for over two years, with the long term goal of developing the combined properties as a mixed-use high density development.

The proposed development concept discussed at the meeting would require an Official Plan/Secondary Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment, Section 37 (Density Bonussing) Agreement and Site Plan application.

The concept prepared and submitted for discussions was largely based upon - or guided by - the PARTS Central Stations Plan which identified the preferred land use for the subject properties (and the entirety of the Victoria, Park, Rail-line block) as 'Mixed Use High Density'. It was and is our client's goal to implement this direction through a mixed-use high density development.

Through discussions with policy staff present at the Preconsultation Meeting, we were made aware that through the first draft of the New Victoria Park Secondary Plan, the subject lands are proposed as Mixed Use with regulations limiting the height of development to 10 storeys and a maximum FSR of 2.0 (with recommended MIX 3 zoning).

This is a significant departure from the preferred land use designations proposed by the PARTS Central Stations Plan which recommended an FSR of up to 4.0 and no height limitation, which we do not understand given the extensive public and council consultation which was so recently undertaken.

We would like to meet with you as soon as possible to discuss the work completed to date on the Victoria Park Secondary Plan, find out ways to participate in the process, and discuss our client's lands within the context of the PARTS Central Stations Plan and ongoing Victoria Park Secondary Planning exercise and endorsed/approved.

Please let us know a time that will work on your end to meet within the next week. I can be available:

-Friday 2-4
-Next Tuesday (any time)
-Next Wednesday (morning only)

I look forward to hearing from you.

Dave Galbraith
Planner
IBI GROUP
410 Albert Street, Suite 101
Waterloo ON N2L 3V3 Canada
tel +1 519 585 2255 ext 63209

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.

NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l'expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.
Hi Gail,

As we moved from the first draft of the document (Urban Design Manual) to the final draft, the structure changed significantly to align the formatting with the parent section (City-Wide Design). The main elements have remained the same, in fact we have added additional guidelines that address important topics like diversity, inclusion and sustainability right in the ‘Design for Infill in Central Neighbourhoods’ section.

The zoning proposed for the low-rise areas in the Victoria Park neighbourhood will permit more uses than simply single detached dwellings. As a result these guidelines are necessary to guide change (in the event that there is a proposed land use change or if existing uses are changed to a different, perhaps more intensive use). The permissions for a variety of land uses are provided by the Zoning By-law, and the urban design guidelines act as a tool to implement the Zoning By-law. Therefore it would be inappropriate and not in line with the station areas plans, nor the Zoning By-law, to restrict density in these areas via the design guidelines. The zoning will have stepbacks, setbacks and separation distances, among other tools to ensure that density is placed and designed to be compatible with low-rise uses. In addition the design guidelines will complement the zoning. I will be working with Leon to ensure that the guidelines complement the Victoria Park HCD Plan so that heritage resources are properly protected.

If you have comments with respect to the zoning permissions, please reach out to Tina Malone-Wright who will be working on the zoning for these areas over the coming months as part of the Secondary Plan process. More information can be found here: https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/victoria-park-planning-review.aspx

Dayna Edwards, M.PL, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner (Urban Design) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7324 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | dayna.edwards@kitchener.ca

Hi,

Thanks. The documents look so different. So, are all the elements in the previous document in the Infill document?

I still have a problem with the title that suggests that we actually need to infill. While the area can't be "frozen in time", the title suggests that the direction is in the way of a thaw. As nearly every participant at the charette suggested, there is a fear that
nearby high rise buildings will overwhelm the Victoria Park area. So, we need buffers that really will protect the low-rise historic district rather than infill it. Given that we have seen recent incursions into the VPHCD, with two houses destroyed and two others put at risk, the design needs to be very strong in the face of density pressures. So, rather than promoting infill, why not reinforce the statement that built heritage shall be preserved in the VPHCD?

Gail

On Thu, Feb 21, 2019 at 11:36 AM <Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hi Gail,

Same document – we just changed the title to better reflect the content--

Cheers,

Dayna Edwards, M.PL, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner (Urban Design) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7324 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | dayna.edwards@kitchener.ca

From: Gail Pool
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 11:35 AM
To: Dayna Edwards <Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca>; Adam Clark <Adam.Clark@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Design for Central Neighbourhoods

Hi Dayna and Adam,

I'm curious that the document *Design for Central Neighbourhoods* is not on your webpage list of Urban Design Manual documents. Has it been removed? Is it replaced by the *Residential Infill in Established Neighbourhoods*?

Gail
Hi Gail,

Are you available to come in for an hour today sometime between 2pm and 4pm?

As for your questions below – I’m hoping we can chat about #1 more in person. I can forward your request for more information to Tina Malone-Wright the project manager of the Victoria Park Secondary Plan.

As for question #2, here is a link to the updated Urban Design Manual section for the ‘Downtown’ - https://www.kitchener.ca/en/resourcesGeneral/Documents/DSD_PLAN_UDM_05_Downtown.pdf

Dayna Edwards, M.PL, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner (Urban Design) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7324 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | dayna.edwards@kitchener.ca

Hi Dayna,

I am meeting with a committee of the Victoria Park Neighbourhood Association tomorrow, February 12 to discuss the Secondary Plan for our area. I wrote a week ago to Brandon Sloan with some questions but have not heard back from him.

I am wondering if you can help with the following:

1. The document panels for Victoria Park presented in December were published and I have examined them. However, I would like a more descriptive document that explains how the plan is different from current design guidelines. What has changed? What is the overall objective of the Secondary Plan?
2. I am wondering if there is an update for the Urban Design Manual's section on the Downtown Design Districts done in 2012?

If you have time to discuss the design guidelines, I would like to talk about them. I am available today (Feb 11) and tomorrow (February 12). That would be great since we are meeting at 6pm to discuss the plans.

Sincerely,

Gail

On Thu, Jan 31, 2019 at 1:19 PM <Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca> wrote:
   | Good Afternoon,
As per the email below that was sent in early January, I am following up to inform you that final draft has been posted on the City’s website for your review and comment: www.kitchener.ca/urbandesignmanual

Comments on the final draft are due to myself in writing by April 1st 2019.

For those requesting stakeholder meetings (optional) the following dates/times have been reserved:
March 18th 1pm – 4pm
March 19th 9am – 12pm
March 20th 1pm – 4pm
March 22nd 9am – 5pm

Please follow up with me outlining your availabilities with respect to a 1 hour meeting and I will set something up.

Let me know if you have any questions pertaining to the process or the final draft document,

Dayna Edwards, M.P.L., MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner (Urban Design) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7324 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | dayna.edwards@kitchener.ca

Good Afternoon and Happy New Year,

2019 marks the year that City Staff are planning to bring Part A: Land Use and Built Form Urban Design Guidelines of the City’s Urban Design Manual to Council for approval.

As we move towards approval, the following represents an overview of the proposed timeline, outlining key milestones:

Late January – Early February: A final draft will be posted online and emailed to stakeholders for a complete review.
Early February: Engagement with internal staff and local agencies.
February: Engagement with local Secondary Plan Neighbourhoods with respect to the Central Neighbourhoods Residential Infill Guidelines.
Late March: Deadline for stakeholder comments + stakeholder interviews
April – July: Revision to the final draft based on comments received.
September 2019: Final draft to Council for approval.

Update can be found on the project website at www.kitchener.ca/udm
I look forward to working with you over the coming months on this worthwhile project. Please let me know if you have any questions.

**Dayna Edwards, M.PL, MCIP, RPP**
Senior Planner (Urban Design) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7324 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | dayna.edwards@kitchener.ca
Hi,

The existing and current Victoria Park Secondary Plan can be found in the Official Plan 1994. I have provided the link below. The policies are contained in Part 3, Section 13.5 – Victoria Park Secondary Plan and the corresponding maps can be found under Municipal Plans, Map 14 and Map 15.


At the Open House we reproduced the existing Victoria Park Secondary Plan for ease of comparison to the proposed land use and these two plans can be found in the Information Panels for the Victoria Park Open House, listed as Existing Land Use and Proposed Land Use. In this document you will also find out the existing land use designations are zoned and how the proposed land use designations are intended to be zoned.

As mentioned in my previous email, “For the residential properties in the VPHCD you will note that there is a change in zone name, currently R-5 to new RES-3, and this is to reflect the zone name in the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law as well as to reflect similar existing zoning in the Civic Center Heritage Conservation District, where new triplexes are not permitted. There may be area/site specific regulations proposed for the zoning arising out of the consultation and the urban design charrette.”


There are minor land use changes to some of the other properties in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan, i.e. some Mixed Use to Medium Density Residential, Institutional to Mixed Use (institutional is permitted in mixed use), reduced residential density in the westerly area of the plan along Victoria Street South.

The provision of park space and public realm in the City, and particularly in areas intended for intensification is an important land use consideration. This is something that was examined and reviewed during the preparation of the PARTS Central Plan. I have attached the link to the PARTS Central Plan. the provision of parks and public realm is noted in Section 10 of the Plan. Several recommendations were included in the plan including looking at the area in the northern part of the PARTS Central Plan for a potential major civic park/Urban Space.

https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/parts-study-areas.aspx#Central

The City is also able to require a parkland dedication in the form of land or cash-in-lieu as a condition/requirement of development. Unfortunately, land supply for the provision of new parks is limited in the central neighbourhoods. This is important to consider with intensification/redevelopment projects and working with those developers to see if there is an opportunity to provide park/public realm opportunities on these sites.

If you would like to discuss further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,
Hi Tina,

Thanks for your response to my questions. You mention the fact that previous plans were made 25-30 years ago. If there is a copy of the previous plan for Victoria Park, I would still like to see it to compare how the plans have changed. I have your assurance that very little was done except to change R-5 to RES-3, for example. I am also assured that the VPHCD is not impacted.

However, there are many impacts on the VPHCD that are occurring as a result of intensification, e.g., in the Warehouse District and along the LRT. This is particularly important when considering the Victoria Park itself. It seems that parks are not very fully integrated into the plans. It is stated that “...their location and programming is determined by the City, based on assessed need and population... and that locations are planned in consultation with stakeholders and industry partners on a system basis...[They] should generate synergies in combination with other public, institutional and privately owned active and natural spaces” (City-Wide Design, p. 29). I would replace the “should” in the last statement with “need”. It is also stated: “Consider non-traditional opportunities for new park spaces in existing built-up areas and intensification areas to serve greater densities of people with a more diverse range of needs” (p. 20).

So, in that light it seems to me that intensification will impact on existing parks and that a number of new parks need to be established since the high rise developments have very little added public space for the residents. If I understand correctly, a portion of development fees go into a parks fund. There is a plan for parks, but no specific planning for additional parks, as far as I can see.

Mayor Vrbanovic has been quoted in The Record as seeing a need for parks in view of intensification. The impact on Victoria Park, 47 acres of prime recreational space in the centre of the city and readily available for all residents of the city, is a gem that developers will see as a huge asset to their proposed high rise buildings.

I have no problem with intensification as such; it just needs to be done hand-in-hand with the additional needs for the public realm and parks spaces in particular. If I were to add to the urban design proposals, I would suggest that at least some of existing car parking space be somehow designated as park space. Or brownfields? If you have needs for residential and business space, do you not also have a need for recreational space? This is not as much a design question as one that will be up to staff to find and develop, but the design manual should point to the need for new space. Perhaps it is there in the above quoted statements? Could that be made much more of an urban design “requirement”? Also, should the Victoria Park Design include some proposals for future development of the Park?

On Tue, Feb 19, 2019 at 11:57 AM <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hi Tina,

Thank you for your email and for your interest in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan.

For ease of response I have provided answers to your questions below.

If you would like to discuss further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
The Parks Master Plan identifies the City’s parks, the hierarchy of parks, the intent for park space and these recommendations are implemented where possible, primarily through the land use designations in the Secondary Plan. Existing parks will be designated for park use in the new Secondary Plan.

4. What zoning changes have been made?
No official zoning changes have been made yet. At the Open House for the Victoria Park Secondary Plan, and as contained in the panels, the City presented information on the existing and proposed land uses and the existing and proposed zoning for the lands in the new Secondary Plan. There were also panels to explain what uses and the built form typology, i.e. 3 storeys, that would be proposed in the new zone categories. For the most part, there are not a lot of changes to the Victoria Park Secondary Plan. Several of the changes are in name only, to reflect the new zone categories in the City’s new Comprehensive Zoning By-law. For the residential properties in the VPHCD you will note that there is a change in zone name, currently R-5 to new RES-3, and this is to reflect the zone name in the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law as well as to reflect similar existing zoning in the Civic Center Heritage Conservation District, where new triplexes are not permitted. There may be area/site specific regulations proposed for the zoning arising out of the consultation and the urban design charrette.

5. Does the plan offer more protection for the VPHCD?
The Victoria Park Secondary Plan implements the appropriate land use designations to reflect the goals, objectives and intent of the VPHCD. The 2 plans complement and work together to protect and achieve the vision for the neighbourhood.

6. Is this a replacement for the VPHCD Plan?
The new Victoria Park Secondary Plan is not a replacement for the VPHCD Plan. The 2 plans coexist currently and this will not change. The VPHCD Plan is approved under the Ontario Heritage Act and the Victoria Park Secondary Plan is approved under the Planning Act.
I realize that the deadline for comments was February 1, but the Information Panels document was not posted until recently. I am trying to get a committee of neighbours together to discuss the plan and we will take a bit of time to do that. I understand from Brandon Sloan that the process will be completed by June and so there is still time to make comment. Is that an accurate statement?

Yes there is still time to comment on the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan. We are hoping to finalize the Secondary Plans and zoning before the summer in order to be able to take them to a Committee/Council meeting in the fall for approval.

Perhaps these questions can be answered better in a meeting and I would be happy to take some time to discuss my questions.

Sincerely,

110 Water Street South
Kitchener, ON
Please see attached comments.

Best,
Current Land Use Policies in Proposed Secondary Plan Areas

Proposed Land Use
Victoria Park
Secondary Plan

Legend
Proposed Landuse
- Low Rise Residential
- Medium Rise Residential
- Mixed Use
- Open Space
- Natural Heritage Conservation

Secondary Plan Boundary
Specific Policy Area
1. Low Rise Residential
2. Low Density Mixed Use
3. Medium Density Mixed Use
4. 520 Queen St S
5. 18 Schneider Ave
6. 205-215 Victoria St S
7. 15 Michael St
8. 119 Joseph St
9. 79 Joseph St
10. 400 Queen St S
11. 5 Michael St

Flooding Hazard Overlay
- Floodway
- Flood Fringe

Ecological Restoration Areas Overlay

60

60
Draft Land Use Policies in Proposed Civic Centre Secondary Plan Areas

Proposed Land Use
Civic Centre Secondary Plan

Legend
Proposed Land use
- Low Rise Residential
- Medium Rise Residential
- High Rise Residential
- Low Rise Residential Office
- Mixed Use
- Open Space

Secondary Plan Boundary

Specific Policy Area
1. Low Rise Residential
3. Medium Density Mixed Use
4. 187 Queen St N
5. 189 Queen St N
6. 30-40 Margaret Ave
Webber is a high density urban corridor. It connects downtown to Waterloo and yet, all other routes compromised. This is the best route now.

Sites of future high density development.
Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Civic Centre Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before February 01st, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   
   Refer to attached documents.
   
   ____________________________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________________________

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   Refer to attached documents.

   ______________________________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

   Refer to attached documents.

   ______________________________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________________________

   ______________________________________________________________________
Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]

Mailing Address: 23 Richmond Ave. Kitchener

Email: [Redacted]
Good afternoon

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review process. Your comments are logged and will be considered moving forward.

We are commencing the review of Victoria Street Secondary Plan and in the process of applying new Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations. The notices were mailed to residents last week. A Public Open House is scheduled on Tuesday, February 5th, 2019 from 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm (Drop-in format) at the Kitchener City Hall – Conestoga Room. The notice can be found on webpage: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR. Again, your input is important and we look forward to hearing from you.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Kind regards,

Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
Thank you for attending the Victoria Park Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before February 01st, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   I fully support the proposed land use designation in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan, specifically the proposed change from Low Rise Multiple Residential to Low Rise Residential along the Victoria Street corridor between Strange Ave and Walnut Street.
   __________________________________________________________

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   I also support the proposed zoning change from RES-7 to RES-5 along the same Victoria Street corridor mentioned above.
   __________________________________________________________

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?
   As a resident and owner of homes on Herlan Avenue, backing on and bordering the Victoria Park Plan Review area, I would like to see building heights kept lower along the Victoria Street corridor between Strange Ave. and Walnut Ave to keep it compatible with zoning and land uses on our Street.
   __________________________________________________________

   __________________________________________________________

   __________________________________________________________

   __________________________________________________________

   __________________________________________________________

   __________________________________________________________
Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

It would have been appreciated if the City had notified owners in and adjacent to specific Secondary Plan Review Areas that the plan reviews were happening. We were only notified this week by our neighbourhood association via our Counsellor and only because of the upcoming Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review which we are part of. Had we not been on the neighbourhood association email list, we would have not been aware of the reviews at all!

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name:  
Mailing Address: 23/27 Herlan Avenue, Kitchener ON N2G 2C4
Email:  

Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Good morning Stephen,

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review process.

Your comments are logged and will be considered moving forward.

Regards,

Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994

Thanks,

Stephen Hurlburt, CAMS
AML/ATF Compliance Consultant
Manulife

Please send general AML/ATF inquiries to: AMLATF_Office_Canadian_Division@Manulife.com

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY The information contained in this email message
and any attachments may be confidential and legally privileged and is intended for the use of the addressee(s) only. If you are not an intended recipient, please: (1) notify me immediately by replying to this message; (2) do not use, disseminate, distribute or reproduce any part of the message or any attachment; and (3) destroy all copies of this message and any attachments.
Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Victoria Park Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before February 01st, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   Generally comfortable with the current land use designations. Primary concern is with new builds/infills being in line with the current neighborhood styles/setbacks.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   Proposed zoning largely makes sense. Strongly opposed to building vertically in the area surrounding the park.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighborhood character?
   The vast majority of houses in the area are 100 years old. While new developments are necessary, the new builds should respect setbacks, heights, and general restrictions of surrounding neighborhood. Trying away sunlight and views for long-term residents via higher buildings & townhouses should be discouraged.
Hello [Redacted]

Thank you for your comments with respect to the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan.

We are in receipt of your email and your comments. They will be considered in the process moving forward.

The timelines for further community engagement have not been set but we have your email address and we will be able to keep you informed.

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Secondary Plan Review process.

Regards,

**Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP**
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

---

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2018 6:18 PM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Subject: input for review of neighbourhood around VP

The City of Kitchener is currently undertaking a review of its land use planning in the neighbourhood around Victoria Park and getting into the details of zoning, heritage conservation, and urban design.

Please do not allow anymore high rise buildings in this area. They block the sun which makes my walk to the library terribly cold most of the year. Please encourage only ones that maintain a special feel to this side of the downtown so as to balance with Olde Berlin.

805 Queen's Blvd.
Good morning Tina and Brandon,
Please see Frank Etherington's email below regarding his concerns about green space requirements for downtown condo developments.
Thank you,
Preet

-----Original Message-----
From: Frank Etherington
Sent: Tuesday, December 4, 2018 7:06 PM
To: Preet Kohli <Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca>
Cc: 
Subject: open house tonight

Preet

Even though I am no longer councillor for Ward 9 and Victoria Park, I will continue as a member of the Victoria Park Working Group and the neighbourhood association. I presume you have been in touch with our new councillor, Debbie Chapman.

Please include my email, the above emails (and Debbie’s) on your list and keep me notified re the park planning review.

I planned to attend the information meeting tonight but, because of a heavy cold, could not make it.

Would you please send me some general info about any changes that might have an impact on the park and particularly any proposed planning change to our neighbourhood heritage area. As a former councillor and a park resident I am very interested in any proposed planning changes that affect the park and surrounding areas, particularly the Queen Street section of the heritage area.

Like other area homeowners, I am concerned about a lack of green space provided for many of the downtown condos....the ones where developers argue they are close to Victoria Park and do not need green space for their developments. Victoria Park is rapidly becoming exhausted with thousands of condo families using it most weekends alongside dozens of large weekend festivals. There is almost standing room only for kids at the splash area most summer weekends and I have already notified city officials about this situation. I intend to bring this issue up before the Working Group and council in the New Year.

Thanks in advance for any information and sorry I could not be at your meeting.

I look forward to seeing you, without the cold, at the Kitchener Housing dinner later this month.

Frank
Hello Mr. Phohl,
Thank you for question and your interest in this Neighbourhood Planning Review project.

The purpose of tonight’s open house meeting is to ‘kick off’ the review of the existing Victoria Park Secondary Plan contained in the City’s Official Plan. I have included the notice letter which provides more information.

This is the beginning of the process of updating and applying new land use designations and zoning regulations to the lands in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan (see location map below).

This process will apply a land use designation and zoning to Victoria Park within the Secondary Plan.

I can forward your suggestions on uses within Victoria Park to our Parks Planning Staff for their
future consideration.

Please let me know if you have any further comments or questions with respect to this planning review project.

Regards,

**Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP**
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener  
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

---

**From:** Barry Pfohl  
**Sent:** Monday, December 03, 2018 3:27 PM  
**To:** Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>  
**Subject:** Victoria Park Planning Review

Good Afternoon

My wife and I are planning on moving into The Charlie West Condos and become a resident of the Victoria Park area within two years.

I am wondering what this planning review will involve.

Is it for residence to add there wants and needs for future planning of the park or is it more of an information to what is being planned.

I have a few suggestions on some changes and improvements that I would like to see in the park. Ie. Fountain in the lake (helps maintain a healthier lake), Off leash dog park (allows condo owners a place to run their dogs), outside food vendor (a place to buy a drink or food then sit on a bench to enjoy)

Is this something that I should be attending?

**Barry Pfohl**  
Mechanical Engineering Technologist  
Engineering Project Coordinator
## 5.0 Public Comments and Staff Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Written: August 28, 2018</td>
<td>The zoning was changed to M.U status in 2010, then again in 2012, I believe there were some changes made to certain properties on the street. I was sent a DRAFT notification of this but at the time I thought because draft was written across every page that this was not a final change. I didn’t receive any follow up after. Anyway, I put it up for sale in April as I retired and no longer needed it for my business. As I've waiting for a buyer and after a couple of people inquired about living there, I started to think that if it doesn't sell maybe I should do a couple of small renovations and rent it out. After checking this out with my real estate agent, he informed me that things had changed and I was no longer able to do that because it needed an environmental study done before the city would allow it. That section of the information I have is APPENDIX &quot;C&quot; - SPECIAL USE PROVISIONS 401. I now feel like my hands are tied if it doesn't sell as I would like to possibly use it for that purpose but can't. My question is, was there ever an environmental study done on this land and if so, what was the determination OR what would it require to go about finding out if the zoning could ever be changed to residential and the cost of doing the things that are required? I hope I have explained this properly so that you understand the guidance I am looking for to help me proceed. I am more than willing to come in and discuss my options with you to determine what I can or can’t do with the property. Right now I am forced to pay pretty high property taxes and insurance and a handful of other expenses just to keep everything up to date on this building.</td>
<td>We can definitely provide you some information and help answer your questions. Please let me know when a good time would be this week for a phone call.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Written: December 3, 2018</td>
<td>My wife and I are planning on moving into The Charlie West Condos and become a resident of the Victoria Park area within two years. I am wondering what this planning review will involve. Is it for residence to add there wants and needs for future planning of the park or is it more of an information to what is being planned. I have a few suggestions on some changes and improvements that I would like to see in the park. Ie. Fountain in the lake (helps maintain a healthier lake), off leash dog park (allows condo owners a place to run their dogs), outside food vendor (a place to buy a drink or food then sit on a bench to enjoy). Is this something that I should be attending?</td>
<td>The purpose of tonight’s open house meeting is to ‘kick off’ the review of the existing Victoria Park Secondary Plan contained in the City’s Official Plan. I have included the notice letter which provides some more information. This is the beginning of the process of updating and applying new land use designations and zoning regulations to the lands in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan (see location map below). This process will apply a land use designation and zoning to Victoria Park within the Secondary Plan. I can forward your suggestions on uses within Victoria Park to our Parks Planning Staff for their future consideration. Please let me know if you have any further comments or questions with respect to this planning review project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>805 Queens Boulevard Written: December 6, 2018</td>
<td>The City of Kitchener is currently undertaking a review of its land use planning in the neighbourhood around Victoria Park and getting into the details of zoning, heritage conservation, and urban design. Please do not allow anymore high rise buildings in this area. They block the sun which makes my walk to the library terrible cold most of the year. Please encourage only ones that maintain a special feel to this side of the downtown so as to balance with Olde Berlin.</td>
<td>The land use designation and zoning take into consideration the appropriate locations for intensification and appropriate urban design and transition regulations will be put in place to mitigate impacts on existing built form.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4 | 16 Dill Street Written: December 4, 2018 | 1. Simpler graphics and explanation of this. Impacts of the changes are required. Background info is good but too much of it and it isn’t relevant to the impact of changes.  
2. Information on planning steps and opportunities for public input should be provided. Is this the last chance for public input? Seems like a done deal  
3. Avoid another planning debacle like the Drewlo Iron Horse Tower.  
4. The design for residential infill panels and host was quite good. The planning panels did not adequately convey the purpose and differentiate the proposed changes and impacts. | Thank you for your interest and participation in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review process. This was the first community engagement session there will be further opportunity to comment and participate in the process. |
| 5 | Written: December 4, 2018 | 1. It looks to me like you are trying to keep within the current style or theme of the neighbourhood.  
2. I am pleased with the zoning as shown  
3. Smart building design. | Thank you for your interest and participation in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review process. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? &lt;br&gt;Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? &lt;br&gt;Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? Additional Comments</td>
<td>Thank you for your interest and participation in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review process. Most of the changes were to land use and zoning category names with a few land use changes to site specific properties. The information does not seem straightforward. It would be beneficial to fully articulate what these changes will mean and why these changes will benefit the community. Much of the information seems superfluous, it'd be nice to get the straightforward goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>184 David Street  &lt;br&gt;Written: December 4, 2018</td>
<td>The information does not seem straightforward. It would be beneficial to fully articulate what these changes will mean and why these changes will benefit the community. Much of the information seems superfluous, it’d be nice to get the straightforward goods.</td>
<td>Thank you for your interest and participation in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review process. Most of the changes were to land use and zoning category names with a few land use changes to site specific properties. Staff would require further information to further elaborate on the concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Written: January 22, 2019</td>
<td>Generally comfortable with current land use designations. Primary concerns is with new builds/infills being in line with the current neighbourhood sizes/setbacks. &lt;br&gt;Proposed zoning largely makes sense. Strongly opposed to the building vertically in the area surrounding the park. &lt;br&gt;The vast majority of houses in the area are 100 years old. While new developments are necessary, the new builds should respect setbacks, heights, and general aesthetics of surrounding neighbourhood. Taking away sunlight and views for long-term residents via higher buildings and townhouses should be discouraged.</td>
<td>Thank you for your interest and participation in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review process. The land use designation and zoning take into consideration the appropriate locations for intensification and appropriate urban design and transition regulations will be put in place to mitigate impacts on existing built form. A large majority of the Victoria Park Secondary Plan is designated as a Heritage District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23 and 27 Herlan Avenue &lt;br&gt;Written: January 24, 2019</td>
<td>I fully support the proposed land use designation in Victoria Park Secondary Plan, specifically the proposed change from Low Rise Multiple Residential to Low Rise Residential along the Victoria Street corridor between Strange Ave. and Walnut Street. &lt;br&gt;I also support the proposed zoning change from RES-7 to RES-5 along the same Victoria Street corridor mentioned above. &lt;br&gt;As a resident and owner of homes on Herlan Avenue, backing on and bordering the Victoria Park Plan Review area, I would like to see building heights kept lower along the Victoria Street corridor between Strange Ave. and Walnut Ave to keep it compatible with zoning and land use on our Street. &lt;br&gt;It would have been appreciated if the City had notified owners in and adjacent to specific Secondary Plan Review Areas that the plan reviews were happening. We were only notified this week by our neighbourhood association via our Councilor and only because of the upcoming Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review which we are part of. Had we not been on the neighbourhood association email list, we would have not been aware of the review at all!</td>
<td>Thank you for your interest and participation in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>340-342, 350, 360 &amp; 372 Queen St.S.</td>
<td>Phone call from resident who lives on Schneider Avenue questioned the proposed designations for the existing SDDs at the SW corner of Queen St and Courtland Ave. Currently MUC &amp; MU-1, but shown on the proposed land use map as MUC w Sp.Pol 3 and Mix 2 zoning. Believes such designation and zoning is not compatible with existing form of development and objective in HCD Plan to conserve historic housing stock. Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 Water Street South Written: December 9, 2018</td>
<td>I was unable to get to the December 1 Open House and would like more information about the Victoria Park Secondary Plan. I am not sure what the overall objective of the plan is and what has changed since the original plans. These were made 25-30 years ago, according to one panel. Are you referring to the Victoria Park Heritage Conservation District Plan or some other document? Specifically, I would like more explanation of the document Information Panels. Questions: 1. Is there a descriptive document of overall objectives and changes? 2. The boundaries of the VPHCD do not align with the Secondary Plan, so what plans are being made that would impact on the VPHCD plan? 3. How does the Parks Plan relate to the Secondary Plan? 4. What zoning changes have been made? 5. Does the plan offer more protection for the VPHCD? 6. Is this a replacement for the VPHCD Plan? I realize that the deadline for comments was February 1, but the Information Panels document was not posted until recently. I am trying to get a committee of neighbours together to discuss the plan and we will take a bit of time to do that. I understand from Brandon Sloan that the process will be completed by June and so there is still time to make comment. Is that an accurate statement? Perhaps these questions can be answered better in a meeting and I would be happy to take some time to discuss my questions.</td>
<td>The first few panels provide more information on the process and the hierarchy of documents. Ans1: The City’s Secondary Plans form part of the City’s Official Plan. When the City was updating its Official between 2010-2014, the Secondary Plans and their review were deferred and put on hold until the City completed ION station area plans, “PARTS Plans (Planning Around Rapid Transit Station Areas)”, a study on “Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS)” and the Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHL). The overall objective of the Neighbourhood Planning Review is to update the Secondary Plans as per the recommendations in the PARTS Central Plan and the RIENS Study, which goals were to identify the appropriate locations for intensification, protect the established neighbourhoods, and ensure new infill/redevelopment where permitted is compatible with the existing built form, the streetscape and the neighbourhood. As part of this process, the City will also be implementing the Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHL) and updating the City’s Urban Design Manual to include urban design briefs/guidelines for the City’s central neighbourhoods. Ans2: The boundaries of the VPHCD do not currently align with the existing Victoria Park Secondary Plan. The proposed new boundary of the Victoria Park Secondary Plan would not impact the VPHCD Plan. Ans3: The Parks Master Plan identifies the City’s parks, the hierarchy of parks, the intent for park space and these recommendations are implemented where possible, primarily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? Additional Comments</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through the land use designations in the Secondary Plan. Existing parks will be designated for park use in the new Secondary Plan. Ans4: No official zoning changes have been made yet. At the Open House for the Victoria Park Secondary Plan, and as contained in the panels, the City presented information on the existing and proposed land uses and the existing and proposed zoning for the lands in the new Secondary Plan. There were also panels to explain what uses and the built form typology, i.e. 3 storeys, that would be proposed in the new zone categories. For the most part, there are not a lot of changes to the Victoria Park Secondary Plan. Several of the changes are in name only, to reflect the new zone categories in the City’s new Comprehensive Zoning By-law. For the residential properties in the VPHCD you will note that there is a change in zone name, currently R-5 to new RES-3, and this is to reflect the zone name in the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law as well as to reflect similar existing zoning in the Civic Center Heritage Conservation District, where new triplexes are not permitted. There may be area/site specific regulations proposed for the zoning arising out of the consultation and the urban design charrette. Ans5: The Victoria Park Secondary Plan implements the appropriate land use designations to reflect the goals, objectives and intent of the VPHCD. The 2 plans complement and work together to protect and achieve the vision for the neighbourhood. Ans6: The new Victoria Park Secondary Plan is not a replacement for the VPHCD Plan. The two plans coexist currently and this will not change. The VPHCD Plan is approved under the Ontario Heritage Act and the Victoria Park Secondary Plan is approved under the Planning Act. Ans7: Yes, there is still time to comment on the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan. We are hoping to finalize the Secondary Plans and zoning before the summer in order to be able to take them to a Committee/Council meeting in the fall for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 11 | 10 Water Street South | **Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
**Question 2:** What are your comments about the zoning?  
**Question 3:** What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | The existing and current Victoria Park Secondary Plan can be found in the Official Plan 1994. I have provided the link below. The policies are contained in Part 3, Section 13.5 – Victoria Park Secondary Plan and the corresponding maps can be found under Municipal Plans, Map 14 and Map 15. https://www.kitchener.ca/en/building-and-development/official-plan.aspx?_mid_=9852#Previous-Official-Plan-1994-version  
At the Open House we reproduced the existing Victoria Park Secondary Plan for ease of comparison to the proposed land use and these two plans can be found in the information panels for the Victoria Park Open House, listed as Existing Land Use and Proposed Land Use. In this document you will also find out the existing land use designations are zoned and how the proposed land use designations are intended to be zoned. As mentioned in my previous email, “For the residential properties in the VPHCD you will note that there is a change in zone name, currently R-5 to new RES-3, and this is to reflect the zone name in the new Comprehensive Zoning By-law as well as to reflect similar existing zoning in the Civic Center Heritage Conservation District, where new triplexes are not permitted. There may be area/site specific regulations proposed for the zoning arising out of the consultation and the urban design charrette.”  
There are minor land use changes to some of the other properties in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan, i.e. some Mixed Use to Medium Density Residential, Institutional to Mixed Use (institutional is permitted in mixed use), reduced residential density in the westerly area of the plan along Victoria Street South. The provision of park space and public realm in the City, and particularly in areas intended for intensification is an important land use consideration. This is something that was examined and reviewed during the preparation of the PARTS Central Plan. I have attached the link to the PARTS Central Plan. The provision of parks and public realm is noted in Section 10 of... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | | **Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
**Question 2:** What are your comments about the zoning?  
**Question 3:** What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments** | residential and business space, do you not also have a need for recreational space? This is not as much a design question as one that will be up to staff to find and develop, but the design manual should point to the need for new space. Perhaps it is there in the above quoted statements? Could that be made much more of an urban design "requirement"? Also, should the Victoria Park Design include some proposals for future development of the Park? |
| 12 | Written: December 4, 2018 | It looks to me like you are trying to keep within the current style or theme of the neighbourhood I am pleased with the zoning shown Smart building design. | Thank you for your comments. |
| 13 | Contacted: December 4, 2018 | A resident at the PIC and questioned the Medium Rise Residential proposed to be applied to the existing low rise KHI development on Linden Avenue. He was of the opinion the existing development is compatible with the HCD and that the proposed Medium Rise designation does not correspond to the existing development and could allow for redevelopment at a density and of a built form that would be inappropriate for the site and HCD. | Staff have reviewed and are proposing to revise the designation to Low Rise Residential with a RES -5 zone to recognize the existing development. |
We met with City staff yesterday to discuss a proposed development at the properties known as 186, 190 and 200 Victoria Street, Kitchener with and on behalf of our client ------ who owns the 186-190 Victoria Street portion of the lot and who undertaking his due diligence review of the 200 Victoria Street portion of the site. ------ has been working with the current owner of the site for over two years, with the long term goal of developing the combined properties as a mixed-use high density development.

The proposed development concept discussed at the meeting would require an Official Plan/Secondary Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment, Section 37 (Density Bonussing) Agreement and Site Plan application. The concept prepared and submitted for discussions was largely based upon - or guided by - the PARTS Central Stations Plan which identified the preferred land use for the subject properties (and the entirety of the Victoria, Park, Rail-line block) as 'Mixed Use High Density'. It was and is our client's goal to implement this direction through a mixed-use high density development.

Through discussions with policy staff present at the Preconsultation Meeting, we were made aware that through the first draft of the New Victoria Park Secondary Plan, the subject lands are proposed as Mixed Use with regulations limiting the height of development to 10 storeys and a maximum FSR of 2.0 (with recommended MIX 3 zoning).

This is a significant departure from the preferred land use designations proposed by the PARTS Central Stations Plan which recommended an FSR of up to 4.0 and no height limitation, which we do not understand given the extensive public and council consultation which was so recently undertaken.

We would like to meet with you as soon as possible to discuss the work completed to date on the Victoria Park Secondary Plan, find out ways to participate in the process, and discuss our client's lands within the context of the PARTS Central Stations Plan and ongoing Victoria Park Secondary Planning exercise and endorsed/approved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>23 Richmond Avenue</td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td>1. Staff have reviewed and are proposing to revise the designation to Low Rise Residential with a RES-5 zone to recognize the existing development. 2. Staff have reviewed and are proposing to revise the designation to Low Rise Residential with a RES-5 zone to recognize the existing development. 3. Low Rise Residential land use designation and the RES-5 zone is an appropriate transition land use and zoning category for this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: January 30, 2019</td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. concern with the medium rise residential designation for lands on linden ave. 2. concerns with the medium rise residential designation for the lands at the end of David Street (david and Dill) 3. concerns with the Low Rise Residential landuse designation on properties located on Victoria Street.</td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 16 | Written: May 12, 2019 | At the impetus of Melissa Bowman I contacted a few residents of Victoria Park to consider the draft secondary plan. We used a map to outline some of the areas we felt needed to be examined in more detail (please see attached document). I was unable to follow up at the end of March and was not sure if the document reached you. I realize that the process is well underway but I hope that there is still time for you to consider our thoughts. | Both sides of Theresa Street are proposed to be designated Low Rise Residential. Any change to this land use designation will require and Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment. |

<p>|    | 1. Theresa backing onto Michael is at risk. The area may be subject to erosion of low rise residential since it is close to the Innovation District and there are several large developments on Victoria. | 2. This area is excluded from the Victoria Park Plan. Will it be an area for expansion of high rise (10+)? |
|    | 2. This area is part of the Urban Growth Centre and subject to the land use designation policies in the Urban Growth Centre. | 3. Currently low rise, subsidized housing is scheduled to be high rise |
|    | This property is proposed to be designated medium rise residential. Staff have reviewed the land use designation with respect to other comments received and will be revising to low rise residential. | 4. Area outside of the VPHCD could be developed into high rise. Lots are deep and suited for development being near the trail and park. |
|    | This area is designated Low Rise Residential and cannot be developed with high rise buildings. | 5. Area of the current bus depot is identified in the Urban Design Manual Downtown, Part A, p.10 as having 5 high rise buildings. Yet there has been very positive interest in making Gaukel a pedestrian walkway (no cars) once the bus station is moved. |
|    | This area is part of the Urban Growth Centre and subject to the land use designation policies in the Urban growth Centre. | 6. This triangle is wild and often wet. There needs to be more parkland for the vastly increased numbers of downtown residents. |
|    | This area is part of the floodplain and fully regulated by the GRCA. | 7. The creek runs in this area and there is a wild footpath to Victoria Street. Could this not be improved so the pedestrians and bike users are not at risk of falling into the creek? |
|    | The undesignated trail is located in the floodplain and fully regulated by the GRCA. | 83 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>The building currently on David is a four storey building that fits nicely into the neighbourhood with several trees on its grassy frontage. This is a design that planners should consider, as opposed to flat roofs with no greenery. It would have been better to shift the parking area back from the street (Figure 1).</td>
<td>The urban design manual and zoning regulation encourage parking to be located behind all buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no crosswalk on Queen Street anywhere between Courland and Highland. That cuts off the entire neighbourhood to the South of Queen.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment. Staff support safe pedestrian crossings where attainable. Comments have been forwarded to the Region of Waterloo for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jubilee drive did not exist once. With increased traffic along Park, there is a tendency for cars to race through despite a 40kph limit sign before entering Jubilee and a 30 kph limit on Jubilee. Water street also suffers from those racing to get from Courtland to downtown or Weber, Victoria East and King. Perhaps speed bumps could be added here. Alternatively: a) we made Water Street a deadend or b) we return to Jubilee Drive to parkland, which would make it a much better place to visit.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment. Comments have been forwarded to Transportation Planning staff for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is heritage lighting on several streets around the park, but not on Water between Joseph and the park. One wonders why this street, a gateway to the park, has no such lighting.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comment. Comments have been forwarded to Transportation Planning staff for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I like most of the comments. I especially agree with the one about the 4 storey building on David. It fits well into the neighbourhood. I would be sorry to lose the wild areas to more manicured parkland - there is less and less space in the city for small wild creatures and especially birds to nest. I would not like to see subsidized housing torn down for high rises. Could the bus station area by 3-4 storey rent geared to income housing? Could the triangular area along the trail from Joseph Sturm community garden to West to Victoria (currently a scrap yard with two small houses facing onto West) be purchased and turned into parkland? Developing the informal path into a bike and pedestrian pathway would then make even more sense.</td>
<td>The bus station lands currently owned by the Region of Waterloo are part of the Urban Growth Centre and subject to the land use designation policies in the Urban growth Centre. Comments have been forwarded to the Region. The triangular area lands along the trail are located within the floodplain and fully regulated by the GRCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? Additional Comments</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Written: December 4, 2018</td>
<td>Would you please send me the general info about any changes that might have an impact on the park and particularly any proposed planning change to our neighbourhood heritage area. As a former councillor and a park resident I am very interested in any proposed planning changes that affect the park and surrounding areas, particularly the Queen Street section of the heritage area.. Like other area homeowners, I am concerned about a lack of green space provided for many of the downtown condos....the ones where developers argue they are close to Victoria Park and do not need green space for their developments. Victoria Park is rapidly becoming exhausted with thousands of condo families using it most weekends alongside dozens of large weekend festivals. There is almost standing room only for kids at the splash area most summer weekends and I have already notified city officials about this situation. I intend to bring this issue up before the Working Group and council in the New Year.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Justification and Summary

General Justification:

- The Parks Master Plan identifies the City’s parks, the hierarchy of parks, the intent of park space and these recommendations are implemented where possible, primarily through the land use designations in the Secondary Plan. Existing parks will be designated for park use in the new secondary plan.
- The provision of park space and public realm in the City, and particularly in areas intended for intensification is an important land use consideration.
- The City is able to require a parkland dedication in the form of land or cash-in-lieu as a condition/requirement of development. Unfortunately, land supply for the provision of new parks is limited in the central neighbourhoods. This is important to consider with intensification/redevelopment projects and working with those developers to see if there is an opportunity to provide park/public realm opportunities to these properties.
- Additional consideration was given to recognize and appropriately plan for any development given that the majority of this neighbourhood is a designated heritage district. A limited designation and zoning have been applied to established residential areas of this plan to protect the heritage value and character.

Site Specific Justification:

- 15, 35 Linden Avenue: Currently zoned R-7 and was originally proposed to be designated Medium Rise Residential and zoned RES-6. Following Staff consideration it was determined that a Low Rise Residential designation and RES-5 zone were more appropriate to reflect the existing built form.
- 340-372 Queen Street South: Currently zoned as MU-1 and proposed to be designated Mixed Use and zoned MIX-2. Deviated from Low Density Mixed Use from the PARTS Central plan as additional density could be appropriately reached on these properties as reviewed through a 3D modelling exercise by Staff.
- 186, 190, 200 Victoria Street: Originally proposed to be designated Mixed Use and zoned as MIX-3, but is now proposed to be zoned MIX-4 as these properties have the capacity to develop and implement the recommended High Density Mixed Use from the PARTS Central plan.
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APPENDIX C – CEDAR HILL AND SCHNIEDER CREEK SECONDARY PLAN
1.0 Objective

The Cedar Hill Secondary Plan was adopted by City Council in May 1994 and was approved by Regional Council in May 1995. Given this secondary plan is nearly 25 years old, City Planning Staff evaluated the existing secondary plan, in conjunction with other municipal documents and consultation to create an updated version. This plan applies new land use designations and zoning regulations which reflects direction from the City, Region, Province and other external agencies.

The Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek review involves the area containing the existing Cedar Hill Secondary Plan and a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan. This new area is proposed to become the new Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.

1.1 Location Map
2.0 Considerations

2.1 Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) – Central Station Study Area

The PARTS Plans were conducted to ensure the City of Kitchener’s station areas are developed in stable ways that support local transit and add value to communities. The studies completed thus far include recommendations for the following: Land use; Engineering infrastructure; Pedestrian and cycling connection enhancements; Transportation demand management measures; Public realm and streetscape improvements in surrounding areas; Road and parking implications; Community infrastructure; and, Public art opportunities.

The PARTS Central Plan was intended to be a guiding document with its goals and strategies to be implemented through an Official Plan Amendment, a Secondary Plan, a Zoning By-law Amendment, and updates to the Urban Design Manual. The Preferred Plan (Land Use Map) developed through this process acted as a guide for the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. Incorporation of new land use designations and zones with updated regulations were considered in conjunction with the existing conditions and uses of properties, and their existing permissions and special policies and regulations. Any deviation between the Preferred Plan and the draft Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan was done through Staff review and public comment and consultation to achieve the best land use planning suited to the existing and future development of the community.

2.2 Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

The City of Kitchener undertook RIENS in hopes to develop a clear and fair process for approving development projects in established neighbourhoods. Typically development proposals are considered based on the size and impact on the surrounding area, and the zoning by-laws and urban design standards in place. The intent of the recommendations of this study was to further ensure that new development blends and is compatible with the neighbourhood. This was intended to be achieved through modifications to regulations for building heights, front yard setbacks, garage and driveway widths, and front porches in the zoning by-law for central neighbourhoods in the study area.

Cedar Hill was underwent consideration for an additional recommendation given the number of development applications in recent years, and that it was scheduled to undergo a Secondary Plan review as part of this Neighbourhood Planning Review Process. A recommendation of RIENS was to require Site Plan Approval in the Cedar Hill neighbourhood as a pilot project for all new single-detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings.

2.3 Urban Design Guidelines (UDG)

The Urban Design Manual is a guide for the development community, residents, special-
interest groups, city council and staff for details on our city’s urban design guidelines and standards. The recent update of Part A of the Urban Design Manual was approved on September 9, 2019 by council as part of the Community and Infrastructure Services Committee agenda. The guidelines were last updated in 2000 and Kitchener has since seen rapid change and intensification throughout the city, triggering a desire to ensure that the guidelines reflect the evolving expectations for the design of buildings and public spaces.

Urban Design staff held a public design charrette for the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek neighbourhood on February 11, 2019. The intent of the charrette was to directly speak to and address residents’ concerns and identify opportunities for better design in their community. These neighbourhood specific guidelines will be brought forward for approval as part of the Secondary Plans for each neighbourhood. Upon approval of the secondary plan for this neighbourhood, the neighbourhood specific design guidelines will be added as part of the area specific guidelines for Central Neighbourhoods.
Prioritize Peter Street as a primary pedestrian corridor and design it to provide a safe and comfortable pedestrian connection from the neighbourhood to the station stop and the downtown. A safe, enhanced pedestrian connection at Peter Street and Courland Avenue West should be provided as Courland Avenue West develops into a mixed-use urban corridor.

Pedestrian and cycling infrastructure should be prioritized for Benton Street (from Mike Wagner Green to King Street), where grades are less steep.

Cedar Street (between Charles Street East and Church Street) and Benton Street (at Courland Avenue East) have both been identified as gateways to the neighbourhood. New buildings at gateway intersections should be of high quality architecture and urban design, be oriented toward the street and positively reflect the character and context of the neighbourhood.

Design for changes in elevation between neighbouring sites, public spaces, views and vistas and the street. The design of buildings and public spaces at these locations should be high quality and oriented towards the public realm to welcome people into the neighbourhood.

Design new retaining walls to complement and respect the existing urban fabric. New retaining walls should be of a similar size, scale, height and length as those found throughout the neighbourhood, and should be built of high-quality, attractive and durable materials. Where there is need for a larger scale retaining wall, it should be stepped or terraced to perpetuate the existing neighbourhood character, with high-quality landscape design.

Development on Courland Avenue East is to address the street. Provide setbacks and setbacks where a property abuts low-rise residential properties. Design Courland Ave, as a main pedestrian corridor with wide sidewalks and buildings with ground floors that address the public realm through enhanced glazing, architecture, landscaping and street trees.

New development at the top of Cedar Hill is to be designed to mitigate against unwanted, cumulative wind conditions. Proposals in this area should require a wind study, with any recommended mitigation measures implemented as part of the development application.

Kaufman Park
Pursue opportunities to remove the retaining wall along Stirling Avenue to provide strategic permeability between the street and the park.

Where new development is proposed along Madison Avenue South abutting the park, public access to the park should be provided.

Sandhills Park
Improve access and visibility at St. George Street, Cedar Street North and Peter Street through the use of wayfinding signage and landscaping.

New development fronting on Sandhills Park should provide enhanced glazing and articulation along the rear facade to provide increased natural surveillance on the park space.

Mike Wagner Green
Improve the identity of Mike Wagner Green through lighting and signage at the south end of Peter Street.

New development will respect and complement the desirable aspects of the established neighbourhood character, including front porches, pitched roofs, detached rear garages, and use of brick as the dominant building material.

Encourage public/private street trees to maintain established narrow streetscapes.
2.4 Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) Study

The CHL Study was undertaken to determine how to best creatively conserve the historical integrity and early development pattern of our city, while encouraging new growth. Identifying historic places that blend the built and natural environment that have key ties to the events, people and activities that form the shape of our city were accounted through an inventory detailing these CHLs. A comprehensive summary of the findings and recommendations of this study for CHLs within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek neighbourhood is below.
Introduction

Our cultural heritage resources provide a link to the past and are an expression of the city’s culture and history. They contribute in a significant way to Kitchener’s identity and unique character, and help instill civic pride, foster a sense of community and sense of place. The conservation of cultural heritage resources also contributes to making our neighbourhoods a more interesting and appealing place to live, work and play.

The Province of Ontario through the Provincial Policy Statement (a planning document that provides policy direction on matters of Provincial interest related to land use planning and development), requires that municipalities conserve significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs).

With this in mind, the conservation of cultural heritage resources has been an important consideration in work undertaken by the City as part of the comprehensive planning review of the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek area. This work, which culminates in updating the policies and land use planning framework of the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan, aims to encourage development and growth in a manner that is respectful of cultural heritage and contributes to making the neighbourhood unique and distinctive.

Built Heritage Resources

Built heritage resources are buildings and structures that may have either design/physical, historic/associative or contextual heritage value. The designation and listing of heritage property on the Municipal Heritage Register is an important tool in the City’s efforts to conserve its built heritage resources.

Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act provides the strongest heritage protection available for conserving heritage resources, and allows a municipality to control proposals for demolition and alteration through a heritage permit system. While a “listed” property is afforded a more limited measure of protection, the City can require studies such as a heritage impact assessment and/or a conservation plan to guide the consideration of new development and identify measures to avoid or mitigate negative impacts to significant cultural heritage resources and attributes.

Currently, there are 21 built heritage resources located within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan boundary and included on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register. Of these 21 properties, 5 are formally protected through a heritage designation under the Ontario Heritage Act, and 16 properties are “listed” as non-designated properties. Current designated and listed heritage properties within the Secondary Plan boundary are identified on Map 2.
Cultural Heritage Landscapes

While the City has long maintained a heritage register of significant built heritage resources, efforts to identify and conserve significant cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs) is a relatively new undertaking. In 2014, an inventory of 55 significant cultural heritage landscapes in Kitchener was established. Cultural heritage landscapes are defined in the Provincial Policy Statement as a geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples of cultural heritage landscapes include but are not limited to parks, mainstreets, cemeteries, trailways, industrial complexes, and neighbourhoods.

Within a cultural heritage landscape, there are often buildings, structures, landscape features and other attributes that collectively illustrate a historical theme. Themes considered to be significant, are those that are essential to understanding the evolution of a City and that underpin its identity. The Kitchener CHL Study concluded that several established residential neighbourhoods that maintain a high degree of heritage integrity and are representative of the planning concepts and housing styles of the period in which they were developed, are worthy of being conserved.

The 2014 Kitchener CHL Study identifies the Cedar Hill Neighbourhood as a significant cultural heritage landscape, and is one of 12 established residential neighbourhoods of considerable value and significance identified in the study. In addition to the Cedar Hill Neighbourhood, portions of the Iron Horse Trail CHL and CN Railway CHL are located within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan boundary.

Cedar Hill is considered unique among Kitchener neighbourhoods, in part because of the manner in which the urban fabric has adapted to its topography and elevation. First developed on the original plan of the town survey in the 1850s, this area of Kitchener is prominent not only for its atypical height over the surrounding City, but also for the continuum of buildings of various sizes, use and age, which range from residential to institutional, and date from the mid 19th to late 20th centuries. Detached residential buildings within the neighbourhood are terraced into significant slopes often along narrow roadways, thus requiring the retaining walls, multiple stairs to front entrances, and the steep driveways that are uniquely characteristic of the area. The topography of the land also contributes to creating framed and sometimes dramatic long views into and out of the neighbourhood.
A Phased Approach to CHL Conservation

Taking stock and identifying the cultural heritage resources that are important to a community is a critical first step in any conservation strategy. For each CHL identified in the 2014 CHL Study, the study provides a description of the landscape; establishes a preliminary boundary of interest; identifies the historical integrity, and cultural and community values associated with the landscape; and finally, describes the character defining features of the CHL.

While the Study does not in itself protect CHLs, it serves as the first of three phases of work involved in establishing appropriate CHL conservation strategies for each landscape, as follows:

**Phase 1** – Establish an Inventory of Significant CHLs and identify priority CHLs for further study and analysis.

**Phase 2** – Conduct fieldwork, analysis and property owner engagement in identifying heritage attributes and a preferred conservation strategy for select CHLs.

**Phase 3** – Implementation and management of a preferred CHL conservation strategy or strategies.

Phase 1 noted above is complete. Priority CHLs have been identified including the Cedar Hill Neighbourhood CHL. Phase 2 is in progress for select priority CHLs. This includes work undertaken by City Planning staff in arriving at the cultural heritage policies included in this Secondary Plan. The timing associated with the third and final phase the City’s CHL conservation strategy is in part dependent upon
the nature and complexity of the strategies recommended for each CHL. Strategies affording the best protections are typically those governed by Provincial legislation such as the Ontario Heritage Act (e.g. heritage designation and listing of heritage property), and the Planning Act (e.g. Secondary Plan policies, assignment of appropriate land use and zoning, implementation of neighbourhood design guidelines through site plan control).

**Fieldwork and Analysis**

One of the first steps undertaken in examining the cultural heritage landscape significance of the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek neighbourhoods, involved documenting current conditions using an evaluation form referencing the same CHL values and attributes identified as applying to the Cedar Hill Neighbourhood in the 2014 CHL Study. The evaluation form referenced the following attributes of cultural heritage landscape interest:

- Topography
- Narrow streetscapes
- Consistent street edge
- Variety of housing types
- Common characteristics among single detached dwellings
- Range of dates of construction and a mingling of early and late housing, high rise structures and institutional buildings
- Gateway entrances into the neighbourhood
- Significant views and vistas within and beyond the neighbourhood.

A team of City staff with expertise in heritage planning, policy planning and urban design conducted several site visits and used the evaluation form to record existing conditions on each street within the Secondary Plan area boundary. Notable areas were identified, including groupings or collections of streets and properties having similar significant or unique heritage characteristics. Some of the working maps generated from these on-site visits are illustrated below.
Review of Land Use & Zoning

Staff also reviewed and considered preliminary land use designations assigned to property as part of the Secondary Plan review, and with the assistance of computer modeling, made note of where proposed land use and associated zoning could conflict with CHL conservation interests (e.g. permitting a form of development that may not achieve an appropriate transition in scale with the existing historic low-rise character on certain residential streetscapes). This information was then considered in assigning land use designations which balance opportunities for growth and development with heritage conservation objectives.
Attributes Contributing to Cultural Heritage Landscape Value

The fieldwork and on-site evaluations undertaken by City staff resulted in the identification of the following attributes of primary Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) interest. In many respects, these attributes contribute to making the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek area unique among the City’s established residential neighbourhoods.

Common design elements of the built environment, particularly among low-rise residential properties, which contribute to establishing the character of the residential streetscapes.

Street facing single detached dwellings with the front façade playing a dominant role in the appearance and character of the streetscape.

- Primarily brick construction.
- Front porch, often full width.
- Minimal setback from the street.
- No or detached rear garage.
Example of streetscape on Eby Street exemplifying some of the common building and design elements characteristic of the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek area.

Built and natural landscape features often accentuating the significant topography of the neighbourhood, unique enclaves of development, and street patterns.

- Buildings terraced into steep slopes.
- Steep steps to front entrances and steep driveways.
- Retaining walls in various styles, sometimes featuring a high degree of artisanship.
- Narrow and one-way streets.
- No or small landscaped boulevards.
- Private street trees.
- Enclave of long standing small scale businesses and compatible industries on Whitney Place.

There are numerous examples of retaining walls in the CHL. The manner in which these features are constructed varies, from low to high, short to long, and from plain to decorative. These built features can add character and visual interest to the streetscape.
Terraced houses with steep front stairs and driveways

Enclave of single storey buildings occupied by long standing small businesses and industries on Whitney Place, that operate in harmony with the surrounding residential neighbourhood.

Aerial view of narrow and/or one-way streets such as Whitney, Martin and Bruder
Select gateway locations at points of entry into the neighbourhood and at intersections between major and local streets

Corner locations sometimes featuring properties of heritage value or interest.

- Areas where development frame views into and out of the neighbourhood; maintain views of the hill and local streetscape; and could allow for intensification opportunities oriented toward major streets while transitioning in scale toward stable low density residential areas on local streets.

Courtland and Madison looking northeast

Charles and Cedar looking southwest
Benton at St. George looking southeast

Courtland and Cedar looking northeast

Courtland at Peter looking northeast
Select terminating vistas along local streets toward structures and/or features of cultural heritage interest.

- Views typically along narrow streetscapes to a central terminating point of interest which may include a property of heritage value, or a building having design characteristics which accentuates the local built form, common streetscape character; and which help frame the streetscape and create a sense of boundary.
View down Cedar Street terminating at the former Bonnie Stuart Shoe Factory and sign at 141 Whitney Place. Bonnie Stuart Shoes was a long standing business in the neighbourhood, manufacturing and selling children’s shoes and attracting a clientele well beyond the City limits. While Bonnie Stuart closed in the 1990s after decades in operation, the building remains a local landmark and is now occupied by Globe Studios providing office and artist studio space.

View down St. George Street terminating at Cedar Street South. The terminating view to 105 Cedar Street South helps to frame and enclose the St. George Street streetscape.
View down Bruder Avenue terminating at Peter Street. The terminating view to 131 Peter Street helps to frame and enclose the Bruder Avenue streetscape.

View down Hebel Place terminating at 63 Courtland Avenue East, part of the original JM Schneider factory until 1925, later home to Silverwoods Dairy, and a listed property on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register.
Long and distant city-wide views atop Cedar Hill at the crest of Cedar Street South looking southwest.

The view atop Cedar Hill looking southwest affords an obstructed view for several kilometers, toward the City’s countryside and well beyond the limits of the Cedar Hill Neighbourhood. A vantage point that is unique to Cedar Hill and not duplicated in other central established neighbourhoods.

Individual or select groupings of properties having specific cultural heritage value or significance.

- Presence of several designated and listed built heritage resources, representing a variety of building types and architectural styles.
- Properties currently not included on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register but are of potential cultural heritage value or interest because of their design/physical, historic/associative and/or contextual value (e.g. Peter Street concrete stamped houses).
Examples of designated and listed built heritage resources in the neighbourhood.
Series of 18 concrete houses (above) located on Peter Street built c.1914 and stamped to resemble brick. These houses were an experimental mass production by prominent builder Casper Braun and are of considerable heritage interest but currently have no heritage status.

The house municipally addressed as 157-159 Benton Street (shown above) at the corner of Martin Street was reportedly constructed in 1879 by David Schneider, the grandson of early settlers Joseph & Barbara Schneider, making it the oldest building within the Benton, Cedar, Courtland and Mill Street area.
49 and 53 Courtland Avenue East reportedly have direct ties to the J.M. Schneider and Ahrens families, who were prominent industrialists and community leaders.

**Public Engagement & Comments**

Information on resources and attributes of cultural heritage value or interest within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan study area was made available to property owners and the public both online (on the City’s Neighbourhood Planning Review webpage) and at public information meetings held in May and November 2018 to inform and solicit public feedback and comment.

Specifically, information panels on existing (designated and listed) cultural heritage resources; identified heritage attributes (e.g. views and vistas, grouping of properties of interest); individual properties recommended for listing; attributes contributing to the CHL/neighbourhood character (e.g. front porches, garages, building setbacks, views and terminating vistas); proposed refinements to the CHL boundary; and examples of planning and legislative tools to achieve a level of conservation, were made available for review and discussion.

*Participants at the May 2018 Public Information Meetings*
In addition, staff solicited feedback through a dotmocracy exercise (responding to questions by adding stickers/dots) to gauge public interest regarding specific attributes contributing to CHL value within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek area. Those in attendance at the May 2018 public information meeting were asked to select images that represented the “look and feel” desired in the neighbourhood, and to advise on a scale of 1 to 7 how important it is that the City establish some form of regulation to achieve such desired feature.

Sample images of the dotmocracy exercise from the May 2018 public information meeting.
The results of the dotmocracy exercise revealed the following general sentiment among participants at the public meeting:

**Front Porches:** Strong preference for single or two storey full width porch designs. Large majority believe it is very important to regulate porches.

**Garages:** Strong preference for rear yard detached or no garages. Majority believe it is very important to regulate garages.

**Gateways & Built Form Transitions:** An equal number of respondents favoured designs illustrating medium density residential development adjacent to low rise residential, and new loft conversions on a corner in a predominantly low rise neighbourhood. Few respondents favoured multi-unit tall buildings located in a low rise neighbourhood, and mentioned that drastic and sudden changes in height should be avoided in favour of development that transitions and step down toward lower scale development.

**Building Design, Materials & Colour:** Respondents strongly favoured the illustrated example of new multi-residential development that is similar in design, and uses materials already present and characteristic of the neighbourhood. Designs featuring contemporary shapes and colours were disliked.

**Setbacks:** Streets featuring development with a consistent street edge and varied setback were much favoured over streets with an inconsistent street edge (Eby Street favoured over Hebel Place example). Strong majority felt it was very important to regulate setbacks.

**View atop Cedar Hill:** A strong majority of respondents expressed that the view from the top of Cedar Hill is very important.

**Terminating Vistas:** A very slim majority of the respondents expressed that it is very important to maintain the built form and terminating vistas at the end of select streets, with almost the same number of respondents expressing that it is not important.

In addition to the dotmocracy exercise, public sentiment regarding attributes contributing to the cultural heritage value of the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek area was received verbally at the public information meetings; in writing from individual property owners; and collectively from the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood Working Group (Making our Neighbourhood Great, December 2015) and the Cedar Hill Community Group (Visioning Report of the Cedar Hills Community Prepared for the City of Kitchener Planning Staff, June 2019).

**Recommendations to address cultural heritage interests within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek area**

Having examined the cultural heritage value and attributes of the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek area, and having considered the feedback and input received from property owners and the public through the Secondary Plan process, the following measures are recommended to be applied to address cultural heritage interests and objectives.
Refinement of the Cedar Hill CHL boundary

Several properties located on Benton Street and Charles Street at the outer edge or limits of the Cedar Hill Neighbourhood CHL boundary identified in the 2014 CHL study, lack the CHL features and attributes common among other properties within the CHL boundary. These non-contributing properties are recommended to be excluded from the CHL boundary. It is also recommended that the properties fronting Madison Avenue South, the most easterly street climbing and descending the hill, serve as the easterly limit of the CHL. This results in the refined CHL boundary excluding a few properties along Courtland Avenue East approaching Stirling Avenue South. Similarly, it is recommended that the Schneider Creek - Stirling Greenway serve as the southern boundary of the CHL. This would result in excluding a few residential properties on Mill Street from the CHL boundary, but adding the former Bonnie Stuart (now Globe Studios) building and several small industries/commercial establishments on Whitney Place that are perhaps more physically and historically associated with the identity of the community. A copy of the refined CHL boundary is included within Map 1.

Measure to be considered in the Official Plan

- The Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Neighbourhood CHL, Iron Horse Trail, and Canadian National Railway Line should be identified on Map 9 in the Official Plan as Cultural Heritage Landscapes.

Measures to be considered in the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan

- **Establish area design guidelines that support cultural heritage conservation objectives.**
  
  Area specific design guidelines applying to the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan and to be considered in guiding and reviewing development and other Planning applications, should support and be consistent with heritage conservation interests and objectives. This would include adding design guidelines to encourage new development to utilize existing/natural topography in building and site design through the use of stairs and retaining walls; for the design of new development to reflect the desirable aspects of the established neighbourhood character, including front porches, peaked roofs, detached rear garages, and use of brick as the dominant building material; and for the principal facades of buildings to locate and orient themselves at the termination of a street or view corridor.

- **Regulate development at key gateway locations.**
  
  Zoning and land use applied to corner properties located at gateway locations identified in the Secondary Plan should regulate building height, setbacks and built form to achieve a proper transition towards stable low density residential uses on local streets, and to protect and enhance views of the hill and of local streetscape features characteristic of the neighbourhood. Development at gateway locations should appropriately frame the intersection, especially where a building(s) of cultural heritage interest is located at the corner. Properties located on and contained within identified gateways as identified on Map 2, are considered to be of **specific CHL interest**. Development proposed on such property, and which may impact views, may be subject to a Heritage Impact Assessment (see discussion on Properties of Specific CHL Interest below).
Gateway locations and related properties of specific CHL interest within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek area include:

- the intersection of Charles Street East and Cedar Street looking to the southwest (35 Cedar St. S. and 101 Charles St. S.);
- the intersection of Courtland Avenue East and Cedar Street looking to the northeast (148 Cedar St. S. and 160 Courtland Ave. E.);
- the intersection of Courtland Avenue East and Madison Avenue North looking to the northeast (148 Madison Ave. S. and 184 Courtland Ave. E.);
- the intersection of Courtland Avenue East and Peter Street looking to the northeast (96 Courtland Ave. E. and 102 Courtland Ave. E.);
- the intersection of Charles Street East and Eby Street looking to the southwest (33 Eby St. S. and 75 Charles St. E.);
- the intersection of Benton Street at St. George Street looking to the southeast (87 Benton St. / 46 St. George St. and 93-99 Benton St. / 39-43 St. George St.); and,
- the intersection of Benton Street at Church Street looking to the southeast (39 Church St. and 51 Benton St.).

**Regulate development to protect the long view atop Cedar Hill.**

Zoning and land use applied to properties on Cedar Street from the top (or crest) of the hill southward toward and including properties at the intersection with Courtland Avenue East; should regulate building height, setbacks and built form to maintain and protect the long view of the City and countryside beyond. Properties contained within the Cedar Hill viewshed as identified on Map 2, are considered to be of specific CHL interest. Development proposed on such property and which may impact the Cedar Hill viewshed, may be subject to a Heritage Impact Assessment (see discussion on **Properties of Specific CHL Interest** below). Properties of specific CHL interest and contained within the Cedar Hill viewshed include:

- 128 St. George St.; and
- 148 and 160 Courtland Ave. E.

**Encourage development to maintain terminating vista views**

The following terminating vistas along local streets, toward structures and/or features of cultural heritage interest within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek CHL, are encouraged to be maintained in the review and consideration of applications for development:
the terminating vista to the Bonnie Stuart sign at 141 Whitney Place looking southwest from Cedar Street South toward Whitney Place;

the terminating vista to 131 Peter Street looking southeast from Bruder Avenue;

the terminating vista to 105 Cedar Street South looking southeast from St. George Street; and,

the terminating vista toward 63 Courtland Avenue East looking southwest from Hebel Place.

Identify Property of Specific CHL Interest, where a Heritage Impact Assessment may be required for CHL conservation

Currently, as part of the assessment of proposed development impact on built heritage resources, the City may require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for planning applications potentially impacting a cultural heritage resource located on property that is designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, and on property located adjacent protected (designated) heritage property. The City’s Official Plan also states that the City may require the submission of a HIA for development, redevelopment and site alteration that has the potential to impact an identified cultural heritage landscape.

While the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Cultural Heritage Landscape boundary encompasses the majority of the Secondary Plan area, it is not the City’s intent to potentially require a HIA for development on any and all property within the CHL boundary. Rather, it is recommended that within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek CHL, the ability to require a HIA be limited to planning and development applications having the potential to impact property identified as being of specific CHL interest. Such properties are identified on Map 2 and include the following:

- protected heritage property designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- property “listed” on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register under Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- property identified as being of cultural heritage interest and recommended for listing on the Municipal Heritage Register (until such time as a decision is made by Council on formally listing the property);
- property located adjacent protected and listed heritage property;
- property within and forming part of an identified gateway; and,
- property on Cedar Street South, St. George St. and Courtland Avenue East within and forming part of the identified view shed of the long view atop Cedar Hill.

Where development is proposed on property that is of specific CHL interest but not designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, then such HIA may be scoped and limited in review to assess visual and contextual impact.

Measures to be considered under the Ontario Heritage Act
• Existing built heritage resources designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and listed as non-designated property on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register shall be conserved.

• The following additional properties are identified as being of cultural heritage interest and should be further reviewed and considered for listing on the Municipal Heritage Register through the City’s 4-step listing process:
  
  o Stamped concrete houses on Peter Street between Whitney Place and the end of Peter Street at the footbridge at Schneider Creek, municipally addressed as 123, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, and 146 Peter Street;

  o 49 and 53 Courtland Avenue East which reportedly have direct ties to the J.M. Schneider and Ahrens families, who were prominent industrialists and community leaders; and,

  o 157-159 Benton Street at the northeast corner of Benton Street and Martin Street, reportedly the oldest house in the Benton, Cedar, Courtland and Mill Street area, built c. 1879.
### 3.0 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td>Staff begins Neighbourhood Planning Reviews and commences the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan. This review incorporates the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017/18 - May 2018</strong></td>
<td>Staff prepare material with relation to specific neighbourhood character topics to present to the public for feedback about what works well within their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 29, 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Information Meeting #1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public were asked to answer questions interactively using stickers regarding neighbourhood character topics including: front porches; garages; built form transition; building design, materials and colours; setbacks; view (Cedar Hill); and, terminating vistas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public feedback collected through a “dot-mocracy” exercise and by written submissions following the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 2018 – October 2018</strong></td>
<td>Using data collected from the public meeting Staff identified what tools could be used to regulate each of the topics and developed how each could be incorporated considering the level of importance as identified by the participants at the public meeting. Staff prepare material to present a draft of the land use plan and zoning map at the next public information meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 30, 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Information Meeting #2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff present information in an open house setting with the draft land use designations and zones for the neighbourhood. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit any further comments by comment form or through e-mail following the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November 2018 – December 2019</strong></td>
<td>Public comments are received and reviewed by Staff. Updated draft maps for land use and zoning are finalized. Final recommendations for this secondary plan will be brought forward to council in Fall/Winter 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September – October 2019</strong></td>
<td>Internal City Staff review of all draft secondary plan policies and mapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 11, 2019</strong></td>
<td>All property owners within the Secondary Plan area are sent notice of a Statutory Public Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 9, 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Information Meeting #3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff present all draft maps for six secondary plans, including land use and zoning maps for Cedar Hill Schneider Creek. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit final comments by comment form or e-mail following the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2019</strong></td>
<td>Staff conduct a final review of all secondary plan maps with public comments received and prepare a report for council. Final draft maps are finalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2020</strong></td>
<td>Secondary Plans Report to Committee/Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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May 8, 2018

To: Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

RE: Public Open House – Neighbourhood Specific Secondary Plan Review
New Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan
The First Step in the Process of Applying Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations

The City would like to formally invite you to participate in the Neighbourhood Specific Review of the City’s Secondary Plans. We are starting with the review of what will become the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. The boundary of this new secondary plan would combine the existing Cedar Hill Secondary Plan with a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan (see location map below).

A Public Open House is scheduled as outlined below:

WHEN: Tuesday, May 29, 2018
6:30 pm – 8:30 pm (Drop-in and working stations)
7:00 pm (15 minute staff presentation)
Location: Kitchener Market – Community Room
300 King Street East
An updated land use framework within the City’s Secondary Plan areas was deferred as part of the review of our new 2014 Official Plan. The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters. A ‘Secondary Plan’ is a more detailed land use and policy document that forms part of the Official Plan, and is used by the City to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city.

The Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study. The City is now in a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans. This will begin with the review of the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan and a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan, proposed to become the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.

We are getting into the details of land use, zoning, heritage conservation, and urban design.

We want to canvass your opinions on the preferred land uses, and understand your opinions on the character that you would like to see in your neighbourhood. This will help us determine what regulatory tools should be implemented to protect these features. These tools can include traditional planning tools like zoning regulations and urban design guidelines, and/or other tools such as heritage listings and designations.

The Public Open House will include a number of working stations to provide an opportunity to discuss and share your input on the land uses proposed for the new Secondary Plan and the character that you would like to see in the secondary plan area. The evening will include a brief staff presentation at 7:00 pm to provide some background information, the format of the Open House, and next steps.

Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you!

Help guide the implementation of land use, zoning, heritage conservation and urban design in your neighbourhood by attending our public open house on May 29th!

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Yours truly,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner – Policy

c. Brandon Sloan, Manager, Long Range and Policy Planning
Alain Pinard, Director of Planning
Janette MacDonald, Community Engagement Consultant
Councillor Frank Etherington
Neighbourhood Specific Reviews
Proposed New Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan

Open House
May 29, 2018
Agenda and Format

6:30 p.m.  Arrival, Sign-in
Rotating around room with individual opportunity to write down information and ideas and discuss study with staff

7:00 p.m.  Overview Presentation
Rotating around room with individual opportunity to write down information and ideas and discuss study with staff

8:30 p.m.  Conclusion
Background

- The Secondary Plans were deferred as part of the new Official Plan (2014)
  - Station Area Planning – PARTS Central Plan
  - Urban Design Guidelines
  - Cultural Heritage Landscape Study
  - RIENS Study
Process

• In a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans through a process called a Neighbourhood Specific Review
• The implementation of various studies; i.e. PARTS, CHLS, RIENS
• Starting with the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan and a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan
Secondary Plans (1994 OP)
Proposed Boundary
How Can You Provide Input?

Station 1: Sign-In and Information

Station 2: Existing Land Use and Proposed Land Use

Station 3: Neighbourhood Character (Urban Design/Cultural Heritage)

Station 4: 3D Modelling
Process/Next Steps

• Work has begun on the review of the first new Secondary Plan
• This is the first Open House/Engagement Session on the preliminary work
• Will take all the information back from this session
• Apply land use designation and zoning to lands with the new proposed Secondary Plan boundary
• Further consultation/engagement
• No Council decisions in 2018
Thank You!

FOR ONGOING AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION on this project or to provide written comments at any time, please view the City’s website at https://www.kitchener.ca/en/planning-and-development-consultations.aspx

Email comments to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca

or contact the Project Manager

**Tina Malone-Wright**, MCIP, RPP, Project Manager/Senior Planner
519-741-2200 x7765 (TTY:1-866-969-9994)
tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
Current Land Use Policies in Existing Secondary Plan Areas

Legend

Existing Land Use
- Low Rise Conservation
- Low Rise Multiple Residential
- Low Density Multiple Residential
- Medium Density Multiple Residential
- High Density Multiple Residential
- Convenience Commercial
- Low Density Commercial Residential
- Medium Density Commercial Residential
- High Density Commercial Residential
- Neighbourhood Institutional
- Community Institutional
- Major Institutional
- General Industrial
- Mixed Use Corridor
- Neighbourhood Park
- Open Space

Existing Special Policy Area

Proposed Secondary Plan Boundary

Regulatory Flood Line

Floodplain
- Floodway
- Flood Fringe
# Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan – Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range of Permitted Uses</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Maximum Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential Conservation</td>
<td>Within these areas, the existing built form and streetscape character within these established neighbourhoods is intended to be retained and conserved. Adaptive reuse of existing housing stock strongly encouraged. New dwelling construction will respect and be compatible with the established character of the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>Low density housing types, including single detached dwellings, duplex dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, and where appropriate, other low density dwelling types such as street townhouse dwellings and small-scale multiple dwellings.</td>
<td>Minimum of 1 / Maximum of 2</td>
<td>3 storeys (4 if onto a Regional Rd or City Arterial St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rise Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low density housing types including townhouse dwellings in a cluster development, multiple dwellings, and special needs housing.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>High density multiple dwellings and special needs housing to achieve a high intensity of residential use.</td>
<td>Minimum of 1 / Maximum of 4</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Mixed Use</td>
<td>Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.</td>
<td>Retail, office uses, day care, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.</td>
<td>Minimum of 1 / Maximum of 2</td>
<td>24 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Employment</td>
<td>Recognizes a growing demand for employment lands for 'start-ups' and 'makers'; Predominantly office and high-tech manufacturing.</td>
<td>Creative production industries, artisan's establishment, studio (art and music), craftsman shop, live/work space, shared facilities, galleries, studios, office space for creative professionals, and retail sales associated with production of goods and materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Mixed Use</td>
<td>Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.</td>
<td>Retail, office uses, day care, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.</td>
<td>Minimum of 1 / Maximum of 4</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature.</td>
<td>Secondary and post-secondary educational facilities; long-term care facilities; social, cultural, and administrative facilities; small-scale institutional uses compatible with surrounding uses such as public and private elementary schools, libraries, day care centers, and places of worship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage</td>
<td>These natural heritage features are intended to be protected and/or conserved for their ecological functions. Natural heritage features can include provincially or locally significant wetlands, valleys, woodlands, threatened or endangered species habitat, and lands subject to natural hazards or flooding. No new development is permitted in these areas.</td>
<td>Conservation activities; forest, fish, and wildlife management; and small scale passive recreation activities (i.e. trails).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan – Land Uses

**Flooding Hazard Overlay**

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

In the **Floodway**, no new development or site alteration will be permitted. Development is limited to land uses that, by their nature, must locate within the floodway, including flood and/or erosion control works, structures necessary for conservation, water supply, wastewater management, or minor additions or passive non-structural uses which do not affect flood flows. Generally, these lands are intended to be designated Natural Heritage Conservation.

In the **Flood Fringe**, development, redevelopment, or site alteration may be permitted, subject to appropriate floodproofing standards to the flooding hazard elevation or another flooding hazard standard approved by the Minister of Natural Resources.

**Ecological Restoration Areas Overlay**

Ecological Restoration Areas are lands and waters that have the potential to be enhanced, improved, or restored to a more natural state, contributing to the overall diversity and connectivity of the Natural Heritage System. Ecological Restoration Areas are identified by the City in order to enhance the diversity and connectivity of the Natural Heritage System and to provide habitat supportive of the overall sustainability of the system.

Development, redevelopment or site alteration will not be permitted unless an Environmental Impact Study or other appropriate study evaluates the area’s ecological functions in its optimal ecological state and demonstrates to the satisfaction of the City, Region, Grand River Conservation Authority and/or Province, as appropriate, that there will be no adverse environmental impacts on the restored feature or the ecological functions of the feature in its optimal ecological state.

**What is Floor Space Ratio (FSR)?**

Floor Space Ratio (FSR) is the amount of building floor area that may be developed on a property and is dependent on the lot area. The value is calculated by dividing the building floor area by the lot area.
The purpose of this station is to:

1. describe the existing and desired ‘look and feel’ of the neighbourhood
2. determine what level of regulation should be applied in order to maintain and achieve the desired ‘look and feel’ of the neighbourhood

Neighbourhood character refers to the ‘look and feel’ of a specific area. It is shaped by a combination of public and private elements, such as buildings, topography and natural features. Heritage conservation measures and urban design guidelines contribute to neighbourhood character. More specifically, they may provide direction on such things as such things as: architecture and urban design; variety of eras of construction; scale of buildings; vistas and views; condition of buildings; streetscape design and amenities; hard and soft landscaping; wayfinding; and, colour.
POTENTIAL TOOLS TO PROTECT NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER IN CEDAR HILL-SCHNEIDER CREEK

OFFICIAL PLAN/SECONDARY PLAN POLICIES

An Official Plan serves as a roadmap for managing future growth, land use, and environmental protection. An Official Plan is prepared with input from the community and contains objectives and policies to balance social, economic and environmental interests. The policies deal with matters such as land uses, housing, natural heritage & environmental management, urban design and cultural heritage resources. A Secondary Plan is part of the Official Plan and contains more detailed policies and land uses for a specific geographic area.

ZONING BY-LAW REGULATIONS

A Zoning By-law establishes and regulates the use of land by implementing the policies of the Official Plan, such as:

- the use of land or buildings or structures (e.g. residential, commercial)
- The location of buildings or structures on a lot (e.g. distance of buildings from lot lines)
- the height and amount of floor area that can be developed on a lot
- the number, size and location of parking spaces

A Zoning By-law cannot:

- Distinguish on the basis of ownership or occupancy
- Regulate architectural design, landscaping, construction materials, or colours
- Preserve natural environment features such as trees
SITE PLAN CONTROL

Site Plan Control is the process that is used to regulate the various features on the site of an actual development. The goal is to improve the image of the City through better individual developments by applying consistent standards and guidelines. The process reviews features such as building and site design, building location, shadows, buffers and landscaping, grading and drainage, storm water management, lighting, garbage and loading areas, parking and access by pedestrians and vehicles.

Before making improvements to a property, Site Plan Control may be required if you are planning to:
• Construct a new building or addition
• Undertake major building renovations, which substantially increase the size or usability of a building or structure
• Establish a commercial parking lot
• Make alterations to an already approved site plan

A municipality must pass a Site Plan Control By-law outlining the types of development that require site plan approval. At present, Kitchener’s Site Plan Control By-law does not apply to:
• A single-detached dwelling
• A semi-detached dwelling
• A duplex

URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

Urban Design Guidelines establish the objectives, priorities and expectations for urban design in the City. In Kitchener, the guidelines are consolidated into the Urban Design Manual, which contains urban design guidelines, design briefs and design standards. The guidelines apply to projects across the City and address such things as building types, streetscapes and accessible features. The design briefs provide detailed design guidance for specific types of development, areas or land uses (e.g. PARTS, Tall Buildings). The design standards address matters such as parking, lighting and landscaping. The manual is used by City staff and the development industry in the review and approval of specific types of development applications, such as official plan amendments, zone change applications and site plan control applications. The guidelines are flexible and do not have the same regulatory power as other tools such as the Zoning By-law.
HERITAGE DESIGNATION OF INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES

Heritage designation is a tool that municipalities use to protect heritage properties. It recognizes the importance of a property to the local community; protects the property’s cultural heritage value; encourages good stewardship; and, promotes knowledge and understanding about the property. It involves the adoption of a Designating By-law, which applies to the real property and provides a description of the property, a statement of cultural heritage value or interest, a description of the heritage attributes, and a legal description of the property. If an owner of a designated property wishes to make alterations that affect the heritage attributes then the owner must apply for a Heritage Permit from the municipality.

HERITAGE LISTING OF INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES

Listing is a tool that municipalities use to identify properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest to the municipality. It recognizes the importance of a property to the local community; provides an interim protection from demolition; and, enables the City to require a Heritage Impact Assessment with the submission of a Planning Act application such as a Site Plan.

Unlike designating an individual property, listing does not provide protection under the Heritage Act. Owners are not required to apply for a Heritage Permit to alter the heritage attributes of their property.
FRONT PORCHES

Select up to three (3) images that best reflect the character that you want to see in your neighbourhood.

1. Stoop
2. Enclosed porch
3. Single-storey full-width porch
4. Two-storey full-width porch

Based on the image(s) you selected above, how important is it that the City regulates this feature?

Not important 1 2 3 4 5 Important

GARAGES

Select up to three (3) images that best reflect the character that you want to see in your neighbourhood.

1. Attached front-facing garage
2. Detached full-width garage
3. Stamped concrete garage
4. Detached rear-facing garage

Based on the image(s) you selected above, how important is it that the City regulates this feature?

1 2 3 4 5 Important

Not important
BUILT FORM TRANSITION

Select up to two (2) images where you think the built form transition (e.g. the difference in height between buildings) has been done well.

Based on the image(s) you selected above, share your comments about what you like and what you don’t like related to the built form transition.

BUILDING DESIGN, MATERIALS & COLOURS

Select up to two (2) images that best reflect the building design, materials and/or colours that you want to see in your neighbourhood.

Based on the image(s) you selected above, share your comments about what you like and what you don’t like related to the building design, materials and/or colours.
VIEWS

How important is this view from the top of Cedar Street near St. George?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not important Somewhat important Very important

Would this view be more important if you had an opportunity to spend time here in a parkette or seating area?

YES  NO

TERMINATING VISTAS

How important is it to maintain the built form at the end of streets?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not important Somewhat important Very important
CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

Built Heritage Resources
means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal community. Built heritage resources are generally located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or included on local, provincial and/or federal registers.

Cultural Heritage Landscapes
means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).

Heritage Act Tools
• Heritage Conservation Easement Agreements
• Designation of Individual Properties (Part IV)
• Designation of Groups of Properties (Part V – Heritage Conservation District)
• Listing of Individual Properties
• Heritage Funding (Grants and Tax Refunds)

Planning Act Tools
• Official Plan/Secondary Plan Policies
• Community Improvement Plans
• Zoning By-law Regulations
• Subdivision Agreements
• Demolition Control
• Site Plan Control
• Urban Design Guidelines

Other Tools
• Corridor Management Plans
• Park Management Plans
• Stewardship Activities
• Public Education
• Commemoration and Interpretation
Existing Built Heritage Resources

Legend
- Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Boundary
- Heritage Conservation District (HCD)
- Municipal Heritage Register
  - Listed
  - Part IV (Individual Property)
  - Part V (Victoria Park Area HCD)

Examples of Heritage Properties
- 90 Church St (Part IV)
- 160 Courtland Ave (Listed)
Proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) Boundary and Heritage Attributes

Legend
- Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Boundary
- Cultural Heritage Landscape Study Boundary
- Proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape Boundary
- Ground Elevation (in metres)
  - < 322
  - 322 - 325
  - 325 - 330
  - 330 - 345
  - > 345
- Terminating Vistas
- View at Top of Hill
- Entrance Views
- Grouping of Buildings on Peter St

DISCLAIMER: This document is subject to copyright and may only be used for your personal, non-commercial use, provided you keep intact the copyright notice © 2018. Some portions of this publication are produced using information under licence use from Temiar c 1969, Registry of Rights c 2010 and may not be reproduced without permission.
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Cedar Hill Neighbourhood
Cultural Heritage Landscape

Proposed Heritage Attributes

- Topography of land
- Variety of housing types
- Common housing design characteristics
  - Front porches
  - Peak roofs
  - Detached rear yard garages
  - Brick or appearance of brick
- Range of construction dates
- Mingling of early and late housing, high-rise structures, and institutional buildings
- Variety of density that blends within the predominantly low rise built form
- Consistent street edge (front yard & exterior side yard setbacks)
- Grouping of buildings on Peter Street between Whitney Place and the dead end
- Narrow street design
  - Narrow right-of-way
  - One-way streets
  - Narrow road width
  - Narrow or no sidewalks
  - Narrow or no boulevards
  - Public street trees
  - Private front yard trees that contribute to streetscape
  - Shallow front yard and exterior side yard setbacks
Designated Properties

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can pass by-laws to formally designate properties of cultural heritage value or interest. Formal designation is one way of publicly acknowledging a property’s heritage value to the community. Designation also helps conserve important properties for the enjoyment of present and future generations by ensuring that changes are managed in a way that respects the heritage values. This includes protection from demolition. The City has designated approximately 85 individual properties and 4 heritage conservation districts.

Listed Non-Designated Properties

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can list non-designated properties of cultural heritage value or interest on the Municipal Heritage Register. Listing is the first step the City should take to identify properties that may warrant some form of recognition, conservation and/or protection. Listing provides interim protection from demolition by increasing the amount of time the City has to process a demolition permit under the Ontario Building Code (generally from 10 to 60 business days) to provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the property merits formal designation. Listing also enables the City to ask for Heritage Impact Assessments and/or Conservation Plans with the submission of a complete Planning Act application.

Listed Non-Designated Properties versus Designated Properties
Well I don't think I have heard a planning/zoning meeting referred to as "fun" however I think that is great that you think that Brandon. 

I am a tad remiss is not responding earlier about the meeting.

I would like to add my appreciation to the City for coming out and doing such a great job helping us to get a better understanding of the complexities of a Secondary Planning process. It is daunting to realize just how much work must go into developing the plan plus figuring out how to present the plan in a way that residents can understand both the process and the plan. As I am quite familiar with many of the other residential areas, I am glad our meeting was "fun".

I was not present at the initial meeting so I did not understand that Schneider Creek is linked to Cedar Hill but in reviewing the explanation, that link makes total sense.

I very much appreciate the efforts to listen and hear what we have been saying for so many years and that "hearing" is clearly reflected in the plan.

It is important that residents understand that any plan is just that...a plan and can be changed through other committees such as the Committee of Adjustments so we need to be vigilant and contribute when we are aware that the "Plan" is being challenged.

It was exciting to see that every street was represented with people clearly invested in their "little corner" of Cedar Hill.

Looking forward to the next meeting.

Kind regards
Karen

On Fri, 2 Nov 2018 at 08:55, <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca> wrote:

It was a fun night.

-we require tree management as part of the site plan process

-I made the Director of Transportation aware of the traffic comments

Brandon Sloan
Manager, Long Range & Policy Planning | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 x7648 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | brandon.sloan@kitchener.ca
Tina:

Thanks very much.

I do actually have a question from a neighbour who wasn't able to attend but is very interested. He is really concerned that there are a number of very old trees at the back of the properties on Courtland and that these might all go with redevelopment. He sent me a photo and I think he was looking particularly at the properties between Peter and Benton, some of which are quite deep although it may be all of the area. No doubt this is something that might be expected in an older area. Would you be able to explain how plans such as these take the tree inventory of the area into account? Thanks very much.

One other thing -- one of the people at the meeting asked about the development that seems to have started on Benton close to Courtland. I walked past and it seems to be a work site. However, I think this is actually storage for the Arrow project.

Sally

On 11/1/2018 9:10 PM, Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca wrote:

Thank you Sally and Lori for your email and comments. Thank you to all for organizing this meeting.

It was our pleasure to come out to your neighbourhood meeting and provide more information on the Secondary Plan Review for the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek area. It was great to see the turn out and the amount of interest in this project.

Transportation Planning will be consulted on the new Secondary Plan and land uses,
and in consultation with them, we will consider how best we can deal with the traffic concerns during the planning process.

We appreciate the input and look forward to the process ahead.

In the interim, please let me know if there are any further questions or comments.

Thank you again for your participation thus far.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Lori Gove
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 9:46 AM
To: 'Sally Gunz'; Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>; Brandon Sloan <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca>
Cc: Brandon Sloan <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Zoning meeting thank you and traffic on Church street

My thanks for the great meeting also.

I want to echo Sally’s comments re traffic in the neighbourhood. I am on Church and the traffic has intensified since the work started on the LRT. Vehicles race down Church between Benton and Cedar, and as there is no traffic calming/bumps or stop signs they travel very fast. We feel like we live beside a hiway. Requests to the councillor and the city for some action have met with deaf ears I am afraid. WE have 3 bus stops on Church and I am afraid the day will come when one of those kids, or a
senior trying to get across the street, will get hit.

Traffic; it’s speed and number of vehicles going down Church is our number one concern these days! Please pass this on to your colleagues when you discuss traffic in the Cedar Hill neighbourhood.

Lori Gove

From: Sally Gunz
Sent: October 31, 2018 8:30 AM
To: Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca; Lori Gove
Cc: Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca
Subject: Re: Another change to flyer---directions to Community Room

Tina:

Thanks again very much for the meeting last night. This was the best kind of community meeting so far as I am concerned. People clearly are really interested and they could ask what they wanted. Thanks also for meeting with our friends the Watsons at the end. They have a perfectly maintained home and have been dealing with some really crappy owners near them probably speculating. Not unlike some of the bad times in the Cedar/Eby block. I think they feel scared obviously about possible change and any thoughts about how design features etc might impose more thoughtful development when it happens and allow for them to live where they are and as they live as long as they wish.

I wanted to mention a couple of things as I fear I sounded like a traffic nut (i.e. no change ever because of traffic). I am not. I drive and I use public transit. Two things though:

1. Re Peter St: my only concern is that the engineering people work closely with you and your plans. We were given a choice of no parking or one way on Peter St St. G to Courtland. Stark choices. Our argument was any change on Peter will affect other streets and St. G and Church in particular. It will affect how people live. Our request was simply for the city to consider changes more holistically. As I think of your very good goals of ensuring the protection of existing neighbourhoods, I think we must consider any change that affects that. So, e.g., if Peter becomes one way I will have always to use either St. G or
Church to access my home by car. Now maybe that reduces some through traffic. Not sure (and it won't affect St. G as that is one way so people won't now be turning left from Peter). But it needs thinking through along with your plans. Note: right now the engineering plans are on hold for at least another year. The rationale for not taking a very small allowance (to allow wider sidewalks) was trees but apparently the one relevant tree (corner of Courtland) is slated for removal soon anyway. Not sure this is the answer but it is one of several options here.

2. Re Courtland: the changes to traffic there recently are quite remarkable. And however much we want to divert to public transit I think we have to be realistic about what will happen on Courtland. This is a major thoroughfare to the downtown and particularly since Charles is less useable by cars. Right now, at peak times it is actually hard to make a right turn out of Peter. I don't know anyone who tries to make left turns -- too much going on. We have seen several nasty accidents at what were earlier very minor intersections. What complicates things is the two schools. Maplegrove adds a good deal of traffic to Cedar and Courtland to the lower half of Peter and I suspect that is why we have more bumps.

I am not suggesting no intensification on Courtland. However, real care will have to be taken to make sure cars can exit the properties. I know the Watsons have a lot of difficulty now and have all kinds of alternate approaches including parking on Peter which itself now has little parking available most of the time. I don't know what design features can be used but I think it will be important to consider. I am always afraid for the pedestrians with cars making a quick turn in breaks of traffic. Right now the problem is mainly peak times but I cannot imagine with the lack of alternate routes that this will not change.

Thanks again.

Sally (not a traffic nut!!)

On 2018-09-28 12:59 PM, Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca wrote:

No issues with the flyer.

Thanks,

Tina

From: Karen Taylor-Harrison
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 12:45 PM
To: Gunz Sally; Lori Gove; Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Another change to flyer---directions to Community Room
If everyone is ok I will arrange for flyer to be printed.

Karen

--

Karen Taylor-Harrison
Cedar Hill Community Group

--

Karen Taylor-Harrison
Cedar Hill Community Group
Brandon:

Sorry for taking so long to reply. Thanks and I will pass this on to my neighbour.

Sally

On 2018-11-02 8:55 AM, Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca wrote:

   It was a fun night.
   -we require tree management as part of the site plan process
   -I made the Director of Transportation aware of the traffic comments

Brandon Sloan
Manager, Long Range & Policy Planning | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 x7648 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | brandon.sloan@kitchener.ca

Tina:

Thanks very much.

I do actually have a question from a neighbour who wasn't able to attend but is very interested. He is really concerned that there are a number of very old trees at the back of the properties on Courtland and that these might all go with redevelopment. He sent me a photo and I think he was looking particularly at the properties between Peter and Benton, some of which are quite deep although it may be all of the area. No doubt this is something that might be expected in an
older area. Would you be able to explain how plans such as these take the tree inventory of the area into account? Thanks very much.

One other thing -- one of the people at the meeting asked about the development that seems to have started on Benton close to Courtland. I walked past and it seems to be a work site. However, I think this is actually storage for the Arrow project.

Sally

On 11/1/2018 9:10 PM, Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca wrote:

Thank you Sally and Lori for your email and comments. Thank you to all for organizing this meeting.

It was our pleasure to come out to your neighbourhood meeting and provide more information on the Secondary Plan Review for the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek area. It was great to see the turn out and the amount of interest in this project.

Transportation Planning will be consulted on the new Secondary Plan and land uses, and in consultation with them, we will consider how best we can deal with the traffic concerns during the planning process.

We appreciate the input and look forward to the process ahead.

In the interim, please let me know if there are any further questions or comments.

Thank you again for your participation thus far.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 |
tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Lori Gove
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 9:46 AM
To: 'Sally Gunz' ; Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Cc: Brandon Sloan <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Zoning meeting thank you and traffic on Church street
My thanks for the great meeting also.
I want to echo Sally’s comments re traffic in the neighbourhood. I am on Church and the traffic has intensified since the work started on the LRT. Vehicles race down Church between Benton and Cedar, and as there is no traffic calming/bumps or stop signs they travel very fast. We feel like we live beside a hiway. Requests to the councillor and the city for some action have met with deaf ears I am afraid. We have 3 bus stops on Church and I am afraid the day will come when one of those kids, or a senior trying to get across the street, will get hit.
Traffic; it’s speed and number of vehicles going down Church is our number one concern these days! Please pass this on to your colleagues when you discuss traffic in the Cedar Hill neighbourhood.

Lori Gove

From: Sally Gunz
Sent: October 31, 2018 8:30 AM
To: Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca; LoriGove
Cc: Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca
Subject: Re: Another change to flyer---directions to Community Room

Tina:

Thanks again very much for the meeting last night. This was the best kind of community meeting so far as I am concerned. People clearly are really interested and they could ask what they wanted. Thanks also for meeting with our friends the Watsons at the end. They have a perfectly maintained home and have been dealing with some really crappy owners near them probably speculating. Not unlike some of the bad times in the Cedar/Eby block. I think they feel scared obviously about possible change and any thoughts about how design features etc might impose more thoughtful development when it happens and allow for them to live where they are and as they live as long as they wish.

I wanted to mention a couple of things as I fear I sounded like a traffic nut (i.e. no change ever because of traffic). I am not. I drive and I use public transit. Two things though:

1. Re Peter St: my only concern is that the engineering people work closely with you and your plans. We were given a choice of no parking or one way on Peter St St. G to Courtland. Stark choices. Our argument was any change on Peter will affect other streets and St. G and Church in particular. It will affect how people live. Our request
was simply for the city to consider changes more holistically. As I think of your very good goals of ensuring the protection of existing neighbourhoods, I think we must consider any change that affects that. So, e.g., if Peter becomes one way I will have always to use either St. G or Church to access my home by car. Now maybe that reduces some through traffic. Not sure (and it won't affect St. G as that is one way so people won't now be turning left from Peter). But it needs thinking through along with your plans. Note: right now the engineering plans are on hold for at least another year. The rationale for not taking a very small allowance (to allow wider sidewalks) was trees but apparently the one relevant tree (corner of Courtland) is slated for removal soon anyway. Not sure this is the answer but it is one of several options here.

2. Re Courtland: the changes to traffic there recently are quite remarkable. And however much we want to divert to public transit I think we have to be realistic about what will happen on Courtland. This is a major thoroughfare to the downtown and particularly since Charles is less useable by cars. Right now, at peak times it is actually hard to make a right turn out of Peter. I don't know anyone who tries to make left turns -- too much going on. We have seen several nasty accidents at what were earlier very minor intersections. What complicates things is the two schools. Maplegrove adds a good deal of traffic to Cedar and Courtland to the lower half of Peter and I suspect that is why we have more bumps.

I am not suggesting no intensification on Courtland. However, real care will have to be taken to make sure cars can exit the properties. I know the Watsons have a lot of difficulty now and have all kinds of alternate approaches including parking on Peter which itself now has little parking available most of the time. I don't know what design features can be used but I think it will be important to consider. I am always afraid for the pedestrians with cars making a quick turn in breaks of traffic. Right now the problem is mainly peak times but I cannot imagine with the lack of alternate routes that this will not change.

Thanks again.

Sally (not a traffic nut!!)

On 2018-09-28 12:59 PM, Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca wrote:

No issues with the flyer.
Thanks,
Tina

From: Karen Taylor-Harrison
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 12:45 PM
To: Gunz Sally; Lori Gove
Subject: Another change to flyer---directions to Community Room

If everyone is ok I will arrange for flyer to be printed.
Karen

--
Karen Taylor-Harrison
Cedar Hill Community Group
Wonderful. Thanks

John MacDonald
Principal
John MacDonald Architect inc.

On Sep 19, 2018, at 9:26 AM, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>

John,
We do not have a date as to when a next or final draft will be available for comment. This is one of the three new Secondary Plans that I am working on.

Our aim is to bring final drafts of plans/policies of the Secondary Plans to Committee/Council in the last quarter of 2019.

It is the City’s practice as well as a Planning Act requirement to provide a commenting period when considering new or amendments to Secondary Plans and corresponding zoning. Accordingly, there will be notification and an ability to comment at a future date in time.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

---

On Sep 18, 2018, at 9:26 AM, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

John,

We had not received any reply to our e-mail of July 16. Your communication is the first.

Michelle did not get a chance to before she left early on maternity leave and asked that I send the reply to you on her behalf being the Project Manager of the new Secondary Plan. I simply quoted her email so that you would know that the comments were provided by Michelle in response to the email that you directed to her. My comment "in the interim" refers to the fact that we are still working through the comments and making revisions to the land uses, policies and zoning in advance of coming back to the community. Typically, the comments that we receive on draft plans and policies and the responses to them, are usually reflected as a whole in a next draft or final package. We have taken a slightly different approach with this process and are providing individualized responses in advance of a next draft or final package for approval.

Thank you for your additional comments. We will take them into consideration as we move forward with the new Secondary Plan and policies.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

---

On Sep 18, 2018, at 11:19 AM, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

John,

I apologize if my email implied that Michelle had responded to you previously before my email this morning. I know she did not. My email is the first communication that you have received from the City.

Michelle did not get a chance to before she left early on maternity leave and asked that I send the reply to you on her behalf being the Project Manager of the new Secondary Plan. I simply quoted her email so that you would know that the comments were provided by Michelle in response to the email that you directed to her. My comment "in the interim" refers to the fact that we are still working through the comments and making revisions to the land uses, policies and zoning in advance of coming back to the community. Typically, the comments that we receive on draft plans and policies and the responses to them, are usually reflected as a whole in a next draft or final package. We have taken a slightly different approach with this process and are providing individualized responses in advance of a next draft or final package for approval.

Thank you for your additional comments. We will take them into consideration as we move forward with the new Secondary Plan and policies.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

---

Tina,

Thanks for that. We had not received any reply to our e-mail of July 16. Your communication is the first.

Within your communication you appear to be quoting Michelle Drake with quotation marks as though it’s from some form of communication to me, and state: In the interim, Michelle Drake provided the following in response to your email before she left on maternity leave.

Please be advised that we have received no such communication from Michelle Drake or anyone else on this matter, in response to the July 16 e-mail to Michelle with copy to yourself.

It is most disturbing that the City believes it has replied, when it has not.

Cultural Heritage Landscape Study

Regarding the view down Cedar as it pertains to 141 Whitney, we continue to disagree that such a view constitutes any different a vista than in hundreds of locations across the City where a street turns or there is a T-intersection. We assume that the City is not going to list every one of these and see no reason for the property to be on a list under the Heritage Act.

Perhaps the Cultural Heritage Landscape Study more generally looks at the vista from the top of the hill at Cedar near St. George? In that instance the City may wish to discuss height limitations to properties in the immediate lands to the south and east on the shoulder of the hill, but I suggest it hardly applies to 141 Whitney in the bottom distance without reference to any other property on such a list.

Can the City please specifically identify the statements in the CHL Study that name our property please, given that Michelle appears to be citing the Study with direct reference to just our property or its importance in the vista. I do not see any reference in the Study to 141 Whitney nor to a vista or condition that pertains. In the case that the City is citing more generalized statements in support of its position, I believe that reinforces the point that the City surely doesn’t wish to list all such properties because they happen to be located at the end of the street. This makes little sense to us, as having been singled out.

With Respect to Making Our Neighbourhood Great, Schneider Creek Document

It is the particular nature of the Schneider Creek neighbourhood that the road structure and topography creates a nice sense of enclosure and a bit of a contrasting openness in the two orientations of the grid of streets in the neighbourhood. This is hardly a heritage matter to be listed but a matter of character that should be taken into account whenever development is proposed. I suggest that the appropriate response to this character, if restrictions need to be in place formally, is to place some restriction on the City to not change its street pattern without considering this character (for instance, by joining Whitney to Madison by expropriating a portion of our and church property), and also not undertaking to change the topography in the rights-of-way by raising or lowering them substantially.
Requested Action

We continue to disagree strongly that any listing be placed upon the 141 Whitney property. Please remove it from consideration.

Thank you.

John MacDonald,
CityWorks
A Culture-Making Business in A Business-Making Culture

On Sep 18, 2018, at 10:00 AM, <Michelle.Drake@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hi John,
Thank you for your email and for the comments that you provided in response to the information that we presented at the Community Engagement Session on the proposed new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan on May 29th, 2018.

We have been working through the comments and work is still progressing on the land use plans, associated policies and zoning.

In the interim, Michelle Drake provided the following in response to your email before she left on maternity leave.

"John,
Staff have identified important terminating vistas that contribute to the cultural heritage landscape within the proposed Cedar Hill Schneider Creek secondary plan area. These terminating vistas were initially identified based on the Kitchener Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood: Making our Neighbourhood Great! document identified as a community asset and view), and various site visits and discussions among the staff working team. At the May 29, 2018 public open house, the majority of residents responded that terminating vistas within the neighbourhood were either somewhat important, or very important. One of three examples of a terminating vista provided to residents was that of 141 Whitney Place.

Staff are not proposing to designate 141 Whitney Place. Staff are proposing that terminating vistas be listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. Some of the terminating vistas are already listed while other are not. Currently, 141 Whitney Place is not listed.

It is important to understand the impact of listing on the Municipal Heritage Register. Listing does not provide protection under the Ontario Heritage Act, does not impose restrictions or obligations with respect to obtaining heritage approvals under the Ontario Heritage Act (e.g. a Heritage Permit is not required, review by the City’s Heritage Kitchener committee is not required, etc.), and does not require Council approval to make alterations. Listing has two implications. First, listing does increase the amount of time municipalities have to process demolition applications made under the Ontario Building Code to provide time to evaluate whether a property merits some form of protection, such as designation, under the Ontario Heritage Act, which is subject to a separate legal process with appeal mechanisms. Second, listing does allow the City to ask for a Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan, if necessary, as part of a complete Ontario Planning Act application in order to address conservation policies outlined in the Ontario Planning Act and the Provincial Policy Statement.

Staff will consider your comments along with those of other residents and members of the public as we continue to draft the secondary plan for this area."

There will be future opportunities to provide your comments on the proposed new Secondary Plan and proposed zoning.

Should you have any questions or additional comments at this time please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Michelle Drake,
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 |TTY 1-866-969-9994 | mdrake@kitchener.ca

From: Michelle Drake
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 12:01 PM
Subject: re: 141 Whitney Place - Secondary Plan for Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek

Michelle,
I’ve conferred with other building ownership at 141 Whitney Place, based on the City’s potential review of the property at 141 Whitney Place as somehow being worthy of a form of heritage designation. This idea was floated in the recent public meeting for the new Secondary Plan for Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek, which I attended.

We object strongly to the potential for such designation, and see no grounds for it. We ask that the property be removed from any such consideration.

My understanding from conversation is that the criterion for such a designation is that it may end a vista (although not much, as a single storey building at the bottom of a slope). By this criterion there would be an enormous number of properties with heritage designation, at every abrupt turn in street or T-intersection.

We object strongly to the potential for such designation, and see no grounds for it. We ask that the property be removed from any such consideration.

Please do not hesitate to call if you require further clarity regarding our position in this matter.

I’m cc-ing Greg Hayton, who liaises with Globe Studios, for information.

Thank you for your consideration.

On behalf of the property ownership (Globe Studios (K-W) and CityWorks Development and Management Inc.

John MacDonald,
CityWorks
Consider the environment before printing.
This e-mail may contain information that is confidential and is intended for the named recipient. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system.
Hi Tina, thanks for confirming receipt and that you will be reviewing and considering them as the project moves forward. I understand on the materials for next week's meeting and I hope to be there!

Bryan

Hi Bryan,
Thank you for the attached compiled comments on behalf of some of the residents within the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood.

We will definitely review the comments but given the timing of the comments and the meeting on Tuesday, November 20, 2018, they may or may not be reflected in the visuals and other materials that are proposed to be presented at the meeting.

Moving forward, these comments and any comments that we receive with respect to the visuals/materials presented on Tuesday evening will be considered in the final draft of the new Secondary Plan and Zoning when it goes to Committee in the Fall of 2019. If I have any questions or need further clarification on your neighbourhood’s comments, I will definitely be in touch.

Hopefully you and the residents of the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood will be able to attend on Nov. 20th. See you then.

Regards,
Good evening Tina,

Please find attached compiled comments on behalf of some residents within the Schneider Creek neighbourhood. If you have any questions on the attached or would like to discuss further please let me know.

Thank you

Bryan
Hi Tina,

I wanted to let you know that neighbours in the Schneider Creek neighbourhood have met to discuss comments on the proposed secondary plan for the area. We are still finalizing comments and will have them sent to you shortly.

Thanks, happy Canada day!

Bryan Cooper
Proposed Secondary Plan – Comments provided by residents within the “Schneider Creek” neighbourhood:

- **Boundary of Secondary Plan:**

  Why was the corner of Courtland Ave and Benton (148 Benton St) not included in the boundary of the secondary plan? This land is currently vacant and treed and forms a natural boundary of the neighbourhood. This property should be included in the boundary of the secondary plan and appropriate land use designations and zoning applied. Consideration of extending the secondary plan to the limits of property ownership (25 Courtland Ave) would make sense.

- **Existing site specific policies – former Schneider Factory and Courtland Ave public school:**

  Current secondary plan has site specific policies for these lands. Are these policies intended to be eliminated with the new secondary plan or will they be carried forward? Site specific policies should be provided for these lands since they represent likely redevelopment opportunities in the neighbourhood. Access prohibitions from any local roads (Benton, Martin, Peter, Cedar) should be incorporated into the policy and zoning as well as site specific standards for building setbacks (stepbacks and terracing), landscaping and buffering of parking areas. City should consider a proactive neighbourhood design charrette for these sites in advance of completion of the secondary plan to guide the long term redevelopment of these lands.

- **Benton St and Martin St- land use designations:**

  In order to maintain the low rise residential character of Benton St, 145, 147, 149 Benton St should be designated low rise residential conservation as is proposed on the opposite side of Benton St.

  Similarly 26 Martin St and the Martin St frontage of 63 Courtland Ave should be designated low rise residential conservation and zoned accordingly to ensure that any new development completes what is currently a disrupted low rise residential streetscape.

- **Building height and regulations along Courtland Ave:**

  Agree with including height restrictions along Courtland Ave; however, careful consideration of the interface between existing homes along Martin St and Cedar St. is required including accounting for the grade changes between Courtland Ave and Martin St. This difference in topography should be considered in determining
the overall building height. For example, the maximum building height of a development fronting on Courtland Ave. in this area should be determined from the lowest point of the shared rear lot line of the properties on Martin St. that back onto properties fronting on Courtland Ave. This will assist in mitigating the impact of taller buildings and provide for the continued enjoyment of the private backyard space of the Martin Street residences which is important since the proximity of our homes to the street, or public space, means that our private spaces are limited to our rear yards. These much needed and valued spaces add great benefit to our residents in terms of liveability.

There are concerns that with Bonusing permissions a developer may be able to exceed any height restriction applied in the secondary plan. This is of particular concern due to the above mentioned grade changes between Courtland Ave. and Martin St.

The maximum height regulations for Courtland Ave should be a metric measurement rather than measured in “storeys” since the ceiling height of each storey can have a significant impact on the overall height of the building (e.g Breithaupt Block 3). This also gives greater certainty to the public in how tall a building may be.

Zoning standards such as stepbacks should be applied to any new multi storey building so that the building heights are at the lowest height at the interface of existing low rise buildings and property. Building massing and height should be oriented towards Courtland Ave rather than existing single detached dwellings and local streets.

Parking areas and structures need to be carefully managed particularly at the interface of existing low rise residential areas. The overall building height should include any parking structure. Parking structures should not project above grade to avoid blank walls backing onto to homes or streets.

Building setbacks to Courtland Avenue - front yard setbacks should be measured from the existing limits of this Regional road rather than from any future road widening taken by the Region. This will avoid pushing a building closer to the rear yard area of homes on Martin St.

- **Severance/minor infilling criteria:**
  Criteria should be developed to consider any new severance applications within the neighbourhood. Criteria should include whether the lot has sufficient frontage to properly accommodate a new building, parking and landscaping. Properties in
the neighbourhood have very narrow frontages and the lack of boulevard means that any landscaping needs to be provided within the front yard of private property. Wide driveways and attached garages within the front yard should not be permitted.

Some form of architectural control or site plan approval should be required for new infilling of severance lots (or rebuilding of an existing lot) to ensure building style is compatible with surrounding building stock (materials, roof pitch, etc). Garages should be limited to being detached and in the rear yard. Policies should be developed that require new developments to be respectful of the character of the streetscape of this unique neighbourhood- with the open porches, the front doors facing the street, the narrow lots, tightly squeezed houses, tiny front yards, the rooflines, etc.

- **Front yard landscaping in new developments:**
  A suggestion was made by staff at the neighbourhood meeting about the possibility of publicly owned trees within private front yard space for new developments. This should be implemented since there is no opportunity for trees to be installed within the City owned road. Financial securities should be taken for the publicly owned trees with an extended hold period post construction to ensure that they are established and thrive.

- **Zoning Standards:**
  Minimum front yard landscaped open space standard should be incorporated in the zoning of the area to maintain limited front yard landscaping. Maximum driveway width standards that account for the very narrow lot frontages of the area should also be applied. A minimum landscaping strip along the side lot lines within the front yard to eliminate driveways being installed across the frontage of a property or connecting with adjoining lots should also be applied. This is particularly important for any home that is duplexed to ensure that already small front yards of the neighbourhood are not paved over.

- **Transportation:**
  Courtland Ave currently functions as a barrier between the Schneider Creek and Cedar Hill neighbourhoods. The PARTS plan indicates some streetscaping enhancements are intended for this Regional road - how will this implemented and coordinated with the Region and new development in the area and what opportunity for public involvement will there be.

Parking - zoning standards require too much parking for new multi-unit developments and as a result too much of a site is often dedicated to surface
parking when it could be better utilized as amenity space and landscaping. Consider reducing parking standards.

**General Comments on the neighbourhood and new development:**

**Diversity:**
The community would like to see new developments provide spaces for families as well as single people and couples - in doing this we will continue to support this community allowing it to remain vibrant and diverse. Families will also ensure that existing infrastructure, such as schools, remain useful. Consider standards that would require a developer to incorporate some family sized dwelling units.

**Streets:**
Concerns have been raised regarding the often very narrow, yet charming, streets in this area with regard to their ability to handle increased traffic - it would be inappropriate or undesirable to have any new developments use these streets as a back door access - - part of the charm of our community are these often one way, narrow streets which greatly enhance and encourage our social engagement . This close proximity of homes and street provides a unique opportunity to gather, chat and play on the street itself. This makes the community feel safe because we have eyes on the street and know our neighbours

**Walkability:**
It is a great community asset to be able to walk or bike the iron horse trail or amble around to our parks and downtown. Not always needing a car is something we hope to see supported through the new growth. - - the experience at street level will be key to encouraging foot traffic, so scale of buildings, materials used and a mix of uses including shops and retail needs to be planned . Potential destinations are needed.

Residents understand the need to move traffic along but suggest lowering the speed limit on regional roads and streets in the core to improve walkability since it contributes to the enjoyment of living in the core.

**Sidewalks:**
The current sidewalks on some side streets are quite narrow and result in many pedestrians choosing to walk on the street. In addition, steeply angled driveways create slants that make it difficult to maintain your balance and can lead to overturned strollers, childrens' tricycles and wagons, as well as slips and falls, particularly in poor weather conditions. This can be especially problematic for anyone with a mobility challenge or the elderly. In addition the narrow sidewalks leave very little space to put snow or garbage/green bin/blue bins which results in an additional mobility barrier.
Residents acknowledge that the streets in the area were relatively recently reconstructed and therefore there may not be an immediate solution to this issue but wanted to highlight the problem to the City and would like some direction on what process to engage the City in when the time comes for reconstruction of the streets. When the time comes for reconstruction it will be important to consider alternative designs to address this issue but that is still respectful of the character of the neighbourhood.

Trees and green spaces:
The community would like to see an increase in the minimum allotment of green space around new buildings - more lawns, gardens, trees make for a pleasing streetscape and add to community enjoyment. We know this helps promote overall goals that the city has already indicated wanting to achieve.
Good afternoon Tina,

Please see attached our comments for the proposed Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.

If you have any questions or would like any further clarification, please do not hesitate to ask.

Thank you and have a good long weekend.

Regards,

Amanda Stellings
Planner | Polocorp Inc.

379 Queen Street South | Kitchener, ON | N2G 1W6
P: 519-745-3249, ext. 203 | C: 519-591-9704
amanda@polocorpinc.com
June 29, 2018

VIA e-mail

Attention: Tina Malone-Wright, Senior Planner

Reference: Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review
19-41 Mill Street, Kitchener

Dear Ms. Malone-Wright,

In review of the proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan, Polocorp Inc. wishes to provide comments on the information provided as part of the Public Information Meeting #1 held on May 29, 2018. As part of our comments, the following documents have been reviewed:

- Notice of Meeting;
- Staff Presentation;
- Existing & Proposed Land Use;
- 3-D Rendering;
- Neighbourhood Character;
- Cultural Heritage.

While the goals and directions of the Plan are consistent with those for the Region and City, we would request a revision to the plan as it relates to the lands municipally addressed as 19-41 Mill Street.

In review of the documents, alongside the policies contained within the PPS (2014), Growth Plan (2017), Regional Official Plan (2015), and City of Kitchener Official Plan (2014), we wish to formally recommend that the land use designations for the above-noted lands be changed from ‘Medium Rise Residential’ to ‘High Density Mixed Use’ to accommodate future growth while providing both residential and commercial (live/work) uses within the community.

1.0 SITE CONTEXT

The subject lands are municipally addressed as 19-41 Mill Street within the City of Kitchener and are located within 800 metres of a Light Rail Transit station and approximately 300 metres away from the identified urban growth centre for Downtown Kitchener in the Growth Plan (2017).

To the north of the subject lands is Victoria Park, accessed via Queen Street South and the Iron Horse Trail. Victoria Park is the oldest park within the City and is approximately 45 acres (18
hectares) in size, providing recreational and active transit opportunities to the public, including future residents of the proposed development.

To the northeast, accessed via Queen Street South, is the Downtown core for the City of Kitchener, containing a variety of public recreational, retail, and hospitality services, as well as City Hall. The Downtown, identified as an urban growth centre within the 2017 Growth Plan, is approximately 300 metres from the subject lands.

Directly to the east, and across the street on Mill Street, is Mike Wagner Green, a trail and green space that connects to the Iron Horse Trail.

The southern property boundary of the subject lands is shared with the Iron Horse Trail, connecting to the City of Waterloo and Victoria Park to the west, and continuing towards Rockway Golf Course to the east. South of the Iron Horse Trail are CN rail tracks, bordering a commercial/industrial complex to the south.

The properties along Queen Street are designated as ‘Mixed Use Corridor’ within the Mill Woodside Park Neighbourhood Plan for Land Use as well as the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Central Plan. This designation is intended to allow for future development along Queen Street South, an arterial road into the Downtown core of Kitchener.
The subject lands are within close proximity to existing tall buildings (illustrated in Figure 2), including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Image ID</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>588 &amp; 600 Queen Street South</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11 storeys</td>
<td>Zone Change Application Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Horse Towers</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14 storeys</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park Towers</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>14 storeys</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barra on Queen Condos</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6 storeys</td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Lofts</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10 storeys</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Existing and proposed tall buildings

2.0 PLANNING CONTROLS


The Province released an updated Growth Plan in 2017 that provided significant density goals for the Region of Waterloo and its lower-tier municipalities, requiring that the majority of growth be directed to settlement areas. Within this plan, 60% of new development must occur within a delineated built-up area, while maintaining a strategy to meet the policies of section 2.2.2 delineated built-up areas within the Growth Plan. In the 2017 Growth Plan has increased the targets for residential development occurring with the delineated built-up area from 40% to 60%, which are required for consideration as part of the Regional Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review in 2019.
A major transit station area is defined as an, “area including and around any existing or planned higher order transit station or stop within a settlement area; or the area including and around a major bus depot in an urban core. Major transit station areas generally are defined as the area within an approximate 500 metre radius of a transit station, representing about a 10-minute walk”.

While the subject lands are outside of the 500 metre radius of a transit station, they are located within 800 metres of the transit station, which the City has used a criteria for inclusion within their Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) plans. The proximity of the subject lands to higher-order transit provides an opportunity to provide residential dwellings that have access to multiple modes of transit, while also maintaining a location in close proximity to outdoor recreational space. These factors result in an opportunity to contribute to a complete community, in alignment with policy 2.2.1.2. of the Growth Plan.

City of Kitchener Official Plan

Queen Street South is identified as a ‘Transit Corridor’ within the City’s Official Plan, supporting the designation as an Urban Corridor, as per policy 3.C.2.37. As such, the Queen Street South Mixed Use Corridor is considered a Primary Intensification Area as per policy 3.C.2.3., defined as, “lands intended by City, Region or the Province that are to be the focus for accommodating intensification. Primary Intensification Areas include the Urban Growth Centre (Downtown), Reurbanization Corridors, Major Transit Station Areas, Major Local Node, City Nodes, Community Nodes, and Urban Comiors.”

The subject lands are adjacent to the identified Transit Corridor and Primary Intensification Area, which supports intensified development.

Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Central Plan

The City of Kitchener adopted the PARTS Central Plan in April 2016, which includes the subject lands. The preferred land use plan contained within the PARTS Central Plan is to be implemented through a new Secondary Plan/Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.

The subject lands have been identified for ‘Medium Rise Residential’ within the Plan, which permits an FSR of 0.6 to 2.0, and a maximum height of 8-storeys.

Land use designations within the PARTS Central Plan are intended for the achievement of a minimum density of 160 persons/jobs per hectare, which is required to support rapid transit. The PARTS Central Plan identified the subject lands as an area for increased density, adding height and density to the land use designations.

Since the adoption of the PARTS Central Plan, density targets from the Province have significantly increased within the Growth Plan (2017), resulting in a need to amend the PARTS Central Plan plans and guidelines to accommodate the increased growth.

Mill Courtland Woodside Neighbourhood Plan for Land Use

The subject lands are contained within the Mill Courtland Woodside Secondary Plan as ‘Low Density Commercial Residential’. This plan has been identified as a Secondary Plan requiring updates from the City, to conform to existing policy direction from the Region and City, as well as to implement the vision of the PARTS Central Plan.
3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A Pre-Submission Consultation Meeting application has been submitted to the City of Kitchener to facilitate the development of a twenty (20) storey multiple residential dwelling consisting of a two (2) storey podium and eighteen (18) storey tower (Figure 3).

Additional street frontage access is provided through the inclusion of live/work units, allowing for a mix of uses and to allow for visual compatibility with the surrounding low-density neighbourhood.

The proposed development is adjacent to properties identified for high density development along Queen Street, an area subject to increased development pressure as a direct route to the Downtown. Furthermore, the proposed Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan has identified the lands municipally addressed as 585 Queen Street South for High Density Mixed Use (Figure 3).

In the future, the subject lands will be adjacent to high density development. The proposed development allows for a transition to the low-density neighbourhood to the south, through the use of a two-storey podium. The tower has been placed towards Queen Street, for compatibility to the existing and future urban landscape.

Furthermore, the topography of the adjacent sites to the west, along Queen Street will be developed on a higher topography, requiring an appropriate transition to the surrounding neighbourhood to the east. This transition has been incorporated into the proposed development through the use of a podium and through appropriate and compatible architectural and urban design elements.
4.0 REQUESTED REVISIONS TO THE CEDAR HILL SCHNEIDER CREEK SECONDARY PLAN

The intent of the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan is to implement the direction of the PARTS Central Plan, which was approved by Council in 2016, prior to the release of the 2017 Growth Plan.

The proposed land use within the Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Area is for ‘Medium Rise Residential’. Within this plan, ‘Medium Rise Residential’ would permit, “medium density housing types including townhouse dwellings in a cluster development, multiple dwellings, and special needs housing” with an FSR between 0.6 and 2.0, and a maximum building height of 8 storeys.

Figure 4: Subject lands within the proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan

To permit the proposed development, Polocorp Inc. is formally requesting a change in designation within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan to ‘High Density Mixed Use’ to permit, “a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building” and a range in uses. This designation would permit an FSR between 1.0 and 4.0, with no maximum building height.

The revision to the plan represents good planning as it reflects the goals of the Province and Region to provide density in areas that have access to transit. This particular site is adjacent to an identified Transit Corridor which is also a Primary Intensification Area within the City’s Official Plan.

The lands to the southwest of the site, along Queen Street South (municipally addressed as 585 Queen Street) were identified in the PARTS Central Plan as ‘Medium Density Mixed Use’ and have been transitioned into the proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Area as ‘High Density Mixed Use’, understanding that development pressures along Queen Street will
reflect the need to bring residential and commercial development into the Downtown from Queen Street, where existing municipal services and infrastructure currently exist.

5.0 MOVING FORWARD

Polocorp Inc. formally requests that the land designation for the subject lands be changed to ‘High Density Mixed Use’ to accommodate the changes in planning policies on the provincial, regional, and local levels. This is in alignment with the proposed development for the subject lands, as submitted for a Pre-Submission Consultation Meeting. Development in this area is ongoing, and the land uses within the Secondary Plan should be consistent to reflect the changes that will occur within, and adjacent to Queen Street South, identified as a Transit Corridor and Primary Intensification Area.

Furthermore, we would request that you include us on any future correspondence as it relates to this Secondary Plan.

Regards,

Paul Puopolo, President, MCIP, RPP, OALA
Polocorp Inc.

Amanda Stellings, Planner

CC: Pam Tolton, ABA Architects
    Mike Puopolo, Polocorp Inc.
Hi

Good to hear from you. All the info, including 3D renderings are posted here:


Brandon Sloan
Manager, Long Range & Policy Planning | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 x7648 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | brandon.sloan@kitchener.ca

Hi Brandon,

My name is [redacted] and we met at the public open house secondary review plan for the new Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek area. I am emailing you to see if you could provide me a digital package of some or all the information that was presented during the open house. I own the house at 49 Courtland Ave East, so ideally information that applies to the houses on Courtland/Benton would be beneficial.

In addition to the new proposed zoning, if you could send a few of artistic drawings you presented at the open house showing the vision, it would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,
[redacted]
Thanks Tina.

John

On Jun 27, 2018, at 11:26 AM, tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca wrote:

Hi John,
Thank you for your question. The 3D renderings that were prepared for the May 29th Open House have been placed on the City's website, along with the other information presented at the meeting, and can be found at the link below.


The renderings and modelling that were prepared for the meeting on the 29th were based on the extensive modelling work that was completed for the PARTS Central Plan. The proposed land uses in the new Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan that were shown at the meeting are based on this work and the approved PARTS Central Plan.

I have copied Adam Clark, who was involved in the PARTS Central Plan, attended the May 29th Open House, and created the 3D model and renderings for both projects. For any specific questions, I would suggest contacting Adam. He will be able to assist you in your analysis of potential massing and heights in the proposed secondary plan boundary.

Regards,
Tina

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener

-----Original Message-----
From: John MacDonald
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 6:35 PM
To: Tina MaloneWright
Cc: 
Subject: Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek, online modelling tool with the potential massing?

Tina,

Is there a place online where we can go to experience and use the modelling that was shown at the May 29th meeting, showing potential massing, heights, and possibilities within and around the area of the planning boundary?

Cheers,
John
Hello Mr. Featherstone,

Thank you for attending the Open House that was held on Tuesday, May 29th.

We are in receipt of your email and your comments. They will be considered in the process moving forward.

The timelines for further community engagement have not been set but we do know that no decisions will be made in 2018.

I have the sign in sheets from the Open House and your email address and will be able to keep you informed.

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Secondary Plan Review process.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener

Greetings,

I was at the general meeting around changes in the neighbourhood.

My household and many of our neighbours are not in favour of the zoning change for the west side of Mill street. We would not like to see apartment buildings here.
There are many families here...it's already a nice neighbourhood. There are many historic buildings here...many century homes.

Sorry for the tardy response...busy times.

Don Featherstone

[Redacted]
Hi Tina,
Thank you so much for getting back to me, as well as answering my questions so quickly and thoroughly. I found it really helpful. Thank you again.
Have a great day!
Mindy Constantinou

On Mon, Jun 11, 2018 at 4:54 PM, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hi Mindy,

Thank you for your email and for your interest in the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. For those that were unable to attend the Open House on May 29th, all the information that was presented can be found on the City’s website at the following location.


I have provided answers to your questions noted below.
Should you have any other questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener  
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener

From: Mindy Constantinou  
Sent: Sunday, June 10, 2018 4:12 PM  
To: Tina MaloneWright  
Subject: Secondary Plan re: Cedar Hill

Hi Tina,

I was unable to attend the Secondary meeting since I have a one and three year old that go to bed around that time, so please forgive me if I’m asking questions that were already answered.

First, I must say that the design of ‘Cedar Hill’ is impressive. The questions I have come more from a parental perspective and I do understand if you don’t have answers at this time, but it doesn’t hurt to ask.

1. How soon do these projects intend to be started?

[Tina MaloneWright] I am not quite sure what you mean by ‘projects’? The City-initiated new Secondary Plan or proponent-driven development applications?

The Open House that was held on May 29th, was the initial meeting to ‘kick off’ the review of the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. We mailed letters advising of the review and this initial meeting to just over 650 properties. The Open House was the starting point to present a draft map of proposed land uses based on the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Central Plan for comment, and to ask for input related to community features and character to inform the development of the Secondary Plan policies and other tools that may be required to assist in the implementation of the Secondary Plan. i.e. zoning, urban design guidelines, cultural heritage tools (listing, designation), site plan control.

Once we have a new draft Secondary Plan, implementing zoning and any appropriate tools, with input from the neighbourhoods, we will be further engaging with the neighbourhoods before anything is brought before Committee/Council.

We advised at the Open House that there would be no Council decisions in 2018.

If your question is with respect to proponent-initiated developments, these are not within the City’s control and the City cannot predict when a particular property will develop/redevelop, if at all.
2. Will all of these new developments happen or are they just ideas at this point?

[Tina MaloneWright] The new Secondary Plan and Zoning will assign land uses and provide zoning regulations to indicate what the maximum permitted development of lands with the secondary plan can be. Any 3D modelling that was presented at the Open House is a representation of “what could be” under the proposed land use designation that were shown at the Open House. Again, proponent-initiated developments cannot be anticipated/predicted. However based on the proposed land use and zoning one can have an idea of what the development potential of a property is.

3. Will residents be made aware of future meetings on development progress?

[Tina MaloneWright] With respect to the new Secondary Plan, there will be additional meetings and community consultation. Proponent-initiated developments would only be made aware to residents if the proponent was seeking an Official Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Minor Variance application to facilitate the development (looking to develop something that is not permitted by the land use designation and/or zoning by-law). Site Plan applications to develop a property within the existing provisions of the zoning by-law are not circulated to the public.

4. Where do the men’s shelters intend to be moved to?

[Tina MaloneWright] The new Secondary Plan will indicate proposed land use and what uses would be permitted in a particular land use designation. If the men’s shelter is not permitted in the new land use designation in the Secondary Plan then this use would become legal non-conforming and be permitted to continue until such time as they relocate to another property. Their decision to stay or relocate based on the proposed land use is theirs and I am not aware of their future plans.

5. Are there plans for new schools as a result of the increased population?

[Tina MaloneWright] The new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan proposes to retain the existing Institutionally designated lands and is not proposing any new lands be designated Institutional. The need for a new school would be determined by the appropriate school boards.

6. Are there ‘green space’ provisions being considered for this mass number of new residents?

[Tina MaloneWright] The provision of ‘Green space’ is a consideration in the development of the new Secondary Plan. Parkland dedication is a requirement of the redevelopment of properties and it can be given in the form of land or monies.

If you have answers or any direction for me regarding these questions, it would be greatly appreciated. And again, I only ask since my main concern is whether this new vision of the downtown has a ‘family friendly’ perspective, or if I should start looking on MLS to potentially relocate.

Thank you again,

Mindy Constantinou
Hi Karen,

Sounds good. We can touch base later this summer, early September to set something up with the Neighbourhood Association.

To answer your question about when the plan became a public document, I am going to assume you meant the Secondary Plan. In short, we have not prepared the formal Secondary Plan for public consultation. We are not there yet.

The City’s ten (10) Secondary Plans were deferred, as part of the review of the new 2014 Official Plan, to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework in these areas. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study and Plans, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).

Now that these studies are done, the City is in a position to commence review of the existing Secondary Plans with a view of bringing them into the new 2014 Official Plan.

The Open House that was held on May 29th, was the initial meeting to ‘kick off’ the review of the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. We mailed letters advising of the review and this initial meeting to just over 650 properties. The Open House was the starting point to present a draft map of proposed land uses based on the PARTS Central Plan for comment, and to ask for input related to community features and character to inform the development of the Secondary Plan policies and other tools that may be required to assist in the implementation of the Secondary Plan. i.e. zoning, urban design guidelines, cultural heritage tools (listing, designation), site plan control.

Once we have a new draft Secondary Plan, implementing zoning and any appropriate tools, with input from the neighbourhoods, we will be further engaging with the neighbourhoods before anything is brought before Committee/Council.

We advised at the Open House that there would be no Council decisions in 2018.

The information presented at the May 29th Open house is posted on the City’s website and I have attached the link for easy reference.

Any comments and/or feedback that the Neighbourhood Association can provide in advance of staff being able to attend a meeting and facilitate is very much welcomed.

Thanks Karen. I hope you and your family have a wonderful summer as well.

Regards,

Tina

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

Hi Tina:
Thank you for your response. I think at this juncture, we may have to leave the meeting until September.

Tina, can you please tell me when the plan became a public document?

When will the secondary plan go back to Council?

In the meantime, hope you and your families have a wonderful summer.

Regards

Karen

--

Karen Taylor-Harrison

"Never choose not to do something because it will take too much time; time passes anyway."

---Anonymous
Hello,

Thank you for attending the Open House that was held last Tuesday, May 29th.

We are in receipt of the Comment Form and your comments. They will be considered in the process moving forward.

The timelines for further community engagement have not been set but we do know that no decisions will be made in 2018.

I have the sign in sheets from the Open House and your email address and will be able to keep you informed.

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Secondary Plan Review process.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Sunday, June 03, 2018 8:34 PM
To: Tina MaloneWright
Subject: Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review - Comment Form

Dear Tina,

Please find attached our comments regarding the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review from the open house.

Thank you,
Thank you for attending the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan Review Open House. Please provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff before 9 pm on May 29, 2018 or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118.

Write your Comments here:

Please consider not including the lots for 11 Mill St & 15 Mill St in the new medium density residential zoning. These two lots are not deep enough for apartment or townhouse development. In addition, we have a commercial business registered at 11 Mill St, so it is imperative that we maintain the mixed residential and commercial zoning for our lot.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 11 Mill St, Kitchener
Email: [Redacted]
Thanks Tina for your very thorough response. That makes things much clearer (I was struggling to hear questions and responses at the public meeting as some people were on the quiet side :) This makes much more sense though. Thanks again :)

On 5 June 2018 at 10:57, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hi Melissa,

Good question and I talked about a number of pieces of the puzzle last Tuesday evening.

The hierarchy of documents under the Planning Act is the Official Plan and Zoning By-law which implements the Official Plan.

The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters for a 20 year timeframe. A ‘Secondary Plan’ is a more detailed land use and policy document that forms part of the Official Plan, and is used by the City to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city. The City’s Zoning By-law (currently By-law 85-1) is a tool that implements the City’s Official Plan. The Zoning By-law contains regulations to state what uses can be developed on a property, the size of a building, its location of a lot and parking requirements, among other things.

The City’s ten (10) Secondary Plans were deferred, as part of the review of the new 2014 Official Plan, to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).

Now that these studies are done, the City is in a position to commence review of the existing Secondary Plan with a view of bringing them into the new 2014 Official Plan.
Thanks Tina for your very thorough response. That makes things much clearer (I was struggling to hear questions and responses at the public meeting as some people were on the quiet side :) This makes much more sense though. Thanks again :)

On 5 June 2018 at 10:57, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hi Melissa,

Good question and I talked about a number of pieces of the puzzle last Tuesday evening.

The hierarchy of documents under the Planning Act is the Official Plan and Zoning By-law which implements the Official Plan.

The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters for a 20 year timeframe. A ‘Secondary Plan’ is a more detailed land use and policy document that forms part of the Official Plan, and is used by the City to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city. The City’s Zoning By-law (currently By-law 85-1) is a tool that implements the City’s Official Plan. The Zoning By-law contains regulations to state what uses can be developed on a property, the size of a building, its location of a lot and parking requirements, among other things.

The City’s ten (10) Secondary Plans were deferred, as part of the review of the new 2014 Official Plan, to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).

Now that these studies are done, the City is in a position to commence review of the existing Secondary Plan with a view of bringing them into the new 2014 Official Plan.
Since the approval of the 2014 Official Plan, the City has also commenced the review of the City’s new Zoning By-law known as the CRoZBy project (Comprehensive Review of the Zoning By-law). The CRoZBy has not applied new zone categories to the lands in the deferred Secondary Plans.

The City has also commenced the review of its Urban Design Manual. A draft of the City’s Urban Design Guidelines will be considered at a meeting on June 18, 2018. The City uses Urban Design Guidelines to assist in the review of development applications but it does not have authority under the Planning Act like a Zoning By-law.

The PARTS, CHL and RIENS studies/plans may have different land uses and suggest different regulations, but they have no legal status under the Planning Act until they are incorporated into an Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

As mentioned, we have commenced the review of the Secondary Plans to update them based on the studies that have been completed and apply new zoning. There could be other tools that the City applies; i.e. new urban design guidelines, tools under the Ontario Heritage Act, and these will be determined through the consultation process.

Hopefully this answers your question. Let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
Hi Tina,

I attended the open house Tuesday evening and appreciated the opportunity for input. The one question I thought of later was this: with PARTS, CHL, CRoZBy, urban guidelines, the OP, RIENS, etc, how do those all fit together? Is there a hierarchy of some sort? I picture them as all pieces to the same puzzle but I am guessing at some point there may be a conflict between some of them. In which case, does something, like the OP, 'trump' the others?

--

Melissa Bowman
Since the approval of the 2014 Official Plan, the City has also commenced the review of the City’s new Zoning By-law known as the CRoZBy project (Comprehensive Review of the Zoning By-law). The CRoZBy has not applied new zone categories to the lands in the deferred Secondary Plans.

The City has also commenced the review of its Urban Design Manual. A draft of the City’s Urban Design Guidelines will be considered at a meeting on June 18, 2018. The City uses Urban Design Guidelines to assist in the review of development applications but it does not have authority under the Planning Act like a Zoning By-law.

The PARTS, CHL and RIENS studies/plans may have different land uses and suggest different regulations, but they have no legal status under the Planning Act until they are incorporated into an Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

As mentioned, we have commenced the review of the Secondary Plans to update them based on the studies that have been completed and apply new zoning. There could be other tools that the City applies; i.e. new urban design guidelines, tools under the Ontario Heritage Act, and these will be determined through the consultation process.

Hopefully this answers your question. Let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
Hi Tina,

I attended the open house Tuesday evening and appreciated the opportunity for input. The one question I thought of later was this: with PARTS, CHL, CRoZBy, urban guidelines, the OP, RIENS, etc, how do those all fit together? Is there a hierarchy of some sort? I picture them as all pieces to the same puzzle but I am guessing at some point there may be a conflict between some of them. In which case, does something, like the OP, 'trump' the others?

--

Melissa Bowman
4.2 Open House #2
   Notice of Open House
   Information Panels/Maps
   Scanned Sign In Sheets
   Scanned Comment Forms
   Public Comments Received by Email
To: Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

RE: Second (2nd) Public Open House – Neighbourhood Specific Secondary Plan Review
New Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan
Process of Updating and Applying Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations

The City would like to invite you to participate in a Second (2nd) Neighbourhood Meeting for a New Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan and updated zoning. It is scheduled as follows:

Date/Time: Tuesday, November 20, 2018, 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm (Drop-in)
Location: Kitchener City Hall – Rotunda, 200 King Street West

The boundary of this new secondary plan would combine the existing Cedar Hill Secondary Plan with a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan (see location map below).
The City’s Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study. The City is now in a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans. This will begin with the review of the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan and a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan, proposed to become the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.

The City started the review of the Secondary Plans earlier this year. A first meeting was held on Tuesday, May 29, 2018 at the Kitchener Market to introduce the project and identify that we are in an early stage of updating the land use and zoning in the area. At the first meeting, staff provided an overview of the study area, what information is already known, and details on the process and timelines. There was also an opportunity for residents and stakeholders to provide feedback on the proposed land uses and opinions on neighbourhood and streetscape character by providing input on a number of pictures and visuals. The display boards, presentation, questions and comments sheets are on the project website at http://www.kitchener.ca/cedarhill.

The Second Public Open House will provide further opportunities to discuss and share your input on the land uses proposed for the new Secondary Plan and the character that you would like to see in the secondary plan area. In addition, you will obtain more information on zoning regulations and urban design guidelines, and/or other tools such as heritage listings and designations which are proposed to be implemented to protect the character of your neighbourhood.

Information shared at the meeting will also be available online (posted on the project website after the meeting). If you are unable to attend this meeting, you are welcome to provide your input through the project website or to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca.

Your input is important and we look forward to hearing from you!

Yours truly,

T. Malone-Wright

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner – Policy

c. Brandon Sloan, Manager, Long Range and Policy Planning
   Alain Pinard, Director of Planning
   Janette MacDonald, Community Engagement Consultant
   Councillor Frank Etherington
   Councillor Debbie Chapman
The Official Plan is a legal document that contains goals, objectives and policies to manage and direct physical and land use change and their effects on the cultural, social, economic and natural environment within the city.

Official Plan policies:

- direct growth and development decisions in the city.
- governs all aspects of community growth and development, community services, movement of goods and people, conservation and protection of the cultural and natural environment, and the preservation of agricultural resources.
- also includes population and employment forecasts and density and residential intensification level targets

- City Council adopted a new Official Plan in June 2014
  - Ontario Planning Act requires municipalities to amend Zoning By-laws within 3 years of a new Official Plan being in effect
Secondary Plans

Secondary plans are used to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city, indicating the manner in which the goals, objectives, policies and land use designations of the Official Plan will be implemented within respective areas.

In the past Secondary Plans have generally been prepared for existing Built-Up Areas in the city but they may also be prepared in the Designated Greenfield Area.

Once approved, these Plans are incorporated into the Official Plan by formal amendment. Existing secondary plans were created 25-30 years ago.

These were deferred from being incorporated into the new Official Plan (2014) until LRT Station Area Planning was completed (2016-2017).
The City of Kitchener is undertaking a detailed review of the land use and planning framework for many specific neighbourhoods. These are typically locations where there are outdated secondary plans or community plans created 25-30 years ago to help guide the use of land (e.g. where new housing could go, commercial businesses, environmental conservation land, parks, etc.) and policies for new development or redevelopment. To help implement new directions from the province, region, city and other agencies, we are evaluating and updating existing plans to create new ones.

This process involves creating new policies and mapping that will be added to our Official Plan, updating zoning, considering new urban design guidelines and implementing our cultural heritage landscapes. The locations we will review are primarily in the central neighbourhoods, but there are also several other places in the city where we will be engaging with landowners and the neighbourhood to help update these plans. Through this, we will be implementing the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study/Plans, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).
Cultural Heritage Landscapes

In 2014, the City of Kitchener embarked on the first phase of a multi-phased effort to identify and conserve the City’s significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs). The first phase involved taking an inventory, and resulted in City Council approving the Kitchener Cultural Heritage Landscape Study which identifies 55 significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes, including several established residential neighbourhoods.

The City is now beginning its second phase of work, aimed at further identifying the attributes which contribute to making certain CHLs significant, and engaging with property owners on appropriate measures to address the conservation of those attributes and CHLs.
Cultural Heritage Landscapes (cont’d.)

Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) are areas that reflect the interaction of people with the landscape over time, and may include groupings of built heritage, landscape features and archaeological sites that together comprise a significant heritage form.

Cultural Heritage Landscapes are a combination of three layers that include:

- The Land
- Street & Lot Layout - The Public Realm
- Buildings & Other Built Form

Cultural Heritage Landscapes should:

- Have historical value or interest (tell a story)
- Have historic integrity (be authentic)
- Be valued by the community

The Province of Ontario has identified the conservation of cultural heritage resources including CHLs, as an area of Provincial Interest to be considered under the Planning Act and through the Provincial Policy Statement (2014). The Region of Waterloo Official Plan requires that Area Municipalities designate (identify) Cultural Heritage Landscapes in their official plans and establish associated policies to conserve CHLs.
Listed Non-Designated Properties

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can list non-designated properties of cultural heritage value or interest on the Municipal Heritage Register. Listing is the first step the City should take to identify properties that may warrant some form of recognition, conservation and/or protection. Listing provides interim protection from demolition by increasing the amount of time the City has to process a demolition permit under the Ontario Building Code (generally from 10 to 60 business days) to provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the property merits formal designation. Listing also enables the City to ask for Heritage Impact Assessments and/or Conservation Plans with the submission of a complete Planning Act application.

Designated Properties

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can pass by-laws to formally designate properties of cultural heritage value or interest. Formal designation is one way of publicly acknowledging a property’s heritage value to the community. Designation also helps conserve important properties for the enjoyment of present and future generations by ensuring that changes are managed in a way that respects the heritage values. This includes protection from demolition. The City has designated approximately 85 individual properties and 4 heritage conservation districts.
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Current Land Use Policies in Existing Secondary Plan Areas
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Draft Land Use Policies in Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Same as Low Rise Residential land use, however specific policy area will limit the number of units in a multiple dwelling to three units. Consideration will also be given to further regulating building height and density. Analysis to be completed to confirm the properties to which the specific policy area will apply.</td>
<td>Maximum of 0.6</td>
<td>11 metres, 3 storeys (4 storeys if fronting onto a Regional Rd or City Arterial St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong> with specific policy area</td>
<td>Low density housing types, including Single Detached Dwelling, Duplex Dwelling, Semi-Detached Dwelling, and where appropriate and compatible, other low density dwelling types such as Street Townhouse Dwellings and small-scale Multiple Dwellings.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>25 metres (8 storeys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Low density housing types including Cluster Townhouse Dwellings, Multiple Dwellings, and special needs housing.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>25 metres (8 storeys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>High density Multiple Dwellings and special needs housing to achieve a high intensity of residential use.</td>
<td>Minimum of 1.0 / Maximum of 4.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.</td>
<td>Minimum of 1.0 / Maximum of 4.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation Employment</strong></td>
<td>Recognizes a growing demand for employment lands for 'start-ups' and 'makers'. Predominantly office and high-tech manufacturing.</td>
<td>Maximum range between 0.6 and 2.0</td>
<td>6 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Heritage</strong></td>
<td>These natural heritage features are intended to be protected and/or conserved for their ecological functions. Natural heritage features can include provincially or locally significant wetlands, valleys, woodlands, threatened or endangered species habitat, and lands subject to natural hazards or flooding. No new development is permitted in these areas.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Proposed Residential (RES) Zones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas**</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/diagram" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St**</td>
<td>Max – 0.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/diagram" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Office, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-7</td>
<td>Accommodate high density dwelling types and a range of complementary non-residential uses in high rise residential areas</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/diagram" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Health Office, Office, Personal Services, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 2.0 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to regulations that specify requirements such as: minimum lot width; minimum setbacks of buildings from front, side and rear yard; maximum building height, etc. See draft zoning by-law for specific regulations

** Site specific zoning provisions to be drafted to limit building height and density and the number of dwellings in multiple dwellings to 3 units on properties proposed to receive site specific policy

Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
## Proposed Non-Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Employment</td>
<td>EMP-6</td>
<td>Accommodate the employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers.’</td>
<td>Creative Production Industries, Artisan’s Establishment, Studio (Art and Music), Craftsman Shop, Live/Work Space, Galleries, Studios, Office Space For Creative Professionals, High-Tech Manufacturing, Retail Sales associated with High-Tech Manufacturing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>INS-1</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses intended to serve surrounding residential communities</td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Auditorium, Cemetery, Community Centre, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Health Office, Hospice, Place of Worship, Residential Care Facility, Elementary School</td>
<td>4 Storeys (Max. height – 14 metres)</td>
<td>Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS-2</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses that are intended to serve a region and/or city-wide population</td>
<td>Auditorium, Cemetery, Community Centre, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Funeral Home, Health Office, Hospice, Place of Worship, Residential Care Facility Large, Secondary School, Health Clinic, Health Office, Hospital, Post-Secondary School, Social Service Establishment</td>
<td>A base shall be required for buildings greater than 14 metres in height</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>MIX-1</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a low density</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Craftsperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Print Shop, Restaurant, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>4 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIX-2</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a medium density</td>
<td>Uses allowed in MIX-1 plus Large Residential Care Facility, Payday Loan Establishment, Post-Secondary School</td>
<td>5 Storeys**</td>
<td>Min – 1.0 Max – 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIX-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings at a high density within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-2</td>
<td>Min – 2.0 Max – 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>Accommodate comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system</td>
<td>Outdoor active recreation, outdoor passive recreation and cemeteries</td>
<td>Min – 1.0 Max – 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>NHC-1</td>
<td>Protect and/or conserve natural heritage features and their ecological functions</td>
<td>Existing Agriculture and Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>Min – 1.0 Max – 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EUF-1</td>
<td>Recognize existing uses within a floodway or floodplain.</td>
<td>Existing uses</td>
<td>Min – 1.0 Max – 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to regulations that specify requirements such as: minimum lot width; minimum setbacks of buildings from front, side and rear yard; maximum building height, etc. See draft zoning by-law for specific regulations

** Site specific zoning provisions to be drafted to limit the max number of storeys to 5 on Courtland Ave E on properties proposed to receive specific policy. Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
## OVERLAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlay</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flooding Hazard (flood way and flood fringe)</td>
<td>identify lands that are susceptible to flooding hazards and prevent injury or the loss of life, minimize property damage and social disruption, and the aggravation of existing hazards and the creation of new ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope Erosion Hazard</td>
<td>identify lands that are susceptible to slope erosion hazards and prevent injury or the loss of life, minimize property damage and social disruption, and the aggravation of existing hazards and the creation of new ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Restoration Areas</td>
<td>identify lands within Ecological Restoration Areas that are subject to an Environmental Impact Study or other appropriate study prior to development, redevelopment, or site alteration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BUILDING MASSING – FLOOR SPACE RATIO (FSR)

Floor Space Ratio (FSR) is the amount of building floor area that may be developed on a property and is dependent on the lot area. The value is calculated by dividing the building floor area by the lot area.

- **0.6 FSR**
- **1.0 FSR**
- **2.0 FSR**
- **4.0 FSR**
Existing Built Heritage Resources

![Map of Kitchener showing heritage resources and examples of properties.]

**Examples of Heritage Properties**
- 90 Church St (Part IV)
- 160 Courtland Ave (Listed)

**Legend**
- Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Boundary
- Heritage Conservation District (HCD)
  - Listed
  - Part IV (Individual Property)
  - Part V (Victoria Park Area HCD)
- Municipal Heritage Register
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Existing Built Heritage Resources
Proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) Boundary and Heritage Attributes
Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Neighbourhood Cultural Heritage Landscape

Proposed Heritage Attributes

- Topography of land
- Variety of housing types
- Common housing design characteristics
  - Front porches
  - Peak roofs
  - Detached rear yard garages
  - Brick or appearance of brick
- Range of construction dates
- Mingling of early and late housing, high-rise structures, and institutional buildings
- Variety of density that blends within the
- Predominantly low rise built form
- Consistent street edge (front yard & exterior side yard setbacks)

- Grouping of buildings on Peter Street between Whitney Place and the dead end
- Narrow street design
  - Narrow right-of-way
  - One-way streets
  - Narrow road width
  - Narrow or no sidewalks
  - Narrow or no boulevards
  - Public street trees
  - Private front yard trees that contribute to streetscape
  - Shallow front yard and exterior side yard setbacks
Tools To Protect Neighbourhood Character

Built Heritage Resources
means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal community. Built heritage resources are generally located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or included on local, provincial and/or federal registers.

Cultural Heritage Landscapes
means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).

Heritage Act Tools
- Heritage Conservation Easement Agreements
- Designation of Individual Properties (Part IV)
- Designation of Groups of Properties (Part V – Heritage Conservation District)
- Listing of Individual Properties
- Heritage Funding (Grants and Tax Refunds)

Planning Act Tools
- Official Plan/Secondary Plan Policies
- Community Improvement Plans
- Zoning By-law Regulations
- Subdivision Agreements
- Demolition Control
- Site Plan Control
- Urban Design Guidelines

Other Tools
- Corridor Management Plans
- Park Management Plans
- Stewardship Activities
- Public Education
- Commemoration and Interpretation
Zoning is used to regulate:

- Use of land;
- Location of buildings and structures;
- Types of buildings permitted and their associated uses; and
- Lot dimensions, parking requirements, building heights and setbacks from the street/lot lines.

WHAT IS A SITE SPECIFIC PROVISION?

Site specific provisions are added to the base zone to provide additional regulations. Some examples are as follows:

- Garage permissions and location
- Size and location requirements for front porches
- Height limits

WHAT IS AN URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINE:

Urban Design Guidelines establish the objectives, priorities and expectations for urban design in Kitchener. The guidelines apply to projects across the City and address such things as building types, streetscapes and the public realm. The manual is used by City staff and the development industry in the review and approval of specific types of development applications, such as official plan amendments, zone by-law, site plan control and minor variance applications. The guidelines are inherently flexible and negotiable and do not have the same regulatory power as other tools such as the Zoning By-law.
Examples of Zoning Regulations

Achieving a Consistent Building Setback
Any new (or additions to) single detached, semi-detached or street townhouse dwellings required to have a setback from a street that is based on the average setback of the two neighbouring properties.

A tolerance of 1 metre from the average setback has been incorporated into the regulation to provide flexibility. This regulation is in place already in Central Neighbourhoods (REINS Areas).

Garage Projections & Permission
Garage projections & permissions can be implemented using of zoning regulations and/or urban design guidelines

Sample Urban Design Guideline: Where the existing streetscape does not contain street facing garages, only detached recessed garages should be permitted.
CeDAR HILL & SchNEIDER CREEK SECONDARY PLAN AREA

WHAT WE HEARD?

Front porches are an important character defining element

Maintaining the terminating view at the end of streets is somewhat important

New buildings should reflect the character of existing buildings; use of good building materials that are already present in neighbourhood.

Preserving the view from the top of Cedar Hill is very important

Consistent front yard setbacks are preferred over varied setbacks

Tall buildings in low rise areas are bad ideas

strong preference for transition in height; framing and maintaining entrance views; lower overall height and respect for the existing built form.

No garage or a garage in the rear yard is preferred

POTENTIAL CONSERVATION TOOLS IDENTIFIED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Character Element</th>
<th>Potential Conservation Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Plan Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porches</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Form Transitions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design, Materials, Colours</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View (Cedar Hill)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance View/Terminating Vistas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEXT STEPS:

- Input to Secondary Plan Policies and Zoning for Secondary Plan Area
- Prepare Urban Design Guidelines for Central Neighbourhoods (draft available for review) + unique area specific guidelines
- List certain properties on the Municipal Heritage Register
HOW IMPORTANT IS IT THAT THE CITY REGULATE ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Features / Focal Points</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (ie: protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Design, Materials &amp; Colours</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (ie: protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)

POTENTIAL CONSERVATION TOOLS IDENTIFIED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Porches</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Form Transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design, Materials, Colours</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Features / Focal Points</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HOW IMPORTANT IS IT THAT THE CITY REGULATE ...

### Front Porches

| Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e. requires front porches on all new low-rise infill developments?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Important | Important | Indifferent | Not Important | Should not Regulate |

### Garages

| Question: How important is it that the City regulate garages (i.e. setback, location on lot etc.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Important | Important | Indifferent | Not Important | Should not Regulate |

### Built Form Transition

| Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e. requires new development to respect existing built form?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Important | Important | Indifferent | Not Important | Do not Regulate |

### Setbacks

<p>| Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e. requires that buildings form a consistent street edge?) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Important | Important | Indifferent | Not Important | Do not Regulate |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Whiting P1</td>
<td>N2G2X5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185 Benton St.</td>
<td>N2G 3X1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2135 Country Stone Place</td>
<td>N2N3L7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9A Courtland Ave. E.</td>
<td>N2G 2T8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119 Courtland Ave. E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Oak Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Margaret Ave.</td>
<td>N2H 4H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Martin St</td>
<td>N2G 2Y1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Margaret Ave</td>
<td>N2H 4N3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Highland Rd W.</td>
<td>N2M 3B6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 Whitney Place</td>
<td>N2G P28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review
Open House #2 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review Public Meeting. Please Answer the following 4 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before December 10, 2018.

1. What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed land uses?
   
   
   
   

2. What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?
   
   Please look at the consistent use of the mid-rise plan at Madison and Church. The original plan was for Mid-rise on the church corner of Charles but now is low rise.

3. What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?
   
   Can you please change these properties to medium density like the one across the street?

4. What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?
   
   The neighbours on Church and Madison do not like the fact it goes from high density 58 Madison to Madison and up the street but they should have medium density for their lots.

Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review
Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review
Public Meeting #2 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name:

Mailing Address:

Email:

Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review
OK, Bergen messed up everything (well page numbering). Please use this version of the report.

Thanks.

Sally

On 2019-06-27 1:22 p.m., Sally Gunz wrote:
> Here is the final e-version. We say early on that this is a 'living document' and it sure is. It is being sent to you now as there will undoubtedly be more updates needed next week given the pace of change here. But all of us have other lives so it is time to stop.
> You will see that I am sending you two separate documents. The second has sketches for the Benton St vision prepared by John Bergen. These will be printed in the right place in the final hard copy that all of you will receive. However, for now it wasn't easy to insert these without messing up various other things. These are new to this final report.
> Thanks to everyone who has helped in this project. All errors are without doubt my own.
> Sally
Visioning Report of the Cedar Hills Community Prepared for the City of Kitchener Planning Staff

June, 2019
This Visioning Report for the Cedar Hills community is provided to the City of Kitchener Planning Staff as input into the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support proposed new zoning.

The Report is structured in the following manner:

I. Project Summary 2 - 3
II. Introduction 4 - 5
III. Background to Key Issues in Cedar Hill 5 - 7
IV. The Social Role of the Cedar Hill Community Group 7 - 8
V. Vision for Cedar Hill 8 - 9

a. Boundary Streets
   i. Benton Street 10 - 11
   Design Inserts 11a-11c
   ii. Charles Street 12 – 15
   iii. Madison Avenue 15 - 22
   iv. Stirling Avenue 22
   v. Courtland Avenue 22 - 26

b. Other Major Streets
   i. Church Street 26 – 30
   ii. St. George Street 30 - 31
   iii. Cedar Street 31 - 34
   iv. Peter Street 35 - 36

c. Minor Streets
   i. Eby Street 36 - 37
   ii. Hebel Street 37 - 38

VI. Conclusion 39
I. **Project Summary**

This project is provided to the City of Kitchener Planning Staff as input into the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support proposed new zoning.

Cedar Hills (CH) is the site of the original town of Sand Hills. The name accurately describes both the topography and the golden sand found under the topsoil in CH. The neighbourhood is one of the key components of historic Berlin/Kitchener. Many of the original houses remain and the steep hills provide vistas stretching as far as Baden.

Key to understanding the CH vision is knowing its recent history. This is a proud and stable community but also one that has had to face many challenges. Through the Cedar Hill Community Group (CHCG), residents have consistently worked diligently with City and Regional staff to identify and implement solutions. This has consumed extraordinary time and energy on the part of residents.

The primary purpose for this Report is to capture the vision for CH that might in turn, be translated into the new urban design guidelines. The Report reflects the opinions of the residents. It results from community meetings and the circulation of drafts with resulting revisions. Key elements are:

- While CH has experienced much success in fighting challenges, it remains a community facing continued and significant vulnerability. CH is grateful for its strong working relationships with the City. However, it still suffers the effects of past poor planning decisions and, often, changes to infrastructure being made ‘on the cheap’. There is a strong desire that this time round, no street shall be left behind and the very best of design and innovation should be applied.

- Urban intensification inevitably brings challenges, particularly at the transition stage. CH has borne these costs perhaps more than most communities both in the past and still today. Regulations must be both implemented and enforced that effectively protect CH (and other communities) during transitions. What exist today are not fully effective.

- Families and people of all ages and incomes have chosen to move to CH/continue to live in CH because of its proximity to downtown, access to public transit and ethnic and socio-economic diversity. Above all else, this is a walking community yet the state/width of sidewalks and landscaping is often poor and streetscapes are unattractive. Intensification must only occur in conjunction with improved infrastructure that supports social interactions between residents. This applies to all major streets in CH.

- The neighbourhood is generally not opposed to intensification. Rather, its focus is upon how intensification should occur. There is real concern that already redevelopment is squeezing out families and offers few lower cost units. There is little evidence that the current draft proposals will reverse or slow this trend. Family housing on Madison St. is currently being replaced by projects with single bedroom units as is much of the rental property at 86 Cedar St. Most recent new development in CH has been of higher priced, small, rental or condominium units. Further, there is major concern (from both the CH and Schneider Creek communities) that planning descriptions for Courtland Avenue seriously threaten the stability of existing, stable housing stock and the vision for the neighbourhood.

---

1 Cedar Hills residents wish to acknowledge the work of John MacDonald and Elyn Lin of John MacDonald Architect in leading the original visioning exercise upon which this Report is based. As always, John has been willing to support our community and for this we thank him most sincerely.
This Report presents street by street analysis of current conditions with strong vision recommendations. The community is excited by the potential for improvement and presents its vision with the goal not only of improving living conditions for CH but for the entire Downtown. CH has always considered the latter as critical to any design or infrastructure improvements. We highlight some of the key elements of our recommendations:

- The community sees enormous potential for relatively simple infrastructure improvements to the major arteries that would significantly enhance CH in its role as gateway to the City. See proposals for Benton St. in particular.
- There are areas where traffic presents major problems and the community urges serious analysis by both City and Regional experts. For example, the Cedar and Church St intersection is a serious concern. Courtland presents real difficulties for both CH and SC.
- CH urges the City (and, where relevant, the Region) to enhance walkability. In part this can come from side-walk improvements. Essential to these will be coordination with Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro. Currently the placement of large light standards prevents the widening of sidewalks (and narrowing of streets) in a manner that is evident elsewhere in the City. Compare, for example, the effects of light standard type and placement on Joseph or Queen Streets with any in CH. There also exist serious concerns for pedestrian crossings of major streets; in particular Courtland, Benton and Charles. While streets carried lower levels of traffic, these problems were ignored. They no longer can be, particularly with intensification. Proposals are presented.
- Again with intensification comes the need for increased, useable greenspace. CH has two resources. First, the relatively small Sandhills Park facilities which are currently being improved following a major park improvement visioning exercise conducted by the City with the community. Second, the under resourced Cameron/Kaufman Park facilities. An exciting proposal is presented for relatively low cost improvements to the Cameron/Kaufman Park facilities. This could and should become a major resource for adults and children providing major sports (track, tennis, swimming, soccer/football/cricket fields/volley ball, baseball, stair running) and parkland/playground facilities. Most resources already exist but currently access is poorly marked and maintained and the track, in particular, is unusable (other than as the highly innovative cricket pitch). With relatively little cost, this could become a major attraction for the entire Downtown.
- The high concentration of social service uses in CH has reached the point where real harm is happening to the community. The community is not opposed to lower cost housing. Indeed it is concerned that it may be left with not enough. But CH is currently under real stress from some of effects of the existing social service uses and cannot absorb more. CH urges the City to consider replacing some of the lower density properties on Charles St. (and, in particular between Benton and Eby) with mixed market cost rental/condominiums, higher density developments. These should include some units large enough to house families.

We conclude with one caveat. Although there was a concerted effort to ensure this Report represents the views of the entire community, it was far more difficult to gain input from renters, and, in particular, those with limited English language skills, than from home owners. While the authors have done their best to infer the needs of those who didn’t participate directly, we acknowledge this limitation.
II. INTRODUCTION

This report builds on the work of the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood ("SCN") in which that community came together to understand how they collectively defined their neighbourhood and to identify goals for the future. In the course of this exercise, SCN references its relationship with Cedar Hill ("CH"). The two neighbourhoods abut and today the City of Kitchener is combining the two for planning purposes.

CH has long been represented by the Cedar Hills Community Group ("CHCG") and has also always had close associations with the area now represented by SC. As is mentioned in the SC report, the two communities were historically linked by the major employers in the area and CH is an obvious primary route for anyone in SC going downtown. In 1981, the provincial government funded the Ontario Neighbourhood Improvement Project ("ONIP"). The main offices for this project were located near the corner of Benton and Mill Streets and the studied area encompassed all of what today would be SC and CH (and parts of Highland-Stirling). Several major improvements resulted from this project including the closing of Benton Street to Mill (with the replacement by the foot bridge), the creation of Sandhills Park, and the proposal that led to the City creating the Mill-Courtland Community Centre. When there was no formal SC community group, CH incorporated the entire area into its meetings wherever possible. It also actively argued against the Benton Street Realignment project from the early 1980s until relatively recently when the Region sold off its houses on Benton Street and the project was formally shut down. This included participating in a number of City and Regional level studies including those relating to the north-south traffic assessments.

There is no doubt that the growth and effectiveness of the SCN group has enhanced not only SC but also CH and now combining the two areas for planning purposes makes a lot of sense. CH residents enjoy the programming developed by SC. They walk through SC to get to all the amenities identified in the SC report including, most obviously, the Iron Horse Trail, Mill-Courtland Community Centre, the Harry Class Pool, and on to Victoria Park and St. Mary's Hospital. Likewise, SC residents continue to use CH as a key thoroughfare to the downtown.

There are many similarities between the two areas. Although parts of the CH neighbourhood are older than SC, the issues arising for many of the residential streets in CH are similar to those identified in the SC report. There are, however, also differences and some of these were alluded to in the SC report. Most obvious is topography. The dominant feature of CH is its hills, peaking at St. George and Church Streets and sloping down to Courtland and Charles Streets, and to Cameron Heights Collegiate Institute ("Cameron") and Kauffman Park from Madison. More important is the greater proximity to downtown of CH. A number of the properties in CH are large. There is already real mixed use in terms of scale of buildings. There has, particularly since the 1980s, been a significant increase in institutional use of properties. There is a far higher proportion of rentals in CH compared with SC. There has been recurring and significant land speculation in CH that, over the years led to property degradation and depreciation, urban crime, and social disruption. While SC has not been immune to some of these same issues, there is no doubt that the scale is different.3

The most important consequence of the differences for present purposes is that the focus of the two communities has inevitably been different. CH was actively involved in land use issues from the early

---

3 This is not in any way to minimize the issues SC has itself had to face; for example, those affecting Martin Street residents and the industrial uses leading to Courtland as well as some issues on Benton St.
1980s including involvement in a very lengthy secondary planning project at that time. It faced major intensification pressures on St. George and Cedar Streets that resulted in the community becoming very active in planning processes. The negative pressures in the downtown that spilled over into CH, lead to the CHCG spending a good deal of its time working with downtown businesses, the police, city and regional authorities, on very troubling urban issues. In some ways CH was engaged in a seemingly endless fight for its own preservation and that of its very precious downtown and inevitably looked far more in a northerly than southerly direction, other than for the Benton St. realignment issues which it saw as directly threatening the health of both SC and CH.

Today, as we have developed this current report, many of the prior pressures CH faced continue and inevitably inform our perspective. Further land speculation began immediately the LRT was announced and years before it was approved. Institutional land use continues to be a significant part of the neighbourhood and rental properties bring different issues from those of home ownership. All this said, CH is immensely proud of what it has achieved since the early 1980s and is very grateful for the approach adopted by the City in this current planning process and in many other respects. Real care is being taken to listen to what the community wants and needs. There exists respect for the positions of the community and, as a result, the sense that we can make a difference. For this we thank all staff who are involved in the current projects.

III. BACKGROUND TO KEY ISSUES IN CEDAR HILL

The SC report provides a sound basic description of CH and what follows builds on that account.

The naming of our community as Cedar Hills is a relatively recent occurrence. The neighbourhood as it is now defined was created out of the larger Mill-Courtland/Highland Stirling neighbourhoods in order to provide focus for addressing the unique issues facing this particular community, largely the consequences of the crack epidemic in the 1980s and the decline in quality of housing stock caused by land speculation. The boundaries are typically considered to be Charles, Madison, Courtland and Benton streets, although at times we include what is now known as SC and would extend the area to Stirling Street.

If we can legitimately define the character of any neighbourhood, the driving forces that motivated both the creation of CH and the CHCG at least in its modern history have been predominantly political. From the early 1980s, there was a series of events that seriously affected the social fabric of the community and which required resident response. Throughout the 1980s the serious degradation of rental housing with associated problems lead residents, working with the City of Kitchener, Mill-Courtland Neighbourhood Association, and The Waterloo Regional Police Service to create the CHCG to address local issues. The drug and prostitution crisis from the early 1990s was a critical driver of activism, but it was a broader range of unrelated events that encouraged residents to become politically engaged and ultimately, to come together to create the CHCG. In particular:

- The ONIP project introduced many of us to each other for the first time and allowed us to engage in what today would be described as visioning exercises about the future of our community.
- The closure of Victoria School lead to a multi-year dispute with the Waterloo Region School Board. Here CH community members joined members of the Victoria Park neighbourhood (as well as

---

4 The name was the creation of a group including Karen Taylor-Harrison (CHCG), Mark Yantzi (councilor for the ward), John Westbrook (Waterloo Regional Police Service Division 1 commander), and staff from the City. The term reflected Cedar Street being at the peak of the hill, hence Cedar Hill.
parents from across all the downtown elementary schools including J. F. Carmichael, Queen Elizabeth, and Suddaby) to fight the school board’s desire to close what was a very historic resource for our community. While the school was ultimately closed, this period forged very close relationships between community members. More importantly perhaps, it brought the community together with key politicians at all levels and the City in particular. School closure fights became a very unpleasant side effect of living in the city core and at some stage and to various degrees, CH residents were involved in no less than 11 different battles with one or other school board (some schools were evaluated two and three times). In each case, residents had to work together closely.

• The Lost Sea project on St. George Street in the early 1980s was the first exposure the CH group had to a major planning dispute. The essence of the project was the placement of a major high rise on the north side of St. George Street that would fill a large lot between St. George and Church streets. The design was simply a replication of one used by the same developer in London and, while, there was no zoning to prevent the project, it would have destroyed the low-rise streetscape on St. George St. The community argued against the project at the Planning Committee of Council and, to everyone’s surprise, the committee rejected the project with the chair stating ‘let them sue us’. This in fact happened and the legal settlement resulted in the City acquiring the property from the developer with the Kitchener Housing project on Church and St. George streets ensuing. This particular project continues to be cited as an excellent example of sympathetic intensification particular in terms of the St. George Street frontage.

• A very lengthy secondary zoning project ran throughout the 80s. The fiercest arguments arose over intensification on St. George and Peter Streets. A couple from the GTA had consolidated a large number of properties on these streets and sought zoning that would have allowed for major intensification. Since these properties in part backed on to the Wellington Place condominiums, the argument used by both the developers and the city planners was that further tower projects would be appropriate. If this had happened, the entire character of CH would have changed as, at this stage, all the properties subject to rezoning were single unit homes, albeit sometimes broken into more than one rental unit. This secondary planning project was at times very painful. At this time the voice of residents was not considered to be particularly relevant or welcome. However, in the end, the argument for today’s zoning prevailed. The developers sold off the individual houses over time and, as with Bingeman Street in the Central Frederick Street neighbourhood, the properties were then carefully restored and now are generally well maintained by owner-occupiers. Perhaps more importantly, this process educated residents about the need for involvement in their community and gradually cemented respectful relationships with city staff.

• Before the secondary plan was fully implemented a zoning crisis was identified on Cedar Street that demonstrated how exposed the community was to poor development. A group of local lawyers built a somewhat problematic rental complex and the community understood just how little they could do to provide input and protect CH from the kind of development that had already occurred on Madison Avenue. City planners worked with residents and these efforts lead to what was known as conservation zoning throughout much of CH. It is likely this zoning that did more to stabilize the part of CH south of St. George Street than anything else.

The consequence of all these issues was a community that was reasonably well-educated in civic matters and well-position to defend itself against negative forces. Unfortunately, despite the hundreds of hours spent up until then, little would prepare it for the real crisis that came with the crack cocaine epidemic. Whole reports have been written about this period.5 The area most directly affected was north of St. George Street and, in particular, from Church to Charles Streets. However, there were times when the

5 See, for example, the Pierre Filion Report to the City.
negative consequences of what was happening in this fragile part of our community spilled over to the balance of CH and the entirety of CH was seriously at risk. There had been land speculation leading to ownership by landlords with no interest in the well-being of the properties, tenants or community ever since the City rezoned parts of CH for high density development. What became obvious was that, if CH was to survive at all, residents would have to work closely with all City and Regional service providers.

It is not the place here to go through the years of grindingly hard work on the part of CHCG and the City/Region that followed in order to overcome both the actual dangers to the community and the stigma it suffered. CH is grateful to the City for the Interim Control By-law, a temporary down-zoning imposed in order to prevent further development that was exploitative of renters and the community as a whole. While ultimately that zoning was reversed by the Ontario Municipal Board, it bought CH critical time. Today the economic conditions that drive much of the proposed redevelopment are entirely different from those that existed in that period.

The key take away from these events is the observation made at the beginning of this section. CH for all of its recent history has been required to think politically as much as socially. That is not to say it has not engaged in the latter, but when it did (see below), its efforts were focused very much on enhancing the reputation of CH as a healthy and safe place to live. And while there have been extraordinary successes, none of us yet rests easy. It is for this reason we are particularly grateful for the opportunity to continue to work with the City on the current visioning and zoning exercises.

IV. THE SOCIAL ROLE OF CEDAR HILL COMMUNITY GROUP

When CH residents are asked to describe their community, one of the terms most often used is ‘stable’. This is somewhat ironic in light of the obvious threats alluded to above and it is also a reflection of how the community is in fact comprised of quite distinct parts. But even in its most vulnerable areas, CH has a lengthy history of stable home ownership and it is likely this, more than anything else, that has ultimately allowed it to survive and in fine form. So, for example, one of the Peter St. residents is only the third owner of their house built in the 1880s. While they have lived there for 38 years (and the prior owner 57 years), they have current neighbours who were there when they moved in.

There is little doubt that one of the most difficult things for CH residents to handle was and even continues to be the denigration of their community by outsiders. It was not uncommon to have taxi drivers ask residents why they live in such a bad area. Police, real estate agents, and teachers have been quoted as saying how ‘bad’ the area was. CH and the downtown in general were described by outsiders as being dangerous and run-down.

At different times, and sometimes in direct response to the criticism of outsiders, the community engaged in initiatives to reinforce what they saw to be the strengths of CH (and the downtown) including:

- Visioning exercises with real estate agents to provide materials that accurately described CH. Key elements that residents valued were its economic, social and racial diversity, its proximity to downtown, its affordability, and its cohesiveness.
- Working with the City of Kitchener to improve communication between Property Standards, planning and zoning.
- Establishing, with the police and others, key programs including the Citizens on Patrol Program and the John School.
• Receiving 5 year funding (2004-09) from the Trillium Foundation for a project called the Downtown East, Ya Gotta Love It (DEYGLI). In 2009 CH applied for and received an Annual Grant from the City of Kitchener that allowed DEYGLI to extend the work that had been done during the duration of the Trillium Funding to other downtown neighbourhoods.

• Establishing a small committee made up of Property Standard Enforcement, Police and DEYGLI to work with landlords and tenants to resolve issues and effect improvements to the properties.

• CH was awarded funding through the Festival of Neighbourhoods program and used it for two purposes. First, it built a concrete pad with electrical hook ups in Sandhills Park. For a period, CH held an annual folk festival using this facility. Second, it created a very successful loan program to assist with improvements to house facades.

• When the blocks north of Church street were particularly vulnerable to drugs and prostitution, a street party was held on Eby Street to bring all residents together, including the most disadvantaged and transient.

• For many years there was a community garden off the pathway leading to Cameron Heights School. This was very successful and only ended as those who lead the project gradually no longer needed the garden space.

• As part of the East End project, an annual soccer program was created at Courtland School. All children attending downtown schools were invited and the program was run by volunteers from the community for at least 10 years. Up to 70 and more children would gather once a week in May and June for informal soccer games. Parents would bring their children and meet their neighbours, often for the first time. Often parents were new to Canada, coming from countries where soccer was highly popular. The Community Centre has ensured the program continues today and works with community volunteers from CH and SC.

• There are regular and active get-togethers between large groups of neighbours. For example, an annual holiday potluck with a large group has been running for at least 28 years and each year brings in new participants.

Reviewing the success of social gatherings and events in CH, there are certainly some real, long-term successes such as the soccer program. But other events such as the folk festival did not continue. With the benefit of hindsight, there are some fairly obvious reasons for this. First, the seemingly endless political exercises in which the community was required to engage consumed the energy and focus of most of the leaders in the community and there was simply no bandwidth available for organizing events unless they had a very specific goal such as the Eby Street party. Second, although we think of CH as homogeneous and small, it actually covers a reasonably large and certainly diverse area and this will be discussed below. Within the particular segments of the community, there is not a large number of people not otherwise occupied who are available for the intense work required for events such as the folk festival. It is our hope that as CH is now more stabilized, more people will step forward in a leadership role for these type of activities. Indeed, part of the project to revitalize Sandhills Park included interest in activities using that space and there are now a number of younger residents actively planning the kind of activities a healthy community requires. There is now a real sense of generational change in the very best sense of the expression. CH continues to be a healthy and thriving community.

V. VISION FOR CEDAR HILLS

CH engaged in a visioning exercise through the spring of 2019. This in part began with the consultation process for Sandhills Park that took place in 2018 but the primary driver was the City holding a number of meetings relating to new zoning and secondary planning. Most importantly in February, the City
conducted a charrette for the combined SC and CH communities to discuss drafting urban design guidelines. It was at this meeting that the CH representatives committed to engaging in an equivalent exercise to that resulting in the SC Report. This began with a meeting (March 27, 2019) in which John Macdonald and Elyn Lin of John Macdonald Architect led members of the SC community through a series of exercises where they were required to consider the relative priorities of different uses in the SC streetscape; in particular, pedestrians, public transportation, private vehicles, neighbourhood activities, and social interaction within the streetscape. Community members were asked to evaluate and rank the significance of each aspect for all the major streets in CH.

This visioning exercise took place within the context of the proposed new zoning for CH. This is not the place to discuss the zoning changes in any depth, but what is particularly important from the perspective of the community as a whole, is both the stabilization of existing uses for the majority of the area and also recognition of higher density on the perimeter roads. While much of this zoning was already in place, there is no doubt that the current plans brought likely intensification of Courtland properties, for example, very much to the fore-front of residents’ minds.

We begin our summary of the visioning exercise with the over-riding impressions the community has of CH. People genuinely enjoy living here. This is their home; they choose to live here and they are, by and large, happy that they do so. There are important features that residents value; diversity and socio-economic diversity in particular, proximity to the downtown with all its amenities and the Market in particular, and stability and age of the housing. One of the most important features is the walkability of CH and this is reflected in much of the focus of the vision for the future. This is a community committed more to walking and the use of public transit than to their cars.

We did not spend time preparing a formal ‘vision statement’. However, when we told community members the statement from the old East End Project, it resonated. That statement was: Downtown East, you Gotta Love It. While obviously this would require adaption to CH, it does reflect a certain feistiness and resilience that has always defined who we are.

We now turn to the specific streets examined in our review process:

1. **Boundary Streets**

The boundary streets were classified as Courtland, Benton, Charles and Madison. We have also included Stirling for brief comment as it is highly relevant to CH but is often ignored.

The key element of all these streetscapes is how, generally speaking, they fail to meet the needs of both CH and the City in terms of providing an attractive and welcoming environment for a walking population accessing the Downtown and CH. It is one of the long-standing major concerns of CH residents that little attention has ever been given to the attractiveness of the main arteries (including these boundary roads) in the East End. Comparing these with the very attractive streetscapes on, for example, Queen, Joseph and much of King streets, roads such as Benton and Courtland are remarkably unattractive. There is little attention to attractive lighting. Sidewalks are often narrow and in a poor repair, there are few trees and limited natural shade, light standards are often in sidewalks, there are limited safe places for crossing streets, and generally everything appears to be geared to cars. Encouraging the use of bikes is seen as an important part of CH but bike lanes are, mostly problematic. There are limited points where pedestrians can cross any of the boundary roads safely. The key plus for CH has been the addition of the LRT which is generally acknowledged to be a significant improvement.
We now turn to the individual streets. For each we will begin with a short summary of key elements envisaged for the future.

a. Benton Street

Summary:

- **Real and exciting potential as gateway to CH and downtown.** See Sketches pages 11a-c.
- **Requires sidewalk improvements and greater width in particular.**
- **Replacement of light standards to ensure consistency with other major downtown streets will allow for greater sidewalk width and enhance overall visual appeal.**
- **More green space is needed and tree planting required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness.**
- **Good bike lanes are needed.**
- **Place boulevard in street centre to enhance attractiveness.**
- **Reduce lanes to one each way other than at corners.**
- **Crosswalk required, likely near top of hill.** No current crossing from Courtland to Charles.
- **Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.**

Benton Street is, in a sense, a major thoroughfare without a purpose. Residents recall the major changes that occurred when it was intended this would be a key north-south access route for the City. The road was widened and trees were removed. Today the street is dominated by construction at the Arrow site and, opposite, vacant lots between Courtland and St. George. It lacks any pedestrian crossing between Courtland and Charles. Sidewalks are narrow, in a poor state if repair, and have large light standards within them in most parts. There is some public transit but no stops within the CH boundaries. There is a LRT stop at Benton and Charles.

In terms of social interaction, there is little that exists on Benton St. that encourages interaction. People do attend churches and there now is the new medical centre on the corner of Benton and Church. But the general sense from the community is that social interaction is minimal. This is not a street you tend to expect to stop and talk to neighbours. It is primarily a way of moving cars and, for the most part, cars from outside CH. There is no safe crossing place between Courtland and Charles. Walking, particularly in winter is unpleasant and often unsafe (narrow, un-cleared side-walks).

What is the community vision for Benton Street? Comments were remarkably consistent and generally there was a sense of enormous potential. One observation was representative of many: _It could stay as an artery for traffic, but it could be a point of pride and beauty in downtown Kitchener with greenery etc. and bike paths_. People are genuinely excited about the potential for retail/commercial use in the ground floors of new buildings. One suggested this could become like Belmont Village. The current Arrow building is a fine example of design that took an old industrial building and appears to have used real care to make the building visually attractive from the street.

In order to achieve many of the improvements proposed for Benton, it is assumed that there should be a reduction of traffic lanes by one each way other than for turning lanes at the major corners. This would be consistent with two of the major streets that feed Benton, Charles and Courtland. For some time it has
also been the current position with one lane used for parking and another, southbound, closed for construction. There has been no particular negative effect felt from this reduction.

Residents have bought into the new planning vision that encourages more public spaces and this includes thoughtful building design. This should be a major pedestrian thoroughfare and wider sidewalks on both sides would be important. In order to achieve this, however, light standards must be moved. Residents want more shade trees and green space at the sidewalks and areas adjacent to them including for any new development sites. They suggest a boulevard in the centre of the street to reinforce these design features. They also encourage proper bike lanes to complement sidewalks and boulevard. There is concern that intensification could provide barriers to the streetscape so real care must be taken in the design guidelines to ensure appropriate heights and interaction with the public spaces. To repeat the comments about the initial Arrow development, there is a desire for new development to be part of our community and interact with our community. It is critical it not present as a closed door space.

In sum, perhaps for Benton Street more than any other there was real excitement for its potential. In part this is no doubt because of how poorly it supports the community now. But people accept the need for redevelopment and they really want this street to become not only a gateway to CH but also a gateway to the City and one that makes us all proud. See sketches 11a-c.

Images of narrow side-walks with intruding light standards, Benton St.

The following 3 pages illustrate one strong vision for the future of Benton Street, prepared by John Bergen and reflecting the views of the community.
b. Charles St.

Summary:

- **Invest in improvements to enhance both downtown and CH.**
- **Green space and tree planting required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness, particularly near LRT stations.**
- **Good bike lanes (if possible)**
- **Address access to Madison with well-designed stairway.**
- **High priority need for cross-walk at Eby.**
- **Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.**
- **Encourage mixed cost housing for intensification projects.**
- **No additional social service uses.**

Many of the observation about Benton are mirrored with Charles with the exception that some of the expensive infrastructure has already been done. The sidewalks in the CH stretch are, for the most part, in good shape and reasonably wide. The LRT slows down traffic and presents a less car dominated vista.

There are consistent negative comments from the community about this street, however. Most obviously, there has been almost nothing done in terms of allowing for green spaces and there are few if any trees. It is a hot and not particularly attractive street to walk along. There are concerns that the bike lane is somewhat randomly marked and then seems to end suggesting this is clearly not a priority. There are concerns that people perceive this not to be a particular safe street to walk along because of the congregation at times of users of some of the social services agencies. CH has never complained about the location of the men’s shelter per se. Indeed, its placement on Charles predated most of us moving here (although the present usage of the shelter is quite different from the original vision). However, there is no doubt that clients of the various social services are often congregating in this area and residents can feel threatened as they make their way past the various buildings and through groups of people who are often loud and may seem aggressive. Further, parking lots on Charles become gathering places for people both at day and night and they are very disruptive for residents, particularly on Church St.

The most important social use that directly relates to Charles Street is access to the Market and here there was a unanimous desire for a cross-walk at Eby Street. This is a primary access route for many in CH and SC. At other corners controlled by lights there are pleasing cross walk markings. There is nothing at Eby Street and the LRT presents a low barrier which is easy enough to cross for a person but can be difficult when pulling a shopping trolley.

The stretch of Charles that leads to the ramp to Madison is particularly problematic for pedestrians. The sidewalk appears narrower. It is dark and while the mural is an attractive addition it only partially addresses the issue of the massive concrete wall.
There is a pedestrian access to Madison via a flight of very steep steps. These are far from ideal for pedestrians. They are narrow and poorly lit. There is no winter maintenance and instead rough boards are nailed across the entrance to close off the stairs. While the City does its best to maintain them, they attract graffiti and garbage.

Because of the perception of lack of safety, pedestrians often walk beyond the steps and walk up the ramp. Again, this ramp does not give a real sense of safety with poor lighting and little traffic. Many in the community would feel very uncomfortable walking up either the steps or ramp at night by themselves.
Ramp (one-way) from Madison to Charles

Finally, while the north side of Charles is not part of CH, it is highly problematic from a design perspective. There is redevelopment happening and so it is perhaps unfair to judge the attractiveness of some of the streetscape, but the stretch at the back of the Crowne Plaza (parking) is no doubt permanent and inherently unattractive.

The community is almost unanimous in terms of what it would like for Charles St. It wants this to become an attractive and healthy place for the community to walk and bike. There is real enthusiasm for the LRT and people ask that the two stations (at Benton and at Cedar) become more neighbourhood places. This might be achieved by enhancing the number of trees and green spaces by the sidewalk. Just having more people walking to use public transit will enhance the streetscape. The addition of a crossing at Eby Street is a high priority for the community. While the blocks are not long, the lack of any recognition that this is the primary access point to the Market is striking and changing this will do a lot to link the two sides of Charles Street with the CH and SC communities.

It is not clear where the primary redevelopment of Charles St will take place given the many existing social services buildings. However, assuming the economic incentive to intensify, the community urges the design specialists to take real care to impose design rules that enhance the street experience. Critical will be ensuring that buildings do not present as a barrier and have sufficient green space and trees on the sidewalk side to enhance the walking experience. Overall, as with Benton, this will be a primary route for the City and it will be how many traveling through the community by car or by LRT will judge the East End. This is the opportunity to insist on really well-thought out and pleasing design.

The lack of adequate bike lanes should be addressed if possible (it is acknowledged that this might be difficult with the LRT).

Finally, the City should be sensitive to the impact of the social service providers on the neighbourhood. While the existing providers are part of our community, it is important that the impact on the community of some of their uses be considered and that there be no expansion. For example, there have been some
rumours (true or otherwise) that more of the older houses closer to Benton might be converted to social service housing.

Elsewhere in this Report concern is expressed for the reduction in availability of family and lower cost housing in CH. CH sees the lots on Charles St as being particularly well suited to more mixed cost (market and subsidized/lower cost) housing units including family suitable housing as intensification takes place. The emphasis here is on ‘mixed’ use and likely private sector housing and not solely either market rental or subsidized cost housing.

c. Madison Avenue

Summary:
- **High priority given to improving current stair access from Charles to Madison**
- **High priority to infrastructure improvements to primary access to greenspace, parkland and exercise facilities from Madison to Cameron Heights school. This could become the major recreational site for CH and SC combining the stairs, running track, tennis courts, pool and playing fields.**
- **Serious concerns exist about the degree of intensification proposed by the draft Secondary Plan.**
- **Sidewalk improvements, green space and tree planting are required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness.**
- **Ensure any development protects churches/public buildings.**
- **Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.**
- **Ensure sound maintenance of existing apartment buildings.**

Madison Avenue is an unusual choice of ‘boundary’ street since it is in fact not a through road and certainly not a major road. Its issues are so unique it was actually inadvertently omitted from the materials provided at the initial CH meeting. While it has generally been considered a boundary for CH, Stirling Avenue is much more similar to the major boundary streets surrounding CH than Madison ever will be. Nonetheless, since it has generally been accepted as a boundary for CH, Madison will be included within this grouping.

Changes to Madison over the last 30 plus years have long been considered by CH to be the exemplar of all that the balance of the neighbourhood did not want to see happen elsewhere, fairly or unfairly. It has a very historic position in CH, having been where a major windmill was located for much of CH’s history, being the site of the first synagogue that served Berlin/Kitchener, the location of the very important St. Joseph’s Church and rectory, providing access to Kaufman Park. Cameron Heights School, and having some of the first experiments with intensification. Madison was affected dramatically by the building of the high school with the resulting steep hill and need for steps and a path to the school. Finally, the change to the road system that divided the road at Charles St. and resulted in the one-way ramp to Charles St. and creating a major barrier to the downtown and seriously affecting land use on the eastern/northerly sides of the road. Generally, Madison might be described as a road where planners and road builders experimented (or perhaps simply took the path of least resistance in their desire to meet other goals) and no one seemed to care too much about streetscape or quality of life for residents.
For many years the CH community and residents of Madison were very concerned about the quality and maintenance of the major apartment buildings. While most of these have improved significantly in the last 10 years, residents note that the building that best defines everything bad from a design perspective for the community is a relatively new addition at # 118. It presents to the street as a plain, square, dark red brick building with smallish windows, no front doors or balconies and poorly maintained landscaping at the street frontage. The entire design appears to be motivated by maximizing the number of units and parking spaces and that this could be built within the last (approximately) five years once more motivates the community to urge for the kinds of design changes that are being studied by this current project.

---

118 Cedar St. (not on garbage pick-up day)

The proposed zoning provides for intensification for the entire street, both sides from Courtland to Charles. This is despite the fact that the north/western part of the street from Church St to its end, has far more in common with the rest of CH that will be protected from change, than the balance of the street. There are also single family homes with smallish lots close to Courtland that are probably better suited to existing use than any form of intensification. There is a real sense that CH will lose valuable single family housing with these zoning proposals.

Existing well maintained housing north end of Madison

Already there are serious issues for the residents from boarded houses on the north-western side of Madison (at the top of the hill backing on the Cameron). All the negative effects felt in prior periods from poor maintenance of properties awaiting redevelopment in CH have recurred and are particularly serious in light of the current drug crisis. This has become a heavy use of both City and police resources and
neighbours are experiencing high level of disturbance from transient (non-legal) users of these properties. Redevelopment is a slow process and meantime the neighbourhood suffers badly.

The street does not have high levels of traffic, mainly because it is reasonably self-contained. It suffers from the same problems of poorly maintained, narrow sidewalks as does the balance of the community. The street is bleak and not easy particularly in winter from a pedestrian perspective. The steep grades and the narrowness of the street itself makes likely intensified traffic a serious concern not only for Madison but also for the obvious access street, Church St. (with the infamous Cedar/Church intersection).

There is little that can be done to improve existing apartment buildings other than ensuring they are well maintained. The concern is for the future. At meetings held by the City, little has been said about the vision by planners for intensification. The community urges City planners to review the proposal for uniform intensification and, in particular, for the stretch at the top of the hill, west side. This seems completely out of character with what is planned for the streetscape immediately around the corner on Church. The question becomes, how much more can one small street with no two-way access take without totally destroying its character.

The path and stairs to Cameron Heights School open up an important part of CH from a social interaction perspective. The school is part of our community. The hill is a primary toboggan run. This is an important access to the playing fields, swimming pool, tennis courts and Kaufman Park. The playing fields are already used frequently for football, soccer, cricket, and volley ball as well as obvious informal uses such as frisbee. The track, when it was maintained, was an important resource for the community. The stairs are in reasonable shape and the school maintains attractive ‘graffiti’ art on the wall.

There is little lighting or signage at the access points and the path can feel isolated. Yet if basic changes particular at the access routes were made, this could become a major facility for the community and the entire downtown. With intensification, this access to the only large green space for CH will become critical. Pedestrians must feel safe at any time accessing their green space and park and put bluntly, right now the path and stairs do not feel very safe at any time. Further, the failure of either the City or the School Board to maintain the running track at the bottom of the hill has created a major barrier to the use of the green space. At different times of year you simply cannot walk on it as you sink deep into mud.
Path to Cameron hill and path across to stairs

Main access from the hill to the stairs
Looking down the hill with Kaufman Park on right

Playing fields with severely damaged track

Cricket and adjacent volley ball game on Cameron playing fields

Despite all the issues that exist currently with Madison, the community sees real potential for improvement but this calls for a serious role on the part of the City. While this will cost money, the
consensus is that this street has already done far more than any should for the overall downtown and it is now pay-back time. Further, if there is to be major development/intensification, it will be important that infrastructure improve.

As the number of residents on Madison increases it will be critical that the social interaction that a streetscape provides be enhanced. One of the most obvious elements is the redesign of the stairs from Charles to Madison. These must be available year round. They cannot continue to present as physically threatening. If this street is to absorb intensification, it must have broad and welcoming access stairs. These would be a major improvement not only for Madison but also for the Charles street design. The message will be that up this hill is a healthy and attractive community that is part of the downtown.

The community urges design of buildings to be sympathetic to the character of the rest of CH. They need well planned frontages and scaling in heights. Perhaps the easiest goal to set is to take what was built at #118 and do almost the opposite.

On a positive side, there have also been carefully created, recent projects; for example, the seniors complex (#143) opposite the church rectory which retained the original house and built behind. Good maintenance of apartment buildings on the eastern side will improve the message that these are well-cared for and even, in some cases, attractive examples of architecture from the 1970s and 1980s.

Real consideration must be given for how traffic will be managed with intensification. This is not a simple street because of access, narrowness and the steep hill. Sidewalks should be widened and there should be better allowances for greenspaces and trees.

The community urges planners to preserve the integrity of the two very important church sites on Madison Street. By creating a buffer around these buildings, avoiding poorly designed intensification, and with the addition of trees and green spaces, their importance to the community will be reinforced and the overall streetscape enhanced.

The City (with or without the School Board) must take full ownership of the access to the green space at Cameron Heights and Kauffman Park. There is the potential to create a major fitness and sporting facility...
on these properties with very little additional cost. This could be a major feature for the community, particular with younger people living in existing and new apartments. The stairs are already a part of many people’s fitness program and having a sound running track would be an amazing facility for the entire community. This does not have to be Olympic standard; just a sound surface with good maintenance (and why not continue the highly innovative, existing joint use as track and cricket pitch?). Further, this would also allow easy access to the tennis courts, pool, playing fields and playground. There is a need for the pathway to be improved with good lighting, renewed paving, lighting, and regular maintenance. The stairs are in reasonable repair although they also need on-going maintenance.

d. Stirling Avenue

Summary:
- Improve corner with Courtland as a gateway to CH and to the downtown.
- Improve access to Iron Horse Trail at this intersection.
- Improve pedestrian experience. Consider changes to the wall along the school property or enhancements to the sidewalk itself.
- Preserve the ‘triangle’ of housing by Courtland.
- Improve access to Kauffman Park.

Since this is only partially within CH, we do not spend a lot of time discussing it. However, it is a street many of us use as pedestrians and there are obvious improvements needed.

The Iron Horse Trail is a very important facility for residents and this is the one place where it falls (almost) within the technical boundaries of CH. However, the entire intersection with Courtland and the interruption of the Trail at that intersection signals strongly that this is car territory and not part of the very important City and community walking experience. A lot of the public and City focus on the Trail has been for the stretch between Queen St and Belmont although the stretch from Queen to Stirling is now closed for upgrades. An excellent next stage will be addressing how the Trail is enhanced at this intersection.

The access to the playing fields and Kauffman Park is, to put it politely, bad. The park is a secret to most in the community there being almost no marking of its existence. The paths in are about as half-baked as any paths could be. This would not be a costly improvement but it would significantly improve the quality of life for residents and increase usage.

The ‘triangle’ coming off of Courtland to Stirling is CH’s ‘little gem’ with well-maintained and stable housing. Real care should be taken to ensure it is protected by the City and CH is committed to ensuring it be included within its borders.

The pedestrian experience walking towards Charles is miserable. There is a high wall on one side and it is a busy road with a good deal of traffic. It is not clear to the community what can be done. It is a wind tunnel in winter and hot in summer. The community encourages the City to consider design improvements.
Summary:

- Volume of traffic and lack of safe, pedestrian crossings are major issues. A real commitment must be made by the City and Region to come up with creative methods of making Courtland a more welcoming and pedestrian friendly street.
- It is important to enhance the sidewalks, greenspaces, and maintain/increase trees.
- Reconsider what intensification looks like. Real harm will come to the community and a major city road if only smallish, box-like developments that are unsympathetic to existing architecture prevail.
- Do not let properties fall prey to the negative effects of land speculation. Existing single unit homes must be protected and there must also be recognition that these may stay in place for many years. They are a healthy part of the community.
- Ensure sound bike lanes.
- Ensure protection of the existing tree canopy as this enhances the community as a whole.
- Commercial use at ground floors is viewed positively but ensure that this is also practical. Will units be leased?

Courtland is a primary focus for CH and, just as for the SC community, more attention was given to this street than any other.

We begin with an observation of just how powerful but in a negative way, materials presented by planners can be. Much of Courtland within the CH boundaries that is not of institutional use, has owner occupied homes that are well maintained and very much cared for (e.g. there is a major investment being made currently on a single family home near the corner with Benton). Residents looked at the pictures presented by planners and could only observe My home doesn’t exist anymore. CH understands that the City is planning for the long term. But there has to be recognition that much of Courtland today is very stable. Yes, there are parts where intensification will happen in the short term, but it would be tragic for the community if the message was that existing single family homes do not belong, speculators should come in immediately, run down the properties (as they already have done with a few), and build. These are real people and it is a real community that is being affected.

Major renovations currently underway for house near the corner of Courtland and Benton
The most obvious difficulty with Courtland is its use as a major thoroughfare despite it being relatively narrow and in many ways ‘dead ending’ at Victoria Park. With the changes to Charles (LRT), Courtland has been called on to carry far more traffic than it did in the past. From the perspective of SC and CH, it divides our communities. It is difficult for pedestrians to cross other than at traffic lights which are far apart. The addition of the Maple Grove school has increased traffic at the Cedar Street intersection as most students are driven by private car to the school and daycare. There are always pressures at the Peter St. corner with access to Courtland School. There has long been a general sense that there is no will to address these issues and the fact that it is a regional and not city road is a major concern. Residents don’t know to whom to talk and how anything can change.

For the purposes of this report we will only reference the north side of Courtland. The only exception to this is the impact the community feels from some of the negative uses at different times at the old dairy site backing on to Martin Street.

Overall, the current design of the street presents as if this is where cars are the priority. Even bike lanes are so narrow and dead end making it hard for cars to navigate bikers safely.

In terms of social interaction, generally there is little sense of this existing. There is a certain amount of foot traffic because of the schools and church and people accessing public transit. However, as with the other streets, people remark on it not being a particularly pleasant walking experience with lack of shade trees, the conditions of the side-walks in places, and the amount of traffic. In terms of neighbourhood activities, Courtland provides major social institutions. Children from our neighbourhood and the other side of King come through CH and cross Courtland to get to Courtland Senior Public School. High school students often use Courtland to access Cameron. Both SC and CH residents must access Courtland to get to other parts of the City. There are two small grocery shops that are important to the community (Madison and Courtland and Benton and Courtland).

Store and small restaurant on corner of Courtland and Benton. Significant improvements currently taking place.

One of the biggest concerns from the community is how intensification would actually work. There has been consistent displeasure with some of the recent projects. Two examples will describe what residents fear: buildings at 103 and 122 Courtland. It is really puzzling that a builder is allowed to present a wall of hydro meters to the streetscape, have lighting that has negative impacts on neighbours, and ignore any windows on the side of the building that looks over a park. 103 presents as a plain block/wall with no connection in terms of design features to the rest of the community. Given house prices and the stability
of home ownership, there is concern that most developments will be on one or two lots only and then repeat the design features of these particular buildings. Of major concern is how residents in any new building will access the street by car. Already this is a major problem for residents. How will this work as traffic continues to intensify?

Existing stable single family housing on Courtland

There are real concerns that City plans will increase land speculation. At present there are 2 or 3 properties between Peter and Benton streets that are poorly maintained and have been subject to the same issues with drugs and prostitution that have been felt in other parts of the community. Despite a lot of work with City staff by neighbours, the problems have not effectively abated. It is critical that we all take into account just how fragile CH remains wherever there is pressure to intensify but where that might not occur for a number of years.

There are real concerns about how the zoning for Courtland is being described. To be blunt, the real fear is a repeat of either the properties at 103 and 122 Courtland. Perhaps higher rise with greater maintenance of green space would be preferable but this should be discussed fully with residents.
Finally, there was support for the notion of shops/commercial use on the ground floor but not a lot of faith that this will occur. Taking the King Street experience (e.g. even the Market) it just seems to be very hard to encourage this use in practice. But if it could occur, it would be very positive for CH.

Courtland is used by buses. It is not known if this will continue following activation of the LRT. Currently it is used by out of town buses as well and this may change if the bus station ultimately moves.

The community spent a good deal of time considering what the future should look like. These considerations include:

- Seeking lower speed limits on Courtland itself or other traffic calming measures.
- Adding protected cross walks, likely at Peter or Cedar Streets. Note, care should be taken with such projects not to exacerbate the difficulty residents already have to get out of their driveways.
- Do anything and everything to encourage foot traffic including improving sidewalks, expanding greenspace, adding trees (balancing act for sight lines for driveway access).
- Maintain public transit and bus stops.
- Improve bike lanes.
- It is very important to the community to maintain all public uses and, in particular, the schools and religious buildings. These are places people to which walk (including to the synagogue at Stirling). It is very important that sidewalks and crossings be designed to ensure safety and enhance general well-being.
- Thought must be given to the practicalities of how intensification might occur, when it will occur, and what it will look like. People are encouraged by the thought of more small businesses and particular ones that might serve the community. Is this practical? Will the building lots be big enough (can there be sufficient land consolidation) for a really well designed project? What happens to properties while we wait for projects to happen?
- There are mixed thoughts about height of the projects. Again, it may well be more a question of actual design quality than height per se. Consideration should be given to those who will be backing on to the projects as well.
- Courtland has lost a number of trees. With any new development, existing trees should be preserved so far as is possible and new trees planted.

2. Other Major Streets

The proposed zoning for each of the following major streets will remain primarily as is or, in the case of Church St. be downzoned. For this reason, we will not discuss building design other than to say, should any existing building be replaced, it will be important to ensure that the design be sympathetic to the surrounding neighbourhood and the streetscape generally be maintained. Properties should have good greenspace, trees, and buildings be of a height, location on site, and shape that are consistent with those nearby.

a. Church St.

Summary:

- A key issue is high volumes of traffic and speed of traffic.
- The intersection with Cedar is dangerous and must be addressed by the appropriate experts. This is becoming increasingly urgent with the growth of population through redevelopment in the area.
Overall, the primary vision is to enhance the pedestrian experience with more green space, trees, benches and even garbage bins particularly for dog waste. Improved access to Cameron is important.

There is still a need to protect some fragile properties and continued support from the City and Region will be required.

Historic buildings must be protected.

Means must be developed to protect Church St. properties from the negative consequences of uses on Charles St. properties.

This street is likely the most important for the community in terms of accessing the downtown and other services. It is a primary walking route and there is always foot traffic. The biggest problem it faces come from the increased traffic, both in terms of volume and speed. With the changes from the LRT project, Church is the primary access point for CH. It is also used as a through way by people wanting short cuts through the community. Combined with traffic is the increasing number of parked cars on the south side of the road which also means not ideal snow maintenance in winter and also poor sight lines for drivers and pedestrians. This is a primary street for school bus stops.

The street is divided by the intersection with Cedar St. which is one many residents fear. Because of increased traffic on both streets, this is a major intersection. The sight lines are poor and cars often speed on Cedar St (the street with the right of way). It is a nasty corner for pedestrians and cars.

While Church street has no public transit other than for school children, it does provide a major access point for bus and LRT. Foot traffic to public transit will undoubtedly increase.

There are already high rise buildings on Church St. and this has created a wind tunnel effect, particularly around Wellington Place.

For a street that is dominated by the needs of pedestrians, sidewalks are narrow, there are few trees, little green space, and the only bench is at the corner of Benton and Church. This is a street for social interaction – where you meet your friends – yet there is little space you can comfortably stop and talk. Light standards are large, unattractive and in the boulevard making expansion of the sidewalk difficult.

Narrow sidewalks and barren sidewalks, Church St.
Church St. has traditionally either had churches on it or provided direct access to them. These are important to the community both for religious and historic reasons. The new medical centre will be increasingly important and attract more foot traffic. The east end of Church St. provides the primary access point to Cameron Heights School and the park/recreational greenspace.

![Historic Jacob C. Shelly house, Church St.](image)

There are some very historic buildings on Church St. both single occupancy and apartment buildings. Residents appreciate the efforts to stabilize the street through the downzoning and avoiding creating the barrier to the rest of the community that higher intensity buildings would have created. There have been some long standing issues with certain buildings on Church St. although many have stabilized over the last few years. The new zoning should reduce the land speculation that was a dominant feature in the 1980s in particular. Of continued concern is, however, the use of land on Charles St. that backs on to the Church St. properties. There is a tendency for the large parking lots to become a noisy gathering place that is very disruptive for residents on Church.

The visions for the future for Church St. primarily address the needs of pedestrians and traffic concerns. The key will be to ensure that the message of the downzoning resonates and that it is widely understood that this is a street for stability not speculation and the community is generally supportive of this City initiative. The community will continue to depend on the various City and Regional resources to ensure appropriate property maintenance etc. as well as defending the proposed zoning against requests for variance.

Residents are anxious for stabilization to occur on Charles St. They are fearful of any further growth in the social sector and strongly believe that for the neighbourhood to be healthy and secure, there can be no expansion either to social sector housing or services. They want development there to be sympathetic to the needs of Church street properties and the community as a whole. In particular, respecting light and privacy and avoiding further large expanses of parking lots where people gather particularly at night and on weekends. They would encourage the City to consider alternative land uses including mixed (economically) housing as suggested elsewhere in this report.
Residents would very much value working with City experts on how to manage the traffic issues on Church and the intersection with Cedar in particular. Some would also like to see the end of paid parking (although not everyone agreed with this) as this is a message that it is not a street for residents but increasingly for people visiting the downtown. In the long run it might be necessary to implement some form of permit parking project although at this time there is again not unanimous support for this. Certainly there is a feeling that more parked cars may slow down traffic and make it less of a ‘through’ road.

Church and Cedar St. Intersection. Note steep grade in both directions on Cedar St.

There is a strong desire to enhance the streetscape for pedestrians and thereby increase social interaction. Residents see this becoming more and more important. Already intensification in other parts of CH has increased the numbers of dog walkers and again this enhances the social exchanges on the street. However, it is also increasing the amount of garbage and dog feces in particular. Increased trees, green spaces, benches and even garbage cans (which are really needed), would all enhance the sense of Church St. being an important place for social interaction.
Finally, it is important to Church St residents that improvements be made to the access to the Cameron properties.

b. St. George St.

Summary:

- *This is a very successful street in the community and the primary goal is not to do anything that detracts from this.*
- *Real care must be taken to ensure whatever happens with the Water Tower site is sympathetic to the community. Ideally it would remain public space but if built on, it must be understood that this is one of the most valuable (from both an economic and visual perspective) vacant sites in the community and good design is critical.*
- *Maintaining the pleasant walking experience is essential.*
- *Thought must be given to the long-term impact of non-resident parking.*
- *There is still a need to protect some fragile properties and continued support from the City and Region will be required.*

St. George is the second east-west street in CH and although it is an important access route, it is more limited than Church as it ends at Cedar St and has one-way traffic, west to east.

The interesting result of the community input session was that comments were almost unanimously positive about the street as it currently is. It is clearly considered to be a successful and generally stable place with mostly well cared for, single family homes. The Kitchener Housing project is well integrated into the community from a design perspective. People like the walking experience and the way houses present front porches to the street. They use expressions like ‘pleasant feeling’. They like the access to Sandhills Park which is a valuable part of the community.

There were some concerns expressed. The first relates to the zoning on Benton and the implications for the buildings on the corner of St. George and Benton. Residents are concerned about loss of light and privacy from any redevelopment. The street is currently bright and clearly exudes warmth for pedestrians. There is a real fear that this might be lost. Further, there is concern about increased traffic. This is a road that children play by and sometimes on (hockey). People drive carefully.

The other site that worries people is the Water Tower site. This provides good green space for the community. There is a fear that this will be intensified and put increased pressure on the street from a traffic and parking perspective. Generally, the concern is that what might be build may be poorly designed for such an important site and reduce the neighbourly feel of St. George St.

There is concern for the amount of parking on the street. In the winter, many other streets have no parking. Some of the residents in high rise buildings use this for additional parking and downtown workers are starting to use it as well. Again, this hurts the ambiance of the street and restricts availability for residents. While this is likely manageable today the concern is that it will not be in the future as the downtown flourishes and intensification elsewhere in CH increases.

Finally, there was some concern for the fragility of some parts of the street where housing is less stable and drugs and other criminal acts have been prevalent. As with much of CH there is real fear that some of the difficult problems could easily come back with poor housing maintenance and that some have not entirely left. Some people expressed concern that these issues have and continue to spill into Sandhills
Park and this, combined with dogs running unleashed, diminishes its attractiveness. That said, the community is appreciative of the upgrading proposals for the park in which they participated in 2018 and which should be conducted, summer 2019.

In terms of what vision people have for the future, the over-riding sentiment was to maintain what we have now. Should there ever be housing built on the Water Tower site it is critical that the design be consistent with the balance of the neighbourhood, maximizing frontages to the street and ideally including the traditional front porch look. There should also be adequate on-site parking. While a more modern design would also work, it should be done well and with input from neighbours.

The two corners on Benton where re-development may occur, must have design restrictions included that take into account the impact on properties on St. George as well as Benton. They cannot be loaded towards the back of the properties as that will be immediately adjacent to St. George St. properties. Height rules must be designed to minimize the impact of reduced light on St. George St. Likewise, parking must be designed so lighting etc. does not negatively affect St. George St. properties.

Finally, at some stage proposals must come forward to address parking on St. George St. This may well take the form of some sort of permit system that allows primary use for local residents and their guests.

c. Cedar St.

Summary:
- **Address major traffic concerns**: speed, intersection with Church, volume of traffic. Have input from traffic experts who address issues from the perspective of enhancing pedestrian rights and experience, protecting community access to roads, reducing use as through road, increasing safety.
- **Carry through lighting style from downtown**.
- **Address sidewalks by increasing width, moving light standards, and increasing tree canopy and green spaces**.
- **Add mini-park style seating and other features such as garbage containers especially for dog walkers at corner with Church St**.
- **Enhance walk to LRT including city supported snow clearance particularly from Church to Charles, better and safer sidewalks, and more attractive streetscape**.
- **Consider Cedar St. as a major throughway for pedestrians using institutional buildings both on Cedar and nearby (including schools). Consider cross walks at Courtland**.
- **Defend proposed zoning and ensure any intensification is sympathetic to the neighbourhood and enhances green space and ambiance**.
- **Protect and preserve institutional buildings/uses**.

Cedar St. is the major street in CH. It runs north south and continues through CH to the downtown and beyond into SC. It is a narrow street that has become a primary access route for and through the neighbourhood. It carries heavy traffic and this has been exacerbated by the LRT which now means west bound traffic cannot make a left hand turn off Charles into CH at Eby or Benton. In terms of topography, it is dominated by the steep hill that peaks at Church St.

If residents are generally happy with St. George St., the almost exact opposite is true of Cedar. People feel cars are king and they travel at speeds that feel very unsafe. The road is narrow which makes cars feel
even more threatening to pedestrians. Cedar St. has experienced some of the nastiest side effects of land speculation. This is particularly the case on the stretch from Church to Charles but also some properties on the balance of the street are poorly maintained. Some of the tenants are disruptive and can make pedestrians feel unsafe.

Sidewalks are narrow and in poor repair. Again, the placement of light standards within sidewalks restricts the width. Generally, the sense is that cars take priority over pedestrians. The fact that sidewalks are not all cleared well in winter makes them particularly problematic/dangerous given the steepness of the hill, particularly in the stretch leading to the new LRT station. There are few trees and almost no greenspace. The high rise at # 86 has been a major problem in the past although it has improved significantly in recent years. The main concern of residents is whether there will be any lower cost rental or family rental remaining at that property. They do not want to see low cost rental as the primary form of housing in the building (it did cause problems in the past as landlords were reluctant to invest in maintenance) but the community values mixed use and diversity.

Cedar St, narrow and unattractive sidewalks with light poles in walking area

In terms of public transit, Cedar St. is used to access buses on Courtland and the LRT on Charles.

There currently is little social interaction because the street is just not a pleasant walking experience. Obviously it is an access point to the downtown and the Market in particular. There are now new restaurants on the corner of King or nearby. There are also important community resources that exist on the south end of the street in CH:

- Maple Grove school is at the site of the old St. Joseph’s school. This brings considerable additional traffic to the school at peak times, particularly from Courtland. It can make that corner uncomfortable for pedestrians. That said, both the school and the daycare are a very positive addition to the neighbourhood and they also increase the use of Sandhills Park during day-time.
- St. Joseph’s Church parking lot is accessed from Cedar (and goes through to Madison)
- There is an entrance to Sandhills Park off of Cedar. At present this is not particularly well maintained and some have thought the signage is not adequate.
- Sandhills Park is currently undergoing improvement. This process has not been seamless and there is real concern about the need for new tree plantings in the Park.
- Cedar St is a primary access route for children going to Courtland Avenue school. It is also important for high school students going to Cameron Heights.
Sandhills Park itself is not addressed extensively in this Report primarily because it has already been part of a community visioning exercise conducted by the City in 2018. Changes are scheduled to be made in summer 2019. The community has, however, found the follow up process to the final report by the City a little frustrating. Beyond posting notices in the Park, there has been almost no news about what is happening and residents have had to set up a process of communications with City staff themselves. At the time of writing, the Park has had many trees and shrubs removed with much debris remaining (‘clean-up’ was part of the plan). After follow ups with City staff there have been assurances that this will be completed as work progresses but it is still not clear when or even whether new tree plantings will take place (beyond those described in the plan). Since the Park was built in the early 80s the only new tree planted was one donated by Courtland School pupils. Initial discussions with the City staff this spring suggested that there may not be money for new trees since these were not part of the costing of the Park redesign (only the removal of damaged trees) and would have to come from a different budget. It is very
much hoped that this is not correct. The original trees in the Park were often the very fragile Manitoba maples, and after approximately 35 years, more lasting plantings should and must take place in order for the Park to be a viable green space for the community.

The community noted that existing zoning will be retained for much of Cedar Street and there are concerns that speculators have already bought up properties and will push for a variance if the new zoning is approved. People are discouraged by the ability of some property owners to push boundaries and not in a way that helps the community. Once zoning is in place it should be accepted and defended. This street is very fragile and cannot tolerate any more speculation by people with little interest in creating good developments but only wanting a quick economic return.

Of all the streets in CH, this was the one where the community had most difficulty envisaging significant improvements. The following summarizes what residents urge the City to consider:

- What can be done to discourage Cedar St. being considered a through road and a quick alternative to Stirling or Benton Streets? The street cannot be widened. The intersection with Church is dangerous. The community believes it is essential that this issue be addressed for the safety of the community and the well-being of the children who use Cedar St as an access to Maple Grove, Courtland Avenue and Cameron Heights Schools. The residents envisage possible road calming measures. Here, however, they will need the advice of traffic experts.
- Lighting is, by and large, ‘grim’. One strong signal that this is a street that is cared for and is for residents and pedestrians and not just cars would be to continue the lighting from the north side of Charles and take it all the way to Courtland or beyond (as with Queen). These smaller standards would also allow for the widening of sidewalks.
- It is unlikely that Cedar will ever become much of a bike route because of the hill. However, the pedestrian experience should be significantly enhanced. Sidewalks should be widened and having the road slightly narrower might discourage some through traffic. While there is no room for boulevards, tree plantings on adjacent properties should be encouraged.
- An obvious place for enhancing the pedestrian experience is at the top of the hill. Is there scope for a tiny green space setting with a bench that encourages people to stop and talk? Something equivalent to that which exists at the Benton corner.
- With stable zoning there should be real enforcement of property standards and general encouragement of improving existing properties.
- Sandhills Park is a critical resource for the community. CH appreciated the visioning process for improvement and is looking forward to work being completed. However, it is essential that tree plantings take place in order for the Park to remain a pleasing green space for all.
- For the part of Cedar where intensification will take place, there should be care taken to ensure access is not onto Cedar Street but rather Charles. Redevelopment of the properties closest to Charles should be designed to maximize green space and trees on the Cedar St frontage.
- With the LRT stop at Cedar, there will be much more pedestrian traffic and this alone will make people feel safer. However, it also increases the need to improve the pedestrian experience on Cedar itself. No one should feel unsafe walking there and access in winter in particular should be free of ice and other dangers.
- One location for a cross-walk is at the corner of Cedar and Courtland.
d. Peter St.

Summary:
- **Important design features of this street are presently under review with the major infrastructure work proposed in the next year or two. These will drive the design of sidewalks, trees and green space and the primary desire of the residents is for them to continue to have real and valuable input to this process. To date City staff have been very responsive to neighbourhood concerns and creative in their design approach.**
- **With the infrastructure project proposed, this is the perfect opportunity to address the light standard issue that plagues CH as a whole. Given the goal of widening sidewalks, light standards should be replaced and reduced in size plus not placed so as to reduce sidewalk space.**
- **There is a continued need for support from City and Regional staff with the few remaining fragile properties.**
- **There should be better signage and access to Sandhills Park.**
- **Priority should be given to improving the laneway access to Sandhills Park. It is understood that this is part of the proposed infrastructure project.**

Peter St. generally is a stable street that residents identified primarily as a major walking route to the downtown or, the opposite way, to the Iron Horse Trail and beyond. It is still used as something of a throughway for traffic but since it stops at Church St. the pressure is not as great as on Cedar St. It has no public transit other than school buses but is an access route to both buses and LRT. It is probably potentially the most congenial north south artery for pedestrians particularly as the hill is not as steep as with Cedar and Madison. Many of the houses on Peter St. are significant historically dating back to the 1880s and earlier.

The primary concerns are once more for the poor quality of the sidewalks, the lack of trees and green space. Generally, it is not viewed as nearly as pleasant a walking experience as it should be. People have mixed thoughts about the width of the sidewalks themselves. They are, however, particularly concerned that infrastructure improvements do not include replacing light standards (Kitchener Wilmot Hydro explained that current standards are adequate) and this closes off a critical opportunity to increase sidewalk space and improve the overall attractiveness of the streetscape. With the road already dug up, underground wiring could be considered. Residents urge the City to use this opportunity as a template for
The present location of light standards appears to be the primary obstacle to enhancing walkability in much of the downtown. Further, generally, above ground wiring on streets too narrow for wide boulevards and tree plantings makes for a barren and unattractive streetscape.

Residents value the sloped curbs as often it is necessary to ‘slide’ into driveways in winter. Current City plans for infrastructure changes are sound for both parts of the street.

Peter St. is an important access point to Sandhills Park. The signage, however, to the park is poor. The public laneway is in a very bad state of repair and it is not even clear where the lane ends at the park entrance. This latter part may be addressed by the upgrades that will take place in 2019. While there was some confusion as to whether the laneway will be part of the major infrastructure improvements, it now appears that it is.

There are a few remaining properties that are fragile and these need the continued support of regional and city staff and by-law enforcement in particular.

Overall, for the future residents are really looking forward finally to having infrastructure improvements but only if the design features meet their needs and wishes. Key will be improving the streetscape. Housing is, for the most part in good condition and stable. A more visible entrance and signage way to the park would be valued.

3. Minor streets

There were two minor streets in CH that are discussed here because they have an important role in the neighbourhood and for different reasons:

a. Eby St.

Summary:

- Preserve this as a critical walking route linking CH with the downtown. Increase the width of sidewalks and make road narrower.
- Enhance quality of sidewalks.
- Ensure any intensification on the easterly side does not remove the existing street facing housing but is, instead, behind these buildings.
- Respect the need to enhance feelings of safety for all residents and ensure no expansion of potentially disruptive uses.

Eby St. in CH is one block long but it is most people’s (from CH and SC) primary access route to the Market, other parts of King East, and to the LRT. It carries a high amount of foot traffic. It is generally used as an alternate to Cedar St. because it is far less steep. Car traffic has been reduced with the changes on Charles St. for the LRT.

The street could have been well designed from a pedestrian perspective at the time infrastructure was replaced. However, this was still an era when the primary focus appears to have been, unfortunately, for the car, not pedestrians and there was a total rejection of smaller light standards and underground wiring. The sidewalks are relatively narrow. In many places two people cannot pass without one going onto the road.
There were once serious problems with properties particularly on the eastern side of the street but many of these have been stabilized. There are, concerns, however, about what is to come. There are a number of properties behind the street facing houses and these are not always well maintained. Several of the driveways are gravel on this side and these give the impression of being temporary.

The northerly end of Eby is affected by the same pressures as Charles. Again, residents would value no additional social services on this street where there is already a heavy concentration. They do note that most of the properties on Eby St. itself cause few issues and the residents are genuine members of the community as much as anyone else. The primary concern is with the more transient population coming from Charles St.

This is an area that will be subject to some intensification. Where it might occur on Eby St. residents would like it to take place behind the street front houses, in order to preserve the current small-scale look of the street. Careful design guidelines will have to be prepared in order to achieve this goal. Above all else, work must be done to ensure the highly significant role of this street as a primary pedestrian route to the Downtown is maintained.

b. Hebel St.

Summary:
- The key is to preserve the current ambiance of the street.
- The access to the sidewalk must be improved.
- When creating design guidelines for Benton intensification, care must be taken to ensure no negative effects flow through to Hebel.

Hebel St. is a very historic, one block, one-way street between St. George and Courtland. It has a number of very attractive older homes some of which are immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. It is important to the neighbourhood that the character of this street be preserved. There was some redevelopment with a small town house project a number of years ago. While there is nothing wrong with these properties, it would be nice to see any new development be more in keeping with the existing housing as current
design standards would suggest. In particular, the goal should be not having the primary frontage being expansive parking allowances.

Infrastructure improvements are scheduled for the next year or two. As with Peter St. this will be the perfect opportunity to ensure underground wiring and smaller light standards. This is a narrow road with a very narrow sidewalk. It is a walking street for most residents but the experience is not, currently, particularly pleasant.

![Hebel from St. George](image1)

![Historic housing on Hebel](image2)

There are concerns about the following:

- At some stage there will be major redevelopment on the land backing onto Hebel on Benton. This must be done in such a way that it does not destroy the light and ambiance of Hebel.
- The corner property on St. George street has for years had a very poorly built and maintained retaining wall. It is now difficult to walk on the sidewalk at that stretch, and generally not possible in winter. This should be addressed, perhaps at the time of the infrastructure improvements.
- There is an old apartment complex half way down on the east side. While this is currently not presenting any difficulties to the community it has been problematic in the past. Since this leads into a laneway that goes through onto Peter St. this created problems elsewhere in the community as well. The units are small and old and while no one is suggesting they should be changed, real care should be taken to ensure the landlord provides appropriate maintenance and supervision.
VII. **CONCLUSION**

This concludes this visioning report. As with any such exercise, it should be considered very much as a living document and this iteration captures the community at one particular period of time. Over the next year there will be major improvements: Sandhills Park is scheduled for upgrade incorporating community wishes and both Peter and Hebel Streets will have their long promised infrastructure work conducted. The full impact of the LRT will become known.

Researching and writing this report has allowed all CH residents the opportunity to reassess the vision they have for the community they most deeply love. CH continues to face challenges but it also will continue to work with City and Regional staff and politicians as well as social service providers to find long term solutions that are in the best interests of all members of the community. The history of CH is evidence of just how effective partnerships and hard and creative work can be in protecting this thriving and strong community.

This report provides detailed proposals for improving the streetscape of CH. These are as much for enhancing the downtown as a whole as they are for CH. The major streets are the gateway to our community and the entire downtown.

As we researched our streetscapes for this project, the goal of enhancing the walking experience became paramount. This is a walking community. It is on the streets that we have many of our best social exchanges. Yet currently, most of our sidewalks are narrow and unattractive. Unlike other parts of the inner downtown, there is no room for large boulevards in the road allowance with attractive tree plantings. Much of the infrastructure improvement in CH was conducted at a time when sustaining roadways for vehicular traffic remained paramount. Because light standards are maintained by a separate regulatory body, no one seriously addressed the negative impact of their current positioning and their large size. For planners considering how to improve the infrastructure of downtown communities and CH in particular, addressing this critical obstacle to ensuring wide and welcoming sidewalks should be of the highest priority. Creative solutions are essential.

Finally, the community continues to be grateful for the strong support it receives from City staff. The relationship is, for the most part sound and respectful. Residents commit themselves to work with staff on all issues affecting their community.
Alain, Brandon, Tina and Debbie:

Please find attached a Visioning Report prepared by the Cedar Hills Community as input for the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support the proposed new zoning.

This project began with the work of City staff who encouraged us to prepare our own vision document. We were assisted as we began this project by John Macdonald and Elyn Lin of John Macdonald Architects. John and Elyn led the community in the initial visioning exercise and have shown continued interest throughout spring 2019. The community has been involved throughout.

We will be preparing a print version of this document in due course but in truth we want to let this ‘sit’ for a couple of weeks or so in order that we may back for a final proof-read with fresh eyes. But since we believe the substance is all there, we wanted to get you this almost final version now in e-form so that you can consider its content as you conduct your work. Of course we will ensure you have a final, hard copy version as soon as it is available.

I believe I can speak on behalf of all of the community when I say that we are all most grateful for the City Staff support and the support of you, Debbie. Throughout the recent zoning meetings we have been struck by the openness of everyone we have met to considering the community perspective, even when we are mixed up at times and not always clear. For all of this we thank you.

Of course we hope that this document is a beginning for further discussion. We would be thrilled if suggestions might be incorporated into your proposals. No doubt you will have further suggestions for improvement.

Thanks. And please pass this on to any relevant City staff whom I have inadvertently omitted in this email.

Sally
Visioning Report of the Cedar Hills community Prepared for the City of Kitchener Planning Staff

June, 2019
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I. **Project Summary**

This project is provided to the City of Kitchener Planning Staff as input into the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support proposed new zoning.

Cedar Hills (CH) is the site of the original town of Sand Hills. The name accurately describes both the topography and the golden sand found under the topsoil in CH. The neighbourhood is one of the key components of historic Berlin/Kitchener. Many of the original houses remain and the steep hills provide vistas stretching as far as Baden.

Key to understanding the CH vision is knowing its recent history. This is a proud and stable community but also one that has had to face many challenges. Through the Cedar Hill Community Group (CHCG), residents have consistently worked diligently with City and Regional staff to identify and implement solutions. This has consumed extraordinary time and energy on the part of residents.

The primary purpose for this Report is to capture the vision for CH that might in turn, be translated into the new urban design guidelines. The Report reflects the opinions of the residents. It results from community meetings and the circulation of drafts with resulting revisions. Key elements are:

- While CH has experienced much success in fighting challenges, it remains a community facing continued and significant vulnerability. CH is grateful for its strong working relationships with the City. However, it still suffers the effects of past poor planning decisions and, often, changes to infrastructure being made ‘on the cheap’. There is a strong desire that this time round, no street shall be left behind and the very best of design and innovation should be applied.
- Urban intensification inevitably brings challenges, particularly at the transition stage. CH has borne these costs perhaps more than most communities both in the past and still today. Regulations must be both implemented and enforced that effectively protect CH (and other communities) during transitions. What exist today are not fully effective.
- Families and people of all ages and incomes have chosen to move to CH/continue to live in CH because of its proximity to downtown, access to public transit and ethnic and socio-economic diversity. Above all else, this is a walking community yet the state/width of sidewalks and landscaping is often poor and streetscapes are unattractive. Intensification must only occur in conjunction with improved infrastructure that supports social interactions between residents. This applies to all major streets in CH.
- The neighbourhood is generally not opposed to intensification. Rather, its focus is upon how intensification should occur. There is real concern that already redevelopment is squeezing out families and offers few lower cost units. There is little evidence that the current draft proposals will reverse or slow this trend. Family housing on Madison St. is currently being replaced by projects with single bedroom units as is much of the rental property at 86 Cedar St. Most recent new development in CH has been of higher priced, small, rental or condominium units. Further, there is major concern (from both the CH and Schneider Creek communities) that planning descriptions for Courtland Avenue seriously threaten the stability of existing, stable housing stock and the vision for the neighbourhood.

---

1 Cedar Hills residents wish to acknowledge the work of John MacDonald and Elyn Lin of John MacDonald Architects in leading the original visioning exercise upon which this Report is based. As always, John has been willing to support our community and for this we thank him most sincerely.
This Report presents street by street analysis of current conditions with strong vision recommendations. The community is excited by the potential for improvement and presents its vision with the goal not only of improving living conditions for CH but for the entire Downtown. CH has always considered the latter as critical to any design or infrastructure improvements. We highlight some of the key elements of our recommendations:

- The community sees enormous potential for relatively simple infrastructure improvements to the major arteries that would significantly enhance CH in its role as gateway to the City. See proposals for Benton St. in particular.

- There are areas where traffic presents major problems and the community urges serious analysis by both City and Regional experts. For example, the Cedar and Church St intersection is a serious concern. Courtland presents real difficulties for both CH and SC.

- CH urges the City (and, where relevant, the Region) to enhance walkability. In part this can come from side-walk improvements. Essential to these will be coordination with Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro. Currently the placement of large light standards prevents the widening of sidewalks (and narrowing of streets) in a manner that is evident elsewhere in the City. Compare, for example, the effects of light standard type and placement on Joseph or Queen Streets with any in CH. There also exist serious concerns for pedestrian crossings of major streets; in particular Courtland, Benton and Charles. While streets carried lower levels of traffic, these problems were ignored. They no longer can be, particularly with intensification. Proposals are presented.

- Again with intensification comes the need for increased, useable greenspace. CH has two resources. First, the relatively small Sandhills Park facilities which are currently being improved. Second, the under resourced Cameron/Kaufman Park facilities. An exciting proposal is presented for relatively low cost improvements to the Cameron/Kaufman Park facilities. This could and should become a major resource for adults and children providing major sports (track, tennis, swimming, soccer/football/cricket fields/volley ball, baseball, stair running) and parkland/playground facilities. Most resources already exist but currently access is poorly marked and maintained and the track, in particular, is unusable (other than as the highly innovative cricket pitch). With relatively little cost, this could become a major attraction for the entire Downtown.

- The high concentration of social service uses in CH has reached the point where real harm is happening to the community. The community is not opposed to lower cost housing. Indeed it is concerned that it may be left with not enough. But CH is currently under real stress from some of effects of the existing social service uses and cannot absorb more. CH urges the City to consider replacing some of the lower density properties on Charles St. (and, in particular between Benton and Eby) with mixed market cost rental/condominiums, higher density developments. These should include some units large enough to house families.

We conclude with one caveat. Although there was a concerted effort to ensure this Report represents the views of the entire community, it was far more difficult to gain input from renters, and, in particular, those with limited English language skills, than from home owners. While the authors have done their best to infer the needs of those who didn’t participate directly, we acknowledge this limitation.
II. Introduction

This report builds on the work of the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood\(^2\) (“SCN”) in which that community came together to understand how they collectively defined their neighbourhood and to identify goals for the future. In the course of this exercise, SCN references its relationship with Cedar Hill (“CH”). The two neighbourhoods abut and today the City of Kitchener is combining the two for planning purposes.

CH has long been represented by the Cedar Hills Community Group (“CHCG”) and has also always had close associations with the area now represented by SC. As is mentioned in the SC report, the two communities were historically linked by the major employers in the area and CH is an obvious primary route for anyone in SC going downtown. In 1981, the provincial government funded the Ontario Neighbourhood Improvement Project (“ONIP”). The main offices for this project were located near the corner of Benton and Mill Streets and the studied area encompassed all of what today would be SC and CH (and parts of Highland-Stirling). Several major improvements resulted from this project including the closing of Benton Street to Mill (with the replacement by the foot bridge), the creation of Sandhills Park, and the proposal that led to the City creating the Mill-Courtland Community Centre. When there was no formal SC community group, CH incorporated the entire area into its meetings wherever possible. It also actively argued against the Benton Street Realignment project from the early 1980s until relatively recently when the Region sold off its houses on Benton Street and the project was formally shut down. This included participating in a number of City and Regional level studies including those relating to the north-south traffic assessments.

There is no doubt that the growth and effectiveness of the SCN group has enhanced not only SC but also CH and now combining the two areas for planning purposes makes a lot of sense. CH residents enjoy the programming developed by SC. They walk through SC to get to all the amenities identified in the SC report including, most obviously, the Iron Horse Trail, Mill-Courtland Community Centre, the Harry Class Pool, and on to Victoria Park and St. Mary’s Hospital. Likewise, SC residents continue to use CH as a key thoroughfare to the downtown.

There are many similarities between the two areas. Although parts of the CH neighbourhood are older than SC, the issues arising for many of the residential streets in CH are similar to those identified in the SC report. There are, however, also differences and some of these were alluded to in the SC report. Most obvious is topography. The dominant feature of CH is its hills, peaking at St. George and Church Streets and sloping down to Courtland and Charles Streets, and to Cameron Heights Collegiate Institute (“Cameron”) and Kauffman Park from Madison. More important is the greater proximity to downtown of CH. A number of the properties in CH are large. There is already real mixed use in terms of scale of buildings. There has, particularly since the 1980s, been a significant increase in institutional use of properties. There is a far higher proportion of rentals in CH compared with SC. There has been recurring and significant land speculation in CH that, over the years led to property degradation and depreciation, urban crime, and social disruption. While SC has not been immune to some of these same issues, there is no doubt that the scale is different.\(^3\)

\(^2\) Making Our Neighbourhood Great!, Kitchener, December 18, 2015.
\(^3\) This is not in any way to minimize the issues SC has itself had to face; for example, those affecting Martin Street residents and the industrial uses leading to Courtland as well as some issues on Benton St.
The most important consequence of the differences for present purposes is that the focus of the two communities has inevitably been different. CH was actively involved in land use issues from the early 1980s including involvement in a very lengthy secondary planning project at that time. It faced major intensification pressures on St. George and Cedar Streets that resulted in the community becoming very active in planning processes. The negative pressures in the downtown that spilled over into CH, lead to the CHCG spending a good deal of its time working with downtown businesses, the police, city and regional authorities, on very troubling urban issues. In some ways CH was engaged in a seemingly endless fight for its own preservation and that of its very precious downtown and inevitably looked far more in a northerly than southerly direction, other than for the Benton St. realignment issues which it saw as directly threatening the health of both SC and CH.

Today, as we have developed this current report, many of the prior pressures CH faced continue and inevitably inform our perspective. Further land speculation began immediately the LRT was announced and years before it was approved. Institutional land use continues to be a significant part of the neighbourhood and rental properties bring different issues from those of home ownership. All this said, CH is immensely proud of what it has achieved since the early 1980s and is very grateful for the approach adopted by the City in this current planning process and in many other respects. Real care is being taken to listen to what the community wants and needs. There exists respect for the positions of the community and, as a result, the sense that we can make a difference. For this we thank all staff who are involved in the current projects.

III. BACKGROUND TO KEY ISSUES IN CEDAR HILL

The SC report provides a sound basic description of CH and what follows builds on that account.

The naming of our community as Cedar Hills is a relatively recent occurrence. The neighbourhood as it is now defined was created out of the larger Mill-Courtland/Highland Stirling neighbourhoods in order to provide focus for addressing the unique issues facing this particular community, largely the consequences of the crack epidemic in the 1980s and the decline in quality of housing stock caused by land speculation. The boundaries are typically considered to be Charles, Madison, Courtland and Benton streets, although at times we include what is now known as SC and would extend the area to Stirling Street.

If we can legitimately define the character of any neighbourhood, the driving forces that motivated both the creation of CH and the CHCG at least in its modern history have been predominantly political. From the early 1980s, there was a series of events that seriously affected the social fabric of the community and which required resident response. Throughout the 1980s the serious degradation of rental housing with associated problems lead residents, working with the City of Kitchener, Mill-Courtland Neighbourhood Association, and The Waterloo Regional Police Service to create the CHCG to address local issues. The drug and prostitution crisis from the early 1990s was a critical driver of activism, but it was a broader range of unrelated events that encouraged residents to become politically engaged and ultimately, to come together to create the CHCG. In particular:

- The ONIP project introduced many of us to each other for the first time and allowed us to engage in what today would be described as visioning exercises about the future of our community.

---

4 The name was the creation of a group including Karen Taylor-Harrison (CHCG), Mark Yantzi (councillor for the ward), John Westbrook (Waterloo Regional Police Service Division 1 commander), and staff from the City. The term reflected Cedar Street being at the peak of the hill, hence Cedar Hill.
The closure of Victoria School lead to a multi-year dispute with the Waterloo Region School Board. Here CH community members joined members of the Victoria Park neighbourhood (as well as parents from across all the downtown elementary schools including J. F. Carmichael, Queen Elizabeth, and Suddaby) to fight the school board’s desire to close what was a very historic resource for our community. While the school was ultimately closed, this period forged very close relationships between community members. More importantly perhaps, it brought the community together with key politicians at all levels and the City in particular. School closure fights became a very unpleasant side effect of living in the city core and at some stage and to various degrees, CH residents were involved in no less than 11 different battles with one or other school board (some schools were evaluated two and three times). In each case, residents had to work together closely.

The Lost Sea project on St. George Street in the early 1980s was the first exposure the CH group had to a major planning dispute. The essence of the project was the placement of a major high rise on the north side of St. George Street that would fill a large lot between St. George and Church streets. The design was simply a replication of one used by the same developer in London and, while, there was no zoning to prevent the project, it would have destroyed the low-rise streetscape on St. George St. The community argued against the project at the Planning Committee of Council and, to everyone’s surprise, the committee rejected the project with the chair stating ‘let them sue us’. This in fact happened and the legal settlement resulted in the City acquiring the property from the developer with the Kitchener Housing project on Church and St. George streets ensuing. This particular project continues to be cited as an excellent example of sympathetic intensification particular in terms of the St. George Street frontage.

A very lengthy secondary zoning project ran throughout the 80s. The fiercest arguments arose over intensification on St. George and Peter Streets. A couple from the GTA had consolidated a large number of properties on these streets and sought zoning that would have allowed for major intensification. Since these properties in part backed on to the Wellington Place condominiums, the argument used by both the developers and the city planners was that further tower projects would be appropriate. If this had happened, the entire character of CH would have changed as, at this stage, all the properties subject to rezoning were single unit homes, albeit sometimes broken into more than one rental unit. This secondary planning project was at times very painful. At this time the voice of residents was not considered to be particularly relevant or welcome. However, in the end, the argument for today’s zoning prevailed. The developers sold off the individual houses over time and, as with Bingeman Street in the Central Frederick Street neighbourhood, the properties were then carefully restored and now are generally well maintained by owner-occupiers. Perhaps more importantly, this process educated residents about the need for involvement in their community and gradually cemented respectful relationships with city staff.

Before the secondary plan was fully implemented a zoning crisis was identified on Cedar Street that demonstrated how exposed the community was to poor development. A group of local lawyers built a somewhat problematic rental complex and the community understood just how little they could do to provide input and protect CH from the kind of development that had already occurred on Madison Avenue. City planners worked with residents and these efforts lead to what was known as conservation zoning throughout much of CH. It is likely this zoning that did more to stabilize the part of CH south of St. George Street than anything else.

The consequence of all these issues was a community that was reasonably well-educated in civic matters and well-position to defend itself against negative forces. Unfortunately, despite the hundreds of hours spent up until then, little would prepare it for the real crisis that came with the crack cocaine epidemic.
Whole reports have been written about this period. The area most directly affected was north of St. George Street and, in particular, from Church to Charles Streets. However, there were times when the negative consequences of what was happening in this fragile part of our community spilled over to the balance of CH and the entirety of CH was seriously at risk. There had been land speculation leading to ownership by landlords with no interest in the well-being of the properties, tenants or community ever since the City rezoned parts of CH for high density development. What became obvious was that, if CH was to survive at all, residents would have to work closely with all City and Regional service providers.

It is not the place here to go through the years of grindingly hard work on the part of CHCG and the City/Region that followed in order to overcome both the actual dangers to the community and the stigma it suffered. CH is grateful to the City for the Interim Control By-law, a temporary down-zoning imposed in order to prevent further development that was exploitative of renters and the community as a whole. While ultimately that zoning was reversed by the Ontario Municipal Board, it bought CH critical time. Today the economic conditions that drive much of the proposed redevelopment are entirely different from those that existed in that period.

The key take away from these events is the observation made at the beginning of this section. CH for all of its recent history has been required to think politically as much as socially. That is not to say it has not engaged in the latter, but when it did (see below), its efforts were focused very much on enhancing the reputation of CH as a healthy and safe place to live. And while there have been extraordinary successes, none of us yet rests easy. It is for this reason we are particularly grateful for the opportunity to continue to work with the City on the current visioning and zoning exercises.

IV. THE SOCIAL ROLE OF CEDAR HILL COMMUNITY GROUP

When CH residents are asked to describe their community, one of the terms most often used is ‘stable’. This is somewhat ironic in light of the obvious threats alluded to above and it is also a reflection of how the community is in fact comprised of quite distinct parts. But even in its most vulnerable areas, CH has a lengthy history of stable home ownership and it is likely this, more than anything else, that has ultimately allowed it to survive and in fine form. So, for example, one of the Peter St. residents is only the third owner of their house built in the 1880s. While they have lived there for 38 years (and the prior owner 57 years), they have current neighbours who were there when they moved in.

There is little doubt that one of the most difficult things for CH residents to handle was and even continues to be the denigration of their community by outsiders. It was not uncommon to have taxi drivers ask residents why they live in such a bad area. Police, real estate agents, and teachers have been quoted as saying how ‘bad’ the area was. CH and the downtown in general were described by outsiders as being dangerous and run-down.

At different times, and sometimes in direct response to the criticism of outsiders, the community engaged in initiatives to reinforce what they saw to be the strengths of CH (and the downtown) including:

- Visioning exercises with real estate agents to provide materials that accurately described CH. Key elements that residents valued were its economic, social and racial diversity, its proximity to downtown, its affordability, and its cohesiveness.

---

5 See, for example, the Pierre Filion Report to the City.
• Working with the City of Kitchener to improve communication between Property Standards, planning and zoning.
• Establishing, with the police and others, key programs including the Citizens on Patrol Program and the John School.
• Receiving 5 year funding (2004-09) from the Trillium Foundation for a project called the Downtown East, Ya Gotta Love It (DEYGLI). In 2009 CH applied for and received an Annual Grant from the City of Kitchener that allowed DEYGLI to extend the work that had been done during the duration of the Trillium Funding to other downtown neighbourhoods.
• Establishing a small committee made up of Property Standard Enforcement, Police and DEYGLI to work with landlords and tenants to resolve issues and effect improvements to the properties.
• CH was awarded funding through the Festival of Neighbourhoods program and used it for two purposes. First, it built a concrete pad with electrical hook ups in Sandhills Park. For a period, CH held an annual folk festival using this facility. Second, it created a very successful loan program to assist with improvements to house facades.
• When the blocks north of Church street were particularly vulnerable to drugs and prostitution, a street party was held on Eby Street to bring all residents together, including the most disadvantaged and transient.
• For many years there was a community garden off the pathway leading to Cameron Heights School. This was very successful and only ended as those who lead the project gradually no longer needed the garden space.
• As part of the East End project, an annual soccer program was created at Courtland School. All children attending downtown schools were invited and the program was run by volunteers from the community for at least 10 years. Up to 70 and more children would gather once a week in May and June for informal soccer games. Parents would bring their children and meet their neighbours, often for the first time. Often parents were new to Canada, coming from countries where soccer was highly popular. The Community Centre has ensured the program continues today and works with community volunteers from CH and SC.
• There are regular and active get-togethers between large groups of neighbours. For example, an annual holiday potluck with a large group has been running for at least 28 years and each year brings in new participants.

Reviewing the success of social gatherings and events in CH, there are certainly some real, long-term successes such as the soccer program. But other events such as the folk festival did not continue. With the benefit of hindsight, there are some fairly obvious reasons for this. First, the seemingly endless political exercises in which the community was required to engage consumed the energy and focus of most of the leaders in the community and there was simply no bandwidth available for organizing events unless they had a very specific goal such as the Eby Street party. Second, although we think of CH as homogeneous and small, it actually covers a reasonably large and certainly diverse area and this will be discussed below. Within the particular segments of the community, there is not a large number of people not otherwise occupied who are available for the intense work required for events such as the folk festival. It is our hope that as CH is now more stabilized, more people will step forward in a leadership role for these type of activities. Indeed, part of the project to revitalize Sandhills Park included interest in activities using that space and there are now a number of younger residents actively planning the kind of activities a healthy community requires. There is now a real sense of generational change in the very best sense of the expression. CH continues to be a healthy and thriving community.

V. VISION FOR CEDAR HILLS
CH engaged in a visioning exercise through the spring of 2019. This in part began with the consultation process for Sandhills Park that took place in 2018 but the primary driver was the City holding a number of meetings relating to new zoning and secondary planning. Most importantly in February, the City conducted a charrette for the combined SC and CH communities to discuss drafting urban design guidelines. It was at this meeting that the CH representatives committed to engaging in an equivalent exercise to that resulting in the SC Report. This began with a meeting (March 27, 2019) in which John MacDonald and Elyn Lin of John MacDonald Architects led members of the SC community through a series of exercises where they were required to consider the relative priorities of different uses in the SC streetscape; in particular, pedestrians, public transportation, private vehicles, neighbourhood activities, and social interaction within the streetscape. Community members were asked to evaluate and rank the significance of each aspect for all the major streets in CH.

This visioning exercise took place within the context of the proposed new zoning for CH. This is not the place to discuss the zoning changes in any depth, but what is particularly important from the perspective of the community as a whole, is both the stabilization of existing uses for the majority of the area and also recognition of higher density on the perimeter roads. While much of this zoning was already in place, there is no doubt that the current plans brought likely intensification of Courtland properties, for example, very much to the fore-front of residents’ minds.

We begin our summary of the visioning exercise with the over-riding impressions the community has of CH. People genuinely enjoy living here. This is their home, they choose to live here and they are, by and large, happy that they do so. There are important features that residents value; diversity and socio-economic diversity in particular, proximity to the downtown with all its amenities and the Market in particular, and stability and age of the housing. One of the most important features is the walkability of CH and this is reflected in much of the focus of the vision for the future. This is a community committed more to walking and the use of public transit than to their cars.

We did not spend time preparing a formal ‘vision statement’. However, when we told community members the statement from the old East End Project, it resonated. That statement was: Downtown East, you Gotta Love It. While obviously this would require adaption to CH, it does reflect a certain feistiness and resilience that has always defined who we are.

We now turn to the specific streets examined in our review process:

1. Boundary Streets

The boundary streets were classified as Courtland, Benton, Charles and Madison. We have also included Stirling for brief comment as it is highly relevant to CH but is often ignored.

The key element of all these streetscapes is how, generally speaking, they fail to meet the needs of both CH and the City in terms of providing an attractive and welcoming environment for a walking population accessing the Downtown and CH. It is one of the long-standing major concerns of CH residents that little attention has ever been given to the attractiveness of the main arteries (including these boundary roads) in the East End. Comparing these with the very attractive streetscapes on, for example, Queen, Joseph and much of King streets, roads such as Benton and Courtland are remarkably unattractive. There is little attention to attractive lighting. Sidewalks are often narrow and in a poor repair, there are few trees and limited natural shade, light standards are often in sidewalks, there are limited safe places for crossing
streets, and generally everything appears to be geared to cars. Encouraging the use of bikes is seen as an important part of CH but bike lanes are, mostly problematic. There are limited points where pedestrians can cross any of the boundary roads safely. The key plus for CH has been the addition of the LRT which is generally acknowledged to be a significant improvement.

We now turn to the individual streets. For each we will begin with a short summary of key elements envisaged for the future.

a. Benton Street

Summary:

- Real and exciting potential as gateway to CH and downtown.
- Requires sidewalk improvements and greater width in particular.
- Replacement of light standards to ensure consistency with other major downtown streets will allow for greater sidewalk width and enhance overall visual appeal.
- More green space is needed and tree planting required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness.
- Good bike lanes are needed.
- Place boulevard in street centre to enhance attractiveness.
- Crosswalk required, likely near top of hill. No current crossing from Courtland to Charles.
- Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.

Benton Street is, in a sense, a major thoroughfare without a purpose. Residents recall the major changes that occurred when it was intended this would be a key north-south access route for the City. The road was widened and trees were removed. Today the street is dominated by construction at the Arrow site and, opposite, vacant lots between Courtland and St. George. It lacks any pedestrian crossing between Courtland and Charles. Sidewalks are narrow, in a poor state if repair, and have large light standards within them in most parts. There is some public transit but no stops within the CH boundaries. There will be a LRT stop at Benton and Charles.

In terms of social interaction, there is little that exists on Benton St. that encourages interaction. People do attend churches and there now is the new medical centre on the corner of Benton and Church. But the general sense from the community is that social interaction is minimal. This is not a street you tend to expect to stop and talk to neighbours. It is primarily a way of moving cars and, for the most part, cars from outside CH. There is no safe crossing place between Courtland and Charles. Walking, particularly in winter is unpleasant and often unsafe (narrow, un-cleared side-walks).

What is the community vision for Benton Street? Comments were remarkably consistent and generally there was a sense of enormous potential. One observation was representative of many: *It could stay as an artery for traffic, but it could be a point of pride and beauty in downtown Kitchener with greenery etc. and bike paths.* People are genuinely excited about the potential for retail/commercial use in the ground floors of new buildings. One suggested this could become like Belmont Village. The current Arrow building is a fine example of design that took an old industrial building and appears to have used real care to make the building visually attractive from the street.
Residents have bought into the new planning vision that encourages more public spaces and this includes thoughtful building design. This should be a major pedestrian thoroughfare and wider sidewalks on both sides would be important. In order to achieve this, however, light standards must be moved. Residents want more shade trees and green space at the sidewalks and areas adjacent to them including for any new development sites. They suggest a boulevard in the centre of the street to reinforce these design features. There is concern that intensification could provide barriers to the streetscape so real care must be taken in the design guidelines to ensure appropriate heights and interaction with the public spaces. To repeat the comments about the initial Arrow development, there is a desire for new development to be part of our community and interact with our community. It is critical it not present as a closed door space.

In sum, perhaps for Benton Street more than any other there was real excitement for its potential. In part this is no doubt because of how poorly it supports the community now. But people accept the need for redevelopment and they really want this street to become not only a gateway to CH but also a gateway to the City and one that makes us all proud.

Images of narrow side-walks with intruding light standards, Benton St.
b. Charles St.

Summary:

- Invest in improvements to enhance both downtown and CH.
- Green space and tree planting required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness, particularly near LRT stations.
- Good bike lanes (if possible)
- Address access to Madison with well-designed stairway.
- High priority need for cross-walk at Eby.
- Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.
- Encourage mixed cost housing for intensification projects.
- No additional social service uses.

Many of the observation about Benton are mirrored with Charles with the exception that some of the expensive infrastructure has already been done. The sidewalks in the CH stretch are, for the most part, in good shape and reasonably wide. The LRT slows down traffic and presents a less car dominated vista.

There are consistent negative comments from the community about this street, however. Most obviously, there has been almost nothing done in terms of allowing for green spaces and there are few if any trees. It is a hot and not particularly attractive street to walk along. There are concerns that the bike lane is somewhat randomly marked and then seems to end suggesting this is clearly not a priority. There are concerns that people perceive this not to be a particular safe street to walk along because of the congregation at times of users of some of the social services agencies. CH has never complained about the location of the men’s shelter per se. Indeed, its placement on Charles predated most of us moving here (although the present usage of the Shelter is quite different from the original vision). However, there is no doubt that at peak times for clients coming and going, people can feel threatened making their way past the various buildings and through groups of people who are often loud and may seem aggressive. Further, parking lots on Charles become gathering places for people both at day and night and they are very disruptive for residents, particularly on Church St.

The most important social use that directly relates to Charles Street is access to the Market and here there was a unanimous desire for a cross-walk at Eby Street. This is a primary access route for many in CH and SC. At other corners controlled by lights there are pleasing cross walk markings. There is nothing at Eby Street and the LRT presents a low barrier which is easy enough to cross for a person but can be difficult when pulling a shopping trolley.

The stretch of Charles that leads to the ramp to Madison is particularly problematic for pedestrians. The sidewalk appears narrower. It is dark and while the mural is an addition it only partially addresses the issue of the massive concrete wall.
Wall between Cedar and Madison Streets on Charles St.

There is a pedestrian access to Madison via a flight of very steep steps. These are far from ideal for pedestrians. They are narrow and poorly lit. There is no winter maintenance and instead rough boards are nailed across the entrance to close off the stairs. While the City does its best to maintain them, they attract graffiti and garbage.

Stairs from Charles to Madison Streets
Because of the perception of lack of safety, pedestrians often walk beyond the steps and walk up the ramp. Again, this ramp does not give a real sense of safety with poor lighting and little traffic. Many in the community would feel very uncomfortable walking up either the steps or ramp at night by themselves.

Ramp (one-way) from Madison to Charles

Finally, while the north side of Charles is not part of CH, it is highly problematic from a design perspective. There is redevelopment happening and so it is perhaps unfair to judge the attractiveness of some of the streetscape, but the stretch at the back of the Crowne Plaza (parking) is no doubt permanent and inherently unattractive.

The community is almost unanimous in terms of what it would like for Charles St. It wants this to become an attractive and healthy place for the community to walk and bike. There is real enthusiasm for the opening of the LRT and people ask that the two stations (at Benton and at Cedar) become more neighbourhood places. This might be achieved by enhancing the number of trees and green spaces by the sidewalk. Just having more people walking to use public transit will enhance the streetscape. The addition of a crossing at Eby Street is a high priority for the community. While the blocks are not long, the lack of any recognition that this is the primary access point to the Market is striking and changing this will do a lot to link the two sides of Charles Street with the CH and SC communities.

It is not clear where the primary redevelopment of Charles St will take place given the many existing social services buildings. However, assuming the economic incentive to intensify, the community urges the design specialists to take real care to impose design rules that enhance the street experience. Critical will be ensuring that buildings do not present as a barrier and have sufficient green space and trees on the sidewalk side to enhance the walking experience. Overall, as with Benton, this will be a primary route for the City and it will be how many traveling through the community by car or by LRT will judge the East End. This is the opportunity to insist on really well-thought out and pleasing design.

The lack of adequate bike lanes should be addressed if possible (it is acknowledged that this might be difficult with the LRT).
Finally, the City should be sensitive to the impact of the social service providers on the neighbourhood. While the existing providers are part of our community, it is important that the impact on the community of some of their uses be considered and that there be no expansion. For example, there have been some rumours (true or otherwise) that more of the older houses closer to Benton might be converted to social service housing.

Elsewhere in this Report concern is expressed for the reduction in availability of family and lower cost housing in CH. CH sees properties on Charles St as being particularly well suited to more mixed cost (market and subsidized/lower cost) housing units including family suitable housing as intensification takes place. The emphasis here is on ‘mixed’ use and likely private sector housing and not solely either market rental or subsidized cost housing.

c. Madison Avenue

Summary:
- **High priority given to improving current stair access from Charles to Madison**
- **High priority to infrastructure improvements to primary access to greenspace, parkland and exercise facilities from Madison to Cameron Heights school. This could become the major recreational site for CH and SC combining the stairs, running track, tennis courts, pool and playing fields.**
- **Serious issues concerns about the degree of intensification proposed by the draft Secondary Plan.**
- **Sidewalk improvements, green space and tree planting required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness.**
- **Ensure any development protects churches/public buildings.**
- **Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.**
- **Ensure sound maintenance of existing apartment buildings.**

Madison Avenue is an unusual choice of ‘boundary’ street since it is in fact not a through road and certainly not a major road. Its issues are so unique it was actually inadvertently omitted from the materials provided at the initial CH meeting. While it has generally been considered a boundary for CH, Stirling Avenue is much more similar to the major boundary streets surrounding CH than Madison ever will be. Nonetheless, since it has generally been accepted as a boundary for CH, Madison will be included within this grouping.

Changes to Madison over the last 30 plus years have long been considered by CH to be the exemplar of all that the balance of the neighbourhood did not want to see happen elsewhere, fairly or unfairly. It has a very historic position in CH, having been where a major windmill was located for much of CH’s history, being the site of the first synagogue that served Berlin/Kitchener, the location of the very important St. Joseph’s Church and rectory, providing access to Kaufman Park. Cameron Heights School, and having some of the first experiments with intensification. Madison was affected dramatically by the building of the high school with the resulting steep hill and need for steps and a path to the school. Finally, the change to the road system that divided the road at Charles St. and resulted in the one-way ramp to Charles St. and creating a major barrier to the downtown and seriously affecting land use on the eastern/northerly sides of the road. Generally, Madison might be described as a road where planners and road builders experimented (or perhaps simply took the path of least resistance in their desire to meet other goals) and no one seemed to care too much about streetscape or quality of life for residents.
For many years the CH community and residents of Madison were very concerned about the quality and maintenance of the major apartment buildings. While most of these have improved significantly in the last 10 years, residents note that the building that best defines everything bad from a design perspective for the community is a relatively new addition at # 118. It presents to the street as a plain, square, dark red brick building with smallish windows, no front doors or balconies and poorly maintained landscaping at the street frontage. The entire design appears to be motivated by maximizing the number of units and parking spaces and that this could be built within the last five years once more motivates the community to urge for the kinds of design changes that are being studied by this current project.

---

The proposed zoning provides for intensification for the entire street, both sides from Courtland to Charles. This is despite the fact that the north/western part of the street from Church St to its end, has far more in common with the rest of CH that will be protected from change, than the balance of the street. There are also single family homes with smallish lots close to Courtland that are probably better suited to existing use than any form of intensification. There is a real sense that CH will lose valuable single family housing with these zoning proposals.
Existing well maintained housing north end of Madison

Already there are serious issues for the residents from boarded houses on the north-western side of Madison (at the top of the hill backing on the Cameron). All the negative effects felt in prior periods from poor maintenance of properties awaiting redevelopment in CH have recurred and are particularly serious in light of the current drug crisis. This has become a heavy use of both City and police resources and neighbours are experiencing high level of disturbance from transient (non-legal) users of these properties. Redevelopment is a slow process and meantime the neighbourhood suffers badly.

The street does not have high levels of traffic, mainly because it is reasonably self-contained. It suffers from the same problems of poorly maintained, narrow sidewalks as does the balance of the community. The street is bleak and not easy particularly in winter from a pedestrian perspective. The steep grades and the narrowness of the street itself makes likely intensified traffic a serious concern not only for Madison but also for the obvious access street, Church St. (with the infamous Cedar/Church intersection).

There is little that can be done to improve existing apartment buildings other than ensuring they are well maintained. The concern is for the future. At meetings held by the City, little has been said about the vision by planners for intensification. The community urges City planners to review the proposal for uniform intensification and, in particular, for the stretch at the top of the hill, west side. This seems completely out of character with what is planned for the streetscape immediately around the corner on Church. The question becomes, how much more can one small street with no two-way access take without totally destroying its character.

The path and stairs to Cameron Heights School open up an important part of CH from a social interaction perspective. The school is part of our community. The hill is a primary toboggan run. This is an important access to the playing fields, swimming pool, tennis courts and Kaufman Park. The playing fields are already used frequently for football, soccer, cricket, and volley ball as well as obvious informal uses such as frisbee. The track, when it was maintained, was an important resource for the community. The stairs are in reasonable shape and the school maintains attractive ‘graffiti’ art on the wall.

There is little lighting or signage at the access points and the path can feel isolated. Yet if basic changes particular at the access routes were made, this could become a major facility for the community and the entire downtown. With intensification, this access to the only large green space for CH will become critical. Pedestrians must feel safe at any time accessing their green space and park and put bluntly, right now the path and stairs do not feel very safe at any time. Further, the failure of either the City or the
School Board to maintain the running track at the bottom of the hill has created a major barrier to the use of the green space. At different times of year you simply cannot walk on it as you sink deeply into mud.

Path to Cameron hill and path across to stairs

Main access from the hill to the stairs
Looking down the hill with Kaufman Park on right

Playing fields with severely damaged track

Cricket and adjacent volley ball game on Cameron playing fields
Despite all the issues that exist currently with Madison, the community sees real potential for improvement but this calls for a serious role on the part of the City. While this will cost money, the consensus is that this street has already done far more than any should for the overall downtown and it is now pay-back time. Further, if there is to be major development/intensification, it will be important that infrastructure improve.

As the number of residents on Madison increases it will be critical that the social interaction that a streetscape provides be enhanced. One of the most obvious elements is the redesign of the stairs from Charles to Madison. These must be available year round. They cannot continue to present as physically threatening. If this street is to absorb intensification, it must have broad and welcoming access stairs. These would be a major improvement not only for Madison but also for the Charles street design. The message will be that up this hill is a healthy and attractive community that is part of the downtown.

The community urges design of buildings to be sympathetic to the character of the rest of CH. They need well planned frontages and scaling in heights. Perhaps the easiest goal to set is to take what was built at #118 and do almost the opposite.

On a positive side, there have also been carefully created, recent projects; for example, the seniors complex opposite the church rectory (#143) which retained the original house and built behind. Good maintenance of apartment buildings on the eastern side will improve the message that these are well-cared for and even, in some cases, attractive examples of architecture from the 1970s and 1980s.

Real consideration must be given for how traffic will be managed with intensification. This is not a simple street because of access, narrowness and the steep hill. Sidewalks should be widened and there should be better allowances for greenspaces and trees.

The community urges planners to preserve the integrity of the two very important church sites on Madison Street. By creating a buffer around these building from poorly designed intensification, and with the addition of trees and green spaces, their importance to the community will be reinforced and the overall streetscape enhanced.
The City (with or without the School Board) must take full ownership of the access to the green space at Cameron Heights and Kauffman Park. There is the potential to create a major fitness and sporting facility on these properties with very little additional cost. This could be a major feature for the community, particular with younger people living in existing and new apartments. The stairs are already a part of many people’s fitness program and having a sound running track would be an amazing facility for the entire community. This does not have to be Olympic standard; just a sound surface with good maintenance (and why not continue the highly innovative, existing joint use as track and cricket pitch?). Further, this would also allow easy access to the tennis courts, pool, playing fields and playground. There is a need for the pathway to be improved with good lighting, renewed paving, lighting, and regular maintenance. The stairs are in reasonable repair although they also need on-going maintenance.

d. Stirling Avenue

Summary:
• Improve pedestrian experience. Consider changes to the wall along the school property or enhancements to the sidewalk itself.
• Preserve the ‘triangle’ of housing by Courtland.
• Improve access to Kauffman Park.

Since this is only partially within CH, we do not spend a lot of time discussing it. However, it is a street many of us use as pedestrians and there are obvious improvements needed.

The access to the playing fields and Kauffman Park is, to put it politely, bad. The park is a secret to most in the community there being almost no marking of its existence. The paths in are about as half-baked as any paths could be. This would not be a costly improvement but it would significantly improve the quality of life for residents and increase usage.

The little ‘triangle’ coming off of Courtland to Stirling is CH’s ‘little gem’ with well-maintained and stable housing. Real care should be taken to ensure it is protected by the City and CH is committed to ensuring it be included within its borders.

The pedestrian experience walking towards Charles is miserable. There is a high wall on one side and it is a busy road with a good deal of traffic. It is not clear to the community what can be done. It is a wind tunnel in winter and hot in summer. The community encourages the City to consider design improvements.

e. Courtland Avenue

Summary:
• Volume of traffic and lack of safe, pedestrian crossings are major issues. A real commitment must be made by the City and Region to come up with creative methods of making Courtland a more welcoming and pedestrian friendly street.
• It is important to enhance the sidewalks, greenspaces, and maintain/increase trees.
• Reconsider what intensification looks like. Real harm will come to the community and a major city road if only smallish, box-like developments that are unsympathetic to existing architecture prevail.
• Do not let properties fall prey to the negative effects of land speculation. Existing single unit homes must be protected and there must also be recognition that these may stay in place for many years. They are a healthy part of the community.

• Ensure sound bike lanes (if possible).

• Ensure protection of the existing tree canopy as this enhances the community as a whole.

• Commercial use at ground floors is viewed positively but ensure that this is also practical. Will units be leased?

Courtland is a primary focus for CH and, just as for the SC community, more attention was given to this street than any other.

We begin with an observation of just how powerful but in a negative way, materials presented by planners can be. Much of Courtland within the CH boundaries that is not of institutional use, has owner occupied homes that are well maintained and very much cared for (e.g. there is a major investment being made currently on a single family home near the corner with Benton). Residents looked at the pictures presented by planners and could only observe My home doesn’t exist anymore. CH understands that the City is planning for the long term. But there has to be recognition that much of Courtland today is very stable. Yes, there are parts where intensification will happen in the short term, but it would be tragic for the community if the message was that existing single family homes do not belong, speculators should come in immediately, run down the properties (as they already have done with a few), and build. These are real people and it is a real community that is being affected.

The most obvious difficulty with Courtland is its use as a major thoroughfare despite it being relatively narrow and in many ways ‘dead ending’ at Victoria Park. With the changes to Charles (LRT), Courtland has been called on to carry far more traffic than it did in the past. From the perspective of SC and CH, it divides our communities. It is difficult for pedestrians to cross other than at traffic lights which are far apart. The addition of the Maple Grove school has increased traffic at the Cedar Street intersection as most students are driven by private car to the school and daycare. There are always pressures at the Peter St. corner with access to Courtland School. There has long been a general sense that there is no will to address these issues and the fact that it is a regional and not city road is a major concern. Residents don’t know to whom to talk and how anything can change.

For the purposes of this report we will only reference the north side of Courtland. The only exception to this is the impact the community feels from some of the negative uses at different times at the old dairy site backing on to Martin Street.

Overall, the current design of the street presents as if this is where cars are the priority. Even bike lanes are so narrow and dead end making it hard for cars to navigate bikers safely.

In terms of social interaction, generally there is little sense of this existing. There is a certain amount of foot traffic because of the schools and church and people accessing public transit. However, as with the other streets, people remark on it not being a particularly pleasant walking experience with lack of shade trees, the conditions of the side-walks in places, and the amount of traffic. In terms of neighbourhood activities, Courtland provides major social institutions. Children from our neighbourhood and the other side of King come through CH and cross Courtland to get to Courtland Senior Public School. High school students often use Courtland to access Cameron. Both SC and CH residents must access Courtland to get to other parts of the City. There are two small grocery shops that are important to the community (Madison and Courtland and Benton and Courtland).
Store on corner of Courtland and Benton. Significant improvements currently taking place

One of the biggest concerns from the community is how intensification would actually work. There has been consistent displeasure with some of the recent projects. Two examples will describe what residents fear: buildings at 103 and 122 Courtland. It seems inconceivable that a builder is allowed to present a wall of hydro meters to the streetscape, have lighting that has negative impacts on neighbours, and ignore any windows on the side of the building that looks over a park. 103 presents as a plain block/wall with no connection in terms of design features to the rest of the community. Given house prices and the stability of home ownership, there is concern that most developments will be on one or two lots only and then repeat the design features of these particular buildings. Of major concern is how residents in any new building will access the street by car. Already this is a major problem for residents. How will this work as traffic continues to intensify?
Existing stable single family housing on Courtland

There are real concerns that City plans will increase land speculation. At present there are 2 or 3 properties between Peter and Benton streets that are poorly maintained and have been subject to the same issues with drugs and prostitution that have been felt in other parts of the community. Despite a lot of work with City staff by neighbours, the problems have not effectively abated. It is critical that we all take into account just how fragile CH remains wherever there is pressure to intensify but where that might not occur for a number of years.

There are real concerns about how the zoning for Courtland is being described. To be blunt, the real fear is a repeat of either the properties at 103 and 122 Courtland. Perhaps higher rise with greater maintenance of green space would be preferable but this should be discussed.

Finally, there was support for the notion of shops/commercial use on the ground floor but not a lot of faith that this will occur. Taking the King Street experience (e.g. even the Market) it just seems to be very hard to encourage this use in practice. But if it could occur, it would be very positive for CH.

Courtland is used by buses. It is not known if this will continue following activation of the LRT. Currently it is used by out of town buses as well and this may change if the bus station moves.
The community spent a good deal of time considering what the future should look like. These considerations include:

- Seeking lower speed limits on Courtland itself or other traffic calming measures.
- Adding protected cross walks, likely at Peter or Cedar Streets. Note, care should be taken with such projects not to exacerbate the difficulty residents already have to get out of their driveways.
- Do anything and everything to encourage foot traffic including improving sidewalks, expanding greenspace, adding trees (balancing act for sight lines for driveway access).
- Maintain public transit and bus stops.
- Improve bike lanes if possible.
- It is very important to the community to maintain all public uses and, in particular, the schools and religious buildings. These are places people walk (including to the synagogue at Stirling). It is very important that sidewalks and crossings be designed to ensure safety and enhance general well-being.
- Thought must be given to the practicalities of how intensification might occur, when it will occur, and what it will look like. People are encouraged by the thought of more small businesses and particular ones that might serve the community. Is this practical? Will the building lots be big enough (can there be sufficient land consolidation) for a really well designed project? What happens to properties while we wait for projects to happen?
- There are mixed thoughts about height of the projects. Again, it may well be more a question of actual design quality than height per se. Consideration should be given to those who will be backing on to the projects as well.
- Courtland has lost a number of trees. With any new development, existing trees should be preserved so far as is possible and new trees planted.

2. Other Major Streets

The proposed zoning for each of the following major streets will remain primarily as is or, in the case of Church St. be downzoned. For this reason, we will not discuss building design other than to say, should any existing building be replaced, it will be important to ensure that the design be sympathetic to the surrounding neighbourhood and the streetscape generally be maintained. Properties should have good greenspace, trees, and buildings be of a height, location on site, and shape that are consistent with those nearby.

a. Church St.

Summary:

- A key issue is high volumes of traffic and speed of traffic.
- The intersection with Cedar is dangerous and must be addressed by the appropriate experts. This is becoming increasingly urgent with the growth of population through redevelopment in the area.
- Overall, the primary vision is to enhance the pedestrian experience with more green space, trees, benches and even garbage bins particularly for dog waste. Improved access to Cameron is important.
- There is still a need to protect some fragile properties and continued support from the City and Region will be required.
- Historic buildings must be protected.
Means must be developed to protect Church St. properties from the negative consequences of uses on Charles St. properties.

This street is likely the most important for the community in terms of accessing the downtown and other services. It is a primary walking route and there is always foot traffic. The biggest problem it faces come from the increased traffic, both in terms of volume and speed. With the changes from the LRT project, Church is the primary access point for CH. It is also used as a through way by people wanting short cuts through the community. Combined with traffic is the increasing number of parked cars on the south side of the road which also means not ideal snow maintenance in winter and also poor sight lines for drivers and pedestrians. This is a primary street for school bus stops.

The street is divided by the intersection with Cedar St. which is one many residents fear. Because of increased traffic on both streets, this is a major intersection. The sight lines are poor and cars often speed on Cedar St (the street with the right of way). It is a nasty corner for pedestrians and cars.

While Church street has no public transit other than for school children, it does provide a major access point for bus and LRT. Foot traffic to public transit will undoubtedly increase.

There are already high rise buildings on Church St. and this has created a wind tunnel effect, particularly around Wellington Place.

For a street that is dominated by the needs of pedestrians, sidewalks are narrow, there are few trees, little green space, and the only bench is at the corner of Benton and Church. This is a street for social interaction – where you meet your friends – yet there is little space you can comfortably stop and talk. Light standards are large, unattractive and in the boulevard making expansion of the sidewalk difficult.

Narrow sidewalks and barren sidewalks, Church St.

Church St. has traditionally either had churches on it or provided direct access to them. These are important to the community both for religious and historic reasons. The new medical centre will be
increasingly important and attract more foot traffic. The east end of Church St. provides the primary access point to Cameron Heights School and the park/recreational greenspace.

Historic Jacob C. Shelly house, Church St.

There are some very historic buildings on Church St. both single occupancy and apartment buildings. Residents appreciate the efforts to stabilize the street through the downzoning and avoiding creating the barrier to the rest of the community that higher intensity buildings would have created. There have been some long standing issues with certain buildings on Church St. although many have stabilized over the last few years. The new zoning should reduce the land speculation that was a dominant feature in the 1980s in particular. Of continued concern is, however, the use of land on Charles St. that backs on to the Church St. properties. There is a tendency for the large parking lots to become a noisy gathering place that is very disruptive for residents on Church.

The visions for the future for Church St. primarily address the needs of pedestrians and traffic concerns. The key will be to ensure that the message of the downzoning resonates and that it is widely understood that this is a street for stability not speculation and the community is generally supportive of this City initiative. The community will continue to depend on the various City and Regional resources to ensure appropriate property maintenance etc. as well as defending the proposed zoning against requests for variance.

Residents are anxious for stabilization to occur on Charles St. They are fearful of any further growth in the social sector and strongly believe that for the neighbourhood to be healthy and secure, there can be no expansion either to social sector housing or services. They want development there to be sympathetic to the needs of Church street properties and the community as a whole. In particular, respecting light and privacy and avoiding further large expanses of parking lots where people gather particularly at night and on weekends. They would encourage the City to consider alternative land uses including mixed (economically) housing as suggested elsewhere in this report.

Residents would very much value working with City experts on how to manage the traffic issues on Church and the intersection with Cedar in particular. Some would also like to see the end of paid parking (although not everyone agreed with this) as this is a message that it is not a street for residents but increasingly for people visiting the downtown. In the long run it might be necessary to implement some form of permit parking project although at this time there is again not unanimous support for this.
Certainly there is a feeling that more parked cars may slow down traffic and make it less of a ‘through’ road.

Church and Cedar St. Intersection. Note steep grade in both directions on Cedar St.

There is a strong desire to enhance the streetscape for pedestrians and thereby increase social interaction. Residents see this becoming more and more important. Already intensification in other parts of CH has increased the numbers of dog walkers and again this enhances the social exchanges on the street. However, it is also increasing the amount of garbage and dog feces in particular. Increased trees, green spaces, benches and even garbage cans (which are really needed), would all enhance the sense of Church St. being an important place for social interaction.

Finally, it is important to Church St residents that improvements be made to the access to the Cameron properties.
b. St. George St.

Summary:
- **This is a very successful street in the community and the primary goal is not to do anything that detracts from this.**
- **Real care must be taken to ensure whatever happens with the Water Tower site is sympathetic to the community. Ideally it would remain public space but if built on, it must be understood that this is one of the most valuable (from both an economic and visual perspective) vacant sites in the community and good design is critical.**
- **Maintaining the pleasant walking experience is essential.**
- **Thought must be given to the long-term impact of non-resident parking.**
- **There is still a need to protect some fragile properties and continued support from the City and Region will be required.**

St. George is the second east-west street in CH and although it is an important access route, it is more limited than Church as it ends at Cedar St and has one-way traffic, west to east.

The interesting result of the community input session was that comments were almost unanimously positive about the street as it currently is. It is clearly considered to be a successful and generally stable place with mostly well cared for, single family homes. The Kitchener Housing project is well integrated into the community from a design perspective. People like the walking experience and the way houses present front porches to the street. They use expressions like ‘pleasant feeling’. They like the access to Sandhills Park which is a valuable part of the community.

There were some concerns expressed. The first relates to the zoning on Benton and the implications for the buildings on the corner of St. George and Benton. Residents are concerned about loss of light and privacy from any redevelopment. The street is currently bright and clearly exudes warmth for pedestrians. There is a real fear that this might be lost. Further, there is concern about increased traffic. This is a road that children play by and sometimes on (hockey). People drive carefully.

The other site that worries people is the Water Tower site. This provides good green space for the community. There is a fear that this will be intensified and put increased pressure on the street from a traffic and parking perspective. Generally, the concern is that what might be build may be poorly designed for such an important site and reduce the neighbourly feel of St. George St.

There is concern for the amount of parking on the street. In the winter, many other streets have no parking. Some of the residents in high rise buildings use this for additional parking and downtown workers are starting to use it as well. Again, this hurts the ambiance of the street and restricts availability for residents. While this is likely manageable today the concern is that it will not be in the future as the downtown flourishes and intensification elsewhere in CH increases.

Finally, there was some concern for the fragility of some parts of the street where housing is less stable and drugs and other criminal acts have been prevalent. As with much of CH there is real fear that some of the difficult problems could easily come back with poor housing maintenance and that some have not entirely left. Some people expressed concern that these issues have and continue to spill into Sandhills Park and this, combined with dogs running unleashed, diminishes its attractiveness. That said, the community is appreciative of the upgrading proposals for the park in which they participated in 2018 and which should be conducted, summer 2019.
In terms of what vision people have for the future, the over-riding sentiment was to maintain what we have now. Should there ever be housing built on the Water Tower site it is critical that the design be consistent with the balance of the neighbourhood, maximizing frontages to the street and ideally including the traditional front porch look. There should also be adequate on-site parking. While a more modern design would also work, it should be done well and with input from neighbours.

The two corners on Benton where re-development may occur, must have design restrictions included that take into account the impact on properties on St. George as well as Benton. They cannot be loaded towards the back of the properties as that will be immediately adjacent to St. George St. properties. Height rules must be designed to minimize the impact of reduced light on St. George St. Likewise, parking must be designed so lighting etc. does not negatively affect St. George St. properties.

Finally, at some stage proposals must come forward to address parking on St. George St. This may well take the form of some sort of permit system that allows primary use for local residents and their guests.

c. Cedar St.

Summary:
- Address major traffic concerns: speed, intersection with Church, volume of traffic. Have input from traffic experts who address issues from the perspective of enhancing pedestrian rights and experience, protecting community access to roads, reducing use as through road, increasing safety.
- Carry through lighting style from downtown.
- Address sidewalks by increasing width, moving light standards, and increasing tree canopy and green spaces.
- Add mini-park style seating and other features such as garbage containers especially for dog walkers at corner with Church St.
- Enhance walk to LRT including city supported snow clearance, better and safer sidewalks, and more attractive streetscape.
- Consider Cedar St. as a major throughway for pedestrians using institutional buildings both on Cedar and nearby (including schools). Consider cross walks at Courtland.
- Defend proposed zoning and ensure any intensification is sympathetic to the neighbourhood and enhances green space and ambiance.
- Protect and preserve institutional buildings/uses.

Cedar St. is the major street in CH. It runs north south and continues through CH to the downtown and beyond into SC. It is a narrow street that has become a primary access route for and through the neighbourhood. It carries heavy traffic and this has been exacerbated by the LRT which now means west bound traffic cannot make a left hand turn off Charles into CH at Eby. In terms of topography, it is dominated by the steep hill that peaks at Church St.

If residents are generally happy with St. George St., the almost exact opposite is true of Cedar. People feel cars are king and they travel at speeds that feel very unsafe. The road is narrow which makes cars feel even more threatening to pedestrians. Cedar St. has experienced some of the nastiest side effects of land speculation. This is particularly the case on the stretch from Church to Charles but also some parts on the
balance of the street where houses and properties are poorly maintained. Some of the tenants are disruptive and can make pedestrians feel unsafe.

Sidewalks are narrow and in poor repair. Again, the placement of light standards within sidewalks restricts the width. Generally, the sense is that cars take priority over pedestrians. The fact that sidewalks are not all cleared well in winter make them particularly problematic/dangerous given the steepness of the hill, particularly in the stretch leading to the new LRT station. There are few trees and almost no greenspace. The high rise at # 86 has been a major problem in the past although it has improved significantly in recent years. The main concern of residents is whether there will be any lower cost rental remaining. They do not want to see this as the primary form of housing in the building (it did cause problems in the past as landlords were reluctant to invest in maintenance) but the community values mixed use and diversity.

Cedar St, narrow and unattractive sidewalks

In terms of public transit, Cedar St. is used to access buses on Courtland and the LRT on Charles.

There currently is little social interaction because the street is just not a pleasant walking experience. Obviously it is an access point to the downtown and the Market in particular. There are now new
restaurants on the corner of King or nearby. There are also important community resources that exist on
the south end of the street in CH:

- Maple Grove school is at the site of the old St. Joseph’s school. This brings considerable additional
  traffic to the school at peak times, particularly from Courtland. It makes that corner
  uncomfortable again for pedestrians. That said, both the school and the daycare are a very
  positive addition to the neighbourhod and they also increase the use of Sandhills Park during
day-time.
- St. Joseph’s Church parking lot is accessed from Cedar (and goes through to Madison)
- There is an entrance to Sandhills Park off of Cedar. At present this is not particularly well
  maintained and some have thought the signage is not adequate.
- Cedar St is a primary access route for children going to Courtland Avenue school. It is also
  important for high school students going to Cameron Heights.

Sandhills Park with children playing and Maple Grove School, on opposite sides of Cedar St
The community noted that existing zoning will be retained for much of the street and there are concerns that speculators have already bought up properties and will push for a variance if the new zoning is approved. People are discouraged by the ability of some property owners to push boundaries and not in a way that helps the community. Once zoning is in place it should be accepted and defended. This street is very fragile and cannot tolerate any more speculation by people with little interest in creating good developments but only wanting a quick economic return.

Of all the streets in CH, this was the one where the community had most difficulty envisaging significant improvements. The following summarizes what residents urge the City to consider:

- What can be done to discourage Cedar St. being considered a through road and a quick alternative to Stirling or Benton Streets? The street cannot be widened. The intersection with Church is dangerous. The community believes it is essential that this issue be addressed for the safety of the community and the well-being of the children who use Cedar St as an access to Maple Grove, Courtland Avenue and Cameron Heights Schools. The residents envisage possible road calming measures. Here, however, they will need the expertise of traffic gurus.
- Lighting is, by and large, 'grim'. One strong signal that this is a street that is cared for and is for residents and pedestrians and not just cars would be to continue the lighting from the north side of Charles and take it all the way to Courtland (as with Queen). These smaller standards would also allow for the widening of sidewalks.
- It is unlikely that Cedar will ever become much of a bike route because of the hill. However, the pedestrian experience should be significantly enhanced. Sidewalks should be widened and having the road slightly narrower might discourage some traffic. While there is no room for boulevards, tree plantings on adjacent properties should be encouraged.
- An obvious place for enhancing the pedestrian experience is at the top of the hill. Is there scope for a tiny green space setting with a bench that encourages people to stop and talk? Something equivalent to that which exists at the Benton corner.
- With stable zoning there should be real enforcement of property standards and general encouragement of improving existing properties.
- For the part of Cedar where intensification will take place, there should be care taken to ensure access is not onto Cedar Street but rather Charles. Redevelopment of the properties closest to Charles should be designed to maximize green space and trees on the Cedar St frontage.
- With the LRT stop at Cedar, there will be much more pedestrian traffic and this alone will make people feel safer. However, it also increases the need to improve the pedestrian experience on Cedar itself. No one should feel unsafe walking there and access in winter in particular should be free of ice and other dangers.
- One location for a cross-walk is at the corner of Cedar and Courtland.

**Summary:**

- **Important design features of this street are presently under review with the major infrastructure work proposed in the next year or two. These will drive the design of sidewalks, trees and green space and the primary desire of the neighbours is to continue to have real and valuable input to this process. To date City staff have been very responsive to neighbourhood concerns and creative in their design approach.**
• With the infrastructure project proposed, this is the perfect opportunity to address the light standard issue that plagues CH. Given the goal of widening sidewalks, light standards should be replaced and reduced in size plus not placed so as to reduce sidewalk space.
• There is a continued need for support from City and Regional staff with the few remaining fragile properties.
• There should be better signage and access to Sandhills Park.
• Priority should be given to improving the laneway access to Sandhills Park. This could be part of the infrastructure project.

Peter St. generally is a stable street that residents identified primarily as a major walking route to the downtown or, the opposite way, to the Iron Horse Trail and beyond. It is still used as something of a throughway for traffic but since it stops at Church St. the pressure is not as great as in Cedar St. It has no public transit other than school buses but is an access route to both buses and LRT. It is probably potentially the most congenial north south artery for pedestrians particularly as the hill is not as steep as with Cedar and Madison. Many of the houses on Peter St. are significant historically dating back to the 1880s and earlier.

The primary concerns are once more for the poor quality of the sidewalks, the lack of trees and green space. Generally, it is not viewed as nearly as pleasant a walking experience as it should be. People have mixed thoughts about the width of the sidewalks themselves. They are particularly concerned that infrastructure improvements do not include replacing light standards (Kitchener Wilmot Hydro explained that current standards are adequate) and this closes off a critical opportunity to increase sidewalk space. With the road already dug up, underground wiring would not be a major issue. Residents urge the City to use this opportunity as a template for CH as a whole. Right now, the location of light standards appears to be the primary obstacle to enhancing walkability in communities.

Residents value the sloped curbs as often it is necessary to ‘slide’ into drive ways in winter. Current City plans for infrastructure changes are sound for both parts of the street.

Peter St. is an important access point to Sandhills Park. The signage, however, to the park is poor. The public laneway is always in a very bad state of repair and it is not even clear where the lane ends at the
park entrance. This latter part may be addressed by the upgrades that will take place in 2019. But the laneway itself is outside of that process and continues to decline even though snow clearance is good.

There are a few remaining properties that are fragile and these need the continued support of regional and city staff.

Overall, for the future residents are really looking forward finally to having infrastructure improvements but only if the design features meet their needs and wishes. Key will be improving the streetscape. Housing is, for the most part in good condition and stable. A more visible entrance and signage way to the park would be valued.

3. Minor streets

There were two minor streets in CH that were discussed because they have an important role in the neighbourhood and for different reasons:

a. Eby St.

Summary:

- Preserve this as a critical walking route linking CH with the downtown. Increase the width of sidewalks and make road narrower.
- Enhance width of sidewalks.
- Ensure any intensification on the easterly side does not remove the existing street facing housing but is behind these buildings.
- Respect the need to enhance feelings of safety for all residents and ensure no expansion of potentially disruptive uses.

Eby St. in CH is one block long but it is most people’s (from CH and SC) primary access route to the Market, other parts of King East, and shortly to the LRT. It carries a high amount of foot traffic. It is generally used as an alternate to Cedar because it is far less steep. Car traffic has been reduced with the changes on Charles for the LRT.

The street could have been well designed from a pedestrian perspective at the time infrastructure was replaced. However, this was still an era when the primary focus was, unfortunately, for the car, not pedestrians and there was a total refusal to consider smaller light standards and underground wiring. The sidewalks are relatively narrow. In many places two people cannot pass without one going onto the road.
Eby St from the corner of Church illustrating narrow sidewalks

There were once serious problems with properties particularly on the eastern side of the street but many of these have been stabilized. There are, concerns, however, about what is to come. There are a number of properties behind the street facing houses and these are not always well maintained. Driveways are often gravel on this side so give the impression of being temporary.

The northerly end of Eby is affected by the same pressures as Charles. Again, residents would value no additional social services on this street where there is already a heavy concentration. They do note that most of the properties on Eby St. itself cause few issues and the residents are genuine members of the community as much as anyone else. The primary concern is with the more transient population on Charles St.

This is an area that will be subject to some intensification. Where it might occur on Eby St. residents would like it to take place behind the street front houses, in order to preserve the current small-scale look of the street. Careful design guidelines would have to be prepared in order to achieve this goal. Above all else, work must be done to ensure the highly significant role of this street as a primary pedestrian route to the Downtown is maintained.

b. Hebel St.

Summary:
- The key is to preserve the current ambiance of the street.
- The access to the sidewalk must be improved.
- When creating design guidelines for Benton intensification, care must be taken to ensure no negative effects flow through to Hebel.

Hebel St. is a very historic, one block, one-way street between St. George and Courtland. It has a number of very attractive older homes some of which are immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. It is important to the neighbourhood that the character of this street be preserved. There was some redevelopment with a small town house project a number of years ago. While there is nothing wrong with these properties, it would be nice to see any new development be more in keeping with the existing housing as current
design standards would suggest. In particular, not having the primary frontage being expansive parking allowances.

Infrastructure improvements are scheduled for the next year or two. As with Peter St. this will be the perfect opportunity to ensure underground wiring and smaller light standards. This is a narrow road with a very narrow sidewalk. It is a walking street for most residents but the experience is not, currently, particularly pleasant.

Hebel St from the cnr. of St. George

Historic housing on Hebel

There are concerns about the following:

- At some stage there will be major redevelopment on the land backing onto Hebel on Benton. This must be done in such a way that it does not destroy the light and ambiance of Hebel.
- The corner property on St. George street has for years had a very poorly built and maintained retaining wall. It is now difficult to walk on the sidewalk at that stretch, and generally not
possible in winter. This should be addressed, perhaps at the time of the infrastructure improvements.

- There is an old apartment complex half way down on the east side. While this is currently not presenting any difficulties to the community it has been problematic in the past. Since this leads into a laneway that goes through onto Peter St. this created problems elsewhere in the community as well. The units are small and old and while no one is suggesting they should be changed, real care should be taken to ensure the landlord provides appropriate maintenance and supervision.
Hi Bob,
I understand that you were in attendance at the Urban Design Charrette/Discussion for the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan and had a question with respect to the timing of the proposed new zoning regulations.

This discussion that was had on Feb. 11\textsuperscript{th} will guide the preparation of the neighbourhood specific guidelines and assist in developing new zoning regulations for the lands in the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.

As well, we will also be reviewing and considering the feedback that yourself and others in the neighbourhood have provided, in responses to the 2 Open Houses that have been held, to be able to bring final land use designations, policies and zoning to a Committee/Council meeting late fall 2019.

We have your contact information and will be able to notify you when we have more details on the zoning and the timing of consideration.

In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact myself or Dayna.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Dayna Edwards
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2019 12:39 PM
To: 'Bob Neskovic' <...>
Cc: Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Subject: RE: You're Invited to a Schneider Creek/Cedar Hill Urban Design Charrette

Hi Bob,

Thank you for the follow up email.
I’m sorry we were not able to touch base after the meeting. I have forwarded your email to Tina Malone-Wright who will respond regarding the timing of zoning moving forward.

Thanks for your participation in the discussion with respect to the ‘motel’ like buildings. We will work on crafting some zoning regulations in addition to urban design guidelines that will discourage this form of building.

Dayna

Dayna Edwards, M.PL, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner (Urban Design) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7324 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | dayna.edwards@kitchener.ca

From: Bob Neskovic
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2019 7:57 PM
To: Dayna Edwards <Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Re: You're Invited to a Schneider Creek/Cedar Hill Urban Design Charrette

Hi Dayna,

Thanks for hosting the urban design meeting last night. Unfortunately, I was not able to stay for the group sessions as I had other other obligations that I needed to attend to.

I was hoping there would have been a small break to ask you when we will be able to get the specifics regarding the new proposed zoning. As an owner of three properties on Courtland/Benton, I'm specifically interested in finding out what limitations of any there will be around building along Courtland Ave East.

During the meeting one of the home owners asked how we could avoid developers from building "motel" like buildings along Courtland. I was pleased to hear this concern and suggested that the city should look to encourage developers to assemble lands along Courtland by having new zoning to allow developers to for example build higher with the more lots they assemble. I've already formally shared this feedback with the city but I was glad to hear that this was also a concern of other living in the neighborhood.

Do you have any information on when we can expect to hear the final details regarding zoning?

Regards,
Bob Neskovic

On Tue, Jan 15, 2019 at 3:59 PM <Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Good Afternoon Schneider Creek and Cedar Hill Neighbours,

As part of the Neighbourhood Secondary Planning process that is currently underway for the Schneider Creek/Cedar Hill area—City staff will be developing a set of urban design guidelines for ‘Residential Infill in Central Neighbourhoods’.

This document will apply to all neighbourhoods within the central city area, and in
addition, we hope to have a section that contains guidelines unique to each neighbourhood. As it stands, the general guidelines have been drafted that will apply to all neighbourhoods—these guidelines will address things like building placement, setbacks, garage projects, landscaping, building design and massing, etc.

We would like to invite you to join staff in a design charrette intended to develop the unique set of Schneider Creek/Cedar Hill guidelines. The 2 hour design charrette will take place at the following time/location:

**Monday, February 11th 2019 from 6:30pm – 8:30pm at City Hall 2nd Floor Schmaltz Room**

Please see the attached poster invitation—please feel free to share with your neighbours.

I’m hoping you will join planning and urban design staff to share your experience, vision and ideas for Schneider Creek/Cedar Hill. Your RSVP prior to February 8th would be greatly appreciated.

Let me know if you have any questions,

Relevant Links:


**Dayna Edwards, M.PL, MCIP, RPP**  
Senior Planner (Urban Design) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener  
519-741-2200 ext. 7324 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | dayna.edwards@kitchener.ca
Hi [name],

Thank you for your email and for clarifying your concerns in writing.

These comments are very useful and will inform future consideration of the zoning regulations that will be applied to future developments in the neighbourhood. Part of the reason for the zoning review is to ensure new developments and future infill are compatible in scale and character with surrounding properties, the streetscape and overall neighbourhood. Some of the issues/concerns that you have expressed were also shared by other property owners/neighbourhoods before and during the RIENS (Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods) Study. The RIENS Study is one of the reasons for the review of the zoning regulations in our central neighbourhoods.

As I mentioned in my last email I would encourage you to attend Dayna’s Urban Design Charrette session on February 11th, 2019. It will be held here at City Hall in the Schmalz Room on the 2nd Floor starting at 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm. It will be a great opportunity to discuss several of the items of concern in your email and how they can be potentially addressed either through a guideline, a zoning regulation or both.

Thank you again.

We look forward to discussing further with you as we progress in the Official Plan and Zoning By-law review for the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek neighbourhood.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
Hi Tina,

Thank you for taking the time to address my concerns.

In regards to our last conversation, I wanted to clarify my concerns with future developments and the adjacent property built by the Madison group.

My concern with the new proposed set back regulations; is they will be misused by developers. The guidelines discussed in the planning departments proposal allows developers a legal loophole to tear down existing structures and put new structures at the same side and front set back distance as old structures. The builders will use the closest point of old structure to the neighbouring property. While making the new structure larger in length and width; of course to maximize profits their roofs will not slope and be more box like to increase living space. The windows of any adjacent properties that face new build are now all negatively affected. For example: my home for instance does not get any direct sunlight after mid morning on the main floor. Three of my large windows currently look at solid brick wall and 15 gas meters. I know you can't tear down what has been built, but you shouldn't allow this to happen to anyone else either.

My concern with the proposed zone changes are adjacent property now can build up higher with new categories. It may not be your intention with the current developments, but if the city amends their policies as outlined. Any developer will use them to their advantage to maximize their profits. They don't care about history and that my home was built in the late 1800's.

As I stated on the phone. I don't fault the current planning committee for previous decisions, but when you indicated that you sent an individual to check that the build generally complies with the approved building papers and he said that it does; that's very difficult to understand. My main concern is for the safety of my family. Here are the issues I stated over the phone. I'd like to mention a lot of these issues can be fixed without tearing down the existing structure.

1) 15 gas meters placed under 7 feet from my driveway without any real safe guards put in place. (there are no metal posts in ground protecting these meters from any possible impact)

2) The roof that is slanted towards my property on the building closest to Cedar street builds up with snow whenever there is a large snowfall. That snow comes crashing down all at once due to slope of roof. It falls directly into my driveway due to close proximity. My main concern there is for the safety of my children.

3) The landscaping of the property has also been sloped towards my property, so all rain and snow; melt or pour into my driveway. Even the downspouts are placed to go onto there grass where it is sloped towards my property and the water comes directly into my driveway.

4) poor visibility for getting out of my driveway as well; minimum 14-foot visibility triangle not given (especially being on top of hill. visibility is already hindered.)

5) Where the fence begins to go on angle in back end of my property; it begins to encroach on my land. Importance of this is that the second structure is built closer than first structure. It has overhanging built out lofts. (Overhang is less than two feet from my property line)

I'd further like to clarify, when I spoke about the 8 air conditioners and the over hanging balconies; I was stating how these things should not be ever allowed to happen again.

1) 8 air conditioners were placed on the fence line beside what at that point was the master...
bedroom to my property. These air conditioners were removed three years after installation for reasons I'm not fully aware of.

2)When I mentioned the balconies, I said luckily; I'm not the poor old man on Madison Street where the Madison group also built another building with balconies that are directly above his fence line, his massive back yard is worthless now.

In our conversation I also mentioned that the cities interactive mapping system is inaccurate in many areas with regards to my property and adjacent new build (81 Cedar St S. and 87 Cedar ST S) The Interactive Mapping System displays the building that was built; as being set in more than my property. 87 Cedar St. S is set back less than 3 feet from the sidewalk; my home is 14 feet and 1 inch set back from the sidewalk. If there are any decisions or discussions, the individuals involved need to see the sites in person. I am more than willing to forward pictures and bring in a copy of my official survey or any information requested.

Thank you again,

Tina Malone Wright

From: Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca
Sent: January 24, 2019 5:59 PM
To: 
Cc: Debbie.Chapman@kitchener.ca; Sarah.FitzPatrick@kitchener.ca; Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca; Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca; SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca
Subject: 81 Cedar Street South and 87 Cedar Street South

Good afternoon,

I am following up on our phone conversations from January 16th and this past Monday, January the 21st.

As discussed the zoning of your property with respect to uses is not intended to change. Between the existing Zoning by-law 85-1 and the new CRoZBy Zoning By-law there are some differences in the names of the respective zones. I believe you are zoned R5 now under Zoning By-law 85-1 and the proposed zoned category in CRoZBy is R4 which is essentially the same zone category with respect to use.

We are still reviewing the setback regulations that will be contained in the new CRoZBy Residential zones. The proposed regulations relate to some of the questions that we asked at the Open House on May 29th, 2018, with respect to the location of garages, front porches and some of the views in the neighbourhood. Dayna Edwards is holding an Urban Design Charrette on Monday, February 11th, which results from this Charrette may also impact the regulations proposed to be contained in the Zone Categories.

With respect to the adjacent property at 87 Cedar Street South, the land use designation and zone category to be applied, are not intended to give more development rights to this property. We will review this further and make the necessary revisions.

As promised, I did ask the Urban Designer that worked on the file, to visit the property at 87 Cedar
Street South to ensure that it was developed in accordance with the approved Site Plan, File SP13/028/C/AP. He visited the site yesterday, January 23rd, and sent me the following:

“As per our conversation I went out to inspect the above noted site and I can confirm that the building and site has been built in general conformity to the approved plans.

I can also confirm that no balconies or air conditioning units are affixed to the exterior of the buildings on the rear(side) facades facing the adjacent properties.

Let me know if you require any further information.”

Once we have the Final Draft Land Use Designation and Zone Categories determined and applied to the Secondary Plans, there will be additional consultation before any decisions are made at Committee/Council.

I would encourage you to attend Dayna’s Urban Design Charrette session on February 11th, 2019. It will be held here at City Hall in the Schmalz Room on the 2nd Floor starting at 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm.

In the interim if there are any additional concerns or questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
Good afternoon

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review process.

Your comments are logged and will be considered moving forward.

Regards,

Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
assemble the properties and ultimately make a profit. We are afraid that the effects of this, will unfortunately lead to some single houses sandwiched in-between newer buildings. If this were to occur, the City of Kitchener and the residents of that neighborhood would miss the opportunity to fulfill the vision that the City of Kitchener has worked hard in developing and that were demonstrated via the 3-D renderings at the open house.

While it is important to take the local residents concerns into consideration when making this plan, we feel that it is also vital that your decisions take into considerations the developers to whom you will be relying on to fulfill the vision for this area. Limiting the height of buildings (according to developers), will lead to an incomplete vision of the area. Please reconsider removing the limit of 5 floors and allowing the maximum height of the MIX-2 zoning to 8 floors as currently allowed for MU-2 zoning.

If you would like to talk to us further about this, please feel free to reach out to us.

Regards,
Hi folks,

As I do not live in the neighbourhood, I will not attempt a comment on Questions 1, 2 or 4.

3. Regarding the UDM Guidelines
There may be situations in which a transition in height may be achieved by increasing the separation between buildings. Often, increasing the separation may not be enough. Having a portion of the new development match the neighbour’s setback and height can help reduce the impact of the taller neighbouring elements.

Other Issues:
We still need to establish clearer communally-accepted rules governing transitions and shadowing. I believe appropriate transitions are based on mirroring the built form limitations of the less intensively used property and then scaling up beyond. If a sloped building is deemed unacceptable, the “treads” of the steps can be widened. As to shadowing, Mississauga’s rules may offer some ideas. Please see


Thank you,

Hal Jaeger
## 5.0 Public Comments and Staff Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>181 Madison Avenue South</td>
<td>Can we please have more traffic calming measures on our increasingly busy streets? I live on Madison South, near Courtland and since the ion construction began, traffic has increased in volume and speed! It is dangerous for our children to walk from our front door, the sidewalk in front of our house to our driveway. As the proposed Secondary Plan would greatly increase the number of people in the neighbourhood and therefore cars, we would appreciate this being taken into consideration.</td>
<td>As more density is added to the neighbourhood, it is hoped that there is increased use of the ION by the residents of and visitors to the neighbourhood rather an increase in vehicular traffic. Zoning and Urban Design guidelines can assist by requiring new developments to address the street to create, support and/or enhance pedestrian-friendly streets with the provision of wide sidewalks and street furniture and trees and in the case of Mixed Use buildings ground floors that address the public realm through their use, enhanced glazing and design treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>212 Stirling Avenue South</td>
<td>Thank you for doing this, citizens involvement is very important for me. I think one things that wasn’t addressed is the mixing of the neighbourhood. Improvements are great but I think it’s important that the people that live in the neighbourhood can afford to live there. I think you should be careful about having rentals, condos and affordable housing.</td>
<td>The PARTS Central Plan reviewed the land uses in the areas around the ION stops to ensure a mix of uses and densities to support the ION. Housing that is affordable is an important planning consideration, particularly in proximity to public transit. The PARTS Central Plan recommended that Bonusing for additional height and density could be used to encourage the provision of affordable housing, but this approach has been changed through provincial legislation. This will be examined and reviewed further through the Secondary Plan review as well as through additional work that the City is doing with respect to an Affordable Housing Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 Mill Street</td>
<td>Please consider not including the lots for 11 Mill St. and 15 Mill St. in the new medium density residential zoning. These two lots are not deep enough for apartment or townhouse development. In addition, we have a commercial business registered at 11 Mill St. So it is imperative that we maintain the mixed residential and commercial zoning for our lot.</td>
<td>The properties at 11 and 15 Mill Street are currently designated 'Low Density Commercial Residential' and zone 'CR-1'. The proposed land use and zoning that was shown at the Open House was 'Medium Rise Residential' to implement the recommendation for land use in the PARTS Central Plan. Given these parcel's size and proximity/adjacency to the Mixed Use properties on Queen Street, it is proposed that these 2 properties be designated 'Mixed Use' and zone 'MU-1'. This is consistent with the recommendation for the lots on Queen Street in the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan. The properties at 19-41 Mill Street will continue to be recommended for Medium Rise Residential, while the listed property at 43 Mill Street and the properties to the south will be recommended to be designated Low Rise Residential. This change will maintain the existing Mixed Use land use designation and zoning of the properties at 11 and 15 Mill Street, provide an opportunity for a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4 | Melissa Bowman  
Written June 5, 2018 | I attended the open house Tuesday evening and appreciated the opportunity for input. The one question I thought of later was this: with PARTS, CHL, CRoZBy, urban guidelines, the OP, RIENS, etc, how do those all fit together? Is there a hierarchy of some sort? I picture them as all pieces to the same puzzle but I am guessing at some point there may be a conflict between some of them. In which case, does something, like the OP, 'trump' the others? | medium rise form of housing to accommodate additional families in the neighbourhood while also providing the listed property and low rise residential built form to be maintained on the southwesterly side of Mill Street.  
• Good question and I talked about a number of pieces of the puzzle last Tuesday evening.  
• The hierarchy of documents under the Planning Act is the Official Plan and Zoning By-law which implements the Official Plan.  
• The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters for a 20 year timeframe. A ‘Secondary Plan’ is a more detailed land use and policy document that forms part of the Official Plan, and is used by the City to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city. The City’s Zoning By-law (currently By-law 85-1) is a tool that implements the City’s Official Plan. The Zoning By-law contains regulations to state what uses can be developed on a property, the size of a building, its location of a lot and parking requirements, among other things.  
• The City’s ten (10) Secondary Plans were deferred, as part of the review of the new 2014 Official Plan, to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).  
• Now that these studies are done, the City is in a position to commence review of the existing Secondary Plan with a view of bringing them into the new 2014 Official Plan.  
• Since the approval of the 2014 Official Plan, the City has also commenced the review of the City’s new Zoning By-law known as the CRoZBy project (Comprehensive Review of the Zoning By-law). The CRoZBy has not applied new zone categories to the lands in the deferred Secondary Plans.  
• The City has also commenced the review of its Urban Design Manual. A draft of the City’s Urban Design Guidelines will be considered at a meeting on June 18, 2018. The City uses Urban Design |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 | Karen Taylor-Harrison Written: June 8, 2018 | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
Additional Comments | Guidelines to assist in the review of development applications but it does not have authority under the Planning Act like a Zoning By-law.  
- The PARTS, CHL and RIENS studies/plans may have different land uses and suggest different regulations, but they have no legal status under the Planning Act until they are incorporated into an Official Plan and Zoning By-law.  
- As mentioned, we have commenced the review of the Secondary Plans to update them based on the studies that have been completed and apply new zoning. There could be other tools that the City applies; i.e. new urban design guidelines, tools under the Ontario Heritage Act, and these will be determined through the consultation process. |

Thank you for your response. I think at this juncture, we may have to leave the meeting until September. Tina, can you please tell me when the plan became a public document? When will the secondary plan go back to Council?  
- Sounds good. We can touch base later this summer, early September to set something up with the Neighbourhood Association.  
- To answer your question about when the plan became a public document, I am going to assume you meant the Secondary Plan. In short, we have not prepared the formal Secondary Plan for public consultation. We are not there yet.  
- The City’s ten (10) Secondary Plans were deferred, as part of the review of the new 2014 Official Plan, to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework in these areas. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study and Plans, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).  
- Now that these studies are done, the City is in a position to commence review of the existing Secondary Plans with a view of bringing them into the new 2014 Official Plan.  
- The Open House that was held on May 29th, was the initial meeting to ‘kick off’ the review of the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. We mailed letters advising of the review and this initial meeting to just over 650 properties. The Open House was the starting point to present a draft map of proposed land uses based on the PARTS Central Plan for comment, and to ask for input related to community features and character to inform the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
Additional Comments | | development of the Secondary Plan policies and other tools that may be required to assist in the implementation of the Secondary Plan. i.e. zoning, urban design guidelines, cultural heritage tools (listing, designation), site plan control.  
• Once we have a new draft Secondary Plan, implementing zoning and any appropriate tools, with input from the neighbourhoods, we will be further engaging with the neighbourhoods before anything is brought before Committee/Council.  
• We advised at the Open House that there would be no Council decisions in 2018.  
• The information presented at the May 29th Open House is posted on the City’s website and I have attached the link for easy reference.  
• Any comments and/or feedback that the Neighbourhood Association can provide in advance of staff being able to attend a meeting and facilitate is very much welcomed.  
| 6 | 81 Cedar Street South  
Written: June 10, 2018 | First, I must say that the design of ‘Cedar Hill’ is impressive. The questions I have come more from a parental perspective and I do understand if you don’t have answers at this time, but it doesn’t hurt to ask.  
1. How soon do these projects intend to be started?  
2. Will all of these new developments happen or are they just ideas at this point?  
3. Will residents be made aware of future meetings on development progress?  
4. Where do the men’s shelters intend to be moved to?  
5. Are there plans for new schools as a result of the increased population?  
6. Are there ‘green space’ provisions being considered for this mass number of new residents?  
If you have answers or any direction for me regarding these questions, it would be greatly appreciated. And again, I only ask since my main concern is whether this new vision of the downtown has a ‘family friendly’ perspective, or if I should start looking on MLS to potentially relocate. | 1. I am not quite sure what you mean by ‘projects’? The City-initiated new Secondary Plan or proponent-driven development applications?  
The Open House that was held on May 29th, was the initial meeting to ‘kick off’ the review of the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. We mailed letters advising of the review and this initial meeting to just over 650 properties. The Open House was the starting point to present a draft map of proposed land uses based on the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Central Plan for comment, and to ask for input related to community features and character to inform the development of the Secondary Plan policies and other tools that may be required to assist in the implementation of the Secondary Plan. i.e. zoning, urban design guidelines, cultural heritage tools (listing, designation), site plan control.  
Once we have a new draft Secondary Plan, implementing zoning and any appropriate tools, with input from the neighbourhoods, we will be further engaging with the neighbourhoods before anything is brought before Committee/Council.  
We advised at the Open House that there would be no Council decisions in 2018.  
If your question is with respect to proponent- |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initiated developments, these are not within the City’s control and the City cannot predict when a particular property will develop/redevelop, if at all. 2. The new Secondary Plan and Zoning will assign land uses and provide zoning regulations to indicate what the maximum permitted development of lands with the secondary plan can be. Any 3D modelling that was presented at the Open House is a representation of “what could be” under the proposed land use designation that were shown at the Open House. Again, proponent-initiated developments cannot be anticipated/predicted. However based on the proposed land use and zoning one can have an idea of what the development potential of a property is. 3. With respect to the new Secondary Plan, there will be additional meetings and community consultation. Proponent-initiated developments would only be made aware to residents if the proponent was seeking an Official Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Minor Variance application to facilitate the development (looking to develop something that is not permitted by the land use designation and/or zoning by-law). Site Plan applications to develop a property within the existing provisions of the zoning by-law are not circulated to the public. 4. The new Secondary Plan will indicate proposed land use and what uses would be permitted in a particular land use designation. If the men’s shelter is not permitted in the new land use designation in the Secondary Plan then this use would become legal non-conforming and be permitted to continue until such time as they relocate to another property. Their decision to stay or relocate based on the proposed land use is theirs and I am not aware of their future plans. 5. The new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan proposes to retain the existing Institutionally designated lands and is not proposing any new lands be designated Institutional. The need for a new school would be determined by the appropriate school boards. 6. The provision of ‘Green space’ is a consideration in the development of the new Secondary Plan. Parkland dedication is a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    |                  | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
|    |                  | Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
|    |                  | Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
|    |                  | Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
|    |                  | Additional Comments | requirement of the redevelopment of properties and it can be given in the form of land or monies. |
| 7  | 15 Mill Street   | My household and many of our neighbours are not in favour of the zoning change for the west side of Mill street. We would not like to see apartment buildings here.  
|    | Written: June 16, 2018 | There are many families here...it's already a nice neighbourhood.  
|    |                  | There are many historic buildings here...many century homes. | The properties at 11 and 15 Mill Street are currently designated 'Low Density Commercial Residential' and zoned 'CR-1'. The proposed land use and zoning that was shown at the Open House was 'Medium Rise Residential' to implement the recommendation for land use in the PARTS Central Plan. Given these parcel’s size and proximity/adjacency to the Mixed Use properties on Queen Street, it is proposed that these two properties be designated 'Mixed Use' and zone 'MU-1'. This is consistent with the recommendation for the lots on Queen Street in the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan. The properties at 19-41 Mill Street will continue to be recommended for Medium Rise Residential, while the listed property at 45 Mill Street and the properties to the south will be recommended to be designated Low Rise Residential. This change will maintain the existing Mixed Use land use designation and zoning of the properties at 11 and 15 Mill Street, provide an opportunity for a medium rise form of housing to accommodate additional families in the neighbourhood while also providing the listed property and low rise residential built form to be maintained on the southwesterly side of Mill Street. |
| 8  | 49 Courtland Avenue East | My name is ___ and we met at the public open house secondary review plan for the new Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek area. I am emailing you to see if you could provide me a digital package of some or all the information that was presented during the open house. I own the house at 49 Courtland Ave East, so ideally information that applies to the houses on Courtland/Benton would be beneficial.  
<p>|    | Written: June 28, 2018 | In addition to the new proposed zoning, if you could send a few of artistic drawings you presented at the | Good to hear from you. All the info, including 3D renderings are posted here: <a href="https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/cedar-hill-and-schneider-creek.aspx">https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/cedar-hill-and-schneider-creek.aspx</a> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>John MacDonald</td>
<td>Is there a place online where we can go to experience and use the modelling that was shown at the May 29th meeting, showing potential massing, heights, and possibilities within and around the area of the planning boundary?</td>
<td>Thank you for your question. The 3D renderings that were prepared for the May 29th Open House have been placed on the City’s website, along with the other information presented at the meeting, and can be found at the link below. <a href="https://www.kitchener.ca/en/planning-and-development-consultations.aspx#">https://www.kitchener.ca/en/planning-and-development-consultations.aspx#</a> The renderings and modelling that were prepared for the meeting on the 29th were based on the extensive modelling work that was completed for the PARTS Central Plan. The proposed land uses in the new Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan that were shown at the meeting are based on this work and the approved PARTS Central Plan. I have copied Adam Clark, who was involved in the PARTS Central Plan, attended the May 29th Open House, and created the 3D model and renderings for both projects. For any specific questions, I would suggest contacting Adam. He will be able to assist you in your analysis of potential massing and heights in the proposed secondary plan boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Amanda Stellings, Polocorp Inc. 19-41 Mill Street</td>
<td>Please see attached our comments for the proposed Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. 19-41 Mill Street, Kitchener 5.0 Moving Forward Polocorp Inc. formally requests that the land designation for the subject lands be changed to 'High Density Mixed Use' to accommodate the changes in planning policies on the provincial, regional, and local levels. This is in alignment with the proposed development for the subject lands, as submitted for a Pre-Submission Consultation Meeting. Development in this area is ongoing, and the land uses within the Secondary Plan should be consistent to reflect the changes that will occur within, and adjacent to Queen Street South, identified as a Transit Corridor and Primary Intensification Area.</td>
<td>The properties at 19-41 Mill Street are currently designated ‘Low Density Commercial Residential’ and zoned ‘CR-1’. The proposed land use and zoning that was shown at the Open House was ‘Medium Rise Residential’ to implement the recommendation for land use in the PARTS Central Plan. The request for land use is for ‘High Rise Residential’ given the location of the lands in the PARTS Central Plan. The purpose of the Secondary Plan Review is not for the consideration of site-specific proposals which require detailed review and public consultation not contemplated through the PARTS Central Plan. Owner initiated site-specific OPA and ZBA applications would be required to implement a High Rise Residential land use designation on the subject lands wherein the specifics of the proposal and appropriateness of such a land use designation would be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10 Whitney Place</td>
<td>I wanted to let you know that neighbours in the Schneider Creek neighbourhood have met to discuss comments on the proposed secondary plan for the area. We are still finalizing comments and will have them sent to you shortly.</td>
<td>I look forward to receiving the comments and feedback on the consultation materials that were presented at the Open House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John MacDonald</td>
<td>I’ve conferred with other building ownership at 141 Whitney Place, based on the City’s potential review of the property at 141 Whitney Place as somehow being worthy of a form of heritage designation. This idea was floated in the recent public meeting for the new Secondary Plan for Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek, which I attended. We object strongly to the potential for such designation, and see no grounds for it. We ask that the property be removed from any such consideration. My understanding from conversation is that the criterium for such a designation is that it may end a vista (although not much, as a single storey building at the bottom of a slope). By this criterium there would be an enormous number of properties with heritage designation, at every abrupt turn in street or T-intersection. We do not believe this is at all grounds for contemplating a designation. Please do not hesitate to call if you require further clarity regarding our position in this matter. I’m cc-ing Greg Hayton, who liaises with Globe Studios, for information. Thank you for your consideration. On behalf of the property ownership (Globe Studios (K-W) and CityWorks Development and Management Inc.</td>
<td>Staff have identified important terminating vistas that contribute to the cultural heritage landscape within the proposed Cedar Hill Schneider Creek secondary plan area. These terminating vistas were initially identified based on the Kitchener Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood: Making our Neighbourhood Great! document (identified as a community asset and view), and various site visits and discussions among the staff working team. At the May 29, 2018 public open house, the majority of residents responded that terminating vistas within the neighbourhood were either somewhat important, or very important. One of three examples of a terminating vista provided to residents was that of 141 Whitney Place. Staff are not proposing to designate 141 Whitney Place. Staff are proposing that terminating vistas be listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. Some of the terminating vistas are already listed while other are not. Currently, 141 Whitney Place is not listed. It is important to understand the impact of listing on the Municipal Heritage Register. Listing does not provide protection under the Ontario Heritage Act, does not impose restrictions or obligations with respect to obtaining heritage approvals under the Ontario Heritage Act (e.g. a Heritage Permit is not required, review by the City’s Heritage Kitchener committee is not required, etc.), and does not require Council approval to make alterations. Listing has two implications. First, listing does increase the amount of time municipalities have to process demolition applications made under the Ontario Building Code to provide time to evaluate whether a property merits some form of protection, such as designation, under the Ontario Heritage Act, which is subject to a separate legal process with appeal mechanisms. Second, listing does allow the City to ask for a Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan, if necessary, as part of a complete Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    |                   | **Question 1:** What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
**Question 2:** What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
**Question 3:** What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
**Question 4:** What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
**Additional Comments** | Planning Act application in order to address conservation policies outlined in the Ontario Planning Act and the Provincial Policy Statement. Staff will consider your comments along with those of other residents and members of the public as we continue to draft the secondary plan for this area. |
| 13 | Cedar Hill Neighbourhood Association  
Written: October 31, 2018 | Concerned about traffic on Peter St, Church st and St. George St. They are also concerned about old trees at the back of the properties on Courtland during the development. | We require Tree Management Plans as part of the Site Plan Approval Process. Planning Staff forwarded the traffic concerns to the Director of Transportation. |
| 14 | Bryan Cooper  
Written: November 13, 2018 | **Boundary of Secondary Plan:**  
Why was the corner of Courtland Ave and Benton (148 Benton St) now included in the boundary of the secondary plan? This land is currently vacant and treed and forms a natural boundary of the neighbourhood. This property should be included in the boundary of the secondary plan and appropriate land use designations and zoning applied. Consideration of extending the secondary plan to the limits of property ownership (25 Courtland Ave) would make sense.  
Existing site specific policies - former Schneider Factor and Courtland Ave public school:  
Current secondary plan has site specific policies for these lands. Are these policies intended to be eliminated with the new secondary plan or will they be carried forward? Site specific policies should be provided for these lands since they represent likely redevelopment opportunities in the neighbourhood. Access prohibitions from any local roads (Benton, Martin, Peter, Cedar) should be incorporated into the policy and zoning as well as site specific standards for building setbacks (stepbacks and terracing), landscaping and buffering of parking areas. City should consider a proactive neighbourhood design charrette for these sites in advance of completion of the secondary plan to guide the long term redevelopment of these lands.  
Benton St and Martin St- land use designations:  
In order to maintain the low rise residential character of Benton St, 145, 147, 149 Benton St should be designated low rise residential conservation as is | Thank you for the attached compiled comments on behalf of some of the residents within the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood.  
We will definitely review the comments but given the timing of the comments and the meeting on Tuesday, November 20, 2018, they may or may not be reflected in the visuals and other materials that are proposed to be presented at the meeting.  
Moving forward, these comments and any comments that we receive with respect to the visuals/materials presented on Tuesday evening will be considered in the final draft of the new Secondary Plan and Zoning when it goes to Committee in the Fall of 2019. If I have any questions or need further clarification on your neighbourhood’s comments, I will definitely be in touch.  
Hopefully you and the residents of the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood will be able to attend on Nov. 20th. See you then. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proposed on the opposite side of Benton St. Similarly 26 Martin St and the Martin St frontage of 63 Courtland Ave should be designated low rise residential conservation and zoned accordingly to ensure that any new development completes what is currently a disrupted low rise residential streetscape. Building height and regulations along Courtland Ave: Agree with including height restrictions along Courtland Ave; however, careful consideration of the interface between existing homes along Martin St and Cedar St. is required including accounting for the grade changes between Courtland Ave and Martin St. This difference in topography should be considered in determining the overall building height. For example, the maximum building height of a development fronting on Courtland Ave. in this area should be determined from the lowest point of the shared rear lot line of the properties on Martin St that back onto properties fronting on Courtland Ave. This will assist in mitigating the impact of taller buildings and provide for the continued enjoyment of the private backyard space of the Martin Street residences which is important since the proximity of our homes to the street, or public spaces, means that our private spaces are limited to our rear yards. These much needed and valued spaces add great benefit to our residents in terms of liveability. There are concerns that with Bonusing permissions a developer may be able to exceed any height restriction applied in the secondary plan. This is of particular concern due to the above mentioned grade changes between Courtland Ave. and Martin St. The maximum height regulations for Courtland Ave should be a metric measurement rather than measured in &quot;storeys&quot; since the ceiling height of each storey can have a significant impact on the overall height of the building (e.g Breithaupt Block 3). This also gives greater certainty to the public in how tall a building may be. Zoning standards such as stepbacks should be applied to any new multi-storey building so that the building heights are at the lowest height at the interface of existing low rise buildings and property. Building massing and height should be oriented towards Courtland Ave rather than existing single detached dwellings and local streets. Parking Areas and Structures need to be carefully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
  Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
  Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
  Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
  Additional Comments | | managed particularly at the interface of existing low rise residential areas. The overall building height should include any parking structure. Parking structures should not project above grade to avoid blank walls backing onto homes or streets. Building setbacks to Courtland Avenue - front yard setbacks should be measured from the existing limits if this Regional road rather than from any future road widening taken by the Region. This will avoid pushing a building closer to the rear yard area of homes on Martin St.  
  Severance/minor infilling criteria:  
  Criteria should be developed to consider any new severance applications within the neighbourhood. Criteria should include whether the lot has sufficient frontage to properly accommodate a new building, parking and landscaping. Properties in the neighbourhood have very narrow frontages and the lack of boulevard means that any landscaping needs to be provide within the front yard of private property. Wide driveways and attached garages within the front yard should not be permitted. Some form of architectural control or site plan approval should be required for new infilling of severance lots (or rebuilding of an existing lot) to ensure building style is compatible with surrounding building stock (materials, roof pitch, etc). Garages should be limited to being detached and in the rear yard. Policies should be developed that require new developments to be respectful of the character of the streetscape of this unique neighbourhood- with the open porches, the front doors facing the street, the narrow lots, tightly squeezed houses, tiny front yards, the rooflines, etc.  
  Front yard landscaping in new developments:  
  A suggestion was made by staff at the neighbourhood meeting about the possibility of publicly owned trees within private front yard space for new developments. This should be implemented since there is no opportunity for trees to be installed within the City owned road. Financial securities should be taken should be taken for the publicly owned trees with an extended hold period post construction to ensure that they are established and thrive.  
  Zoning Standards:  
  Minimum front yard landscaped open space standard should be incorporated in the zoning of the area to | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maintain limited front yard landscaping. Maximum driveway width standards that account for the very narrow lot frontages of the area should also be applied. A minimum landscaping strip along the side lot lines within the front yard to eliminate driveways being installed across the frontage of a property or connecting with adjoining lots should also be applied. This is particularly important for any home that is duplexed to ensure that already small front yards of the neighbourhood are not paved over. Transportation: Courtland Ave currently functions as a barrier between the Schneider Creek and Cedar Hill neighbourhoods. The PARTS plan indicates some streetscaping enhancements are intended for this Regional road - how will this implemented and coordinated with the Region and new development in the area and what opportunity for public involvement will there be. Parking - zoning standards require too much parking for new multi-unit developments and as a result too much of a site is often dedicated to parking when it could be better utilized as amenity space and landscaping. Consider reducing parking standards. General Comments on the neighbourhood and new development: Diversity: The community would like to see new developments provide spaces for families as well as single people and couples - in doing this we will continue to support this community allowing it to remain vibrant and diverse. Families will also ensure that existing infrastructure, such as schools, remain useful. Consider standards that would require a developer to incorporate some family sized dwelling units. Streets: Concerns have been raised regarding the often very narrow, yet charming, streets in this area with regard to their ability to handle increased traffic - it would be inappropriate or undesirable to have any new developments use these streets as a back door access - part of the charm of our community are these often one way, narrow streets which greatly enhance and encourage our social engagement. This close proximity of homes and street provides a unique opportunity to gather, chat and play on the street itself. This makes the community feel safe because we have eyes on the street and know our</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
Additional Comments |
| | Neighbours.  
Walkability:  
It is a great community asset to be able to walk or bike the iron horse trail or amble around to our parks and downtown. Not always needing a car is something we hope to see supported through the new growth - the experience at street level will be key to encouraging foot traffic, so scale of buildings, materials used and a mix of uses including shops and retail needs to be planned. Potential destinations are needed.  
Residents understand the need to move traffic along but suggest lowering the speed limit on regional roads and streets in the core to improve walkability since it contributes to the enjoyment of living in the core.  
Sidewalks:  
The current sidewalks on some side streets are quite narrow and result in many pedestrians choosing to walk on the street. In addition, steeply angled driveways create slants that make it difficult to maintain your balance and can lead to overturned strollers childrens' tricycles and wagons, as well as slips and falls, particularly in poor weather conditions. This can be especially problematic for anyone with a mobility challenge or the elderly. In addition the narrow sidewalks leave very little space to put snow or garbage/green bin/blue bins which results in an additional mobility barrier.  
Residents acknowledge that the streets in the area were relatively recently reconstructed and therefore there may not be an immediate solution to this issue but wanted to light the problem to the City and would like some direction on what process to engage the City in when the time comes for reconstruction of the streets. When the time comes for reconstruction it will be important to consider alternative designs to address this issue but that is still respectful of the character of the neighbourhood.  
Trees and green spaces:  
The community would like to see an increase in the minimum allotment of green space around new buildings - more lawns, gardens, trees make for a pleasing streetscape and add to community enjoyment. We know this helps promote overall goals that the city has already indicated wanting to achieve. | Staff Response |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | 46, 49, 53 Courtland Avenue East  
Written: December 17, 2018 | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
Additional Comments | Thank-you for hosting the 2nd public open house neighborhood meeting for the New Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.  
My partners and I own the 46, 49 and 53 Courtland Ave East properties. As owners of these properties that will be see a change in zoning, we have been in contact with several developers regarding the properties and wanted to share with you some of the feedback we have received. Currently the three properties are zoned CR-1 and the proposed change would see the zoning changed to MIX-2 (MU-2).  
A CR-1 zoning today, allows for a maximum building height of 18 meters or approximately 4 floors, while MU-2 zoning allows for up to 8 floors. With your proposed change in zoning, the properties along Courtland Ave would change to a MIX-2 zoning with a cap at 5 floors (as we have been told). This limit of 5 floors effectively makes this a minor change as the difference between the current allowed height and the proposed height of 5 floors would be the addition of 1 floor to the current CR-1 zoning.  
This limit of 5 floors is something that all the developers we have spoken to have commented on as a deterrent to them looking to purchase and assemble the properties along Courtland Ave. My partners and I are also in agreement that such a limit will deter developers from trying to assemble properties along the street as there is not enough building space allowed to entice developers to assemble the properties and ultimately make a profit. We are afraid that the effects of this, will unfortunately lead to some single houses sandwiched in-between newer buildings. If this were to occur, the City of Kitchener and the residents of that neighborhood would miss the opportunity to fulfill the vision that the City of Kitchener has worked hard in developing and that were demonstrated via the 3-D renderings at the open house. While it is important to take the local residents concerns into | A 5 floor max height was reviewed through the PARTS Central Plan and supported through the recommendation (3D modeling). Maximum height provision will be maintained. There may be transitional setbacks. |

End of comments received after first open house.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54 and 58 Madison Avenue</td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: November 20, 2018</td>
<td>1. Please look at the consistent use of the mid-rise plan at Madison and Church. The original plan was for mid-rise on the church corner of Charles but now is low rise. 2. Can you please change these properties to medium density like the one across the street? 3. The neighbours on Church and Madison do not like the fact that it goes from high density 58 Madison 62 Madison and up the street but they should have medium density for their lots.</td>
<td>We have reviewed the lot fabric in the area. It does not appear conducive to support medium rise built form and could not accommodate this density and appropriate transition from low rise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81 Cedar Street South Contacted: January 16, 2019 and January 21, 2019</td>
<td>Concerns with adjacent property 87 Cedar Street South - amount of development on site and ensuring that only existing zoning permissions are maintained. This site currently has R-6 zoning. Proposing Medium Rise and new R-6 zoning. Should only have Low Rise Residential and new R-5.</td>
<td>I am following up on our phone conversations from January 16th and this past Monday, January the 21st. As discussed the zoning of your property with respect to uses is not intended to change. Between the existing Zoning by-law 85-1 and the new CRoZBy Zoning By-law there are some differences in the names of the respective zones. I believe you are zoned R5 now under Zoning By-law 85-1 and the proposed zoned category in CRoZBy is R4 which is essentially the same zone category with respect to use. We are still reviewing the setback regulations that will be contained in the new CRoZBy Residential zones. The proposed regulations relate to some of the questions that we asked at the Open House on May 29th, 2018, with respect to the location of garages, front porches and some of the views in the neighbourhood. Dayna Edwards is holding an Urban Design Charrette on Monday, February 11th, which results from this Charrette may also impact the regulations proposed to be contained in the Zone Categories. With respect to the adjacent property at 87 Cedar Street South, the land use designation and zone category to be applied, are not intended to give more development rights to this property. We will review this further and make the necessary revisions. As promised, I did ask the Urban Designer that worked on the file, to visit the property at 87 Cedar Street South to ensure that it was developed in accordance with the approved Site Plan, File SP13/028/C/AP. He visited the site yesterday, January 23rd, and sent me the following: “As per our conversation I went out to inspect the above noted site and I can confirm that the building and site has been built in general conformity to the approved plans. I can also confirm that no balconies or air conditioning units are affixed to the exterior of the buildings on the rear/side facades facing the adjacent properties. Let me know if you require any further information.” Once we have the Final Draft Land Use Designation and Zone Categories determined and applied to the Secondary Plans, there will be...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>additional consultation before any decisions are made at Committee/Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>81 Cedar Street South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Written: January 28, 2019 | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
Additional Comments |
|   | Thank you for taking the time to address my concerns.  
In regards to our last conversation, I wanted to clarify my concerns with future developments and the adjacent property built by the Madison group.  
My concern with the new proposed set back regulations; is they will be misused by developers.  
The guidelines discussed in the planning departments proposal allows developers a legal loop whole to tear down existing structures and put new structures at the same side and front set back distance as old structures. The builders will use the closest point of old structure to the neighbouring property. While making the new structure larger in length and width; of coarse to maximize profits their roofs will not slope and be more box like to increase living space. The windows of any adjacent properties that face |
|   | Thank you for your email and for clarifying your concerns in writing.  
These comments are very useful and will inform future consideration of the zoning regulations that will be applied to future developments in the neighbourhood. Part of the reason for the zoning review is to ensure new developments and future infill are compatible in scale and character with surrounding properties, the streetscape and overall neighbourhood. Some of the issues/concerns that you have expressed were also shared by other property owners/neighbourhoods before and during the RIENS (Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods) Study. The RIENS Study is one of the reasons for the review of the zoning regulations in our central neighbourhoods. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?</td>
<td>As I mentioned in my last email I would encourage you to attend Dayna’s Urban Design Charrette session on February 11th, 2019. It will be a great opportunity to discuss several of the items of concern in your email and how they can be potentially addressed either through a guideline, a zoning regulation or both. Thank you again. We look forward to discussing further with you as we progress in the Official Plan and Zoning By-law review for the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>new build are not all negatively affected. For example: my home for instance does not get any direct sunlight after mid morning on the main floor. Three of my large windows currently look at solid brick wall and 15 gas meters. I know you can’t tear down what has been built, but you shouldn’t allow this to happen to anyone else either. My concern with the proposed zone changes are adjacent property now can build up higher with new categories. It may not be your intention with current developments, but if the city amends their policies as outlined. Any developer will use them to their advantage to maximize their profits. They don’t care about history and that my home was built in the late 1800’s. As I stated on the phone. I don’t fault the current planning committee for previous decisions, but when you indicated that you sent an individual to check that the build generally complies with the approved building papers and he said that it does; that’s very difficult to understand. My main concern is for the safety of my family. Here are the issues I stated over the phone. I’d like to mention a lot of these issues can be fixed without tearing down the existing structure. 1) 15 gas meters placed under 7 feet from my driveway without any real safe guards put in place. (there are no metal posts in ground protecting these meters from any possible impact) 2) The roof that is slanted towards my property on the building closest to Cedar Street builds up with snow whenever there is a large snowfall. That snow comes crashing down all at once due to slope of roof. It falls directly into my driveway due to close proximity. My main concern there is for the safety of my children. 3) The landscaping of the property has also been sloped towards my property, so all rain and snow; melt or pour into my driveway. Even the downspouts are placed to go onto there grass where it is sloped towards my property and the water comes directly into my driveway. 4) poor visibility for getting out of my driveway as well; minimum 14-foot visibility triangle not given (especially being on top of hill. visibility is already hindered.) 5) Where the fence begins to go on angle in back end of my property; it begins to encroach on my land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
Additional Comments | |
| | | Importance of this is that the second structure is built closer than first structure. It has overhanging built out lofts. (Overhang is less than two feet from my property line)  
I’d further like to clarify, when I spoke about the 8 air conditioners and the over hanging balconies; I was stating how these things should not be ever allowed to happen again.  
1) 8 air conditioners were placed on the fence line beside what at that point was the master bedroom to my property. These air conditioners were removed three years after installation for reasons I’m not fully aware of.  
2) When I mentioned the balconies, I said luckily; I’m not the poor old man on Madison Street where the Madison group also built another building with balconies that are directly above his fence line, his massive back yard is worthless now.  
In our conversation I also mentioned that the cities interactive mapping system is inaccurate in many areas with regards to my property and adjacent new build (81 Cedar St. S. and 87 Cedar ST S) The Interactive Mapping System displays the building that was built; as being set in more than my property. 87 Cedar St. S is set back less than 3 feet from the sidewalk; my home is 14 feet and 1 inch set back from the sidewalk. If there are any decisions or discussions, the individuals involved need to see the sites in person. I am more willing to forward pictures and bring in a copy of my official survey or any information requested. | |
| 5 | Written: November 20, 2018 | As I do not live in the neighbourhood, I will not attempt a comment on Questions 1, 2 or 4.  
3. Regarding the UDM Guidelines  
There may be situations in which a transition in height may be achieved by increasing the separation between buildings. Often, increasing the separation may not be enough. Having a portion of the new development match the neighbour’s setback and height can help reduce the impact of the taller neighbouring elements.  
Other Issues:  
We still need to establish clearer communally-accepted rules governing transitions and shadowing. I believe appropriate transitions are based on mirroring the built form limitations of the less | An urban design charrette was held February 11, 2019. Transitional issues will be reviewed through the application of the zone category and also addressed through the Urban Design Guidelines. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?</td>
<td>Staff have reviewed the submitted visioning report. All urban design recommendations outlined have been reviewed and considered by urban design staff while undergoing the update to the urban design manual. All relevant proposed land use and zoning comments and concerns related to this secondary plan area process have been copied and responded to by staff below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>John Macdonald Architects Sally Gunz</td>
<td>intensively used property and then scaling up beyond. If a sloped building is deemed unacceptable, the “treads” of the steps can be widened. As to shadowing, Mississauga’s rules may offer some ideas. Please see <a href="http://www6.mississauga.ca/onlinemaps/planbldg/UrbanDesign/FinalStandards_ShadowStudies_July2014.pdf">http://www6.mississauga.ca/onlinemaps/planbldg/UrbanDesign/FinalStandards_ShadowStudies_July2014.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: June 20, 2019</td>
<td>Please find the attached a Visioning Report prepared by the Cedar Hills Community as input for the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support the proposed new zoning. This project began with the work of City staff who encouraged us to prepare our own vision document. We were assisted as we began this project by John Macdonald and Elyn Lin of John Macdonald Architects. John and Elyn led the community in the initial visioning exercise and have shown continued interest throughout spring 2019. The community has been involved throughout. We will be preparing a print version of this document in due course but in truth we want to let this ‘sit’ for a couple of weeks or so in order that we may back for a final proof-read with fresh eyes. But since we believe the substance is all there, we wanted to get you this almost final version now in e-form so that you can consider its content as you conduct your work. Of course we will ensure you have a final hard copy version as soon as it is available. I believe I speak on behalf of all the community when I say that we are all most grateful for the City Staff support and the support of you, Debbie. Throughout the recent zoning meetings we have been struck by the openness of everyone we have met to considering the community perspective, even when we are mixed up at times and not always clear. For all of this we thank you. Of course we hope that this document is a beginning for further discussion. We would be thrilled if suggestions might be incorporated into your proposals. No doubt you will have further suggestions for improvement. Thanks. And please pass this on to any relevant City staff whom I have inadvertently omitted in this e-mail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Justification and Summary

General Justification:

- RES-3 zone applied generally across established low rise residential streets to maintain the existing character, with limited permissions for additional uses.
- Properties fronting Courtland Avenue given increased permissions with Medium Rise Mixed Use designation and zone (MIX-2) but limited to a 5-storey height limit to maintain character and require new development to have appropriate transition to low rise residential.
- Individual low rise residential properties were identified to be zoned as RES-5 dependent on the existing use as well as lot size and lot width.
- Properties on the north side of Church Street identified as Medium Rise Residential in the PARTS Central Preferred Plan were designated as Low Rise Residential and zoned RES-3 through this review based on the existing use of the properties and lot fabric.
- Lands south of Whitney Place previously zoned for General Industrial uses have been designated Innovation Employment and zoned EMP-6 to permit more compatible uses adjacent to the established neighbourhood and floodplain, and reflects the recommendations of the PARTS Plan.
- PARTS Central Plan recommended that bonusing for additional height and density could be used to encourage the provision of affordable housing. This will be examined and reviewed further through the secondary plan review as well as through additional work that the City is doing with respect to an Affordable Housing Strategy.
- Special policies were created and added to this neighbourhood that speak to maintaining the existing character through new development that considers front porch design and garage location.

Site Specific Justification:

- 11 and 15 Mill Street: Proposed to be Medium Rise Residential on the first draft of this secondary plan. Changed designation to Mixed Use to reflect existing uses of the properties and justified through their proximity to a major corridor (Queen Street South).
- 19-41 Mill Street: Proposed to be Medium Rise Residential on the first draft of this secondary plan to implement the recommendation from the PARTS Central Plan. High Rise Residential was requested for this property but Staff do not support the change from Low Density Commercial Residential to this land use. Staff have determined that this change would require an owner-initiated site specific Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications on these lands and falls outside the scope of this review.
- 87 Cedar Street South: Proposed to maintain Medium Rise Residential land use designation. Concerns were expressed regarding increased permissions for this property. Staff have reviewed and maintained the existing permissions.
- 91 Madison Ave S: Proposed to be Institutional on the draft of this secondary plan. PARTS designated the property as Medium Rise Residential and the property is currently zoned as R-6. Staff determined that an Institutional designation and INS-1 zone are more appropriate for this property.
# Table of Contents

1.0 Objective ................................................................................................................................. 1

2.0 Considerations .......................................................................................................................... 2
   2.1 Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) – Rockway Study Area ......................... 2
   2.2 Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS) ......................... 2
   2.3 Urban Design Guidelines (UDG) ............................................................................................ 2

3.0 Process Timeline ...................................................................................................................... 4

4.0 Public Consultation Materials .................................................................................................. 5
   Open House Notice ..................................................................................................................... 6
   Staff Presentation ....................................................................................................................... 8
   Information Panels/Maps ............................................................................................................ 28
   Handout .................................................................................................................................... 47
   Scanned Sign-in Sheets ............................................................................................................. 54
   Scanned Comment Forms ......................................................................................................... 64
   Comments Received by Emails ................................................................................................. 68

5.0 Public Comments and Staff Responses .................................................................................... 105

6.0 Justification and Summary ...................................................................................................... 114
1.0 Objective

The Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan was adopted by City Council in May 1994 and was approved by Regional Council in May 1995. Given this secondary plan is nearly 25 years old, City Planning Staff evaluated the existing secondary plan, in conjunction with other municipal documents and consultation to create an updated version, now called the Rockway Secondary Plan. This plan applies new land use designations and zoning regulations which reflects direction from the City, Region, Province and other external agencies.

1.1 Location Map
2.0 Considerations

2.1 Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) – Rockway Station Study Area (focus area and influence area)

The PARTS Plans were conducted to ensure the City of Kitchener’s station areas are developed in stable ways that support local transit and add value to communities. The studies completed thus far include recommendations for the following: Land use; Engineering infrastructure; Pedestrian and cycling connection enhancements; Transportation demand management measures; Public realm and streetscape improvements in surrounding areas; Road and parking implications; Community infrastructure; and, Public art opportunities.

The PARTS Rockway Plan was intended to be a guiding document with its goals and strategies to be implemented through an Official Plan Amendment, a Secondary Plan, a Zoning By-law Amendment, and updates to the Urban Design Manual. The Preferred Plan (Land Use Map) developed through this process acted as a guide for Rockway Secondary Plan. Incorporation of new land use designations and zones with updated regulations were considered in conjunction with the existing conditions and uses of properties, and their existing permissions and special policies and regulations. Any deviation between the Preferred Plan and the draft Rockway Secondary Plan was done through Staff review and public comment and consultation to achieve the best land use planning suited to the existing and future development of the community.

2.1 Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

The City of Kitchener undertook RIENS in hopes to develop a clear and fair process for approving development projects in established neighbourhoods. Typically development proposals are considered based on the size and impact on the surrounding area, and the zoning by-laws and urban design standards in place. The intent of the recommendations of this study was to further ensure that new development blends and is compatible with the neighbourhood.

2.2 Urban Design Guidelines (UDG)

The Urban Design Manual is a guide for the development community, residents, special-interest groups, city council and staff for details on our city’s urban design guidelines and standards. The recent update of Part A of the Urban Design Manual was approved on September 9, 2019 by council as part of the Community and Infrastructure Services Committee agenda. The guidelines were last updated in 2000 and Kitchener has since seen rapid change and intensification throughout the city, triggering a desire to ensure that the guidelines reflect the evolving expectations for the design of buildings and public spaces.

Urban Design staff held a public design charrette for the Rockway neighbourhood on April
24, 2019. The intent of the charrette was to directly speak to and address residents’ concerns and identify opportunities for better design in their community. These neighbourhood specific guidelines will be brought forward for approval as part of the Secondary Plans for each neighbourhood. Upon approval of the secondary plan for this neighbourhood, the neighbourhood specific design guidelines will be added as part of the area specific guidelines for Central Neighbourhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROCKWAY 04.1.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leverage existing laneways as a community asset.</strong> Provide opportunity for enhanced pedestrian movement, recreation, and cultural activities. Re-establish existing lanes through redevelopment where possible, to create continuous mid-block connections over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian movement through laneways should be strengthened by providing through connections where dead ends currently exist.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The addition of pedestrian scale lighting and wayfinding elements should be considered through redevelopment or capital projects to improve the quality of laneways and areas adjacent to the Iron Horse Trail.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is significant need for new park space in this area, both in close proximity to ION stops and throughout the neighbourhood. Opportunities for new parks and public realm improvements are to be pursued (both through capital funding and private development) to correct this deficiency. New parks should have at minimum frontage on two streets and connect through active transportation means to the Iron Horse Trail.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure new mid-rise development is compatible with low rise developments (ie: corner properties; backing onto laneways; where Mixed Use abuts low-rise residential) and design site such that delivery and service vehicles do not need to use local streets to access new developments.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide and enhance tree canopy and green boulevard extensions where there are opportunities.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td>Staff begins Neighbourhood Planning Reviews and commences the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan. This review incorporates the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017 – March 2019</strong></td>
<td>Staff prepare material with relation to specific neighbourhood character topics to present to the public for feedback about what works well within their community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **March 28, 2019**    | **Public Information Meeting #1**  
                         Staff present information in an open house setting with the draft land use designations and zones for the neighbourhood. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit any further comments by comment form or through e-mail following the meeting. |
| **March 2019 – December 2019** | Public comments are received and reviewed by Staff. Updated draft maps for land use and zoning are finalized. Final recommendations for this secondary plan will be brought forward to council in Fall/Winter 2019. |
| **September – October 2019** | Internal City Staff review of all draft secondary plan policies and mapping. |
| **October 11, 2019**  | All property owners within the Secondary Plan area are sent notice of a Statutory Public Meeting. |
| **December 9, 2019**  | **Public Information Meeting #2**  
                         Staff present all draft maps for six secondary plans, including land use and zoning maps for Rockway. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit final comments by comment form or e-mail following the meeting. |
| **December 2019**     | Staff conduct a final review of all secondary plan maps with public comments received and prepare a report for council. Final draft maps are finalized. |
| **Spring 2020**       | **Secondary Plans Report to Committee/Council** }
4.0 Public Consultation Materials

4.1 Open House #1
   Notice of Open House
   Staff Presentation
   Information Panels/Maps
   Handout
   Scanned Sign In Sheets
   Scanned Comment Forms
   Public Comments Received by Email
March 13, 2019

Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

RE: Public Open House – Neighbourhood Specific Secondary Plan Review
Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan
Process of Applying Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations

The City would like to formally invite you to participate in the Neighbourhood Planning Review of the City’s Secondary Plans. We are commencing the review of the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan and in the process of applying new Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations. See location map below for the boundary of this study area.

A Public Open House is scheduled as outlined below:

WHEN: Thursday, March 28th, 2019
6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. (Drop-in format)
Brief Staff Presentation to Provide Background and Describe Process - 6:45 pm
LOCATION: Mill Courtland Community Centre - 216 Mill Street
An updated land use framework within the City’s Secondary Plan areas was deferred as part of the review of our new 2014 Official Plan. The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters. The Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study. The City is now reviewing the Secondary Plans and in the process of applying new Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations.

As a result of the background studies and work that has been done:

- A portion of the existing Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan is recommended to be added to the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan; (These lands were previously consulted on as part of the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan)
- A portion of the existing Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan is proposed to be merged with the parent policies of the Official Plan;
- A portion of lands shown on Map 3 – Land Use in the City’s Official Plan are proposed to be merged with the new Secondary Plan; and
- The remaining portion of the existing Mill Courtland Secondary Plan may be renamed to the Rockway Secondary Plan to reflect the updated boundary.

Draft Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations have been applied to the properties in the boundary of the study area for your consideration and review at the Open House scheduled for March 28th, 2019.

Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you on March 28th, 2019!

Information shared at the meeting will also be available online (posted on the project website after the meeting). If you are unable to attend this meeting, you are welcome to provide your input through the project website: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR or to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Yours truly,

Tina Malone-Wright
Senior Planner – Policy

Brandon Sloan, Manager, Long Range and Policy Planning
Alain Pinard, Director of Planning
Councillor Debbie Chapman
Neighbourhood Specific Planning Review
Proposed New Mill Courtland Woodside Park
Neighbourhood Secondary Plan

Open House
March 28, 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Arrival, Sign-in&lt;br&gt;Rotating around room with individual opportunity to review the panels, write down information and ideas and discuss project review with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Overview Presentation&lt;br&gt;Rotating around room with individual opportunity to review the panels, write down information and ideas and discuss project review with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Conclusion – Thank you for attending&lt;br&gt;Have a great night!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

• The Secondary Plans were deferred as part of the new Official Plan (2014)
  ➢ Station Area Planning – PARTS Central/Rockway Plans
  ➢ Urban Design Guidelines
  ➢ Cultural Heritage Landscape Study
  ➢ RIENS Study
8.1 Land Use Plan

To support the implementation of the Key Directions and Strategies for built form and land use, a new land use framework has been created recommending new land use designations for the station area as well as showing new connections and public realm amenities. These land use designations should inform the development of a secondary plan for the station area, as well as related zoning by-law updates. A description of the intent of the different land use designations as well as an appropriate range of densities for each is provided on the opposite page.
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Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study – PARTS Rockway Plan (Mobility)

KEY DIRECTIONS
1. Introduce a Fine-Grained Street & Block Network to Break Up Large Sites.
2. Extend the Iron Horse Trail Network.
3. Transform Kent Ave into a Complete Street.
4. Improve the Pedestrian & Cycling Conditions on Borden Avenue Between Charles Street & the Aud.

The Mobility Framework Map Legend
- Study Area Boundary
- Focus Area Boundaries
- ION Line & Stops
- Potential Street Connections: Indicates possible public/private driveway/street connections to be further determined through a future process.
- Active Transportation Network (existing)
- Active Transportation Network (proposed)
- Bike Share Station (proposed): Indicates areas where the provision of bike share facilities over time could help to support travel between the LRT station and destinations within the station area.
- Priority Crossings: Indicates areas where intersection improvements such as enhanced markings and reduced curb radii should be directed to enhance the safety of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the street.

Scale (approx) 400m
Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study – PARTS Rockway Plan (Public Realm)

**KEY DIRECTIONS**

1. Facilitate the ecological restoration of Schneider & Shoemaker Creek Corridors, along with improved stormwater management.
2. Develop a New Park Space / Urban Plaza at the Mill Stop.
3. Introduce New Parks & Open Spaces as a Component of all Large-Scale Developments.
4. Create Opportunities for green infrastructure within large development blocks, parks & open spaces.
5. Introduce streetscape improvements on King St. to catalyze redevelopment & enhance its gateway function.

---

**The Public Realm Framework Map Legend**

- **Study Area Boundary**
- **Focus Area Boundaries**
- **ION Line & Stops**
- **Priority Parkland Acquisition Areas**
- **Natural Heritage Conservation**
- **Two-Zone Policy Area (Floodplain)** Overlay over land use designation.
- **Existing Park Space**
- **Potential Locations for New Park Space** Indicates possible public/private park spaces to be further determined through a future process.
- **Existing Open Space / Cemetery**
- **Existing Street Tree Locations**

Scale (approx.) 400m
Process

• In a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans through a process called a Neighbourhood Specific Planning Review
• The implementation of various studies; i.e. PARTS, CHLS, RIENS
• Now reviewing the existing Mill Courtland Woodside Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan
Secondary Plan (1994 Official Plan)
Proposed Boundary
Boundary Changes

Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan
Changes to Existing Secondary Plan Boundary
1. Removed - Added to Map 3
2. Removed - Added to Cedar Hill D.O.P. Plan
3. Removed - Added to Victoria Park Plan
4. Added - Removed from Map 3
Proposed Changes to Map 3 – Land Use
Proposed New Secondary Plan
Land Uses

Mill Courtland Woodside Secondary Plan – Land Uses

Low Rise Residential

DESCRIPTION: Same as low rise residential land use, however specific policy area may limit some of the dwelling types that will be permitted and will limit the number of units in a multiple dwelling to 4 units where a multiple is permitted. Consideration will also be given to further regulating garages, building height and density. Analysis to be completed to confirm the properties to which the specific policy area will apply.

Low Rise Residential

DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: low density housing types, including single detached dwellings, duplex dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and where appropriate and compatible, other low density dwelling types such as street townhouse dwellings and small-scale multiple dwellings.
FSR: maximum of 0.6
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 3 storeys (4 if onto a Regional Rd or City Arterial St)

Medium Rise Residential

DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: medium density housing types including townhouse dwellings in a cluster development, multiple dwellings, and special needs housing.
FSR: minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 2.0
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 8 storeys

High Rise Residential

DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: high density multiple dwellings and special needs housing to achieve a high intensity of residential use.
FSR: minimum of 2.0 / maximum of 4.0
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: none

Mixed Use with specific policy area

DESCRIPTION: Permits a broad range of mixed use of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.

RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: retail, office uses, day care, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.

Maximum Non-Residential Gross Floor Area: for SP 2 is 7500 sq.m., and for SP 3 is 10,000 sq.m.
FSR: minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 2.0
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: for SP 2 it is 24 m., and for SP 3 it is 32 m.

Mixed Use

DESCRIPTION: Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.

RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: retail, office uses, day care, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.

Maximum Non-Residential Gross Floor Area: for SP 2 is 7500 sq.m., and for SP 3 is 10,000 sq.m.
FSR: minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 4.0
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: none

Station Area Commercial

DESCRIPTION: Allow commercial uses predominately serving the City’s Major Transit Station Area.

RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Artisan’s Establishment, Bistro, Catering Services Establishment, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Conference Convention or Exhibition Facility, Craftsperson Shop, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Health Office, Hotel, Payday Loan Establishment, Pet Services Establishment, Personal Services, Retail Outlet, Propane, Studio

Innovation Employment

DESCRIPTION: Recognizes a growing demand for employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers’. Predominantly office and high tech manufacturing.

RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: creative, production industries, artisan’s establishment, studio (art and music), craftsperson shop, live/work space, shared facilities, galleries, studios, office space for creative professionals, and retail sales associated with production of goods and materials.

MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 6 storeys.

Institutional

DESCRIPTION: These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature.

RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: secondary and post-secondary educational facilities; long-term care facilities; social, cultural, and administrative facilities; and institutional uses compatible with surrounding uses such as public and private elementary schools, day care centres, and places of worship.

Open Space

DESCRIPTION: These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increases the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.

RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation, Community Facility and Cemeteries

Natural Heritage

DESCRIPTION: These natural heritage features are intended to be protected and conserved for their ecological functions. Natural heritage features can include provincially or locally significant wetlands, valleys, woodlands, threatened or endangered species habitat, and lands subject to natural features or flooding. No new development is permitted in these areas.

RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: conservation areas, forests, rare, and wildlife management, and small scale passive recreation activities (i.e. trails).
Proposed Zoning

Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan - Proposed Zoning
# Proposed Residential (RES) Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="house" alt="" /> <img src="second_dwelling" alt="" /> <img src="semi_dwelling" alt="" /> <img src="street_townhouse" alt="" /> <img src="multiple_dwelling" alt="" /> <img src="hospice" alt="" /> <img src="small_residential_care_facility" alt="" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas</td>
<td>RES-4 uses + <img src="lodging_house" alt="" /> <img src="hospice" alt="" /> <img src="large_residential_care_facility" alt="" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>The site specific may limit height and FSR depending on property context and heritage attributes (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas</td>
<td><img src="cluster_townhouse" alt="" /> <img src="multiple_dwelling" alt="" /> <img src="lodging_house" alt="" /> <img src="hospice" alt="" /> <img src="large_residential_care_facility" alt="" /></td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Office, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-7</td>
<td>Accommodate high density dwelling types and a range of complementary non-residential uses in high rise residential areas</td>
<td><img src="multiple_dwelling" alt="" /> <img src="lodging_house" alt="" /> <img src="hospice" alt="" /> <img src="large_residential_care_facility" alt="" /></td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Health Office, Office, Personal Services, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 2.0 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics
*Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
# Proposed Non-Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Employment</td>
<td>EMP-6</td>
<td>Accommodate the employment lands for &quot;start-ups&quot; and &quot;makers&quot;.</td>
<td>Creative Production industries, Artisan's Establishment, Studio (Art and Media), Craftsmen Shop, Live/Work Space, galleries, studios, office space for creative professionals, High-Tech Manufacturing, Retail sales associated with High-Tech Manufacturing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>INS-1</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses intended to serve surrounding residents and communities.</td>
<td>Artisan's Establishment, Auditorium, Cemetery, Community Centre, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Health Office, Hospital, Place of Worship, Residential Care Facility, Elementary School</td>
<td>4 Storeys (Max. heights = 14 metres)</td>
<td>Max = 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INS-2</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses that are intended to serve a region and/or city-wide population.</td>
<td>Auditorium, Cemetery, Community Centre, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Funeral Home, Health Office, Hospital, Place of Worship, Residential Care Facility, Large, Secondary School, Health Clinic, Health Office, Hospital, Post-Secondary School, Social Service Establishment</td>
<td>A base shall be required for buildings greater than 14 metres in height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (Sp.2)</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings within the City's Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan's Establishment, Brewpub, Castle Townhouse Dwelling, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Commercial Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Post Service Establishment, Place of Worship, Print Shop, Restaurant, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services, Large Residential Care Facility, Payday Loan Establishment, Post-Secondary School</td>
<td>6 Storeys</td>
<td>Min = 0.6, Max = 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (Sp.3)</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings within the City's Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Uses allowed in MIX-2 plus Large Residential Care Facility, Payday Loan Establishment, Post-Secondary School</td>
<td>30 Storeys</td>
<td>Min = 0.6, Max = 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings at a high density within the City's Major Transit Station Area.</td>
<td>Uses allowed in MIX-3</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-3</td>
<td>Min = 0.6, Max = 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>COM-5</td>
<td>Accommodate transit-supportive and transit-oriented commercial uses within the City's Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Catering Service Establishment, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Conference, Convention or Exhibition Facility, Craftsmen Shop, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Health Office, Hospital, Payday Loan Establishment, Post Service Establishment, Personal Services, Retail Outlet, Produce Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>Accommodate comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system.</td>
<td>Outdoor active recreation, outdoor passive recreation and cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>NHC-1</td>
<td>Protect and/or conserve natural heritage features and their ecological functions.</td>
<td>Existing Agricultural and Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>EUF-1</td>
<td>Recognize existing uses within a floodway or floodplain.</td>
<td>Existing uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
Overview of Information Provided this Evening – Your Feedback and Comments

- Sign-In and General Information
- Neighbourhood Planning Review Process
- Existing and Proposed Land Use and Zoning
- PARTS, Zoning Details and Urban Design
Process/Next Steps

• Work has begun on the review of the MCWP Secondary Plan
• This is the first Open House/Engagement Session on the preliminary work
• Will collect and consider the comments and feedback from the Open House materials
• Urban Design Charrette – Wed. April 24\textsuperscript{th}, 2019
• Revisions to the land use designation and zoning
• Further consultation/engagement
• Committee/Council consideration late Fall 2019?
FOR ONGOING AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION on this project or to provide written comments at any time, please view the City’s website at: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR

Email comments to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca

or contact the Project Manager

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Project Manager/Senior Planner
519-741-2200 x7765 (TTY:1-866-969-9994)
tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
Regulatory Framework and Official Plan

The Official Plan is a legal document that contains goals, objectives and policies to manage and direct physical and land use change and their effects on the cultural, social, economic and natural environment within the city.

Official Plan policies:

- direct growth and development decisions in the city.
- governs all aspects of community growth and development, community services, movement of goods and people, conservation and protection of the cultural and natural environment, and the preservation of agricultural resources.
- also includes population and employment forecasts and density and residential intensification level targets

- City Council adopted a new Official Plan in June 2014
- Ontario Planning Act requires municipalities to amend Zoning By-laws within 3 years of a new Official Plan being in effect
Secondary Plans

Secondary plans are used to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city, indicating the manner in which the goals, objectives, policies and land use designations of the Official Plan will be implemented within respective areas.

In the past Secondary Plans have generally been prepared for existing Built-Up Areas in the city but they may also be prepared in the Designated Greenfield Area.

Once approved, these Plans are incorporated into the Official Plan by formal amendment. Existing secondary plans were created 25-30 years ago.

These were deferred from being incorporated into the new Official Plan (2014) until LRT Station Area Planning was completed (2016-2017).
Neighbourhood Planning Reviews

- The City of Kitchener is undertaking a detailed review of the land use and planning framework for many specific neighbourhoods. These are typically locations where there are outdated secondary plans or community plans created 25-30 years ago to help guide the use of land (e.g. where new housing could go, commercial businesses, environmental conservation land, parks, etc.) and policies for new development or redevelopment. To help implement new directions from the province, region, city and other agencies, we are evaluating and updating existing plans to create new ones.

- This process involves creating new policies and mapping that will be added to our **Official Plan**, updating **zoning**, considering new **urban design guidelines** and implementing our **cultural heritage landscapes**. The locations we will review are primarily in the central neighbourhoods, but there are also several other places in the city where we will be engaging with landowners and the neighbourhood to help update these plans. Through this, we will be implementing the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study/Plans, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).
Mill Courtland Woodside Park Airphoto (Boundary Changes)
Proposed Changes Map 3 Land Use
Existing Land Use – Mill Courtland Woodside Park

- Existing Land Use Secondary Plan
  - Low Rise Conservation
  - Low Density Multiple Residential
  - Medium Density Multiple Residential
  - Convenience Commercial
  - Low Density Commercial Residential
  - Medium Density Commercial Residential
  - High Density Commercial Residential
  - Neighbourhood Institutional
  - Community Institutional
  - General Industrial
  - Mixed Use Corridor
  - Neighbourhood Mixed Use Centre
  - Neighbourhood Park
  - Open Space

- Existing Landuse Map 3
  - Low Rise Residential
  - Medium Rise Residential
  - General Industrial Employment
  - Institutional
  - Natural Heritage Conservation

- Proposed Secondary Plan Boundary
  - Changes to Existing Secondary Plan Boundary
  1. Removed - Added to Map 3
  2. Removed - Added to Cedar Hill S.C. Plan
  3. Removed - Added to Victoria Park Plan
  4. Added - Removed from Map 3

Special Policy Area

Flooding Hazard Overlay
- Floodway
- Flood fringe

Ecological Restoration Areas Overlay
## Land Use Visualization

### Low Rise Residential
- **DESCRIPTION:** Same as low rise residential land use, however specific policy area may limit some of the dwelling types that will be permitted and will limit the number of units in a multiple dwelling to 4 units where a multiple is permitted. Consideration will also be given to further regulating garages, building height and density. Analysis to be completed to confirm the properties to which the specific policy area will apply.

### Medium Rise Residential
- **DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** medium density housing types including townhouse dwellings in a cluster development, multiple dwellings, and special needs housing.
- **FSR:** maximum of 0.6 / maximum of 2.0
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** 3 storeys (4 if onto a Regional Rd or City Arterial St)

### High Rise Residential
- **DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** high density multiple dwellings and special needs housing to achieve a high intensity of residential use.
- **FSR:** minimum of 2.0 / maximum of 4.0
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** none

### Mixed Use
- **DESCRIPTION:** Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.
- **RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** retail, office uses, day care, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, art-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.
- **Maximum Non-Residential Gross Floor Area:** for SP.2 is 7500 sq.m. and for SP.3 is 10,000 sq.m
- **FSR:** minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 2.0
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** for SP.2 it is 24 m. and for SP.3 it is 32 m.

### Station Area Commercial
- **DESCRIPTION:** Allow commercial uses predominantly serving the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.
- **RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Catering Service Establishment, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Conference, Convention or Exhibition Facility, Craftsperson Shop, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Health Office, hotel, Payday Loan Establishment, Pet Services Establishment, Personal Services, Retail Outlet, Propane, Studio

### Innovation Employment
- **DESCRIPTION:** Recognizes a growing demand for employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers’. Predominantly office and high-tech manufacturing.
- **RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** creative production industries, artisan’s establishment, studio (art and music), craftsman shop, live/work space, shared facilities, galleries, studios, office space for creative professionals, and retail sales associated with production of goods and materials.
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** 6 storeys

### Institutional
- **DESCRIPTION:** These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature.
- **RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** secondary and post-secondary educational facilities, long-term care facilities, social, cultural, and administrative facilities; small-scale institutional uses compatible with surrounding uses such as public and private elementary schools, libraries, day care centers, and places of worship.
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** none

### Open Space
- **DESCRIPTION:** These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.
- **RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation, Community Facility and Cemeteries

### Natural Heritage
- **DESCRIPTION:** These natural heritage features are intended to be protected and/or conserved for their ecological functions. Natural heritage features can include provincially or locally significant wetlands, valleys, woodlands, threatened or endangered species habitat, and lands subject to natural hazards or flooding. No new development is permitted in these areas.
- **RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** conservation activities; forest, fish, and wildlife management; and small scale passive recreation activities (i.e. trails)
Mill Courtland Woodside Park - Existing Zoning
Mill Courtland Woodside Park - Proposed Zoning
# Proposed Residential (RES) Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION, LODGING HOUSE, HOSPICE, SMALL RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RES-5</strong></td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas</td>
<td><strong>RES-4 uses +</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site specific may limit height and FSR depending on property context and heritage attributes (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION, LODGING HOUSE, HOSPICE, LARGE RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY</td>
<td>ARTISAN’S ESTABLISHMENT, COMMUNITY FACILITY, CONVENIENCE RETAIL, DAY CARE FACILITY, OFFICE, HOME OCCUPATION, STUDIO</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>RES-7</td>
<td>Accommodate high density dwelling types and a range of complementary non-residential uses in high rise residential areas</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION, LODGING HOUSE, HOSPICE, LARGE RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY</td>
<td>ARTISAN’S ESTABLISHMENT, COMMUNITY FACILITY, CONVENIENCE RETAIL, DAY CARE FACILITY, FINANCIAL ESTABLISHMENT, HEALTH OFFICE, OFFICE, PERSONAL SERVICES, HOME OCCUPATION, STUDIO</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 2.0 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics

* Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations
## Proposed Non-Residential Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Employment</td>
<td>EMP-6</td>
<td>Accommodate the employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers’.</td>
<td>Creative Production Industries, Artisan’s Establishment, Studio (Art and Music), Craftsman Shop, Live/Work Space, Galleries, Studios, Office Space For Creative Professionals, High-Tech Manufacturing, Retail Sales associated with High-Tech Manufacturing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>INS-1</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses intended to serve surrounding residential communities</td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Auditorium, Cemetery, Community Centre, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Health Office, Hospice, Place of Worship, Residential Care Facility, Elementary School</td>
<td>4 Storeys (Max. height – 14 metres)</td>
<td>Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INS-2</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses that are intended to serve a region and/or city-wide population</td>
<td>Auditorium, Cemetery, Community Centre, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Funeral Home, Health Office, Hospice, Place of Worship, Residential Care Facility Large, Secondary School, Health Clinic, Health Office, Hospital, Post-Secondary School, Social Service Establishment</td>
<td>A base shall be required for buildings greater than 14 metres in height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>MIX-4 (Sp.2)</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Craftsman Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Print Shop, Restaurant, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services, Large Residential Care Facility, Payday Loan Establishment, Post-Secondary School</td>
<td>8 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6, Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (Sp.3)</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Uses allowed in MIX-2 plus Large Residential Care Facility, Payday Loan Establishment, Post-Secondary School</td>
<td>10 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6, Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings at a high density within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Min – 0.6, Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>COM-5</td>
<td>Accommodate transit supportive and transit-oriented commercial uses within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Catering Service Establishment, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Convention, Convention or Exhibition Facility, Craftsman Shop, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Health Office, Hotel, Payday Loan Establishment, Personal Services Establishment, Retail Outlet, Propane, Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>Accommodate comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system</td>
<td>Outdoor active recreation, outdoor passive recreation and cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage</td>
<td>NHC-1</td>
<td>Protect and/or conserve natural heritage features and their ecological functions</td>
<td>Existing Agriculture and Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>EUF-1</td>
<td>Recognize existing uses within a floodway or floodplain.</td>
<td>Existing uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
PARTS Rockway Mobility Framework Map

**Key Directions**
1. Introduce a Fine-Grained Street & Block Network to Break Up Large Sites.
2. Extend the Iron Horse Trail Network.
3. Transform Kent Ave into a Complete Street.
4. Improve the Pedestrian & Cycling Conditions on Borden Avenue Between Charles Street & the Aud.

**The Mobility Framework Map Legend**
- Study Area Boundary
- Focus Area Boundaries
- ION Line & Stops
  - Potential Street Connections: Indicates possible public/private driveway/street connections to be further determined through a future process.
  - Active Transportation Network (existing)
  - Active Transportation Network (proposed)
  - Bike Share Station (proposed)
  - Priority Crossings: Indicates areas where intersection improvements such as enhanced markings and reduced curb radii should be directed to enhance the safety of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the street.

**Scale (approx.)**
- 400m
PARTS Rockway Public Realm Framework Map

**KEY DIRECTIONS**

1. Facilitate the Ecological Restoration of Schneider & Shoemaker Creek Corridors, along with Improved Stormwater Management.
2. Develop a New Park Space / Urban Plaza at the Mill Stop.
3. Introduce New Parks & Open Spaces as a Component of all Large-Scale Developments.
4. Create Opportunities for Green Infrastructure Within Large Development Blocks, Parks & Open Spaces.
5. Introduce Streetscape Improvements on King St. to Catalyze Redevelopment & Enhance its Gateway Function

---

The Public Realm Framework Map Legend

- **Study Area Boundary**
- **Focus Area Boundaries**
- **ION Line & Stops**
- **Priority Parkland Acquisition Areas**
- **Natural Heritage Conservation**
- **Two-Zone Policy Area (Floodplain) Overlay over land use designation.**
- **Existing Park Space**
- **Potential Locations for New Park Space** Indicates possible public/private park spaces to be further determined through a future process.
- **Existing Open Space / Cemetery**
- **Existing Street Tree Locations**
Zoning is used to regulate:

- Use of land;
- Location of buildings and structures;
- Types of buildings permitted and their associated uses; and
- Lot dimensions, parking requirements, building heights and setbacks from the street/lot lines.

**WHAT IS A SITE SPECIFIC PROVISION?**

Site specific provisions are added to the base zone to provide additional regulations. Some examples are as follows:

- Garage permissions and location
- Size and location requirements for front porches
- Height limits

**WHAT IS AN URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINE:**

Urban Design Guidelines establish the objectives, priorities and expectations for urban design in Kitchener. The guidelines apply to projects across the City and address such things as building types, streetscapes and the public realm. The manual is used by City staff and the development industry in the review and approval of specific types of development applications, such as official plan amendments, zone by-law, site plan control and minor variance applications. The guidelines are inherently flexible and negotiable and do not have the same regulatory power as other tools such as the Zoning By-law.
Examples of Zoning Regulations

Achieving a Consistent Building Setback
Any new (or additions to) single detached, semi-detached or street townhouse dwellings required to have a setback from a street that is based on the average setback of the two neighbouring properties.

A tolerance of 1 metre from the average setback has been incorporated into the regulation to provide flexibility. This regulation is in place already in Central Neighbourhoods (REINS Areas).

Garage Projections & Permission
Garage projections & permissions can be implemented using of zoning regulations and/or urban design guidelines

Sample Urban Design Guideline: Where the existing streetscape does not contain street facing garages, only detached recessed garages should be permitted.
### HOW IMPORTANT IS IT THAT THE CITY REGULATE...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Features / Focal Points</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (e.g. protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Design, Materials &amp; Colours</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (e.g. protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POTENTIAL CONSERVATION TOOLS IDENTIFIED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Character Element</th>
<th>Secondary Plan Policy</th>
<th>Zoning Regulation</th>
<th>Urban Design Guidelines</th>
<th>Heritage Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Porches</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Form Transitions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design, Materials, Colours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Features / Focal Points</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How Important is it that the City Regulate ...?

**Front Porches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Should not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e., requires front porches on all new low-rise infill developments?)

**Garages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Should not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** How important is it that the City regulates garages (i.e., setback, location on lot etc.)

**Built Form Transition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e., requires new development to respect existing built form?)

**Setbacks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e., requires that buildings form a consistent street edge?)
Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan

Fact sheet

**Official Plan** - is a long-term planning document, which contains policies and plans related to land use for a 20-year time horizon for the city as a whole. The Official Plan gets direction from and must conform to Provincial and Regional policies. A new Official Plan for the City was approved on November 19, 2014.

The Secondary Plans were deferred as part of the approval of the 2014 Official Plan to allow for the completion of background studies that would provide direction regarding appropriate land use and policy framework in the Secondary Plan areas.

**Secondary Plans** - are contained in the City’s Official Plan and contain land use policies and mapping which provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city.

These plans guide the use of land such as where housing, commercial businesses, institutional uses and parks should be located and provide policies for new development or redevelopment.

The Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan is just over 25 years old and needs to be updated. To help implement new directions from the province, region, city and other agencies, we are evaluating and updating the existing Secondary Plans to create new ones.

**Urban Design Guidelines** - as part of the Neighbourhood Secondary Planning process that is currently underway for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park area City staff will be developing a set of neighbourhood specific urban design guidelines in addition to the draft urban design guidelines for ‘Residential Infill in Central Neighbourhoods’.

These guidelines will address things like building placement, suggested setbacks, garage location/projections, landscaping, building design and massing, and other aspects of design and place making unique to the neighbourhood.

**Zoning By-law** - establishes and regulates the use of land by implementing the policies of our Official Plan and the Urban Design Guidelines, including:

- Permitted use of land
- Height and location of structures
- Lot size
- Density of development
- Parking requirements

**Background studies supporting Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan:**

- Planning Around Rapid Transit Station - PARTS Rockway Plan: This Plan reviewed the following, in and around the stations stops (Completion date: December, 2017):
  - Lands uses
  - Mobility
Public Realm, and
Technical considerations and Implementation
• Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS) (Completion date: December, 2014):
  o Provided a working inventory of the City of Kitchener’s cultural heritage landscapes which serves as a planning tool in the assessment and management of these resources as the community changes and evolves.
• Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS) (Completion date: February, 2017):
  o The report looked at the planning approval process for development in established neighbourhoods
  o The report contained recommendations to support appropriate and compatible infill.

Next Steps:
• Preparing land use and zoning maps based on the recommendations from the background studies and reports
• Presenting proposed Land Use and Zoning for public feedback (March 28, 2019)
• Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Urban Design Charrette (April 24, 2019) will provide:
  o an opportunity for public to visualize the proposed build form due to upcoming changes; and
  o a direction for zoning bylaw and built form
• Consider public feedback, technical reports and make changes accordingly
• Finalize land use, zoning and related polices and present it to the council
• More information can be found on the City’s website https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR
• Feedback and comments can be emailed here secondaryplans@kitchener.ca
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max. 4.0</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Office, Restaurant, Professional, Home</th>
<th>Community Center, Church, Community Center,</th>
<th>Residential areas, high-rise commercial, non-residential uses, commercial uses, office, retail, mixed-use, residence, parking, storage,</th>
<th>RES-7</th>
<th>High Rise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max. 2.0</td>
<td>2 stories</td>
<td>Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>Commercial, Retail, Day Care, Office, Community Center, Retail, Office, Community Center,</td>
<td>Residential uses in high-rise commercial, non-residential uses, commercial uses, office, retail, mixed-use, residence, parking, storage,</td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 0.5</td>
<td>2 stories</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>Residential uses in high-rise commercial, non-residential uses, commercial uses, office, retail, mixed-use, residence, parking, storage,</td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. 0.6</td>
<td>4 stories</td>
<td>Model Space in City</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>Residential uses in high-rise commercial, non-residential uses, commercial uses, office, retail, mixed-use, residence, parking, storage,</td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Residential (RES) Zones**

Proposed Permitted Uses:
- Residential Uses
- Non-Residential Uses
- Proposed permitted uses

Proposed Zoning:
- Residential Zone
- Mixed Use
- Secondary
- Planned Industrial

Proposed Zoning for RES-1, RES-2, RES-3, RES-4, RES-5, RES-6, and RES-7 zones:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Non-Residential Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Zone**: Various land use designations for different zones.
- **Proposed Land Use**: Mixed Use, Commercial, Cultural Heritage.

Additional notes and considerations related to the zones and their uses.
### SIGN-IN SHEET

**Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**  
**March 28, 2019**

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Paffordon Ave.</td>
<td>N2M 3S6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 Tamroth Close</td>
<td>N2M 3T1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1457 Nyberg St.</td>
<td>N2G 2Z2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144-156 Bedford Rd</td>
<td>N2G 3A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187 Hunt Ave.</td>
<td>N2M 3J4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>506 Stirling Ave. S.</td>
<td>N2M 3J4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Hunt Ave</td>
<td>N2G 2Z0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>216 Mill St</td>
<td>N2M 3R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Rushmore Rd, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2M 2T5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>226 Palmee Ave</td>
<td>N2G 3P8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>526 Mill St</td>
<td>N2G 2Y7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>316 Ottawa St. S.</td>
<td>N2G 3T6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>929 Eden Oak Court Kit</td>
<td>N2A 0H4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185 Mill St.</td>
<td>N0M 3R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246 Madison Ave S</td>
<td>N2M 3H4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>259 Madison Ave S</td>
<td>N2M 3H5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 Madison Ave S</td>
<td>N2M 3H4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188 Mill Ave, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2M 3R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 Denham Dr, R. Hill, L4C 6J1</td>
<td>L4C 6J1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>235 Madison Ave South, Kitchener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94 Kem Ave.</td>
<td>N2G 1J1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1836 Carrel-Koch Rd, St. Agatha, N0B 2L0</td>
<td>N0B 2L0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Courtland Ave E, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 3V3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>281 Courtland Ave E</td>
<td>N2G 3V4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>440 Courtland Ave East</td>
<td>N2G 3V4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>Phone Number*</td>
<td>E-mail Address*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 Grenville Ave</td>
<td>N2G 3S9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124 Sydney St S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98 Kent Ave</td>
<td>N2G 3R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>929 Edm Blvd Condo</td>
<td>N2A 0H4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246 Madison Ave S</td>
<td>N2M 2H4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198 Wentworth Ave</td>
<td>N2M 6S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>418 Court Ave</td>
<td>N2G 2L5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301 Bedford Rd Kit</td>
<td>N2G 3Z2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>Phone Number*</td>
<td>E-mail Address*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198 Highland Road Eas</td>
<td>N2M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287 Continental Eas</td>
<td>N26 2V8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>617 Rummelhardt Dr, Waterloo</td>
<td>N2T 2K7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113 St. George St.</td>
<td>N2G 2T2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>371 Ottawa St. S.</td>
<td>N2M 3P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>472 East Ave Kitchen</td>
<td>N2H 1Z8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>265 Bedford Rd.</td>
<td>N2G 3A7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>464 Mill Street</td>
<td>N2G 2Y6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>464 Mill Street</td>
<td>N2G 2Y6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>268 Mill St.</td>
<td>N2M 3K5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89 Patterson Ave</td>
<td>N2M 3S6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136 Bed Rd</td>
<td>N2G 3A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311 Bedford Rd</td>
<td>N26 3A7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317 Bedford Rd</td>
<td>N3G 3A7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 Patterson Ave</td>
<td>N3M 3S5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>787 Courland Ave E</td>
<td>N2G 2V8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>498 (777) Main St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>342 Courtland Ave E.</td>
<td>N2B2V9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>468 Ottawa St. S.</td>
<td>N2M3S5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102 Kent Ave. Kit</td>
<td>N2G3R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102 Rusk Rd Kit</td>
<td>N2M4S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>197 Sydney St S</td>
<td>N2G3V4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>375 Mill St</td>
<td>N2M3L9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Greenview</td>
<td>N2M3S5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Patterson Ave</td>
<td>N2M3S5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>286 Ottawa St. S.</td>
<td>N2G 3T6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92 Weichel St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>338 + 334 Mill Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 Inwood Cres, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2M 2L4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>235 Milit St. Kit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105 Mill St.</td>
<td>N2M 3P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>450 Highland Rd. E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>395 Ottawa St. S.</td>
<td>N2M 3P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>393 Ottawa St. S.</td>
<td>N2M 3P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SIGN-IN SHEET

Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1
March 28, 2019

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 Acacia St</td>
<td>N2G 3B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 Uplands Dr</td>
<td>N2M 4X5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59 Woodland Ave</td>
<td>N2M 3G8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283 Mill St.</td>
<td>N2M3R4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Hurst Av</td>
<td>N2G8Z6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199 Kent Ave</td>
<td>N2G3R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 Victoria St S, Suite 201</td>
<td>N2M 3S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C/O St Andrews Memorial Anglican Church</td>
<td>N2M 3R4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>275 Mill St, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2M 5R4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>398 Stirling Ave S.</td>
<td>N2M 2H8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before April 19th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   I would recommend that the secondary plan extend further up Mill street on both sides to incorporate areas already supporting multi-family homes.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   That properties on Mill Street between Stirling Ave and Woodland Ave be included in the secondary plan and be considered for medium rise residential zoning.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?
   Mill Street from Stirling to Woodland Park is a mix of old houses with hodge-podge additions and expansions to support multi-family residences. I would recommend that this area be included in the secondary plan and zoned medium rise-residential. There is little character to be retained at this point. Medium rise-residential would be consistent with expected new developments, and current zoning from Woodland Ave to Spading Road (on the west side of the road).
I support including the houses along the west side of Mill Street between Stirling Ave and Woodland Ave (or as far as Spadina) in the secondary plan and increasing the density along Mill Street all the way to Woodend Park. Specifically, I support increasing the density on the west side of Mill St from Stirling Ave to Woodland Ave.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [redacted]
Mailing Address: 191 Wood Cres, Kitchener N2M 2T9
Email: [redacted]

Owner of 197 Mill St.
Thank you for attending the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before April 19th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

   I dislike changing the zoning to the lot on Madison to High Rise Res. It is right between low rise res + Mixed use. There are no other high rises in this neighbourhood.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   I liked to be in the zoning at 185 Mill St. I believe it should remain as the Mill Courtland Zone. I dislike that you propose changing my house from Medium Rise Res to High rise res does not fit in at all.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

   I like the proposal for Mixed Use + Innovation Employment on Stirling Courtland/Mill St. area.
Mill Courtland Woodside Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

Please do something about the abandoned property on Madison St! It's filled with squatters, setting fires & using drugs while littering litter all over the neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 185 7th St., Kitchener
Email: [Redacted]

Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review
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Hi Mike,
Thank you for your interest and for providing your feedback on the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan.

We have logged your comments and they will be considered moving forward.

We have included your contact information on our notification list to keep you informed of any upcoming project announcements.

If you have any further comments or questions or would like to discuss the review process, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,

Tina

---

From: Mike Puopolo <mike@polocorpinc.com>
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2019 1:08 PM
To: Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Cc: Amanda Stellings <amanda@polocorpinc.com>
Subject: RE: Mill/Ottawa Secondary Plan

Tina,

Please disregard the previous email and attachment in that email (below). Please see enclosed the as it pertains to the Mill Courtland Woodside Secondary Plan.

Please include us on any correspondence going forward.

Regards,
From: Mike Puopolo  
Sent: August 12, 2019 12:49 PM  
To: 'tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca' <tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca>  
Cc: Amanda Stellings <amanda@polocorpinc.com>  
Subject: Mill/Ottawa Secondary Plan

Tina,

Further to our conversations, please find enclosed our letter as it pertains to the Mill Courtland Woodside Secondary Plan.

Please include us on any correspondence going forward.

Regards,

**Mike Puopolo**  
Chief Operating Officer | Polocorp Inc.

379 Queen Street South | Kitchener, ON | N2G 1W6  
P: 519-745-3249, ext. 201 | C: 519-749-5780 | F: 519-208-3004  
mike@polocorpinc.com

*This e-mail is confidential and intended only for the addressee. Disclosure of this e-mail to anyone else is not intended as a waiver of confidentiality or privilege. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately.*

---
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July 24 18, 2019

VIA e-mail

Attention: Tina Malone-Wright, Senior Planner
Planning Division | City of Kitchener

Reference: Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review
459-485 Mill Street, Kitchener

Dear Ms. Malone-Wright,

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Polocorp Inc. is the owner of the lands municipally addressd as 459-485 Mill Street in the City of Kitchener. The City of Kitchener is proposing a new Secondary Plan for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Area, which includes the above-noted lands (Figure 1).

Upon review of the proposed Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan, Polocorp Inc. wishes to provide comments on the information provided as part of the Open House #1 held on March 28, 2019.

As part of our comments, the following documents have been reviewed:

- Notice of Meeting dated March 13, 2019;
- Staff Presentation for the March 28, 2019 Open House; and
- Information panels including Existing & Proposed Land Use.

Please note while we have reviewed the information provided online, we were not given notice of the Open House #1 meeting on March 28, 2019. Please include us in further notifications relating to the Secondary Plan for Mill Courtland Woodside Park.
2.0 SITE CONTEXT

The subject lands are municipally addressed as 459-485 Mill Street within the City of Kitchener and are approximately 2.3 acres in size. The lands are located directly adjacent to the Mill/Ottawa LRT stop. The lands were included within the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Rockway study, which formed the PARTS Rockway Plan, approved by Kitchener City Council on December 11, 2017. As part of the station area planning, Polocorp was involved in the Public Information Centres and Stakeholder Workshop to provide input into the planning process as a local developer and community builder in the Region for over 40 years. As part of the station area planning, Polocorp worked with City staff to identify the entirety of the lands bounded by Mill Street to the north, Rockway Golf Course to the east, LRT tracks to the south, and Ottawa Street to the west as ‘Mixed-Use High Density’. The intent of this designation within the PARTS Rockway Plan was to allow the vision for this area to include a mixed-use development that provides direct access to the LRT and transit along Ottawa Street, which is consistent with the City and Region’s vision to provide a sustainable community moving into the future.

The subject lands are located with frontage onto Mill Street, just east of the intersection of Mill Street and Ottawa Street. The LRT tracks run along the southern boundary of the lands, with the Mill Station LRT Stop abutting the lands. Due to the opportune location of these lands to provide a mixed-use development with access to various modes of public transportation, we would like to provide our comments as part of the Secondary Plan review of the area.
3.0 REQUESTED REVISIONS TO THE MILL COURTLAND WOODSIDE PARK SECONDARY PLAN

The following modifications to the ‘Proposed Land Use- Mill Courtland Woodside Park’ and ‘Mill Courtland Woodside Park – Proposed Zoning’ maps are requested:

1) **Removal of the Open Space from the South end of 459-485 Mill Street**
   We have had numerous discussions with the Region of Waterloo as well as the City of Kitchener, and we are investigating creating a linkage between our lands and the LRT Station. In addition, the Region is undertaking a review of their land in the area to determine whether surplus lands will be made available at the corner property along Mill/Ottawa as well as the lands along the LRT tracks. At present, we are proposing approximately 500 units adjacent to that stop on 2.3 acres and would request a modification to the map for the strip along the trail shown as Open Space. With an Open Space designation/zoning, there would be limitations in the ability to creatively enhance the pedestrian realm adjacent to the LRT Station. We would request that this strip be designated and zoned with the MIX-4 category to allow for flexibility in design. It should be noted that this designation would still permit a trail along the LRT corridor, while also allowing for alternative architectural elements to enhance the area.

2) **Removal of the suggestion of a road to bisect our development**
   As indicated in our comments provided during the PARTS Rockway planning study, we do not support a bisecting road through our lands. This road significantly reduces the developability of the lands, while encouraging the use of single-family vehicles in an area optimal for public transit. The PARTS Rockway Mobility Framework Plan illustrates this road, which we would request to be removed from all diagrams, mapping, and illustrations for the Secondary Plan process.

3) **Rezone Hoffman Street to a MIX use zoning with special provisions on the first 2 floors for Employment Uses OR Zone it much higher than 6 storey**
   While we support employment uses along the LRT, we have concerns with the restriction of height to six-storeys in this area. We would recommend a modification to include a special provision on these lands to include two storeys of at-grade commercial. Alternatively, higher densities/height should be permitted in this area to enhance the economic growth in the Major Transit Station Area.

4.0 MOVING FORWARD

Polocorp Inc. would request that the City modify the plans as per the above items 1-3, which would allow the upcoming development in the area to be pedestrian-friendly, provide opportunities for active transit, and encourage an enhanced level of architectural and urban design. With exception to the above modifications, Polocorp Inc. is generally supportive of the proposed Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan.

Furthermore, we would request that you include us on any future correspondence as it relates to the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan.

Regards,

Mike Puopolo, Chief Operations Officer

CC:  Paul Puopolo, Polocorp Inc.
      Amanda Stellings, Polocorp Inc.
Tina,

Further to our conversations, please find enclosed our letter as it pertains to the Mill Courtland Woodside Secondary Plan.

Please include us on any correspondence going forward.

Regards,

Mike Puopolo
Chief Operating Officer | Polocorp Inc.

379 Queen Street South | Kitchener, ON | N2G 1W6
P: 519-745-3249, ext. 201 | C: 519-749-5780 | F: 519-208-3004
mike@polocorpinc.com

This e-mail is confidential and intended only for the addressee. Disclosure of this e-mail to anyone else is not intended as a waiver of confidentiality or privilege. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately.
June 18, 2019

VIA e-mail

Attention: Tina Malone-Wright, Senior Planner

Reference: Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review
459-485 Mill Street, Kitchener

Dear Ms. Malone-Wright,

1.0 INTRODUCTION

We are the owners of 459-485 Mill Street and in review of the proposed Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan, Polocorp Inc. wishes to provide comments on the information provided as part of the Public Information Meeting #1 held on March 28, 2019. As part of our comments, the following documents have been reviewed:

- Notice of Meeting;
- Staff Presentation;
- Information panels including Existing & Proposed Land Use;

Please note while we have reviewed the information provided online, we were not given notice of the March 28, 2019 meeting. We wish to be included in future correspondence.

2.0 SITE CONTEXT

The subject lands are municipally addressed as 459-485 Mill Street within the City of Kitchener and are located directly adjacent to the Mill/Ottawa LRT stop.

The subject lands are approximately 2.3 acres presently.

3.0 REQUESTED REVISIONS TO THE MILL COURTLAND WOODSIDE PARK SECONDARY PLAN

The intent of the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan is to implement the direction of the PARTS Rockway Plan, which was approved by Council in 2017.

The following corrections to the plan are requested:
1) **Removal of the OS/2 Zoning from the South end of 459-485 Mill Street** – We have had numerous discussions with the Region of Waterloo as well as the City of Kitchener, and we are investigating creating a linkage between our lands and the LRT stop. In addition, the Region is undergoing an analysis to declare surplus the corner property along Mill/Ottawa (Region owned), in addition the lands along the LRT tracks that you have denoted as OS/2. At present, we are proposing approximately 500 units adjacent to that stop on 2.3 Acres, and it would make sense to create a linkage between the future development and the LRT stop. With an OS/2 zoning, this does not provide us flexibility in creative ways to dress up that stop.

2) **Removal of the suggestion of a road to bisect our development** – As per the PARTS Rockway mobility Framework man, you indicate that a Potential Street Connection should bisect our lands. We do not agree with this approach as it contravenes what you are attempting to accomplish with the LRT. Namely, to have alternate forms of transportation, other than the car.

3) **Add in a special provision for the Churches along Ottawa and Mill to be MIX zoning with allowances for Churches** – As you may know, the membership for Churches is on the decline, it would be a great benefit to the Churches and the area if these lands were already zoned sympathetic to what is proposed in the area.

4) **Rezone Hoffman Street to a MIX use zoning with special provisions on the first 2 floors for Employment Uses OR Zone it much higher than 6 storey** – While we agree that you need some employment uses along the LRT, 6 storey’s is a very restrictive height limit. Either you put a special provision on these lands that stipulates you need at least 2 storey’s of commercial, or permit heights greater than 6 storey’s, to promote this stop.

**4.0 MOVING FORWARD**

Polocorp Inc. formally requests that to accommodating these changes aligns with planning policies on the provincial, regional, and local levels. With exception to the above requests, Polocorp Inc. fully supports the proposed Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan

Furthermore, we would request that you include us on any future correspondence as it relates to this Secondary Plan.

Regards,

Mike Puopolo, COO
Polocorp Inc.

Amanda Stellings, Planner
I have added the information below to our contact information.

The property below falls within the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan and the more information can be found on the link below:


Regards,
Preet
Good afternoon Kristen,

Thank you for your email and your interest in the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review.

We appreciate receiving your comments/feedback on the information that was presented at the Open House, in particular your comments with respect to the property municipally known as 675 Queen Street South.

The lands at 675 Queen Street South are proposed to come out of the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan and be designated ‘Mixed Use’ on Map 3 – Land Use in the City’s Official Plan (2014).

I note it’s existing MU-3 zoning and site-specific provisions and the proposed MIX-1 zoning that was shown at the Open House. We will review the proposed zoning moving forward in the process.

We have ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and
upcoming meetings.
Thank you again for your participation in the Secondary Plan Review process.

If you have any additional comments or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Kristen Barisdale <kbarisdale@gspgroup.ca>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 12:17 PM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>; Preet Kohli <Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Mill Courtland Woodside Secondary Plan - 675 Queen Street South

Good afternoon,

On behalf of [Redacted], please find enclosed our comments pertaining to the Mill Courtland Woodside Secondary Plan.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or require further information.

Kristen Barisdale, MCIP, RPP
Associate, Senior Planner

GSP Group Inc.
Planning | Urban Design | Landscape Architecture
72 Victoria Street South, Suite 201
Kitchener, ON N2G 4Y9
519 569 8983
Hi [Redacted]

Thank you again for your input and comments on the new Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan. They are very much appreciated.

As Preet Kohli indicated in her email on April 16, 2019 we also received your comments, dated April 11, 2019, and will add your most recent comments to our log and spreadsheet for consideration moving forward during the review process.

We have ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any additional comments or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

---

Re: MCWP Open House Comment Form:

I would appreciate your consideration of some additional comments regarding the west side of Ottawa Street South between Courtland and Mill, from the apartments at 274 and 282 Ottawa St. S. up to the corner of Ottawa and Mill. I have included the original comment form as well, sent on April 11.

Additional comments:
I would like to emphasize the importance for new development in this area to incorporate creative plans to use or absorb rain water on the property, for example permeable parking lots, rooftop gardens, community gardens, and unpaved children’s playgrounds. My concern is that if these deep lots, which are presently mostly open ground, are covered with buildings and hard surface parking lots, heavy rainfall previously absorbed into the ground will run into the storm sewers or onto neighbouring properties. This raises the potential for basement flooding or sewage backup in houses further down Ottawa St. S. towards Courtland Ave. and for basement flooding in houses on Grenville Ave. backing onto new construction. Something which does not show up in the aerial maps, is that lots from about 35 to 47 Grenville Ave. are at a lower elevation than those which they abut on Ottawa St., from a few feet at Number 35 to several feet at Number 47.

In the end, however, all things considered, our preference would be for this section of Ottawa St. S. to remain zoned as Low Rise Residential.

A sincere thankyou for your consideration of these additional comments,

286 Ottawa St. S. Kitchener N2G 3T6

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 12:23 PM
To: secondaryplans@kitchener.ca
Subject: MCWP Open House Comment Form

Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before April 19th, 2019.
1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

I am pleased to see guidelines for new buildings to fit in with the character of existing neighbourhoods in low rise zoning, and would appreciate more of this in mid rise building. Incorporating parkland into the design is also welcome. Overall I am impressed with the detail of design.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

My comments are in regard to the west side of Ottawa Street South between Courtland and Mill, from the apartments at 274 and 282 Ottawa St. South up to the corner of Ottawa and Mill.

The proposed secondary plan for this area is for Medium Rise Residential. I believe the construction of buildings of from 5 to 8 stories would greatly change the character of this neighbourhood and would appear out of place, affecting the surrounding Low Rise properties on the opposite side of Ottawa Street and on Grenville Ave. I realize the lots are deep in this section and the plan is to intensify building close to the Mill St. Station, but I think that 4 stories would be an appropriate maximum height for new building here.

It is important to keep in mind the traffic on Ottawa St. S. between Courtland and Mill Streets. Although at times traffic volume appears low, at rush hours there is a constant stream of traffic, including buses and large transport trucks and it can be difficult to enter the street from the driveway. 8 story residential structures and convenience retail would add more traffic. There are only 2 lanes for traffic and no room to add more. Note that the bicycle lanes proposed in the light rail design were not built.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

Additional comments:

My parents bought the house at 286 Ottawa St. S. in 1947 (I believe it was built in
(1943) and I grew up there. My mother lived there until she died in 2007 and my son, [redacted], is now the homeowner. I attended the meeting at the Mill Courtland Community Centre in his place since he was at work, and am providing these comments following a discussion with him.

Of interest: I remember the old farm house at the corner of Ottawa and Mill (328 Ottawa) and the gully and empty fields beside our home, and fields across the street. Although change is inevitable, we would prefer it to be moderate with new buildings having a maximum of 3 to 4 stories.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [redacted]

Mailing Address: 286 Ottawa St. S. Kitchener

Email: [redacted]
Hi Christina,
Thank you for your email and for your phone call earlier today.

For the most part, the site or lands adjacent to the Mill Street ION stop are proposed to be designated and zoned for Mixed Use and Open Space. I have also attached the panel from the Open House that describes what could be developed in lands designated for Mixed Use and Open Space.

The City is anticipating bringing final documents to implement the changes in the land use designation and zoning to Council late this year. Once the land use designations and zoning are in place, it will be up to individual property owners to develop these sites with uses that are permitted by the land use permissions and this will be done on their timeframe. The City’s role is to put the land use permissions in place to facilitate the change or vision for the neighbourhood and station stop.

As you have noted there is a vision for some open space at the station stop. This could be acquired through the development review process or through an expropriation process. Mostly like it would be acquired through the submission of a site plan application (required parkland dedication). The timing dependent on individual property owners and their desire to redevelop their properties.

I did notice that we did not include the existing land use panel on the website. We will update accordingly, so that you can see what it is now.

Hopefully I have answered your questions.
Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.
Regards,
Tina

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
Hello Tina,

We just spoke on the phone. Thanks for the information.

From what I gather, it looks like the site of the Mill transit stop (Mill/Ottawa S) will be developed and an open (green?) space and a multi use facility? I'm not 100% positive, it is a little confusing without explanation.

Is there an idea of when this will begin or estimated completion? Is there an idea of what exactly will be included in the area of the Mill transit stop? Businesses etc?

Thank you for the info! I really wish I had made the meeting!
Hello Mr. Straus,

Thank you for your input and comments on the new Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan as they relate to 343 and 347 Mill Street.

They are received and appreciated and will be considered moving forward through the review process.

We have your contact information and have added it to our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any additional comments or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
Thanks,
Hi Tina,

Thank you for your email and for attending the Open House for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan.
Yes I recall meeting you at the Open House and our previous correspondence with respect to these properties during the PARTS process.
Thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback on the proposed land use plan for the properties addressed 393 and 395 Ottawa Street South.
I appreciate receiving the edited map that you prepared to clarify the requested change.
We will definitely consider your feedback and comments as we move through this process.
Thank you again David for your input and participation in the Secondary Plan review.
Regards,
Tina

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

Hi Tina,

I hope you are well. That was an informative evening the other week. Thank you for answering my questions after your presentation. I am the owner of Art's Countertops, we have had some discussion on this in the past.
You had mentioned that there is still some time to send in feedback or proposals. I mentioned to you that the 2 properties I own next to each other are being zoned in a slightly
different manner from one another. You had said the dotted line could possibly be moved and I did a little editing to the map from the handout. Please find attached the original and my altered map as a request for a small change. Thank you for your consideration.

sincerely,
Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before April 19th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

   We would like our two properties to move from Medium Rise Residential to High Rise Residential.
   Two properties are 343 Mill St. Kitchener and 347 Mill St. Kitchener.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   No comment

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhhood character?

   I'm in favour of infill/densification projects, existing property owners will benefit and it will keep the growth from sprawling across our farmland.
   It will also inject investment into the older rundown areas.
Write your additional comments here:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name:  

Mailing Address: 1836 Carmel-Koch Rd. St. Agatha ON (owners of 343 and 347 Mill St. Kitchener)

Email:  

Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review
Hi Carol,

The charrette on the 24th of April is for Mill Courtland Woodside Park.

As for someone looking to do a mid-rise building in a major transit station area they would look to both sets of design guidelines, the MTSA section and the Mid-Rise Design section. These would be used to justify their design.

MTSA

Mid-Rise Design

Hope that answers your question. Let me know if you require further clarification,

Dayna Edwards, M.PL, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner (Urban Design) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7324 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | dayna.edwards@kitchener.ca

Hello Carol,
Thank you for your email and your interest in the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan.

The Design Charrette for April 24th is only intended for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park neighbourhood. Dayna Edwards just sent out an email invite to the session so hopefully you received this? If not, I have attached it to this email for your information.

I have also copied Dayna Edwards on this email so that she may answer and provide clarification to your questions related to the Urban Design Manual, specifically the Section for “Design for Residential
Infill in Central Neighbourhoods”.

With respect to your question about a multiple dwelling, a multiple dwelling is a building that contains at least 3 individual dwelling units. The number of dwelling units and the built form of the multiple will vary depending on the land use designation and zone category.

For example in the Low Rise Residential land use designation the RES-4 Zone only permits a multiple dwelling to a maximum of 4 individual dwelling units, while the RES-5 Zone permits a multiple dwelling up to a Floor Space Ratio of 0.6 (Building Floor Area cannot exceed 60% of the lot area) and to maximum height of 3-4 storeys.

In the Medium Rise Residential land use designation, a multiple dwelling is only regulated by built form rather than a maximum number of dwelling units. In the RES-6 zone a multiple dwelling will have a maximum Floor Space Ratio of 2.0 (Building Floor Area cannot exceed 200% of the lot area) and to a maximum of 8 storeys. In the RES-7 zone a multiple dwelling is only regulated by Floor Space Ratio.

Let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.

Regards,
Tina

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
City Hall. Just to clarify, is this in regard to the Civic Centre neighbourhood only, or will other neighbourhoods in the Central Neighbourhoods area be looked at as well.

Second, I also picked up Part A of the Urban Design Manual “Design for Residential Infill In Central Neighbourhoods”. Specifically, the area in which I am interested is on Ottawa St. S. between Courtland and Mill, from the two apartment buildings up to Mill Street, which is proposed as Medium Rise Residential (RES 6). The note on page 1 of part A of the Manual says to refer to “Design for Major Transit Station Areas” for areas not designated low rise residential, but this design appears to be for High Rise Residential. So I have looked at the section of the manual entitled “Medium Rise Residential”. Is this correct? Is there anything else I should look at for Medium rise?

And lastly, in the Proposed Residential (RES) Zones chart (with the coloured headings) handed out at the March 27 meeting, what is meant by the symbol titled “multiple dwelling” (a rectangle divided into small squares) under the column “Proposed Permitted Residential Uses”.

Thankyou Tina and thankyou very much for making this information accessible.

Sincerely,

Carol Boehmer
Hello Carol,

Thank you for your email and your interest in the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan.

The Design Charrette for April 24th is only intended for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park neighbourhood. Dayna Edwards just sent out an email invite to the session so hopefully you received this? If not, I have attached it to this email for your information.

I have also copied Dayna Edwards on this email so that she may answer and provide clarification to your questions related to the Urban Design Manual, specifically the Section for “Design for Residential Infill in Central Neighbourhoods”.

With respect to your question about a multiple dwelling, a multiple dwelling is a building that contains at least 3 individual dwelling units.

The number of dwelling units and the built form of the multiple will vary depending on the land use designation and zone category.

For example in the Low Rise Residential land use designation the RES-4 Zone only permits a multiple dwelling to a maximum of 4 individual dwelling units, while the RES-5 Zone permits a multiple dwelling up to a Floor Space Ratio of 0.6 (Building Floor Area cannot exceed 60% of the lot area) and to maximum height of 3-4 storeys.

In the Medium Rise Residential land use designation, a multiple dwelling is only regulated by built form rather than a maximum number of dwelling units. In the RES-6 zone a multiple dwelling will have a maximum Floor Space Ratio of 2.0 (Building Floor Area cannot exceed 200% of the lot area) and to a maximum of 8 storeys. In the RES-7 zone a multiple dwelling is only regulated by Floor Space Ratio.

Let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.

Regards,

Tina

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
Hello Tina,

I have a few questions in regard to information received at the meeting for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Neighbourhood held on Wednesday, March 27 at the Mill Courtland Community Centre.

First, I picked up the notice for the charrette to be held on April 24 at Kitchener City Hall. Just to clarify, is this in regard to the Civic Centre neighbourhood only, or will other neighbourhoods in the Central Neighbourhoods area be looked at as well.

Second, I also picked up Part A of the Urban Design Manual “Design for Residential Infill In Central Neighbourhoods”. Specifically, the area in which I am interested is on Ottawa St. S. between Courtland and Mill, from the two apartment buildings up to Mill Street, which is proposed as Medium Rise Residential (RES 6). The note on page 1 of part A of the Manual says to refer to “Design for Major Transit Station Areas” for areas not designated low rise residential, but this design appears to be for High Rise Residential. So I have looked at the section of the manual entitled “Medium Rise Residential”. Is this correct? Is there anything else I should look at for Medium rise?

And lastly, in the Proposed Residential (RES) Zones chart (with the coloured headings) handed out at the March 27 meeting, what is meant by the symbol titled “multiple dwelling” (a rectangle divided into small squares) under the column “Proposed Permitted Residential Uses”.

Thankyou Tina and thankyou very much for making this information accessible.
Sincerely,

Carol Boehmer
Hello [Name]

Thank you for your email and for your interest in the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Neighbourhood Secondary Plan Review.

Sorry to hear that you felt that 2 weeks' notice was not sufficient time to be made aware of the Open House that occurred on March 28th. We understand that not everyone can attend the meeting and this is one of the reasons that all of the information from the Open House, presentation and panels, is posted on the City's website for everyone's information shortly after the meeting.

I have added your contact information to our email distribution list and we can notify you by email at such time as the information is posted on the website and for any additional consultation opportunities.

With respect to the neighbourhood specific Design Charrette on the 24th of April, I have forwarded your contact information to the Urban Designer leading this session in order that you be provided with additional information.

With respect to the floodplain question, I am assuming that you were able to get a copy of one of the handouts from the Open House, showing the proposed land use as we have not been able to get it posted to the website as of yet. The floodplain on the proposed land use plan does differ from the floodplain on the existing Secondary Plan as it has been updated and reflects the last import of the data from GRCA on March 3, 2019. I asked our IT Services to confirm that the proposed land use plan as was shown at the Open House does reflect the most current data and references correctly the location and extent of the floodplain. I have attached the GRCA and City PDFs of the floodplain for your information.

I trust this answers your questions.

If you have any additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
I'm disappointed to learn that an Open House was held on March 28th for Secondary Plan for the Mill Courtland Woodside Area. With notices being delivered only 2 weeks prior to the date there was little time to be made aware of it; which I was not.

Please add the following information to your list for any future notifications:

272 Herbert Street
Waterloo, Ont
N2J 1V4

I note that a design charrette is scheduled for April 24th, however, no additional information is provided. Please advise when details are known.

I also note that the flood plain shown on the Proposed Land Use Plan does not coincide with that of the GRCA mapping available online. Can you please let me know what study/information the revised floodplain mapping is based on?

Thank you
Hi,

Thank you for your interest in the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review. Sorry you were unable to attend last night’s Open House to review all the work that has been done.

Currently the property at 186 Highland Road East is designated “Low Rise Conservation” in the Secondary Plan and zone “Residential Five Zone (R-5)” in the City’s Zoning By-Law 85-1.

The proposed new land use designation is “Low Rise Residential” with a “Res-5” zoning. The new land use designation and zoning does permit a few more type of residential uses than is currently permitted.

For example the current zoning permits up to a triplex use (3 dwelling units) on a lot having a minimum area of 495 square metres and a maximum building height of 10.5 metres, covering not more than 55% of the lot area, while the new zoning permits a multiple (more than 3 units) on a lot having a minimum area of 495 square metres, a maximum building height of 11 metres and which building floor area cannot exceed 60% of the lot.

All the information from last night’s Open House should be posted on the City’s website shortly. We now have your email and can add it to our distribution list and notify you at such time as the information is posted.

The proposed land use designations and zoning are only draft at this time and we welcome your feedback and comments.

Should you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
Hello,

We received your letter regarding the above plan. We are unable to attend the open house tonight, but I was hoping you could provide some clarification in regards to the plan for Highland Rd E.

We live at 186 Highland Rd E and just wanted to know what the plan was regarding this section.

Thank you
Hi Carol,

Further to our phone conversation this afternoon I am attaching a location map of the study area.

I am also attaching the link to the webpage where all the information for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan Review will be posted. The webpage for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Review should become live(visibility) shortly.


Should you have any other questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
# 5.0 Public Comments and Staff Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>185 Mill Street</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. Staff have reviewed the designation and zoning at 235 Madison Ave S and have determined that a medium rise residential land use designation is more appropriate than high rise residential at this location. The property at 185 Mill Street is proposed to be designated low rise residential to reflect the existing use of the property and the size of the property is not conducive to a medium rise built form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>197 Mill Street</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>The new boundary of the secondary plan reflects the PARTS Plan that was prepared for the ION stops in the neighbourhood. Whether a property is designated low rise residential in or outside of the secondary plan does not impact the land use designation and zoning permissions applied to properties. These properties on Mill Street are proposed to be designated low rise residential to reflect the existing use of the properties and the size of the properties are not conducive to a medium rise built form (8 storeys and 2.0 FSR). The low rise residential land use designation and proposed RES-5 zoning would still permit multiple dwellings up to three storeys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) I dislike changing the zoning to the lot on Madison to High Rise Res. It is right between low rise res + Mixed use. There are no other high rises in this neighbourhood. 
2) I used to be in the zoning + I am no longer. I'm at 185 Mill St. I believe I should remain in the Mill Courtland zone. I dislike that you propose changing my house from Medium Rise Res to low rise res. 
3) High rise res does not fit with our neighbourhood at all. I like the proposal for Mixed Use + Innovation Employment on Stirling / Courtland / Mill Street. 
4) Please do something about the abandoned factory on Madison. It's filled with squatters, setting fires + using drugs while littering filth all over the neighbourhood. 

1) I would recommend that the secondary plan extend further up Mill Street on both sides to incorporate areas already supporting multi-family homes. 
2) That properties on Mill Street between Stirling Ave and Woodland Ave be included in the secondary plan and be considered for medium rise residential zoning. 
3) Mill Street from Stirling to Woodland Park is a mix of old houses with hodge-podge additions and expansions to support multi-family residences. I would recommend that this area be included in the secondary plan and zoned medium rise-residential. There is little character to be retained at this point. Medium rise-residential would be consistent with Woodland Ave to Spadina Road. (on the west side of the road) 
4) I support including the house along the west side of Mill Street between Stirling and Woodland Ave (or as far as Spadina) in the secondary plan and increasing the density along Mill Street all the way to Woodland Park. Specifically I support increasing the density on the west side of Mill Street from Stirling Ave to Woodland Ave.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3 | 286 Ottawa Street South | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | Thank you for your comments. Staff will be completing 3D modelling to ensure appropriate transitions between low rise residential and medium rise residential properties.  
One of the recommendations coming out of the PARTS Rockway Plan (Planning Around Rapid Transit Station Areas Plans) was the consideration of the incorporation of bonusing regulations in the Focus areas around the ION Stops. The PARTS Central Plan specifically recommended the consideration of Bonusing for properties designated for High Rise Residential or High Density Mix Use for the provision of the community benefit of “Affordable Housing”, but this approach has been changed through provincial legislation. |

1. I am pleased to see guidelines for new buildings to fit in with the character of existing neighbourhoods in low rise zoning, and would appreciate more of this in mid-rise building. Incorporating parkland into the design is also welcome. Overall I am impressed with the detail of design.  

2. My comments are in regard to the west side of Ottawa Street South between Courtland and Mill, from the apartments at 274 and 282 Ottawa St. South up to the corner of Ottawa and Mill. The proposed secondary plan for this area is for Medium Rise Residential. I believe the construction of buildings of from 5 to 8 stories would greatly change the character of this neighbourhood and would appear out of place, affecting the surrounding Low Rise properties on the opposite side of Ottawa Street and on Grenville Ave. I realize the lots are deep in this section and the plan is to intensify building close to the Mill St. Station, but I think that 4 stories would be an appropriate maximum height for new building here.  
It is important to keep in mind the traffic on Ottawa St. S. between Courtland and Mill Streets. Although at times traffic volume appears low, at rush hours there is a constant stream of traffic, including buses and large transport trucks and it can be difficult to enter the street from the driveway. 8 story residential structures and convenience retail would add more traffic. There are only 2 lanes for traffic and no room to add more. Note that the bicycle lanes proposed in the light rail design were not built.  

3. My parents bought the house at 286 Ottawa St. S. in 1947 (I believe it was built in 1943) and I grew up there. My mother lived there until she died in 2007 and my son, David Boehmer, is now the homeowner. I attended the meeting at the Mill Courtland Community Centre in his place since he was at work, and am providing these comments following a discussion with him.  
Of interest: I remember the old farm house at the corner of Ottawa and Mill (328 Ottawa) and the gully and empty fields beside our home, and fields across the street. Although change is inevitable, we would prefer it to be moderate with new buildings having a maximum of 3 to 4 stories.  
I would like to emphasize the importance for new development in this area to incorporate creative plans to use or absorb rain water on the property, for |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>example permeable parking lots, rooftop gardens, community gardens, and unpaved children’s playgrounds. My concern is that if these deep lots, which are presently mostly open ground, are covered with buildings and hard surface parking lots, heavy rainfall previously absorbed into the ground will run into the storm sewers or onto neighbouring properties. This raises the potential for basement flooding or sewage backup in houses further down Ottawa St. S. towards Courtland Ave. and for basement flooding in houses on Grenville Ave. backing onto new construction. Something which does not show up in the aerial maps, is that lots from about 35 to 47 Grenville Ave. are at a lower elevation than those which they abut on Ottawa St., from a few feet at Number 35 to several feet at Number 47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>286 Ottawa Street South</td>
<td>Concerns re: &quot;Bonusing’ rules to be broadened’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: March 28, 2019</td>
<td>CHECK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonusing is a zoning tool which permits increases in height and/or density (building floor area) in exchange for a developer providing community benefits. There are a number of community benefits which can be provided, i.e. public art, community facilities, public transit infrastructure, conservation of cultural heritage resources, affordable housing, indoor/outdoor amenity areas, construction/renovation to LEED standard, to name a few. Currently, the use of Bonusing is only permitted in the Urban Growth Centre Boundary (Kitchener’s Downtown). One of the recommendations coming out of the PARTS Rockway Plan (Planning Around Rapid Transit Station Areas Plans) was the consideration of the incorporation of bonusing regulations in the Focus areas around the ION Stops. The PARTS Central Plan specifically recommended the consideration of Bonusing for properties designated for High Rise Residential or High Density Mix Use for the provision of the community benefit of “Affordable Housing”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>286 Ottawa Street South</td>
<td>I also picked up Part A of the Urban Design Manual &quot;Design for Residential Infill in Central Neighbourhoods”. Specifically, the area in which I am interested is on Ottawa St. S. between Courtland and Mill, from the two apartment buildings up to Mill Street, which is proposed as Medium Rise Residential (RES 6). The note on page 1 of part A of the Manual says to refer to &quot;Design for Major Transit Station Areas&quot; for areas not designed low rise residential, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: April 6, 2019</td>
<td>With respect to your question about a multiple dwelling, a multiple dwelling is a building that contains at least 3 individual dwelling units. The number of dwelling units and the built form of the multiple will vary depending on the land use designation and zone category. For example in the Low Rise Residential land use designation the RES-4 Zone only permits a</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>343 and 347 Mill Street</td>
<td>this design appears to be for High Rise Residential. So I have looked at the section of the manual entitled &quot;Medium Rise Residential&quot;. Is this correct? Is there anything else I should look at for Medium rise? And lastly, in the Proposed Residential (RES) Zones chart (with the coloured headings) handed out at the March 27 meeting, what is meant by the symbol titled &quot;multiple dwelling&quot; (a rectangle divided into small squares) under the column &quot;Proposed Permitted Residential Uses&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: April 8, 2019</td>
<td>multiple dwelling to a maximum of 4 individual dwelling units, while the RES-5 Zone permits a multiple dwelling up to a Floor Space Ratio of 0.6 (Building Floor Area cannot exceed 60% of the lot area) and to maximum height of 3-4 storeys. In the Medium Rise Residential land use designation, a multiple dwelling is only regulated by built form rather than a maximum number of dwelling units. In the RES-6 zone a multiple dwelling will have a maximum Floor Space Ratio of 2.0 (Building Floor Area cannot exceed 200% of the lot area) and to a maximum of 8 storeys. In the RES-7 zone a multiple dwelling is only regulated by Floor Space Ratio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>675 Queen Street South</td>
<td>We would like our two properties to move from Medium Rise Residential to High Rise Residential: Two properties are 343 Mill St. Kitchener and 347 Mill St. Kitchener. I'm in favour of infill/densification projects, existing property owners will benefit and it will keep the growth from sprawling across our farmland. It also inject investment into older rundown areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: April 29, 2019</td>
<td>The two properties at 343 and 347 Mill Street are currently designated low density multiple residential and zoned R-7. It is proposed that they be designated medium rise residential and zoned RES-6. This new land use designation and zoning would permit 8 storeys and 2.0 FSR whereas the existing designation and zoning would only permit 8 storeys with a 1.0 FSR. High rise residential does not exist now and would not be an appropriate built form in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The property is located on the south side of Queen Street South and is surrounded by existing townhouse development to the east, Woodside Park to the south, low rise residential to the west and an existing rail right-of-way to the north. The property at 675 Queen Street South is currently designated as Mixed use Corridor in the existing Mill Courtland Woodside Park Neighbourhood Plan (1994 Official Plan), which is intended to accommodate a broad range of commercial, institutional and multiple residential uses. New development is required to be compatible with surrounding residential uses and shall have a minimum FSR of 0.6 and maximum FSR of 2.0. Permissions for a maximum FSR of 4.0 may be considered for locations that abut an arterial or major collector road, are well separated from low rise residential development and have adequate municipal infrastructure. Queen Street South is identified as a Regional Road at this location, and the property is approximately 800 metres southwest of future ION Light Rail Transit Services along Charles Street East. The property is currently zoned High Intensity Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff have reviewed the comments and are proposing to designate the property Mixed Use with a site specific to grant the property a MIX-4 zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | Use Corridor (MU-3) in the existing Zoning By-law, which permits a wide range of commercial, institutional and residential uses with a minimum FSR of 1.0, a maximum FSR of 4.0 and no height restriction.  
The property is also subject to Special Regulation Provision 508R, which requires residential dwellings, day care facilities, residential care facilities, educational facilities or tourist homes to be located 15 metres from the abutting rail right-of-way, and Special Regulation Provision 520R, which establishes minimum setback requirements to any adjacent properties zoned R-8.  
The property at 675 Queen Street South has been excluded from the Proposed Land Use Plan for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan. We request confirmation of the proposed Official Plan designation applicable to 675 Queen Street South as it has not been identified as part of the new Official Plan (2014) or included as part of the draft Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan.  
The property at 675 is proposed to be zoned Mixed Use One (MIX-1) as part of the zoning for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan. While the proposed MIX-1 Zone maintains permissions for a broad range of commercial, institutional and residential uses, it proposes a maximum building height of 14 metres, a minimum FSR of 0.6 and a maximum FSR 1.0. The proposed MIX-1 Zone identified for 675 Queen Street South as part of the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan is inconsistent with the permissions of the Mixed Use Corridor designation with respect to FSR and significantly reduces the redevelopment and intensification opportunities on the property. We request the property at 675 Queen Street South be zoned Mixed Use Four (MIX-4), which is more consistent with the Mixed Use Corridor designation and existing High Intensity Mixed Use Corridor Zone (MU-3) that currently apply to the property.  
I trust that the above-noted commentary adequately conveys the concerns of the Weber Group of Companies with respect to the property at 675 Queen Street South and will be considered when preparing further drafts of the land use schedules and zoning for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Written: April 15, 2019</td>
<td>We just spoke on the phone. Thanks for the information. From what I gather, it looks like the site of the Mill transit stop (Mill/Ottawa S) will be developed and an open (green?) space and a multi use facility? I’m not 100% positive, it is a little confusing without explanation. Is there an idea of when this will begin or estimated completion? Is there an idea of what exactly will be included in the area of the Mill transit stop? Businesses etc? Thank you for the info! I really wish I had made the meeting!</td>
<td>Thank you for your email and your phone call earlier today. For the most part, the site or lands adjacent to the Mill Street ION stop are proposed to be designed and zoned for Mixed Use and Open Space. I have also attached the panel from the Open House that describes what could be developed in lands designated for Mixed Use and Open Space. The City is anticipating bringing final documents to implement the changes in the land use designation and zoning to Council late this year. Once the land use designations and zoning are in place, it will be up to individual property owners to develop these sites with uses that are permitted by the land use permissions and this will be done on their timeframe. The City’s role is to put the land use permissions in place to facilitate the change or vision for the neighbourhood and station stop. As you have noted there is a vision for some open space at the station stop. This could be acquired through the development review process or through an expropriation process. Mostly like it would be acquired through the submission of a site plan application [required parkland dedication]. The timing dependent on individual property owners and their desire to redevelop their properties. I did notice that we did not include the existing land use panel on the website. We will update accordingly, so that you can see what it is now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>395 Ottawa Street South Written: April 10, 2019</td>
<td>That was an informative evening the other week. Thank you for answering my questions after your presentation. I am Dave the owner of Art’s Countertops, we have had some discussion on this in the past. You had mentioned that there is still some time to send in feedback or proposals. I mentioned to you that the 2 properties I own next to each other are being zoned in a slightly different manner from one another. You had said the dotted line could possibly be moved and I did a little editing to the map from the handout.</td>
<td>Thank you for your email and for attending the Open House for the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan. Yes I recall meeting you at the Open House and our previous correspondence with respect to these properties during the PARTS process. Thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback on the proposed land use plan for the properties addressed 393 and 395 Ottawa Street South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>272 Herbert Street Written: April 2, 2019</td>
<td>I also note that the flood plain shown on the Proposed Land Use Plan does not coincide with that of the GRCA mapping available online. Can you please let me know what study/information the revised floodplain mapping is based on?</td>
<td>With respect to the floodplain question, I am assuming that you were able to get a copy of one of the handouts from the Open House, showing the proposed land use as we have not been able to get it posted to the website as of yet. The floodplain on the proposed land use plan does differ from the floodplain on the existing Secondary Plan as it has been updated and reflects the last import of the data from GRCA on March 3, 2019. I asked our IT Services to confirm that the proposed land use plan as was shown at the Open house does reflect the most current data and references correctly the location and extent of the floodplain. I have attached the GRCA and City PDFs of the floodplain for your information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>186 Highland Road East Written: March 28, 2019</td>
<td>We received your letter regarding the above plan. We were unable to attend the open house tonight, but I was hoping you could provide some clarification in regards to the plan for Highland Rd E. We live at 186 Highland Rd E and just wanted to know what the plan was regarding this section.</td>
<td>Currently the property at 186 Highland Road East is designated &quot;Low Rise Conservation&quot; in the Secondary Plan and zone &quot;Residential five zone (R-5) in the City's Zoning By-Law 85-1. The proposed new land use designation is &quot;Low Rise Residential&quot; with a &quot;Res-5&quot; zoning. The new land use designation and zoning does permit a few more type of residential uses than is currently permitted. For example the current zoning permits up to a triplex use (3 dwelling units on a lot having a minimum area of 495 square metres and a maximum building height of 10.5 metres, covering not more than 55% of the lot area, while the new zoning permits a multiple (more than 3 units) on a lot having a minimum area of 495 square metres, a maximum building height of 11 metres and which building floor area cannot exceed 60% of the lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mike Puopolo, Polocorp Inc. 459-485 Mill Street Written: August 12, 2019</td>
<td>3.0 REQUESTED REVISIONS TO THE MILL COURTLAND WOODSIDE PARK SECONDARY PLAN The following modifications to the ‘Proposed Land Use- Mill Courtland Woodside Park’ and ‘Mill Courtland Woodside Park – Proposed Zoning’ maps are requested: 1) Removal of the Open Space from the South end of 459-485 Mill Street We have had numerous discussions with the Region of Waterloo as well as the City of Kitchener, and we are investigating creating a linkage between our lands and the LRT Station. In addition, the Region is</td>
<td>Thank you for your interest and for providing your feedback on the Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan. We have logged your comments and they will be considered moving forward. We have included your contact information on our notification list to keep you informed of any upcoming project announcements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  |  | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments |  |
|  | undertaking a review of their land in the area to determine whether surplus lands will be made available at the corner property along Mill/Ottawa as well as the lands along the LRT tracks. At present, we are proposing approximately 500 units adjacent to that stop on 2.3 acres and would request a modification to the map for the strip along the trail shown as Open Space. With an Open Space designation/zoning, there would be limitations in the ability to creatively enhance the pedestrian realm adjacent to the LRT Station. We would request that this strip be designated and zoned with the MIX-4 category to allow for flexibility in design. It should be noted that this designation would still permit a trail along the LRT corridor, while also allowing for alternative architectural elements to enhance the area.  
2) Removal of the suggestion of a road to bisect our development  
As indicated in our comments provided during the PARTS Rockway planning study, we do not support a bisecting road through our lands. This road significantly reduced the developability of the lands, while encouraging the use of single-family vehicles in an area optimal for public transit. The PARTS Rockway Mobility Framework Plan illustrates this road, which we would request to be removed from all diagrams, mapping, and illustrations for the Secondary Plan process.  
3) Rezone Hoffman Street to a MIX use zoning with special provisions on the first 2 floors for Employment Uses OR Zone it much higher than 6 storeys  
While we support employment uses along the LRT, we have concerns with the restriction of height to six storeys in this area. We would recommend a modification to include a special provision on these lands to include two storeys of at-grade commercial. Alternatively, higher densities/height should be permitted in this area to enhance the economic growth in the Major Transit Station Area.  
4.0 MOVING FORWARD  
Polocorp Inc. would request that the City modify the plans as per the above items 1-3, which would allow the upcoming development in the area to be pedestrian-friendly, provide opportunities for active transit, and encourage an enhanced level of architectural and urban design. With exception to the above modifications, Polocorp Inc. is generally | If you have any further comments or questions or would like to discuss the review process, please feel free to contact us. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   |                     | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | supportive of the proposed Mill Courtland Woodside Park Secondary Plan. |
6.0 Justification and Summary

General Justification:

- Kennedy Avenue residential block: Originally designated as Low Rise Residential and zoned as RES-5 is now proposed to be designated as Low Rise Residential Limited and zoned as RES-3 to reflect the existing built form.
- Grenville Avenue residential block: Originally designated as Low Rise Residential and zoned as RES-5 is now proposed to be designated as Low Rise Residential Limited and zoned as RES-3 to reflect the existing built form.
- Mill Street and Pattandon Avenue residential block: Properties originally designated as Low Rise Residential and zoned as RES-5 or RES-4 is now proposed to be designated as Low Rise Residential Limited and zoned as RES-3 to reflect the existing built form.
- Charles Street West/Maurice Street/Ottawa Street South/Sydney Street South residential block: Properties to be designated as Low Rise Residential and zoned as RES-5 or RES-4 is now proposed to be designated as Low Rise Residential Limited and zoned as RES-3 to reflect the existing built form.
- Maurice/Ottawa/Sydney residential block with Habitat for Humanity property: Properties originally designated as Low Rise Residential now proposed to be designated as Medium Rise Residential and zoned as RES-6 to reflect the existing built form.

Site Specific Justification:

- 235 Madison Avenue: Proposed to be designated as High Rise Residential and zoned as RES-7 and is now proposed to be designated as Medium Rise Residential and zoned as RES-6. This change deviates from the PARTS Rockway plan to reflect development potential for this site from its current Industrial designation and M-2 zoning and it’s adjacency to low rise residential properties.
- 185 Mill Street: Interest in redesignating this property to Medium Rise Residential was brought forward to Staff. This property will continue to be proposed as Low Rise Residential and zoned as RES-4 (155), but will now be located in Map 3 and is outside of the Secondary Plan boundary.
- 343 and 347 Mill Street: Currently designated as Low Density Multiple Residential and zoned R-7. Staff determined that a High Rise Residential designation is not appropriate for these properties and instead are proposed to be designated Medium Rise Residential and zoned as RES-6.
- 274-320 Ottawa Street South: Properties are currently zoned as R-7 or R-5 and are proposed to be designated as Medium Rise Residential and zoned as RES-6. There were concerns expressed about how increased permissions could change the character of the area. Staff determined that proper compatibility can be ensure using the new zoning regulations to allow for gentle intensification or redevelopment on these properties.
- 99 Ottawa Street South, 108 Sydney Street:
- Maurice Street (South side): Originally proposed to be Low Rise Residential and zoned RES-5 and now proposed to be Low Rise Residential (east) and Medium Rise Residential (west) and zoned as RES-5 and RES-6 respectively.
• 4, 8 Maurice Street: Originally proposed to be designated as Mixed Use and zoned as MIX-4, now the properties are proposed to be zoned as MIX-1 given the development potential of the lots and adjacency to Low Rise Residential properties.

• 589-593 Charles Street: Originally proposed to be designated as Mixed Use and zoned MIX-4 and is now proposed to be zoned MIX-1 given the size of the parcel fabric and adjacency to Low Rise Residential properties.

• 183-207 Ottawa Street: Originally proposed to be designated as Mixed Use and is now proposed to be designated Low Rise Residential and zoned as RES-5.
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1.0 Objective
The King Street East Secondary Plan was adopted by City Council in May 1994 and was approved by Regional Council in May 1995. Given this secondary plan is nearly 25 years old, City Planning Staff evaluated the existing secondary plan, in conjunction with other municipal documents and consultation to create an updated version. This plan applies new land use designations and zoning regulations which reflects direction from the City, Region, Province and other external agencies.

1.1 Location Map
2.0 Considerations

2.1 Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) – Central & Rockway Study Areas

The PARTS Plans were conducted to ensure the City of Kitchener’s station areas are developed in stable ways that support local transit and add value to communities. The studies completed thus far include recommendations for the following: Land use; Engineering infrastructure; Pedestrian and cycling connection enhancements; Transportation demand management measures; Public realm and streetscape improvements in surrounding areas; Road and parking implications; Community infrastructure; and, Public art opportunities.

The PARTS Central Plan and PARTS Rockway Plan were intended to be guiding documents with goals and strategies to be implemented through an Official Plan Amendment, a Secondary Plan, a Zoning By-law Amendment, and updates to the Urban Design Manual. The Preferred Plans (Land Use Maps) developed through this process act as a guide for the King Street East Secondary Plan. Incorporation of new land use designations and zones with updated regulations were considered in conjunction with the existing conditions and uses of properties, and their existing permissions and special policies and regulations. Any deviation between the Preferred Plans and the draft King Street East Secondary Plan were done through Staff review and public comment and consultation to achieve the best land use planning suited to the existing and future development of the community.

2.2 Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

The City of Kitchener undertook RIENS in hopes to develop a clear and fair process for approving development projects in established neighbourhoods. Typically development proposals are considered based on the size and impact on the surrounding area, and the zoning by-laws and urban design standards in place. The intent of the recommendations of this study was to further ensure that new development blends and is compatible with the neighbourhood.

2.3 Urban Design Guidelines (UDG)

The Urban Design Manual is a guide for the development community, residents, special-interest groups, city council and staff for details on our city’s urban design guidelines and standards. The recent update of Part A of the Urban Design Manual was approved on September 9, 2019 by council as part of the Community and Infrastructure Services Committee agenda. The guidelines were last updated in 2000 and Kitchener has since seen rapid change and intensification throughout the city, triggering a desire to ensure that the guidelines reflect the evolving expectations for the design of buildings and public spaces.

Urban Design staff held a public design charrette for the King Street East neighbourhood on May 16, 2019. The intent of the charrette was to directly speak to and address residents’
concerns and identify opportunities for better design in their community. These neighbourhood specific guidelines will be brought forward for approval as part of the Secondary Plans for each neighbourhood. Upon approval of the secondary plan for this neighbourhood, the neighbourhood specific design guidelines will be added as part of the area specific guidelines for Central Neighbourhoods.

### 2.4 Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) Study

The CHL Study was undertaken to determine how to best creatively conserve the historical integrity and early development pattern of our city, while encouraging new growth. Identifying historic places that blend the built and natural environment that have key ties to the events, people and activities that form the shape of our city were accounted through an inventory detailing these CHLs. A comprehensive summary of the findings and recommendations of this study for CHLs within the King Street East neighbourhood is below.
King Street East Secondary Plan

Cultural Heritage Resources Background Study

Introduction

Our cultural heritage resources provide a link to the past and are an expression of the City’s culture and history. They contribute in a significant way to Kitchener’s identity and unique character, and help instill civic pride, foster a sense of community and a sense of place. The conservation of cultural heritage resources also contributes to making our neighbourhoods a more interesting and appealing place to live, work and play.

The Province of Ontario, through the Provincial Policy Statement (a planning document that provides policy direction on matters of Provincial interest related to land use planning and development), requires that municipalities conserve significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs).

With this in mind, the conservation of cultural heritage resources has been an important consideration in work undertaken by the City as part of the comprehensive planning review of the King Street East Secondary Plan area. This work, which culminates in updating the policies and land use planning framework of the King Street East Secondary Plan, aims to encourage development and growth in a manner that is respectful of cultural heritage and contributes to making the neighbourhoods within this area unique and distinctive.

Built Heritage Resources

Built heritage resources are buildings and structures that may have either design/physical, historic/associative, or contextual heritage value. The designation and listing of heritage property on the Municipal Heritage Register is an important tool in the City’s efforts to conserve its built heritage resources.

Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act provides the strongest heritage protection available for conserving heritage resources, and allows a municipality to control proposals for demolition and alteration through a heritage permit system. While a “listed” property is afforded a more limited measure of protection, the City can require studies such as a heritage impact assessment and/or a conservation plan to guide the consideration of new development and identify measures to avoid or mitigate negative impacts to significant cultural heritage resources and attributes.

Currently, there are 16 built heritage resources within the King Street East Secondary Plan boundary and included on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register. Of these 16 properties, 1 is formally designated through a heritage designation under the Ontario Heritage Act, and 15
properties are “listed” as non-designated properties. Current designated and listed properties within the King Street East Secondary Plan boundary are identified on Map 2.

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

While the City has long maintained a heritage register of significant built heritage resources, efforts to identify and conserve significant cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs) is a relatively new undertaking. In 2014, an inventory of 55 significant cultural heritage landscapes in Kitchener was established. Cultural heritage landscapes are defined in the Provincial Policy Statement as a geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples of cultural heritage landscapes include, but are not limited to, parks, main streets, cemeteries, trailways, industrial complexes, and neighbourhoods.

Within a cultural heritage landscape, there are often buildings, structures, landscape features and other attributes that collectively illustrate a historical theme. Themes considered to be significant are those that are essential to understanding the evolution of a City and that underpin its identity. The Kitchener CHL Study concluded that several established residential neighbourhoods that maintain a high degree of heritage integrity and are representative of the planning concepts and housing styles of the period in which they were developed, are worthy of being conserved.

The 2014 Kitchener CHL Study identifies the Onward Avenue Neighbourhood, St. Peter’s Lutheran Cemetery, and First Mennonite Church Cemetery as significant cultural heritage landscapes within the King Street East Secondary Plan area. In addition, a portion of the Central Frederick Neighbourhood CHL as identified in the 2014 CHL Study, is located within the King Street East Secondary Plan boundary (see Map X). Consideration of this latter CHL will be addressed in future studies and will not form part of the CHL work being undertaken with the King Street East Secondary Plan.

Onward Avenue Neighbourhood is one of 12 established residential neighbourhoods of considerable value and significance identified in the study. The **Onward Avenue Neighbourhood** is a stable, mature neighbourhood associated with the expansion of Kitchener, and a marker for the rapid industrial and population growth in the first quarter of the 20th century. The Onward Neighbourhood is representative of the City Beautiful movement with its curved streets embellished by boulevards, and the area remains virtually unchanged since its development in terms of its vegetation, street pattern, and buildings.

The **First Mennonite Church Cemetery** is one of the earliest religious congregations in Waterloo County. The cemetery is still in use and is well-maintained, with new stones mixed in with the
very old. The cemetery is of cultural heritage value in that it is the final resting place of some of the earliest settlers to the area, and for the associated significance of the headstones, monuments, and inscriptions. The cemetery is designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

**St. Peter’s Lutheran Cemetery** has been in continuous operation since its acquisition and consecration in 1871. It is considered to be the largest Lutheran cemetery in Canada.

*Pages from 2014 CHL Study on Onward Avenue Neighbourhood, First Mennonite Church Cemetery and St. Peter’s Lutheran Cemetery*
A Phased Approach to CHL Conservation

Taking stock and identifying the cultural heritage resources that are important to a community is a critical first step in any conservation strategy. For each CHL identified in the 2014 CHL Study, the study provides a description of the landscape; establishes a preliminary boundary of interest;
identifies the historical integrity, and cultural and community values associated with the landscape; and finally, describes the character defining features of the CHL.

While the Study does not in itself protect CHLs, it serves as the first of three phases of work involved in establishing appropriate CHL conservation strategies for each landscape, as follows:

**Phase 1** – Establish an inventory of Significant CHLs and identify priority CHLs for further study and analysis.

**Phase 2** – Conduct fieldwork, analysis and property owner engagement in identifying heritage attributes and a preferred conservation strategy for select CHLs.

**Phase 3** – Implementation and management of a preferred CHL conservation strategy or strategies.

Phase 1 noted above is complete. Priority CHLs have been identified including the Onward Avenue Neighbourhood, First Mennonite Church Cemetery, and St. Peter’s Lutheran Cemetery CHLs. Phase 2 is in progress for select priority CHLs. This includes work undertaken by City Planning staff in arriving at the cultural heritage policies included in this Secondary Plan. The timing associated with the third and final phase of the City’s CHL conservation strategy is in part dependent upon the nature and complexity of the strategies recommended for each CHL. Strategies affording the best protections are typically those governed by Provincial legislation such as the Ontario Heritage Act (e.g. heritage designation and listing of heritage property), and the Planning Act (e.g. Secondary Plan policies, assignment of appropriate land use and zoning, implementation of neighbourhood design guidelines through site plan control).

**Fieldwork and Analysis**

The 2014 Kitchener CHL Study identifies the Onward Avenue Neighbourhood, First Mennonite Church Cemetery, and St. Peter’s Lutheran Cemetery as significant CHLs. City staff reviewed the built heritage resources located within the King Street East Secondary Plan area, including the cultural heritage landscapes, and analyzed existing heritage protections in place for properties located within the King Street East Secondary Plan area boundary and proposed land use and associated zoning.

**Onward Avenue Neighbourhood**

The following attributes, identified in the 2014 Kitchener CHL Study, contribute to the cultural heritage value or interest of the Onward Avenue Neighbourhood CHL:

- Curved and linked street patterns embellished by boulevards;
- Variety of arts and crafts houses:
  - Brick masonry construction
  - Porches
- Gabled roofs
- Scale of dwellings; and
- Building setbacks from the street.
First Mennonite Church Cemetery

The following attributes, identified in the 2014 Kitchener CHL Study, contribute to the cultural heritage value or interest of the First Mennonite Church Cemetery:

- Shape and texture of original topography;
- Informal layout of access roads and paths; and
- Variety and design of the commemorative memorials found including headstones, monuments, inscriptions, and a variety of stone types.

St. Peter’s Lutheran Cemetery

The following attributes, identified in the 2014 Kitchener CHL Study, contribute to the cultural heritage value or interest of the St. Peter’s Lutheran Cemetery CHL:

- Park-like setting;
- Carefully kept grounds;
- Gravel drives and mature trees; and
- Original terrain.
**Review of Land Use & Zoning**

Staff reviewed and considered preliminary land use designations assigned to property as part of the Secondary Plan review and made note of where proposed land use and associated zoning could conflict with CHL conservation interests (e.g. permitting a form of development that may not achieve an appropriate transition in scale with the existing historic low-rise character on certain residential streetscapes). This information was then considered in assigning land use designations which balance opportunities for growth and development with heritage conservation objectives.

**Public Engagement & Comments**

A public information open house regarding the King Street East Secondary Plan was held on April 4, 2019 and proposed land use and zoning designations were presented. An urban design charrette was held on May 16, 2019 and residents had the opportunity to provide recommendations and feedback regarding neighbourhood-specific urban design guidelines for the King Street East Secondary Plan area.

Some of the comments received in response to the open house and urban design charrette highlighted the significance of the Onward Avenue Neighbourhood CHL and the development of appropriate guidelines to minimize the impact of anticipated intensification on the character of the neighbourhood.

**Recommendations to address cultural heritage interests within the King Street East area**

Having examined the cultural heritage value and attributes of the King Street East Secondary Plan area, and having considered the feedback in and put received from property owners and the public through the Secondary Plan process, the following measures are recommended to be applied to address cultural heritage interests and objectives.

**Refinement of Boundaries**

Based on a review of the cultural heritage resources located within the existing boundary of the Onward Avenue Neighbourhood CHL, there are two properties that should be excluded from the CHL boundary, including the property at the northwest corner of King Street East and Dane Street and the property located directly south of the intersection of King Street East and Onward Avenue. These properties lack the CHL features and attributes common among other properties within the CHL boundary, and these non-contributing properties are recommended to be excluded from the CHL boundary. A copy of the refined CHL boundary is included within Map 1.
Measures to be considered in the King Street East Secondary Plan

- Establish area design guidelines that support cultural heritage conservation objectives.

Area specific design guidelines applying to the King Street East Secondary Plan and to be considered in guiding and reviewing development and other Planning applications, should support and be consistent with heritage conservation interests and objectives. This would include adding design guidelines to encourage new development to reflect the desirable aspects of the established character of the Onward Avenue Neighbourhood CHL, including detached rear yard garages, brick as the dominant building material, front porches, and gabled roofs.

The area specific design guidelines are also applicable to areas adjacent to the First Mennonite Church Cemetery and the St. Peter’s Lutheran Cemetery to help guide future infill development and the preservation of the existing character of these CHLs.

- Identify Property of Specific CHL Interest, where a Heritage Impact Assessment may be required for CHL conservation

Currently, as part of the assessment of proposed development impact on built heritage resources, and as referenced in the Provincial Policy Statement under the Planning Act, the City may require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for planning applications potentially impacting a cultural heritage resource located on property that is designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, and on property located adjacent to protected (designated) heritage property. The City’s Official Plan also states that the City may require the submission of a HIA for development, redevelopment and site alteration that has the potential to impact an identified cultural heritage landscape.

It is recommended that within the King Street East Secondary Plan area, that the City have the ability to require a HIA for planning and development applications having the potential to impact property identified as being of specific CHL interest. Such properties are identified on Map 2 and include the following:

- Protected heritage property designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- Property “listed” on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register under Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- Property identified as being of cultural heritage interest and recommended for listing on the Municipal Heritage Register (until such time as a decision is made by Council on listing the property); and
- Property located adjacent to protected and listed heritage property.

Where development is proposed on property that is of specific CHL interest but not designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, then such HIA can be expected to be scoped and limited in review to assess visual and contextual impact.
Measures to be considered under the Official Plan

- Onward Avenue Neighbourhood, First Mennonite Church Cemetery, and St. Peter’s Lutheran Cemetery to be identified on Map 9 in the Official Plan as Cultural Heritage Landscapes.

Measures to be considered under the Ontario Heritage Act

- Existing built heritage resources designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and listed as non-designated property on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register shall be conserved.

- The following additional property is identified as being of cultural heritage interest and should be further reviewed and considered for listing on the Municipal Heritage Register through the City’s 4-step listing process:
  - 243 Weber Street East (St. Peter’s Lutheran Cemetery).
### 3.0 Process Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td>Staff begins Neighbourhood Planning Reviews and commences the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan. This review incorporates the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017/18 - May 2018</strong></td>
<td>Staff prepare material with relation to specific neighbourhood character topics to present to the public for feedback about what works well within their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 4, 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Information Meeting #1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Staff present information in an open house setting with the draft land use designations and zones for the neighbourhood. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit any further comments by comment form or through e-mail following the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 2019 – December 2019</strong></td>
<td>Public comments are received and reviewed by Staff. Updated draft maps for land use and zoning are finalized. Final recommendations for this secondary plan will be brought forward to council in Fall/Winter 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September – October 2019</strong></td>
<td>Internal City Staff review of all draft secondary plan policies and mapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 11, 2019</strong></td>
<td>All property owners within the Secondary Plan area are sent notice of a Statutory Public Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 9, 2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Information Meeting #2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Staff present all draft maps for six secondary plans, including land use and zoning maps for King Street East. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit final comments by comment form or e-mail following the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2019</strong></td>
<td>Staff conduct a final review of all secondary plan maps with public comments received and prepare a report for council. Final draft maps are finalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secondary Plans Report to Committee/Council</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Public Consultation Materials

4.1 Open House #1
   Notice of Open House
   Staff Presentation
   Information Panels/Maps
   Handout
   Scanned Sign In Sheets
   Scanned Comment Forms
   Public Comments Received by Email
March 18, 2019

Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

RE: Public Open House – Neighbourhood Specific Secondary Plan Review
King Street East Secondary Plan
Process of Applying Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations

The City would like to formally invite you to participate in the Neighbourhood Planning Review of the City’s Secondary Plans. We are commencing the review of the King Street East Secondary Plan and in the process of applying new Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations. See location map below for the boundary of this study area.

A Public Open House is scheduled as outlined below:

WHEN: Thursday, April 4, 2019
6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. (Drop-in format)
Brief Staff Presentation to Provide Background and Describe Process - 6:45 pm
LOCATION: Rockway Centre - 1405 King St. E.
An updated land use framework within the City’s Secondary Plan areas was deferred as part of the review of our new 2014 Official Plan. The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters. The Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study. The City is now reviewing the Secondary Plans and in the process of applying new Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations.

As a result of the background studies and work that has been done, a small portion of the King Street East Secondary Plan is proposed to be merged with the parent policies of the Official Plan.

Draft Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations have been applied to the properties in the boundary of the study area for your consideration and review at the Open House scheduled for April 4th, 2019.

Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you on April 4th, 2019!

Information shared at the meeting will also be available online (posted on the project website after the meeting). If you are unable to attend this meeting, you are welcome to provide your input through the project website: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR or to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Yours truly,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner – Policy

Brandon Sloan, Manager, Long Range and Policy Planning
Alain Pinard, Director of Planning
Councillor Debbie Chapman
Councillor Sarah Marsh
Neighbourhood Specific Planning Review
Proposed New King Street East Secondary Plan

Open House
April 4, 2019
Agenda and Format

6:30 p.m. Arrival, Sign-in
Rotating around room with individual opportunity to review the panels, write down information and ideas and discuss project review with staff

6:45 p.m. Overview Presentation
Rotating around room with individual opportunity to review the panels, write down information and ideas and discuss project review with staff

8:30 p.m. Conclusion – Thank you for attending
Have a great night!
The Secondary Plans were deferred as part of the new Official Plan (2014)

- Station Area Planning – PARTS Central/Rockway Plans
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Cultural Heritage Landscape Study
- RIENS Study
Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study – PARTS Central Plan
8.1 Land Use Plan

To support the implementation of the Key Directions and Strategies for built form and land use, a new land use framework has been created recommending new land use designations for the station area as well as showing new connections and public realm amenities. These land use designations should inform the development of a secondary plan for the station area, as well as related zoning by-law updates. A description of the intent of the different land use designations as well as an appropriate range of densities for each is provided on the opposite page.

Map Legend

- Study Area Boundary
- Focus Area Boundary
- ION Line & Stops
- Mixed-Use High Density
- Mixed-Use Medium Density
- Mixed-Use Low Density
- Commercial
- Innovation Employment
- General Employment
- Institutional
- Established Low-Rise Residential
- Low Rise Residential
- Medium Rise Residential
- High Rise Residential
- Parks
- Open Space
- Natural Heritage Conservation
- Two-Zone Policy Area (Floodplain)
- Overlay over land use designation.
- Site Specific Policy Area
- Active Frontage

scale (approx): 400m
Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study – PARTS Rockway Plan

**Key Directions**

1. Introduce a Fine-Grained Street & Block Network to Break Up Large Sites.
2. Extend the Iron Horse Trail Network.
3. Transform Kent Ave into a Complete Street.
4. Improve the Pedestrian & Cycling Conditions on Borden Avenue Between Charles Street & the Aud.

**Mobility Framework Map Legend**

- **Study Area Boundary**
- **Focus Area Boundaries**
- **ION Line & Stops**
- **Potential Street Connections**
  
  Indicates possible public/private driveway/street connections to be further determined through a future process.
- **Active Transportation Network (existing)**
- **Active Transportation Network (proposed)**
- **Bike Share Station (proposed)**
  
  Indicates areas where the provision of bike share facilities over time could help to support travel between the LRT station and destinations within the station area.
- **Priority Crossings**
  
  Indicates areas where intersection improvements such as enhanced markings and reduced curb radii should be directed to enhance the safety of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the street.

**Scale (approx)**

400m

---

PARTS ROCKWAY PLAN 47
Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study – PARTS Rockway Plan

**KEY DIRECTIONS**

1. Facilitate the Ecological Restoration of Schneider & Shoemaker Creek Corridors, along with improved stormwater management.
2. Develop a New Park Space / Urban Plaza at the Mill Stop.
3. Introduce New Parks & Open Spaces as a Component of all Large-Scale Developments.
4. Create Opportunities for Green Infrastructure Within Large Development Blocks, Parks & Open Spaces.
5. Introduce Streetscape Improvements on King St. to Catalyze Redevelopment & Enhance its Gateway Function

---

**The Public Realm Framework Map Legend**

- Study Area Boundary
- Focus Area Boundaries
- ION Line & Stops
- Priority Parkland Acquisition Areas
- Natural Heritage Conservation
- Two-Zone Policy Area (Floodplain)
- Overlay over land use designation.
- Existing Park Space
- Potential Locations for New Park Space
  - Indicates possible public/private park spaces to be further determined through a future process.
- Existing Open Space / Cemetery
- Existing Street Tree Locations

*Scale (approx.) 400m*
Process

- In a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans through a process called a Neighbourhood Specific Planning Review
- The implementation of various studies; i.e. PARTS, CHLS, RIENS
- Now reviewing the existing King Street East Neighbourhood Secondary Plan
Secondary Plan (1994 Official Plan)
Proposed Boundary
Boundary Changes
Proposed Changes to Map 3 – Land Use
Proposed New Secondary Plan

Proposed Land Use
King Street East Secondary Plan

ION Light Rail
Railsegment
Streams
Land Parcel

Proposed Land use
- Low rise Residential
- Medium Rise Residential
- Institutional
- Mixed Use
- Commercial
- Open Space

Secondary Plan Boundary
Specific Policy Area
1. Low Rise Residential
2. Low Density Mixed Use
3. Medium Density Mixed Use
4. 10-14 Rosedale Ave/107-113 Ottawa St N

Flooding Hazard Overlay
- Floodway
- Flood Fringe

Ecological Restoration Areas Overlay

PARTS Boundary
## Land Uses Visualization

### Mixed Use in Urban Corridor
- **Description**: Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.
- **Range of Permitted Uses**: retail, office uses, day care, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.
- **Maximum Non-Residential Gross Floor Area**: 7500 sq.m.
- **FSR**: minimum of 0.6 / a maximum of 2.0
- **Maximum Building Height**: 24 m.

### Mixed Use in MTSA
- **Description**: Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.
- **Range of Permitted Uses**: retail, office uses, day care, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.
- **Maximum Non-Residential Gross Floor Area**: for SP2 is 7500 sq.m. and for SP3 is 10,000 sq.m.
- **FSR**: minimum of 0.6 / a maximum of 2.0
- **Maximum Building Height**: for SP2 it is 24 m. and for SP 3 it is 32 m.

### Station Area Commercial
- **Description**: Allow commercial uses predominately serving the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.
- **Range of Permitted Uses**: Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Catering Service Establishment, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Conference, Convention or Exhibition Facility, Craftsperson Shop, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Health Office, hotel, Payday Loan Establishment, Pet Services Establishment, Personal Services, Retail Outlet, Propane, Studio

### Institutional
- **Description**: These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature.
- **Range of Permitted Uses**: secondary and post-secondary educational facilities; long-term care facilities; social, cultural, and administrative facilities; small-scale institutional uses compatible with surrounding uses such as public and private elementary schools, libraries, day care centers, and places of worship.

### Open Space
- **Description**: These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.
- **Range of Permitted Uses**: Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation, Community Facility and Cemeteries
Proposed Zoning
### Proposed Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a limited range of low density dwelling types in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Single Detached Dwelling" />, <img src="image2" alt="Second Dwelling Unit" />, <img src="image3" alt="Hospice" />, <img src="image4" alt="Small Residential Care Facility" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Single Detached Dwelling" />, <img src="image2" alt="Second Dwelling Unit" />, <img src="image5" alt="Semi Detached Dwelling" />, <img src="image6" alt="Street Townhouse Dwelling" />, <img src="image7" alt="Fourplex" />, <img src="image3" alt="Hospice" />, <img src="image4" alt="Small Residential Care Facility" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Single Detached Dwelling" />, <img src="image2" alt="Second Dwelling Unit" />, <img src="image5" alt="Semi Detached Dwelling" />, <img src="image6" alt="Street Townhouse Dwelling" />, <img src="image8" alt="Cluster Townhouse Dwelling" />, <img src="image9" alt="Multiple Dwelling" />, <img src="image10" alt="Lodging House" />, <img src="image3" alt="Hospice" />, <img src="image4" alt="Small Residential Care Facility" />, <img src="image11" alt="Large Residential Care Facility" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Cluster Townhouse Dwelling" />, <img src="image9" alt="Multiple Dwelling" />, <img src="image10" alt="Lodging House" />, <img src="image3" alt="Hospice" />, <img src="image11" alt="Large Residential Care Facility" /></td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Office, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6, Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics
- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Non-Residential Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics

*Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
Overview of Information Provided this Evening – Your Feedback and Comments

- Sign-In and General Information
- Neighbourhood Planning Review Process
- Existing and Proposed Land Use and Zoning
- PARTS, Zoning Details and Urban Design
Process/Next Steps

• Work has begun on the review of the King Street East Secondary Plan
• This is the first Open House/Engagement Session on the preliminary work
• Will collect and consider the comments and feedback from the Open House materials
• Urban Design Charrette – April/May 2019
• Revisions to the land use designation and zoning
• Further consultation/engagement
• Committee/Council consideration late Fall 2019?
FOR ONGOING AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION on this project or to provide written comments at any time, please view the City’s website at: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR

Email comments to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca

or contact the Project Manager
Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Project Manager/Senior Planner
519-741-2200 x7765 (TTY:1-866-969-9994)
tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
Regulatory Framework and Official Plan

The Official Plan is a legal document that contains goals, objectives and policies to manage and direct physical and land use change and their effects on the cultural, social, economic and natural environment within the city.

Official Plan policies:

- direct growth and development decisions in the city.
- governs all aspects of community growth and development, community services, movement of goods and people, conservation and protection of the cultural and natural environment, and the preservation of agricultural resources.
- also includes population and employment forecasts and density and residential intensification level targets

- City Council adopted a new Official Plan in June 2014
  - Ontario Planning Act requires municipalities to amend Zoning By-laws within 3 years of a new Official Plan being in effect
Secondary Plans

Secondary plans are used to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city, indicating the manner in which the goals, objectives, policies and land use designations of the Official Plan will be implemented within respective areas.

In the past Secondary Plans have generally been prepared for existing Built-Up Areas in the city but they may also be prepared in the Designated Greenfield Area.

Once approved, these Plans are incorporated into the Official Plan by formal amendment. Existing secondary plans were created 25-30 years ago.

These were deferred from being incorporated into the new Official Plan (2014) until LRT Station Area Planning was completed (2016-2017)
Neighbourhood Planning Reviews

- The City of Kitchener is undertaking a detailed review of the land use and planning framework for many specific neighbourhoods. These are typically locations where there are outdated secondary plans or community plans created 25-30 years ago to help guide the use of land (e.g. where new housing could go, commercial businesses, environmental conservation land, parks, etc.) and policies for new development or redevelopment. To help implement new directions from the province, region, city and other agencies, we are evaluating and updating existing plans to create new ones.

- This process involves creating new policies and mapping that will be added to our Official Plan, updating zoning, considering new urban design guidelines and implementing our cultural heritage landscapes. The locations we will review are primarily in the central neighbourhoods, but there are also several other places in the city where we will be engaging with landowners and the neighbourhood to help update these plans. Through this, we will be implementing the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study/Plans, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).
King Street East Secondary Plan - Proposed Land Use

ION Light Rail
Railsegment
Streams
Land Parcel

Proposed Land use
- Low Rise Residential
- Medium Rise Residential
- Institutional
- Mixed Use
- Commercial
- Open Space

Secondary Plan Boundary

Specific Policy Area
1. Low Rise Residential
2. Low Density Mixed Use
3. Medium Density Mixed Use
4. 10-14 Rosedale Ave/107-113 Ottawa St N

Floodway Hazard Overlay
- Floodway
- Flood Fringe

Ecological Restoration Areas Overlay

PARTS Boundary
## King Street East Secondary Plan – Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range of Permitted Uses</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Maximum Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Same as Low Rise Residential land use, however specific policy area may limit some of the dwelling types that will be permitted and will limit the number of units in a dwelling to two units. Consideration will also be given to further regulating garages, building height and density. Analysis to be completed to confirm the properties to which the specific policy area will apply.</td>
<td>Low density housing types, including Single Detached Dwelling, Duplex Dwelling, Semi-Detached Dwelling, and where appropriate and compatible, other low density dwelling types such as Street Townhouse Dwellings and small-scale Multiple Dwellings.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 4.0</td>
<td>3 storeys (4 if onto a Regional Rd or City Arterial St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use in Urban Corridor</strong></td>
<td>Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.</td>
<td>Retail, Office uses, Day Care, Health Office/Clinic, Personal Services, Religious Institution, Commercial Entertainment, Restaurant, Studio, Artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>24 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use in MTSA</strong></td>
<td>Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.</td>
<td>Retail, Office uses, Day Care, Health Office/Clinic, Personal Services, Religious Institution, Commercial Entertainment, Restaurant, Studio, Artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>24 metres (SP.2) or 32 metres (SP.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use with specific policy area</strong></td>
<td>Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.</td>
<td>Retail, Office uses, Day Care, Health Office/Clinic, Personal Services, Religious Institution, Commercial Entertainment, Restaurant, Studio, Artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>24 metres (SP.2) or 32 metres (SP.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Station Area Commercial</strong></td>
<td>Same as Low Rise Residential land use, however specific policy area may limit some of the dwelling types that will be permitted and will limit the number of units in a dwelling to two units. Consideration will also be given to further regulating garages, building height and density. Analysis to be completed to confirm the properties to which the specific policy area will apply.</td>
<td>Retail, Office uses, Day Care, Health Office/Clinic, Personal Services, Religious Institution, Commercial Entertainment, Restaurant, Studio, Artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>24 metres (SP.2) or 32 metres (SP.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature.</td>
<td>Secondary and Post-Secondary Educational Facilities; Long-Term Care Facilities; Social, Cultural, and Administrative Facilities; small-scale institutional uses compatible with surrounding uses such as Public and Private Elementary Schools, Libraries, Day Care Centers, and Places of Worship.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.</td>
<td>Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation, Community Facility and Cemeteries.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Information
- **MAXIMUM NON-RESIDENTIAL GROSS FLOOR AREA**:
  - Mixed Use in MTSA: 7500 sq.m. (SP.2) or 10,000 sq.m (SP.3).
  - Mixed Use with specific policy area: 7500 sq.m.
- **FSR**:
  - Mixed Use in MTSA: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0
  - Mixed Use with specific policy area: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 4.0
  - Station Area Commercial: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0
- **MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT**:
  - Mixed Use in MTSA: 24 metres (SP.2) or 32 metres (SP.3).
  - Mixed Use with specific policy area: 24 metres (SP.2) or 32 metres (SP.3).
  - Station Area Commercial: 24 metres (SP.2) or 32 metres (SP.3).
King Street East Secondary Plan – Existing Zoning
King Street East Secondary Plan – Proposed Zoning
### Proposed Residential (RES) Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses *</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>RES-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a limited range of low density dwelling types in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /> HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /> HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>The site specific may limit height and FSR depending on property context and heritage attributes (TBD)</td>
<td>The site specific may limit height and FSR depending on property context and heritage attributes (TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Diagram" /> HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas.</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Diagram" /> HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
# Proposed Non-Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>INS-1</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses intended to serve surrounding residential communities.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Cemetery, Community Facility, Continuing Care Facility, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Elementary School, Funeral Home, Health Clinic, Hospice, Large Residential Care Facility, Place of Worship, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment</td>
<td>4 Storeys (Max. height – 14 metres)</td>
<td>Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>MIX-4 (SP.2) &amp; MIX-2 (in Urban Corridor)</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Community Facility, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Craftsperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Large Residential Care Facility, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Payday Loan Establishment, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Post-Secondary School, Print Shop, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Retail, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>8 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings at a high density within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Community Facility, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Craftsperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Large Residential Care Facility, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Payday Loan Establishment, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Post-Secondary School, Print Shop, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Retail, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (SP.3)</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Same as uses allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>10 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>COM-5</td>
<td>Accommodate transit supportive and transit-oriented commercial uses within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Amusement Park, Artisan’s Establishment, Automotive Detailing and Repair Operation, Brewpub, Car Wash, Catering Service Establishment, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial Parking Facility, Commercial School, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Conference/Convention/Exhibition Facility, Convenience Retail, Craftsperson Shop, Day Care Facility, Drive-Through Facility, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Funeral Home, Gas Station, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Large Merchandise Retail, Light Repair Operation, Office, Pawn Establishment, Payday Loan Establishment, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Print Shop, Propane Retail Outlet, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Retail, Retail of Motor Vehicles and Major Recreational Equipment, Veterinary Services, Warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>Accommodate comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system.</td>
<td>Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation and Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
PARTS Rockway Mobility Framework Map

The Mobility Framework Map Legend
- **Study Area Boundary**
- **Focus Area Boundaries**
- **ION Line & Stops**
- **Potential Street Connections**
  - Indicates possible public/private driveway/street connections to be further determined through a future process.
- **Active Transportation Network (existing)**
- **Active Transportation Network (proposed)**
- **Bike Share Station (proposed)**
  - Indicates areas where the provision of bike share facilities over time could help to support travel between the LRT station and destinations within the station area.
- **Priority Crossings**
  - Indicates areas where intersection improvements such as enhanced markings and reduced curb radii should be directed to enhance the safety of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the street.

---

**KEY DIRECTIONS**
1. Introduce a Fine-Grained Street & Block Network to Break Up Large Sites.
2. Extend the Iron Horse Trail Network.
3. Transform Kent Ave into a Complete Street.
4. Improve the Pedestrian & Cycling Conditions on Borden Avenue between Charles Street & the Aud.
PARTS Rockway Public Realm Framework Map

KEY DIRECTIONS

1. Facilitate the Ecological Restoration of Schneider & Shoemaker Creek Corridors, along with Improved Stormwater Management.
2. Develop a New Park Space / Urban Plaza at the Mill Stop.
3. Introduce New Parks & Open Spaces as a Component of all Large-Scale Developments.
4. Create Opportunities for Green Infrastructure Within Large Development Blocks, Parks & Open Spaces.
5. Introduce Streetscape Improvements on King St. to Catalyze Redevelopment & Enhance its Gateway Function

The Public Realm Framework Map Legend
- Study Area Boundary
- Focus Area Boundaries
- ION Line & Stops
- Priority Parkland Acquisition Areas
- Natural Heritage Conservation
- Two-Zone Policy Area (Floodplain) Overlay over land use designation.
- Existing Park Space
- Potential Locations for New Park Space Indicates possible public/private park spaces to be further determined through a future process.
- Existing Open Space / Cemetery
- Existing Street Tree Locations
Heritage Resources
What is zoning?

- Use of land;
- Location of buildings and structures;
- Types of buildings permitted and their associated uses; and
- Lot dimensions, parking requirements, building heights and setbacks from the street/lot lines.

What is a site specific provision?

Site specific provisions are added to the base zone to provide additional regulations. Some examples are as follows:

- Garage permissions and location
- Size and location requirements for front porches
- Height limits

What is an urban design guideline:

Urban Design Guidelines establish the objectives, priorities and expectations for urban design in Kitchener. The guidelines apply to projects across the City and address such things as building types, streetscapes and the public realm. The manual is used by City staff and the development industry in the review and approval of specific types of development applications, such as official plan amendments, zone by-law, site plan control and minor variance applications. The guidelines are inherently flexible and negotiable and do not have the same regulatory power as other tools such as the Zoning By-law.
Examples of Zoning Regulations

Achieving a Consistent Building Setback

Any new (or additions to) single detached, semi-detached or street townhouse dwellings required to have a setback from a street that is based on the average setback of the two neighbouring properties.

A tolerance of 1 metre from the average setback has been incorporate into the regulation to provide flexibility. This regulation is in place already in Central Neighbourhoods (REINS Areas).

Garage Projections & Permission

Garage projections & permissions can be implemented using of zoning regulations and/or urban design guidelines

Sample Urban Design Guideline: Where the existing streetscape does not contain street facing garages, only detached recessed garages should be permitted.
The City of Kitchener has identified certain characteristics and design elements of the city that are important for regulation. These include:

**Entry Features / Focal Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e., protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)

**Building Design, Materials & Colours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e., protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)

**Potential Conservation Tools Identified**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Character Element</th>
<th>Potential Conservation Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Plan Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porches</td>
<td>✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td>✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Form Transitions</td>
<td>✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design, Materials, Colours</td>
<td>✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Features / Focal Points</td>
<td>✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓ ⇒ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW IMPORTANT IS IT THAT THE CITY REGULATE ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Front Porches</strong></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Should not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e.: requires front porches on all new low-rise infill developments?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Garages</strong></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Should not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates garages (i.e.: setback, location on lot etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Built Form Transition</strong></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e.: requires new development to respect existing built form?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Setbacks</strong></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e.: requires that buildings form a consistent street edge?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**King Street East Secondary Plan**  
**Fact sheet**

**Official Plan** - is a long-term planning document, which contains policies and plans related to land use for a 20-year time horizon for the city as a whole. The Official Plan gets direction from and must conform to Provincial and Regional policies. A new Official Plan for the City was approved on November 19, 2014.

The Secondary Plans were deferred as part of the approval of the 2014 Official Plan to allow for the completion of background studies that would provide direction regarding appropriate land use and policy framework in the Secondary Plan areas.

**Secondary Plans** - are contained in the City’s Official Plan and contain land use policies and mapping which provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city.

These plans guide the use of land such as where housing, commercial businesses, institutional uses and parks should be located and provide policies for new development or redevelopment.

The King Street East Secondary Plan is just over 25 years old and needs to be updated. To help implement new directions from the province, region, city and other agencies, we are evaluating and updating the existing Secondary Plans to create new ones.

**Urban Design Guidelines** - as part of the Neighbourhood Secondary Planning process that is currently underway for the King Street East area City staff will be developing a set of neighbourhood specific urban design guidelines in addition to the draft urban design guidelines for ‘Residential Infill in Central Neighbourhoods’.

These guidelines will address things like building placement, suggested setbacks, garage location/projections, landscaping, building design and massing, and other aspects of design and place making unique to the neighbourhood.

**Zoning By-law** - establishes and regulates the use of land by implementing the policies of our Official Plan and the Urban Design Guidelines, including:

- Permitted use of land
- Height and location of structures
- Lot size
- Density of development
- Parking requirements

**Background studies supporting King Street East Secondary Plan:**

- Planning Around Rapid Transit Station - PARTS Rockway Plan and PARTS Central Plan: These Plans reviewed the following, in and around the stations stops (Completion date: December, 2017):
  - Lands uses
  - Mobility
  - Public Realm, and
Technical considerations and Implementation

- Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS) (Completion date: December, 2014):
  - Provided a working inventory of the City of Kitchener’s cultural heritage landscapes which serves as a planning tool in the assessment and management of these resources as the community changes and evolves.

- Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS) (Completion date: February, 2017):
  - The report looked at the planning approval process for development in established neighbourhoods
  - The report contained recommendations to support appropriate and compatible infill.

Next Steps:

- Preparing land use and zoning maps based on the recommendations from the background studies and reports
- Presenting proposed Land Use and Zoning for public feedback (April 04th, 2019) We are here
- King Street East Secondary Plan Urban Design Charrette (April/May, 2019) will provide:
  - an opportunity for public to visualize the proposed build form due to upcoming changes; and
  - a direction for zoning bylaw and built form
- Consider public feedback, technical reports and make changes accordingly
- Finalize land use, zoning and related polices and present it to the council
- More information can be found on the City’s website https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR
- Feedback and comments can be emailed here secondaryplans@kitchener.ca
# SIGN-IN SHEET

**King Street East Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**  
**April 04, 2019**

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246 Duke St E</td>
<td>N2H 1B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246 Duke St E</td>
<td>N2H 1B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 Fairview Ave</td>
<td>N2H 3E8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 Fairview Ave</td>
<td>N2H 3E8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 Fairview</td>
<td>N2H 3E8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>178 West N E</td>
<td>N2H 1E4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS Margaret Ave</td>
<td>N2H 4H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>Phone Number*</td>
<td>E-mail Address*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>672 Coldstream Dr, Waterloo</td>
<td>N2V 2S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Onward Ave, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2H 2S7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74 Gordon Ave, N.</td>
<td>N2H 3J2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Fairview Ave</td>
<td>N2H 3E8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>221 Weber St. E</td>
<td>N2H 1E7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 Bohemian Ave N</td>
<td>N2H 3B8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77 Macmillan Ave</td>
<td>N2H 3J8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 Fairview Ave</td>
<td>N2H 3E8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
# SIGN-IN SHEET

## King Street East Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1

### April 04, 2019

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G61 South Philly Dr</td>
<td>N2K 4J5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112 Onward Ave Kit</td>
<td>N2H 3J9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Jackson Ave Kit</td>
<td>N2H 3N8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Druce St.</td>
<td>N2H 3H4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Box 429 New Dundee Av</td>
<td>NOB 2EO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Fairview Avenue</td>
<td>N2H 3E8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49 CMH St N</td>
<td>N2H 2E9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 Cameron St N</td>
<td>N2H 3A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66 Borden Ave N</td>
<td>N2H 3J3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>252 Shakespeare Dr. Waterloo</td>
<td>N2L 2T6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Borden Ave. KCI</td>
<td>N2H 3J1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141 Charles Blvd 01</td>
<td>N2M 5A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>851 Chyno Rd. K1. ON</td>
<td>N3A 2C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Fairview Av.</td>
<td>N2N3E7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90 Dane St</td>
<td>N2H 3H7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SIGN-IN SHEET

King Street East Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1

April 04, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62 Brick St</td>
<td>N2H 3L3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81 Borden Ave N</td>
<td>N2H 3U2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Yane St</td>
<td>N2H 3H7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90 Onward</td>
<td>N2H 3J9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287 Duke St East</td>
<td>N2H 1B4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 Borden Ave N</td>
<td>N2H 3H9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Onward Ave</td>
<td>N2H 3J4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84 Cameron St N.</td>
<td>N2H 3A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122 Weber St E</td>
<td>N2H 1C9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>587 King E</td>
<td>N2H 2M2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93 Cameron St N</td>
<td>N2H 6T3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1440 King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1440 King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1020 King St E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
# SIGN-IN SHEET

**King Street East Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**

**April 04, 2019**

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81 Fairview</td>
<td>N2H 3E9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 Strange St.</td>
<td>N2G 1P8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Shellord Ave N</td>
<td>N2H 3M1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94 Arcitec Pl</td>
<td>N2B 1C5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>261 Melrose Ave Kitchener</td>
<td>N2H 2B9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Fairview Ave</td>
<td>N2H 3E7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>184 Weber St E</td>
<td>N2H1E4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>178 Weber St E</td>
<td>N2H1E4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 Pandora Ave</td>
<td>N2H 3C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
## SIGN-IN SHEET

### King Street East Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1

**April 04, 2019**

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7179 Fayette Cir E, 154175 154 W 3rd St</td>
<td>N2H 1EG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>237 Duke St E</td>
<td>N2H 1A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291 Weber St E</td>
<td>N2H 1A9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 Hein's</td>
<td>N2G 1J8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>520 - 200 Bingenhaus Ctr D</td>
<td>N2B 3Y9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 Stirling Ave N</td>
<td>N2H 3G5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141 Whitney Dr Kit</td>
<td>N2G 2X8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Pandora Ave N</td>
<td>N2H 3C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-15 CAMERON ST. N</td>
<td>N2H 2Z9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111 BEACON AVE. N.</td>
<td>N2H 3J2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
King Street East Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:


Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: ________________________________
Mailing Address: 291 Weber St E 3 (also own 287)
Email: ________________________________
King Street East Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the King Street East Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before April 26, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

I own 2 Weber St properties currently RG that I don’t feel should be downzoned because slightly higher density will be consistent with current blogs. I give more people a chance to live there.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neigbourhood character?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

King Street East Secondary Plan Review
King Street East Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the King Street East Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before April 26, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

King Street East Secondary Plan Review
King Street East Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

- engaging Mix Use to do the
  following:
- allowing mixed density
  to grade relate

- then allow further FSR on the
  upper floor area.
- so the apartment has some economic
  incentive to actually build a mixed use
  # building.

- photos on the website.
- allow reduction in parking for
  true mixed use in a building (because
  true mixed use means we have even less
  need to own that car!).

- Ottawa should be mixed use.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each person they include a name and address.

Name: [blackened]

Mailing Address: [blackened]

Email: [blackened]
From: Tina MaloneWright
To: "Stephanie Mirtitsch"
Cc: Pierre Chauvin; Secondary Plans
Subject: RE: 880 King Street West Kitchener - Midtown Secondary Plan Letter
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2019 3:55:57 PM
Attachments: 19121A_800 King St W_Letter to City Midtown Secondary Plan_May 13 2019_Final.pdf
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png
image005.png
image006.png
image007.png
image008.png
image009.png
image010.png

Good afternoon Stephanie and Pierre,

Thank you for your interest in the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary Plan Review process and for
your feedback.

Your comments are appreciated! They have been logged and will be considered moving forward in
the review process.

We have also ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you
informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any questions or additional comments, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Stephanie Mirtitsch <smirtitsch@mhbcplan.com>
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2019 8:58 AM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Cc: Pierre Chauvin <pchauvin@mhbcplan.com>
Subject: 880 King Street West Kitchener - Midtown Secondary Plan Letter

Good Morning,

Please find attached a letter on behalf of the property owner for 800 King Street West, regarding the
Midtown / KW Hospital Secondary Plan.

Please kindly contact myself and Pierre Chauvin if you require anything additional and with available
meeting times to discuss.
Kind regards,
Stephanie

**STEPHANIE MIRTITSCH, BES, MCIP, RPP | Planner**

**MHBC** Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture
540 Bingemans Centre Drive, Suite 200 | Kitchener | ON | N2B 3X9 | T 519 576 3650 ext. 737 | F 519 576 0121 | smirtitsch@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)

This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.
May 13, 2019

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP Senior Planner – Policy
Planning Division, 6th Floor
City of Kitchener
200 King Street West
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 4G7

Dear Ms. Malone-Wright:

RE: K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan – 800 King Street West
OUR FILE 19121A

We are writing on behalf of the owner of the property municipally addressed as 800 King Street West in the City of Kitchener (the subject lands). The subject lands currently contain a three storey commercial building and associated surface parking, with approximately 230 parking spaces at the rear of the building.

The subject lands are located within the Study Area of the K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan.

The subject lands are currently designated ‘Mixed-Use Corridor’ in the 1994 Official Plan, and are located within the K-W Hospital Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan designates the subject lands ‘Mixed Use Corridor’. The subject lands are also zoned ‘High Intensity Mixed Use Corridor MU-3’, and have not yet been incorporated as part of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law (CRoZBy) review process.

Background

The subject lands and overall Study Area is part of an existing Secondary Plan area which was deferred as part of the City’s Official Plan Review in 2014 to allow for other studies to be completed.

Since 2014, the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) plans have been completed to inform the land use direction and policy framework for the areas around the ION LRT stations. Other studies that have been completed include the Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study.
It is our understanding that these studies have informed the land use and policy direction for the K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood.

Pre-consultation and Proposed Development

A pre-consultation meeting for the subject lands was held on October 9, 2018. At the pre-consultation meeting, the PARTS plan was discussed and it was identified that the front portion of the property has been identified as ‘High Density Mixed Use’ and the rear portion has been identified as ‘Medium Rise Residential’.

In our opinion, the ‘Medium Rise Residential’ designation for a portion of the site is not consistent with the existing ‘Mixed-Use Corridor’ Official Plan designation or the MU-3 zone, which contemplate intensive, transit supportive development, including multiple dwellings with a maximum floor space ratio (FSR) of 4.0. The owner wishes to develop the entire site in accordance with the current Official Plan and Zoning By-law permissions.

The PARTS plan also contemplates a more formal connection to Braun Street and the King Street entrance of the subject lands. We believe that this could be considered through the ultimate redevelopment proposal for the site, as well as many of the additional comments received in the pre-consultation meeting related to design and transportation.

Next Steps

It is our opinion that the entire property should be designated ‘High Density Mixed Use’ to allow for the current development permissions on the site to continue. We believe that the concerns related to access, setbacks, design and parking identified in the pre-consultation meeting can be appropriately mitigated through the design of the site and building.

We would like to request a meeting with you to discuss the next steps of the Secondary Plan process, and the proposed development. Please kindly contact the undersigned with some available times at your earliest convenience. We look forward to working with you through this process.

Yours truly,

MHBC

Pierre J Chauvin MA, MCIP, RPP
Partner

Stephanie Mirtitsch, BES, MCIP, RPP
Planner
Hi Sarah,

Thank you for the email and the information and concerns about land use designation and zoning of the lots on the southwesterly side of Weber Street from Ottawa to Stirling.

The properties are currently zoned “R6” and “R7” which permit multiples to a maximum FSR of 0.6 and 1.0 respectively. At the Open House these properties were shown as proposed to be zoned new “RES-4” which would only permit a multiple dwelling with 4 dwelling units. I did hear similar verbal feedback at the Open House on the reduction of density in this location and we have also had some written comments submitted to us expressing the same concerns.

We will be reviewing these comments in the upcoming weeks and I expect that we will be making some revisions to the land use plan.

Thank you for keeping me in the loop!

Tina

---

From: Sarah Marsh <Sarah.Marsh@kitchener.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2019 12:39 PM
To: Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Zoning on Weber

Hi Tina,

Can you please confirm: have you heard concerns about zoning changes along Weber from Ottawa to Stirling? I’ve heard from one resident who says:

At the secondary plan meeting, a concern was raised about the zoning on weber street and the proposed reduction to a low-density residential from Ottawa to Stirling. It already has a number of mid-level apartments and seems a bit odd to change that standard. It is one of the places where reasonably-priced housing can be found near downtown. is discussing some of this with the
Downtown Development Committee as she is a property owner of two of the affected homes, and began discussion as part of the feedback for that meeting, but I thought it worthwhile to keep you in the loop on that information.

Sincerely,

Sarah

Sarah Marsh
Ward 10 Kitchener City Councillor
Office 519-741-2786
Cell 519-807-8006
Sarah.marsh@kitchener.ca
@marsh_ward10

www.kitchener.ca
Good afternoon.

Thank you for your email and your interest in the new King Street East Secondary Plan Review.

I appreciate that you tried to send some images this morning but unfortunately given their size I did not receive them with your email.

As we have discussed, the maximum FSR and maximum building height work together to achieve an appropriate built form, particularly where higher densities abut low rise residential uses. The built form can be limited by the maximum FSR or building height. Although the lands have a maximum permitted FSR of 4.0, the built form is limited in height by Special Regulation Provision 543R. The maximum permitted FSR does not permit the built form on the property to exceed 24 metres at the highest point without a planning application of some type.

As we also discussed, for the purposes of illustrating intended/proposed built form at the first Open House, it was more appropriate to apply a MIX-2 zoning to these properties. The MIX-2 zone is consistent with existing zone permissions as they relate to building height. If it is possible to achieve a maximum FSR of 4.0 and also meet the current height permissions noted in 543R, then a site-specific policy/regulation could be added to the proposed Mixed Use land use designation and proposed MIX-2 to permit an FSR up to 4.0.

Currently, a proposal which exceeds both the existing maximum building height of 24 metres and maximum FSR of 4.0 would require site-specific amendments to both the Secondary Plan/Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

The Secondary Plan Review process is not intended to consider site-specifics amendments outside of the existing land use permissions or the proposed base land use designation and zone category intended to be applied to the subject lands. The process to consider such change is an owner-initiated application wherein the appropriate justification, studies and reports are submitted in order to consider such a site-specific amendment. The first step in consideration of such amendments is the Pre-Submission Consultation meeting.
If your proposal requires site-specific amendments to implement and you would like staff feedback on the proposal, I suggest you make application for a Pre-Submission Consultation meeting.

Thanks

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: | Sent: Friday, May 03, 2019 10:38 AM | To: Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca | Subject: Fw: 1440 King St. E. - De-intensification

Tina... play apologies but the email wouldn't go through because it was too big of a file.

Here are the other two images.

Thanks...
8. Picking a better location to build a tall building could not be less intrusive to a neighbourhood as there are not very many neighbours that would be directly affected by it. The location is ideal for a taller building.

9. This property is the ONLY property on this side of King Street in the proposed rezoning area that can have a distance of approximately 200 feet from the back of the building to the nearest Low Density Residential. All the other properties would be much closer to neighbours.

10. The colours and design of the building are open to change during the site plan process. What is important is that we get the general massing of the building so that we can maximize the use of this site.

11. There are not very many sites of this size in the proposed zone change area. It would be a shame to see such a formidable site de-intensified, when it can easily accommodate an attractive signature building and yet not affect many neighbours. This is a very unique and rare site.

12. We would like to see if it is possible to extend the zoning that would allow a taller building and still keep our FSR of 4 times.

13. Please note that we would have at a minimum, one layer of underground parking, and possibly a second.

Please take a look at the attached images, and give me some feed back.

If you have some ideas for the design of the building, we are flexible, but really do not want to lose our FSR of 4.

We see that your process is going relatively fast as you have booked another neighbourhood meeting. Please let us know if we need to hire consultants to help us through this process.

Thanks,
Good afternoon Mary,

Thank you for your interest in and for attending the first meeting on the new King Street East Secondary Plan Review.

We very much appreciate receiving your comments/feedback on the information that was presented at the Open House and these comments will be considered moving forward through the review process.

In particular I will review your comment as it relates to the downzoning of lands on Weber Street East.

We have ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any additional comments or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Mary Dever
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2019 4:06 PM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Subject: King Street East secondary plan feedback

350-100 Regina Street South, Waterloo, ON N2J 4P9
See why Canada’s 28th Governor General David Johnston says Canada needs more SHAD
King Street East Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the King Street East Secondary Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before April 26th, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

Write your additional comments here:

King Street East Secondary Plan Review
I commented earlier that I'm surprised at downzoning on Weber St. Properties currently R6 will be switched to lowest density.

The homes in question aren’t representative of the interior neighbouring interior streets. Much more of a mix of 1930’s, 50’s, 70’s. Inconsistent styles and no contiguous streetscape on Weber.

Leaving R6-like density would allow tasteful medium walk-up apartments or stacked town homes - a nice use of a major regional road for those who need affordable rentals, but don’t want to live in a tower.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: 
Mailing Address: 291 Weber St E
Email: 

King Street East Secondary Plan Review
Hello Ivy Holt,
Thank you for your input and comments on the new King Street East Secondary Plan.

One of the objectives of this Secondary Plan Review Process to review the proposed land use and zoning and recommend an appropriate built form and transition that minimizes impacts on adjacent low rise residential properties. We too want to ensure that a mix of land uses are provided in the appropriate locations to facilitate an appropriate range, variety and mix of housing types, styles, densities, tenure and affordability to satisfy the housing needs of the neighbourhood and community.

Thank you for your comments and feedback. They are very much appreciated.

We have your contact information and have added it to our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any additional comments or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
I am a 10 year resident in the King East area of Kitchener, a homeowner with young young children and I hope to raise my family here for many years to come. We love this area and are very excited about the many developments that have already taken place to make downtown Kitchener a safer and more vibrant place to live (LRT, crosswalks, bike lanes, etc).

However, after seeing the massive 20+ story high rise buildings go up in Waterloo along King St. I started to become concerned that the same would happen to King East in Kitchener. I understand the need for housing in the downtown area and the need for affordable housing but would like to see a limit to the number of stories allowed for new high rise towers in this area.

The developers I assume do not live in this neighbourhood and do not care about the impact these towers would have on residents in the area. They care about making money. I hope that the city government will be considering the impact on locals over the potential loss of income to developers.

My main concern is the loss of sunlight for the nearby houses/ neighbourhoods. I am passionate about maintaining and building the urban tree canopy in Kitchener and creating habitats for pollinators through flower gardening. If a 20+ high rise were to go in along King St. on the west side of King the residences on the east side would lose almost half of the day's natural sunlight.

I am in support of creating high density housing downtown with a limit of 12 stories. I am also hoping the City is ensuring that a suitable number of units will be affordable for families with lower incomes (single parent families, refugees, people living with disabilities etc).

Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns,
Ivy Holt
Hi,

Thank you for attending the meeting and reaching out to me afterwards. I’m sorry we didn’t have the full spectrum of zoning information at the meeting.

Firstly, as promised here is the link to the existing zoning: MU-2 (which permits a max height of 24 metres, FSR of 4.0).

https://app2.kitchener.ca/appdocs/Zonebylaw/PublishedCurrentText/Sections//Section%2054%20-%20Medium%20Intensity%20Mixed%20Use%20Corridor%20Zone%20(MU-2).pdf

Special Regulation 541R

https://app2.kitchener.ca/appdocs/Zonebylaw/PublishedCurrentText/Appendix%20D%20-%20Special%20Regulation%20Provisions%20for%20Specific%20Lands//541R.pdf

However in addition to MU-2 zoning a special regulation (541R) has been added to the site to provide for maximum height restrictions within X number of metres from a residentially zoned property. In the case of the subject property, despite the current maximum permitted FSR in the MU-2 Zone of 4.0, the 541R limits the height of development on the subject lands to a maximum of 19.5 metres at a minimum distance from the residentially zoned properties. The intent of this building height + setback regulation would be to provide built form transition, limit shadowing, overlook and privacy impacts.

The maximum FSR and maximum building height work together to achieve an appropriate built form, particularly where higher densities abut low rise residential uses. The built form can be limited by the maximum FSR or building height.

Given the height restrictions in 541R, it may not be possible for a developer to achieve a maximum FSR of 4.0 (this depends on the lot size).

See definition of FSR provided below:

"Floor Space Ratio" means the figure obtained when the building floor area on a lot is divided by the lot area. In the case of a building or part thereof located above a street or lane, calculation of the floor space ratio shall include that portion of the building floor area and that portion of the area of the street or lane between the lot line and the centre line of the street or lane. In the case of a building on a lot within more than one zone having different floor space ratio regulations, floor space ratios shall be obtained using only that portion of the building floor area and only that portion of the lot area within each zone. (By-law 92-232, S.3(q))

The proposed zoning for the site is MIX 4 Sp. 3 which has a maximum FSR of 2.0 and a maximum building height of 10 storeys. Through the Secondary Planning process, staff will be reviewing the special regulation 541R to determine if changes are required to ensure there are appropriate setbacks and building stepbacks needed to properly provide built form transition, limit shadowing, overlook and privacy impacts.

This is a lot of information in an email. If you wish to discuss the proposed changes further, I would recommend booking an appointment with myself and Tina (copied on this email).

Many thanks,

Dayna Edwards, M.PL, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner (Urban Design) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7324 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | dayna.edwards@kitchener.ca
Hello Dayna,

My wife [redacted] and I attended the info session at Rockway on the 4th and we chatted for a bit. We live at 16 Borden Ave North, separated by one residential lot from the commercial property at 926-936 King East. That lot is currently zoned MU-2/541R, slated to go to MIX-4/Sp.3.

Our concern as I mentioned at the meeting is that a high building constructed on that lot would effectively shade our house and yard for much of the day as well as making privacy impossible. I'm finding it difficult to interpret the restrictions and requirements for that lot, and of course they would change depending on use anyway.

The maximum height for MIX-4/Sp.3 in the proposed changes is 8 storeys. Can you give us any indication of whether or not a building of that height would be permitted on the site? Failing that, what is the formula for calculating the FSR – I can't find that in the documents or online info.

Thank you for your time,

[redacted]
Hi

Thank you for your email and for attending the first meeting on the King Street East Secondary Plan Review.

It was a pleasure to meet you as well!

We had a great conversation concerning your property at 112 Onward Avenue and I appreciate receiving your email and comments that you would like to maintain similar land use and zoning permissions for your property reflected in the new Secondary Plan.

As discussed this property is located at the corner of Onward and Weber, a good size lot, and could support and maintain the residential uses that are permitted by the current “Low Rise Multiple Residential” land use designation and existing Residential Six Zone (R-6).

Your comments are documented and we will continue to keep you informed as this project moves forward.

If you have any additional questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you again for following up with your email.

Regards,

Tina

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
Hi Tina,

My wife [REDACTED] and I met you at Thursday evening's meeting re the King Street East Secondary Plan. We live at the corner of Onward Ave and Weber St and were concerned about our property's zoning being changed from its current "Medium Rise Residential" to the proposed "Low Rise Residential". You'd suggested that maintaining the current zoning wouldn't be a problem and asked that I send you an email to remind you of our conversation. So here it is!

And thanks for your help! It was a pleasure meeting you.
Good afternoon

Thank you for your email, your attendance at the Open House and your interest in the King Street East Secondary Plan Review.

The boundary between the lands proposed to be zoned MIX-4 and MIX-2 in the new Secondary Plan was determined by the PARTS Rockway Plan. Lands that are proposed to be zoned MIX-2 were not identified to be included in the final boundary of the Major Transit Station Area. Only lands within the MTSA were given the new MIX-4 Zone.

The property at 1440 King Street East is currently zoned MU-3, with Special Regulation Provision 543R.

I have included the excerpt of 543R from Zoning By-law 85-1 for your information below.

The maximum FSR and maximum building height work together to achieve an appropriate built form, particularly where higher densities abut low rise residential uses. The built form can be limited by the maximum FSR or building height.

In the case of the subject property, despite the current maximum permitted FSR in the MU-3 Zone of 4.0, the 543R limits the height of development on the subject lands to a built form similar to the existing MU-2 Zone and proposed MIX-2 Zone, a maximum of 24 metres at a minimum distance from the residentially zoned properties.

Given the height restrictions in 543R, it may not be possible to achieve a maximum FSR of 4.0?

For the purposes of illustrating intended/proposed built form at the first Open House, it was more appropriate to apply a MIX-2 zoning to these properties. The MIX-2 zone is consistent with existing zone permissions as they relate to building height.
We are still working through the zoning permissions and can do some further modelling to see what the approximate resultant FSR is under the existing height limitations noted in 543R and whether something more than 2.0 can be achieved. If it is possible to achieve a maximum FSR of 4.0 and also meet the current height permissions noted in 543R, then a site-specific policy/regulation could be added to the proposed Mixed Use land use designation and proposed MIX-2 to permit this.

Thank you for your comments and feedback.

We have your contact information and have added it to our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

If you have any additional comments or questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2019 2:54 PM
To: Tina Malone Wright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Subject: DE-Intensification of property

Hello Tina,

We were at your presentation last night at the Rockway Center for the proposed changes in zoning along King.

We own what is probably one of the larger developable properties in the proposed zone changes (almost an acre of land). This is not including the 2 sites already proposed .... the Drewlo Site and the Car Quest site. It would be a shame for the city to not take advantage of such an ideal site as ours for intensification.

Our current zone is MU3, which allows for a FSR of 4 times.

Your current proposal seems to have stopped with the new MIX4 zoning just 2 properties from us. The two properties between us and the MIX4 zone are already fully developed properties with a 12 storey and an 8 storey building. The proposal that you have, seems to be reducing the FSR on our property by half to a FSR of 2 times.

We would like to discuss the possibilities of extending the MIX 4 over to our property. It would include the 2 developed properties (which will remain the same) and ours. We believe that a proper designed, taller building on our property with 4 times FSR, and with proper set backs from the 2 residential properties behind us would fit nicely into the fabric of the future of King (the third property behind us is a city park, which would be an ideal fit with a larger development). Many of the properties along King have residential zones behind them, very similar to ours, however our property is over 300 feet deep, which allows for quite a bit of distance from the 2 residential properties that abut us at the back. There is no other property in the MIX4 with that kind of depth and distance from residential. A property designed building would be able to give enough buffer from the 2 neighbours, and allow for a great looking building with appropriate intensification.

We are not sure why the line was arbitrarily picked to be where it was, but would like to see our property included in the MIX4 zone. This would allow for the site to be developed properly with an appropriate sized building with 4 times FSR coverage.
I understand that you are out of office till the 8th. Please call me so that we can discuss our property further.

Thanks,
Hi Tina,
Can you ensure that Stephen and I are on the circulation list?
Thanks,
Pierre

From: Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca [mailto:Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca]
Sent: March-06-19 10:35 AM
To: Craig.Dumart@kitchener.ca; Pierre Chauvin; SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca; Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca; Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca
Subject: RE: 206 Duke St E - Land Use - Feb 27

Hi ,
Thank you for your email last week. Just getting back into the office and trying to get caught up.

The lands located at 206 Duke Street East are contained in the King Street East Neighbourhood Secondary Plan.

As you may be aware we have begun the review of the Secondary Plans and King Street East is tentatively scheduled for a first Open House next month. This is the first introduction of proposed land uses/zoning for the new Secondary Plan and engagement/consultation on neighbourhood character which could be translated into secondary plan policies, urban design guidelines and area or site-specific zoning regulations.

Following the engagement/consultation, which may also include a design charrette, we will be taking the feedback, revising the plan as appropriate, drafting policies with a view to bringing the new King Street East Secondary Plan, policies and zoning to a Committee/Council for adoption/approval at the earliest late fall of this year.

Notification of the review of the King Street East Secondary Plan will be sent out by mail to all property owners and to those persons on our email distribution list.

Regards,
Tina

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Hi Tina -

When do you anticipate the new zoning for this parcel will be in place?

Thank you!

Hi Tina -

Hope you are well

As the new owner of subject lands, we wish for the Medium Density Multiple Residential designation to be applied to this anomaly current I-1 zone along with the R-7 zone as per the neighbours as you work through the various updates in the zoning / OP / urban design

Thank you!

Best,

--
## 5.0 Public Comments and Staff Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>287 and 291 Weber Street East</td>
<td>Ongoing Mixed Use to do the following - allowing initial density for the grade related uses you want - then allow further FSR for the upper floor uses - So the proponent has clean economic incentive to actually build a mixed use building (like the one in your photos on the boards!) - Allow reduction of parking for true mixed use in a building because true mixed uses means we have even less need to own that car! - Ottawa should be mixed use! - but ok, as per Brandon, true mixed use</td>
<td>The properties at 287 and 291 Weber Street East are proposed to be zoned new RES-5 which is comparable to the existing R-6 zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: April 4, 2019</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. The new MIX-4 zone to be applied in the MTSAs is under review and will consider these comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Written: April 4, 2019</td>
<td>In keeping in accordance with Bill 108, the new RES-3 zone needs to be revised to allow for three dwelling units on a lot, provided that the appropriate zoning regulations can be met. Staff is reviewing the application of site specific regulations for building setbacks, garages, building heights, harmonious designs, additions, and porches as we apply the residential zones to individual streets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. I am in the support of the ‘Low Rise Residential’ with specific policy area. Specifically, I support limiting the number of dwellings unit to two, regulating garages (ensuring setbacks), building heights and density. I live on Borden Ave. N. within the study area. 2. I am in support of changing zoning from RES-5 to RES-3, as proposed. It is appropriate, given that this neighbourhood is included in the ‘Onward Ave. Neighbourhood’ (L-NBR-3) as defined in 2014 Cultural Heritage Landscape Study’. 3. Building setbacks., Garages in rear, Building heights, Building setbacks from side yard property lines, Harmonious designs with neighbouring properties, Additions to rear of houses, rather than front, Porches in keeping with character of street 4. Thank you for your work to maintain the character of our neighbourhood. It is a unique place, and I am pleased that the city is interested in preserving it, despite that the development is inevitable in the city. It would be nice if transitions could be managed between low rise residential and mixed use corridor so they aren’t jarring e.g. stepped height requirements or similar. Please keep me posted on the next steps. Thanks.</td>
<td>In keeping in accordance with Bill 108, the new RES-3 zone needs to be revised to allow for three dwelling units on a lot, provided that the appropriate zoning regulations can be met. Staff is reviewing the application of site specific regulations for building setbacks, garages, building heights, harmonious designs, additions, and porches as we apply the residential zones to individual streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4  | 1440 King Street East | **Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
**Question 2:** What are your comments about the zoning?  
**Question 3:** What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments** | The boundary between the lands proposed to be zoned MIX-4 and MIX-2 in the new Secondary Plan was determined by the PARTS Rockway Plan. Lands that are proposed to be zoned MIX-2 were not identified to be included in the final boundary of the Major Transit Station Area. Only lands within the MTSA were given the new MIX-4 Zone.  
The property at 1440 King Street East is currently zoned MU-3, with Special Regulation Provision 543R.  
The maximum FSR and maximum building height work together to achieve an appropriate built form, particularly where higher densities abut low rise residential uses. The built form can be limited by the maximum FSR or building height.  
In the case of the subject property, despite the current maximum permitted FSR in the MU-3 Zone of 4.0, the 543R limits the height of development on the subject lands to a built form similar to the existing MU-2 Zone and proposed MIX-2 Zone, a maximum of 24 metres at a minimum distance from the residentially zoned properties.  
Given the height restrictions in 543R, it may not be possible to achieve a maximum FSR of 4.0?  
For the purposes of illustrating intended/proposed built form at the first Open House, it was more appropriate to apply a MIX-2 zoning to these properties.  
The MIX-2 zone is consistent with existing zone permissions as they relate to building height.  
We are still working through the zoning permissions and can do some further modelling to see what the approximate resultant FSR is under the existing height limitations noted in 543R and whether something more than 2.0 can be achieved.  
If it is possible to achieve a maximum FSR of 4.0 and also meet the current height permissions noted in 543R, then a site-specific policy/regulation could be added to the proposed Mixed Use land use designation and proposed MIX-2 to permit this. |
|    | Written: April 5, 2019 | **We are the property owners at 1440 King St. E.**  
We own what is probably one of the larger developable properties in the proposed zone changes (almost an acre of land). This is not including the 2 sites already proposed ... the Drewlo Site and the Car Quest site. It would be a shame for the city to not take advantage of such an ideal site as ours for intensification.  
Our current zone is MU3, which allows for a FSR of 4 times.  
Your current proposal seems to have stopped with the new MIX4 zoning just 2 properties from us. The two properties between us and the MIX4 zone are already fully developed properties with a 12 storey and an 8 storey building. The proposal that you have, seems to be reducing the FSR on our property by half to a FSR of 2 times.  
We would like to discuss the possibilities of extending the MIX 4 over to our property. It would include the 2 developed properties (which will remain the same) and ours. We believe that a proper designed, taller building on our property with 4 times FSR, and with proper set backs from the 2 residential properties behind us would fit nicely into the fabric of the future of King (the third property behind us is a city park, which would be an ideal fit with a larger development).  
Many of the properties along King have residential zones behind them, very similar to ours, however our property is over 300 feet deep, which allows for quite a bit of distance from the 2 residential properties that abut us at the back. There is no other property in the MIX4 with that kind of depth and distance from residential. A property designed building would be able to give enough buffer from the 2 neighbours, and allow for a great looking building with appropriate intensification.  
We are not sure why the line was arbitrarily picked to be where it was, but would like to see our property included in the MIX4 zone. This would allow for the site to be developed properly with an appropriate sized building with 4 times FSR coverage. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is a bit of time consuming process to get the designer to make everything exact. I am forwarding a couple of images of a building that we would like to propose. The general shape of the building and the placement of the building are correct. We have placed it among the neighbouring buildings so that you can see it fits nicely with its height. 1. When you look at the aerial view of our proposed building, you will see that it is set very close to King, and that there is a lot of space between the building and the rear neighbours. 2. We are fortunate to have a lot of space between our property and the property to the left... there is a swath of land that is city owned. This space helps the building fit nicely among the other properties. 3. The designer did not design the correct number of parking spaces in the rear design... there is actually more rows as can be seen in the aerial view. 4. The current design shows a bit of a podium with some store fronts, but all that is relatively flexible. 5. The building sits across the street from Rockway, so the park and the building would complement each other very nicely. 6. There is another small children's park behind the property. 7. The property ONLY has 2 neighbours at the back of the property that are zoned low density residential that it could possibly affect. All the other properties touch/abutting the property are zoned medium to high density. There are no residential properties across the street that we would need to deal with. 8. Picking a better location to build a tall building could not be less intrusive to a neighbourhood as there are not very many neighbours that would be directly affected by it. The location is ideal for a taller building. 9. This property is the ONLY property on this side of King Street in the proposed rezoning area that can have a distance of approximately 200 feet from the back of the building to the nearest Low Density Residential. All the other properties would be much closer to neighbours. 10. The colours and design of the building are open to change during the site plan process. What is important is that we get the general massing of the building so that we can maximize the use of this site. 11. There are not very many sites of this size in the proposed zone change area. It would be a shame to see such a formidable site de-intensified, when it can easily accommodate an attractive signature building and yet</td>
<td>Thank you for your submission. The intent of the secondary plan review process is to review the appropriate land use designation and zoning for lands in the secondary plan area and not the review of site specific proposals. It is suggested that you go through the pre-submission consultation process to obtain comments on this site specific proposal. The maximum FSR and maximum building height work together to achieve an appropriate built form, particularly where higher densities about low rise residential uses. The built form can be limited by the maximum FSR or building height. Although the lands have a maximum permitted FSR of 4.0, the built form is limited in height by Special Regulation Provision 543R. The maximum permitted FSR does not permit the built form on the property to exceed 24 metres at the highest point without a planning application of some type. As we also discussed, for the purposes of illustrating intended/proposed built form at the first Open House, it was more appropriate to apply a MIX-2 zoning to these properties. The MIX-2 zone is consistent with existing zone permissions as they relate to building height. If it is possible to achieve a maximum FSR of 4.0 and also meet the current height permissions noted in 543R, then a site-specific policy/regulation could be added to the proposed Mixed Use land use designation and proposed MIX-2 to permit an FSR up to 4.0. Currently, a proposal which exceeds both the existing maximum building height of 24 metres and maximum FSR of 4.0 would require site-specific amendments to both the Secondary Plan/Official Plan and Zoning By-law. The Secondary Plan Review process is not intended to consider site-specific amendments outside of the existing land use permissions or the proposed base land use designation and zone category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 | Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | Commenter Details  
Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet |  
not affect many neighbours. This is a very unique and rare site.  
12. We would like to see if it is possible to extend the zoning that would allow a taller building and still keep our FSR of 4 times.  
13. Please note that we would have at a minimum, one layer of underground parking, and possibly a second. Please take a look at the attached images, and give me some feedback. If you have some ideas for the design of the building, we are flexible, but really do not want to lose our FSR of 4. | intended to be applied to the subject lands. The process to consider such change is an owner-initiated application wherein the appropriate justification, studies and reports are submitted in order to consider such a site-specific amendment. The first step in consideration of such amendments is the Pre-Submission Consultation meeting. If your proposal requires site-specific amendments to implement and you would like staff feedback on the proposal, I suggest you make application for a Pre-Submission Consultation meeting. |
<p>| 6 | Written: April 14, 2019 I am a 10 year resident in the King East area of Kitchener, a homeowner with young young children and I hope to raise my family here for many years to come. We love this area and are very excited about the many developments that have already taken place to make downtown Kitchener a safer and more vibrant place to live (LRT, crosswalks, bike lanes, etc). However, after seeing the massive 20+ story high rise buildings go up in Waterloo along King St. I started to become concerned that the same would happen to King East in Kitchener. I understand the need for housing in the downtown area and the need for affordable housing but would like to see a limit to the number of stories allowed for new high rise towers in this area. The developers I assume do not live in this neighbourhood and do not care about the impact these towers would have on residents in the area. They care about making money. I hope that the city government will be considering the impact on locals over the potential loss of income to developers. My main concern is the loss of sunlight for the nearby houses/neighbourhoods. I am passionate about maintaining and building the urban tree canopy in Kitchener and creating habitats for pollinators through gardening. If a 20+ high rise were to go in along King St. on the west side of King the residences on the east side would lose almost half of the day’s natural sunlight. I am in support of creating high density housing downtown with a limit of 12 stories. I am also hoping the City is ensuring that a suitable number of units will be affordable for families with lower incomes (single parent families, refugees, people living with disabilities etc). | One of the objectives of this Secondary Plan Review Process to review the proposed land use and zoning and recommend an appropriate built form and transition that minimizes impacts on adjacent low rise residential properties. We too want to ensure that a mix of land uses are provided in the appropriate locations to facilitate an appropriate range, variety and mix of housing types, styles, densities, tenure and affordability to satisfy the housing needs of the neighbourhood and community. Thank you for your comments and feedback. |
| 7 | 16 Borden Avenue North My wife Connie and I attended the info session at Rockway on the 4th and we chatted for a bit. We live at 16 Borden Ave North, separated by one residential lot from the commercial property at 926-936 King East. That | | Thank you for attending the meeting and reaching out afterwards. I’m sorry we didn’t have the full spectrum of zoning information at the meeting. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|    | Written: April 10, 2019 | **Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
**Question 2:** What are your comments about the zoning?  
**Question 3:** What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments** | The lot is currently zoned MU-2/S41R, slated to go to MIX-4/Sp.3.  
Our concern as I mentioned at the meeting is that a high building constructed on that lot would effectively shade our house and yard for much of the day as well as making privacy impossible. I'm finding it difficult to interpret the restrictions and requirements for that lot, and of course they would change depending on use anyway.  
The maximum height for MIX-4/Sp.3 in the proposed changes is 8 storeys. Can you give us any indication of whether or not a building of that height would be permitted on the site? Failing that, what is the formula for calculating the FSR - I can’t find that in the documents or online info.  
In addition to MU-2 zoning a special regulation (S41R) has been added to the site to provide for maximum height restrictions within X number of metres from residentially zoned property. In the case of the subject property, despite the current maximum permitted FSR in the MU-2 Zone of 4.0, the S41R limits the height of development on the subject lands to a maximum of 19.5 metres at a minimum distance from the residentially zoned properties. The intent of this building height + setback regulation would be to provide built form transition, limit shadowing, overlook and privacy impacts. The maximum FSR and maximum building height work together to achieve an appropriate built form, particularly where higher densities abut low rise residential uses. The built form can be limited by the maximum FSR or building height. Given the height restrictions in S41R, it may not be possible for a developer to achieve a maximum FSR of 4.0 (this depends on the lot size).  
See definition of FSR provided.  
The proposed zoning for the site is MIX 3 Sp.3 which has a maximum FSR of 2.0 and a maximum building height of 10 storeys. Through the Secondary Planning process, staff will be reviewing the special regulation S41R to determine if changes are required to ensure there are appropriate setbacks and building stepbacks needed to properly provide built form transition, limit shadowing, overlook and privacy impacts. |
| 8  | 112 Onward Avenue  
Written: April 6, 2019 | My wife Trudy and I met you at Thursday evening's meeting re the King Street East Secondary Plan. We live at the corner of Onward Ave and Weber St and were concerned about our property's zoning being changed from its current "Medium Rise Residential" to the proposed "Low Rise Residential". You'd suggested that maintaining the current zoning wouldn't be a problem and asked that I send you an email to remind you of our conversation. So here it is!  
And thanks for your help! It was a pleasure meeting you.  
We had a great conversation concerning your property at 112 Onward Avenue and I appreciate receiving your email and comments that you would like to maintain similar land use and zoning permissions for your property reflected in the new Secondary Plan.  
As discussed this property is located at the corner of Onward and Weber, a good size lot, and could support and maintain the residential uses that are permitted by the current "Low Rise Multiple Residential" land use designation and existing Residential Six Zone (R-6). |
| # | Commenter Details | Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet  
**Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
**Question 2:** What are your comments about the zoning?  
**Question 3:** What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments** | Staff Response  
The lands located at 206 Duke Street East are contained in the King Street East Neighbourhood Secondary Plan.  
As you may be aware we have begun the review of the Secondary Plans and King Street East is tentatively scheduled for a first Open House next month. This is the first introduction of proposed land uses/zoning for the new Secondary Plan and engagement/consultation on neighbourhood character which could be translated into secondary plan policies, urban design guidelines and area or site-specific zoning regulations.  
Following the engagement/consultation, which may also include a design charrette, we will be taking the feedback, revising the plan as appropriate. Drafting policies with a view to bringing the new King Street East Secondary Plan, policies and zoning to a Committee/Council for adoption/approval at the earliest late fall of this year.  
Zoning was implemented to reflect the Medium Rise Residential land use designation.  

| 9 | 206 Duke Street East  
Written: February 27, 2019 | As the new owner of the subject land [206 Duke St E], we wish for the Medium Density Multiple Residential designation to be applied to this anomaly current I-1 zone along with the R-7 zone as per the neighbours as you work through the various updates in the zoning / OP / urban design  

| 10 | Stephanie Mirtitsch,  
MHBC  
880 King Street West  
Written: May 13, 2019 | Next Steps  
It is our opinion that the entire property should be designated ‘High Density Mixed Use’ to allow for the current development permissions on the site to continue. We believe that the concerns related to access, setbacks, design and parking identified in the pre-consultation meeting can be appropriately mitigated through the design of the site and building.  

| 11 | 81 Borden Avenue North  
Written: August 5, 2019 | I’ve been thinking more about the design charrette on May 16. One thing we didn’t discuss that evening is the 2014 Cultural Heritage Landscapes study. I know it’s one of the ingredients in the secondary plan for King Street East you’re working on, but I’m not sure where it falls amongst the many other priorities and studies you must also consider. Anyway, I recently reviewed it, and would like to highlight some things that are especially pertinent to the King Street East secondary plan.  
Onward Ave. Neighbourhood identified as ‘a cultural heritage landscape of considerable value and significance’  
I understand the study’s purpose is to create an inventory of the city’s cultural heritage landscapes as a planning tool in the management of the identified assets as the community evolves. Further, one of the study’s  

Thank you for your interest in the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary plan Review process and for your feedback.  

Thank you for your further comments and feedback, particularly with the relationship and correlation of the 2014 Cultural Heritage Landscapes Study and the King Street East Secondary Plan.  
I have forwarded your comments to our Heritage Planners and staff on the Project Team for their information and consideration.  
The Neighbourhood Planning Review process involves creating new policies and mapping that will be added to our Official Plan, updating zoning, considering new urban design guidelines and implementing
goals is to potentially, “redirect the development of the city in such a manner that preserves and protects identified resources that might otherwise go unnoticed or be at risk.” The Onward Avenue Neighbourhood (off of King St. E.) is identified in the study (L-NBR-3) as one of the 12 residential neighbourhoods with considerable heritage value. The study expresses a desire to ensure that, “the value of the heritage resources in these wonderful neighbourhoods is not ignored or misinterpreted in future planning initiatives.”

As your team works on the secondary plan for King Street East, I hope you’ll revisit the findings about the Onward Avenue Neighbourhood from the Cultural Heritage Landscapes (highlights attached). The study suggests that land assembly, infrastructure up-grades, building massing, building height, types of building cladding, shade, transparency at grade and setbacks all impact the character of older, more stable neighbourhoods. I trust the secondary plan you develop will provide appropriate guidelines to minimize the impact of anticipated intensification on the character of the Onward Avenue/King Street East neighbourhood. While I know that change is inevitable, I am hopeful that through the secondary plan, Planning will have a mechanism to respond to growth/development/infill/intensification while conserving the heritage resources of this neighbourhood. The neighbourhood remains virtually unchanged since its development, making it a unique cultural asset that tells a story of the city’s history, contributes to the city’s built form and gives it a visual identity, character and soul.

Comprehensive conservation guidelines

Further, I note that the study goes so far as to recommend the development of comprehensive conservation guidelines for the residential neighbourhoods identified as having significant heritage resources (like Onward), beyond the four designated as heritage Conservation Districts. The study says, “since styles and technologies change and evolve, a more comprehensive guideline could address the appropriate of adaptation of these new trends in construction and design. Where unique circumstances arise, the guideline could have more specific remedies in appendices that would focus on these individual or unique conditions.” In the absence of such comprehensive guidelines, perhaps the secondary plan for King Street East could serve as a tool to carefully consider the appropriateness of new trends in the context of the Onward Avenue/King Street East neighbourhood – a cultural heritage landscape recognized as having considerable value of significance.

We anticipate identifying the CHL in the King Street East Secondary in the City’s Official and developing guidelines and policies to assist in protecting the establishing character of the neighbourhood. We hope to circulate an entire package of implementation sometime this fall with a public meeting to consider the new Secondary Plans later this year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Staff Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highlights about the neighbourhood from the data sheet (potentially to inform the secondary plan guidelines):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Overall uniformity in the architectural expression, yet individually, each house has its own suite of details and interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Building facades play an important visual role in the streetscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Scale of dwellings is relatively consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Setback from street consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Open front yards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rear yard garages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Variety of arts and crafts features typical of the period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Brick masonry construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Porches accent front elevations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Gabled roofs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal yet informal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One of my biggest concerns is about the size of infill developments I’ve seen in other neighbourhoods. The new homes seem so monstrous, taking up every possible inch of real estate, so that they hulk over and crowd their neighbours, interrupting the visual rhythm of the streetscape. I hope the new secondary plan will be able to preserve the visual rhythm in this neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Justification and Summary

General Justification:
- Appropriate site specific policies for Mixed Use were applied to lands along the corridor based on parcel size and adjacency to other land use designations. Low Rise, Medium Rise, and Medium to High Rise Mixed Use policies were applied to this secondary plan.
- Properties fronting Weber Street East between Cedar Street and Madison Ave North were proposed to be Medium Rise Residential in the PARTS Rockway Plan but have been proposed to be Low Rise Mixed Use through this process to allow for more uses along the corridor.
- Properties fronting Ottawa Street between Brick Street and Weber Street East were proposed to be designated as Institutional and Commercial in the PARTS Rockway Plan. Through this review these properties were proposed to be designated either Institutional or Mixed Use.

Site Specific Justification:
- 287 and 291 Weber Street East: Proposed to be designated Low Rise Residential and zoned RES-5 which is comparable to the existing R-6 zone which will maintain the existing land use permissions.
- 1440 King Street East: Currently zoned MU-3 and is proposed to be designated Mixed Use and rezoned to MIX-2. The boundary between the lands proposed to be MIX-4 and MIX-2 in the new secondary plan was determined by the PARTS Rockway Plan. Lands that are proposed to be MIX-2 were not identified to be included in the final boundary of the Major Transit Station Area as only lands within the MTSA were given the new MIX-4 zone. The MIX-2 zone is consistent with the existing zone permissions as they relate to building height. If it is possible to achieve a maximum FSR of 4.0 and also meet the current height permission noted in 543R, then a site specific policy could be added to the proposed Mixed Use land use designation and MIX-2 zone to permit this.
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1.0 Objective

The Civic Centre Secondary Plan was adopted by City Council in May 1994 and was approved by Regional Council in May 1995. Given this secondary plan is nearly 25 years old, City Planning Staff evaluated the existing secondary plan, in conjunction with other municipal documents and consultation to create an updated version. This plan applies new land use designations and zoning regulations which reflects direction from the City, Region, Province and other external agencies.

The Civic Centre review involves the area containing the existing Civic Centre Secondary Plan and a portion of the Central Frederick Secondary Plan (in the area of Lancaster Street West). This new area is proposed to become the new Civic Centre Secondary Plan.

1.1 Location Map
2.0 Considerations

2.1 Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) – Central Study Area

The PARTS Plans were conducted to ensure the City of Kitchener’s station areas are developed in stable ways that support local transit and add value to communities. The studies completed thus far include recommendations for the following: Land use; Engineering infrastructure; Pedestrian and cycling connection enhancements; Transportation demand management measures; Public realm and streetscape improvements in surrounding areas; Road and parking implications; Community infrastructure; and, Public art opportunities.

The PARTS Central Plan was intended to be a guiding document with its goals and strategies to be implemented through an Official Plan Amendment, a Secondary Plan, a Zoning By-law Amendment, and updates to the Urban Design Manual. The Preferred Plan (Land Use Map) developed through this process acted as a guide for the Civic Centre Secondary Plan. Incorporation of new land use designations and zones with updated regulations were considered in conjunction with the existing conditions and uses of properties, and their existing permissions and special policies and regulations. Any deviation between the Preferred Plan and the draft Civic Centre Secondary Plan was done through Staff review and public comment and consultation to achieve the best land use planning suited to the existing and future development of the community.

2.2 Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

The City of Kitchener undertook RIENS in hopes to develop a clear and fair process for approving development projects in established neighbourhoods. Typically development proposals are considered based on the size and impact on the surrounding area, and the zoning by-laws and urban design standards in place. The intent of the recommendations of this study was to further ensure that new development blends and is compatible with the neighbourhood.

2.3 Urban Design Guidelines (UDG)

The Urban Design Manual is a guide for the development community, residents, special-interest groups, city council and staff for details on our city’s urban design guidelines and standards. The recent update of Part A of the Urban Design Manual was approved on September 9, 2019 by council as part of the Community and Infrastructure Services Committee agenda. The guidelines were last updated in 2000 and Kitchener has since seen rapid change and intensification throughout the city, triggering a desire to ensure that the guidelines reflect the evolving expectations for the design of buildings and public spaces.

Urban Design staff held a public design charrette for the Civic Centre neighbourhood on March 6, 2019. The intent of the charrette was to directly speak to and address residents’
concerns and identify opportunities for better design in their community. These
neighbourhood specific guidelines will be brought forward for approval as part of the
Secondary Plans for each neighbourhood. Upon approval of the secondary plan for this
neighbourhood, the neighbourhood specific design guidelines will be added as part of the
area specific guidelines for Central Neighbourhoods.

2.4 Cultural Heritage Landscapes Study

The Civic Centre neighbourhood is a designated heritage district under the Ontario Heritage
Act. The CHL Study was undertaken to determine how to best creatively conserve the
historical integrity and early development pattern of our city, while encouraging new
growth. Identifying historic places that blend the built and natural environment that have
key ties to the events, people and activities that form the shape of our city were accounted
through an inventory detailing these CHLs. A comprehensive summary of the findings and
recommendations of this study for CHLs within the Victoria Park neighbourhood is below.
Civic Centre Neighbourhood Secondary Plan
Cultural Heritage Resources Background Study

Introduction

Our cultural heritage resources provide a link to the past and are an expression of the city's culture and history. They contribute in a significant way to Kitchener’s identity and unique character, and help instill civic pride, foster a sense of community and sense of place. The conservation of cultural heritage resources also contributes to making our neighbourhoods a more interesting and appealing place to live, work and play.

The Province of Ontario through the Provincial Policy Statement (a planning document that provides policy direction on matters of Provincial interest related to land use planning and development), requires that municipalities conserve significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs).

With this in mind, the conservation of cultural heritage resources has been an important consideration in work undertaken by the City as part of the comprehensive planning review of the Civic Centre Neighbourhood. This work, which culminates in updating the policies and land use planning framework of the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, aims to encourage development and growth in a manner that is respectful of cultural heritage and contributes to making the neighbourhood unique and distinctive.

Built Heritage Resources

Built heritage resources are buildings and structures that may have either design/physical, historic/associative or contextual heritage value. The designation and listing of heritage property on the Municipal Heritage Register is an important tool in the City’s efforts to conserve its built heritage resources.

Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act provides the strongest heritage protection available for conserving heritage resources, and allows a municipality to control proposals for demolition and alteration through a heritage permit system. While a “listed” property is afforded a more limited measure of protection, the City can require studies such as a heritage impact assessment and/or a conservation plan to guide the consideration of new development and identify measures to avoid or mitigate negative impacts to significant cultural heritage resources and attributes.

Of the properties located within the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Secondary Plan boundary, roughly 300 are located within the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Heritage Conservation District and are considered designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. Of these properties, 7 are also individually designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; and 1 property is currently “listed” on the Municipal Heritage Register. Map 1 appended to this report identifies the location and status of built heritage resources located within the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Secondary Plan boundary.
Cultural Heritage Landscapes

While the City has long maintained a heritage register of significant built heritage resources, efforts to identify and conserve significant cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs) is a relatively new undertaking. In 2014, an inventory of 55 significant cultural heritage landscapes in Kitchener was established. Cultural heritage landscapes are defined in the Provincial Policy Statement as a geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples of cultural heritage landscapes include but are not limited to parks, mainstreets, cemeteries, trailways, industrial complexes, and neighbourhoods.

Within a cultural heritage landscape, there are often buildings, structures, landscape features and other attributes that collectively illustrate a historical theme. Themes considered to be significant, are those that are essential to understanding the evolution of a City and that underpin its identity. The Kitchener CHL Study concluded that several established residential neighbourhoods that maintain a high degree of heritage integrity and are representative of the planning concepts and housing styles of the period in which they were developed, are worthy of being conserved.

The 2014 Kitchener CHL Study identifies the Civic Centre Neighbourhood as a significant cultural heritage landscape, and is one of 12 established residential neighbourhoods of considerable value and significance identified in the study. Civic Centre is considered unique among Kitchener neighbourhoods because it is rich in historical, architectural and landscape features that contribute to establishing the heritage character of the community. The Civic Centre Neighbourhood’s heritage attributes are found within its residential architecture, streetscapes, and historical associations; and in particular its association with important business and community leaders during a crucial era of urban growth and development in the City.

The neighbourhood features a wealth of well maintained, finely detailed homes from the late 1880s to the early 1900s that remain largely intact, including a variation of the Queen Anne architectural style locally termed the “attic gable” house, that is more prominent in the Civic Centre Neighbourhood than elsewhere in the City. The area also features a number of unique buildings including churches and commercial buildings which provide distinctive landmarks within and at the edges of the neighbourhood. There is a strong rhythm to most of the streetscapes, with streets framed by mature trees creating a beautiful shaded canopy and comfortable pedestrian environment throughout most of the neighbourhood. The neighbourhood also features a number of linear streets and generally consistent building setbacks combined with both public and private street trees along boulevards. Laneways can also be found threading through the neighbourhood, and reflect more traditional patterns of movement and development.
A Phased Approach to CHL Conservation

Taking stock and identifying the cultural heritage resources that are important to a community is a critical first step in any conservation strategy. For each CHL identified in the 2014 CHL Study, the study provides a description of the landscape; establishes a preliminary boundary of interest; identifies the historical integrity, and cultural and community values associated with the landscape; and finally, describes the character defining features of the CHL.

While the Study does not in itself protect CHLs, it serves as the first of three phases of work involved in establishing appropriate CHL conservation strategies for each landscape, as follows:

**Phase 1** – Establish an Inventory of Significant CHLs and identify priority CHLs for further study and analysis.

**Phase 2** – Conduct fieldwork, analysis and property owner engagement in identifying heritage attributes and a preferred conservation strategy for select CHLs.

**Phase 3** – Implementation and management of a preferred CHL conservation strategy or strategies.

Phase 1 noted above is complete. Priority CHLs have been identified including the Civic Centre Neighbourhood CHL. Phase 2 is in progress for select priority CHLs. This includes work undertaken by City Planning staff in arriving at the cultural heritage policies included in the Secondary Plan. The timing
associated with the third and final phase the City’s CHL conservation strategy is in part dependent upon
the nature and complexity of the strategies recommended for each CHL. Strategies affording the best
protections are typically those governed by Provincial legislation such as the Ontario Heritage Act (e.g.
heritage designation and listing of heritage property), and the Planning Act (e.g. Secondary Plan policies,
assignment of appropriate land use and zoning, implementation of neighbourhood design guidelines
through site plan control).

The Civic Centre Neighbourhood Heritage Conservation District & Cultural Heritage Landscape

The Civic Centre Neighbourhood Heritage Conservation District was approved by by-law on February 25,
2008. The by-law serves to designate 300 properties under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, and formally
adopt the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Heritage Conservation District Plan (CCNHCD Plan). The boundary
of the CCNHCD is illustrated on Map 1 attached to this report and generally encompasses the south side
of Victoria Street North, the east side of Weber Street West to Queen Street North, the north side of
Queen Street North to Ellen Street East, the east side of Ellen Street East to Lancaster Street East, and
both sides of Lancaster Street East to Victoria Street North.

The 2014 Kitchener Cultural Heritage Landscape Study identifies the Civic Centre Neighbourhood as a
significant cultural heritage landscape (CHL). As a continuing landscape that has evolved over time,
heritage conservation districts are considered to be a type of CHL. While the boundary of the Civic Centre
Neighbourhood CHL is consistent with that of the Civic Centre Neighbourhood HCD; the area forming the
Civic Centre Neighbourhood Secondary Plan boundary is slightly larger in that it encompasses all of
the south side Victoria Street North. Certain properties on Victoria Street North are not included in the HCD
and CHL boundaries as they were found to be less architecturally significant than those on the interior of
the neighbourhood and on Weber Street West. Nonetheless, corner properties located at the interface of
Victoria Street North and intersecting streets are included in the HCD and CHL boundary, as they are key
gateway and transition areas between the Mixed Use Corridor on Victoria Street North (where
redevelopment and intensification may be expected) and the residential neighbourhood. Retaining the
corner properties within the HCD boundary at key gateways ensures that the City has greater control over
the design of new development, streetscape and landscape features.

The CCNHCD Plan contains policies and guidelines aimed at conserving the significant architecture and
landscapes which are unique to the Civic Centre area. Specific guidance is provided on conserving and
enhancing the historic buildings in the heritage district, to ensure character defining features and
attributes are conserved when changes are proposed. New building construction, alterations, additions
and demolition may require issuance of a heritage permit. Guidelines and policies also apply to the
conservation of public spaces such as Hibner Park and to streetscape features.
While development has been vigorous around the heritage district given the proximity of the area to the downtown; the district has remained relatively intact with its Victorian architecture and canopied streetscapes. The number, authenticity and condition of the district’s early buildings and landscapes remains significant.

That said, the CCNHCD Plan acknowledges that there are certain properties and areas within the HCD boundary where redevelopment may be expected; either because the property is large in size and vacant (such as on Margaret Avenue), or because the properties are located along a major transit corridor such as the aforementioned Victoria Street North or on Weber Street West. In anticipation, the CCNHCD Plan contains site and area specific policies to help guide redevelopment on such sites, encouraging proposals to work with existing historic buildings, altering, adding to and integrating them into any new development. The HCD Plan also contains guidance on land use and zoning regulations, making recommendations for changes in land use and zoning to properties on Margaret Avenue (since amended through a site specific Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment); on Queen Street North; and in the Mansion and Lancaster Street areas, all of which have been considered as part of the Secondary Plan review.

**Review of Land Use & Zoning**

City planning staff reviewed and considered preliminary land use designations assigned to property as part of the Secondary Plan review. This included using computer modeling to examine how development permitted within certain land use categories, such as the proposed mixed use areas along Weber Street West, may impact existing low rise areas located within the heritage district (illustrated below). Land use
categories and regulations have been applied to balance opportunities for growth and development where appropriate, while respecting heritage conservation objectives and minimizing potential impacts on designated heritage property.

Public Engagement & Comments

Information on resources and attributes of cultural heritage value or interest within the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Secondary Plan study area was made available to property owners and the public both online (on the City's Neighbourhood Planning Review webpage) and at public information meetings. Specifically, information panels on existing (designated and listed) cultural heritage resources; attributes contributing to the CHL/Neighbourhood character; and examples of planning and legislative tools to achieve a level of conservation, were made available for review and discussion. Feedback received on cultural heritage matters primarily centered on concerns regarding compatibility of proposed land use and zoning with existing historic development, and built form transition between possible mid-rise development and existing low-rise areas.

Recommendations to address cultural heritage interests within the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Secondary Plan Area

Having examined the cultural heritage value and attributes of the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Secondary Plan area, and having considered the feedback and input received from property owners and the public through the Secondary Plan process, the following measures are recommended to be applied to address cultural heritage interests and objectives.
**Measures to be considered under the Ontario Heritage Act**

- Existing built heritage resources designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and listed as non-designated property on the City's Municipal Heritage Register shall be conserved. This includes most notably, continuing to apply the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Heritage Conservation District Plan policies and guidelines as a means of conserving Part V designated heritage property.

**Measure to be considered in the Official Plan**

The Civic Centre Neighbourhood CHL should be identified on Map 9 in the Official Plan as a Cultural Heritage Landscape.

**Measures to be considered in the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Secondary Plan**

- **Establish area design guidelines that support cultural heritage conservation objectives.**
  
  While most of the Secondary Plan area is afforded a measure of heritage protection through the designation and regulation of property located within the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Heritage Conservation District, the entire secondary plan area would still benefit from establishing separate area design guidelines that would form part of the City’s Urban Design Manual. Such guidelines would serve to complement the existing heritage district policies and guidelines, addressing issues not necessarily regulated in the CCNHCD Plan, such as improving pedestrian connectivity and movement.

- **Identify Property of Specific CHL Interest, where a Heritage Impact Assessment may be required for CHL conservation**

  Currently, as part of the assessment of proposed development impact on built heritage resources and as referenced in the Provincial Policy Statement under the Planning Act, the City may require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for planning applications potentially impacting a cultural heritage resource located on property that is designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, and on property located adjacent protected (designated) heritage property. The City’s Official Plan also states that the City may require the submission of a HIA for development, redevelopment and site alteration that has the potential to impact an identified cultural heritage landscape. Given properties within the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Secondary Plan are either located within the CCNHCD or are located adjacent protected (designated) property, the City is already in a position of being able to require a HIA for planning and development applications made within the Secondary Plan boundary. As such, all property within the Secondary Plan boundary shall be identified as being Property of Specific CHL Interest, and no new or additional protection measures are necessary. Property identified as being of Specific CHL Interest are identified on Map 1 and include the following:

  - protected heritage property designated under Part IV and/or Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act;
  - property “listed” on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register under Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act;
  - property located adjacent protected and listed heritage property.
Where development is proposed on property that is of specific CHL interest but not designated or listed under the Ontario Heritage Act, then such HIA may be scoped and limited in review to assess visual and contextual impact.
## 3.0 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 2016</strong></td>
<td>Staff begins Neighbourhood Planning Reviews and commences the Civic Centre Secondary Plan review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 2016 –</strong></td>
<td>Staff prepare material with relation to specific neighbourhood character topics to present to the public for feedback about what works well within their community. Draft land use and zoning maps are created for this neighbourhood to be presented to the public for feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **December 12, 2018** | **Public Open House #1**  
Staff present information in an open house setting with the draft land use designations and zones for the neighbourhood. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit any further comments by comment form or through e-mail following the meeting. |
| **November 2018 –** | Public comments are received and reviewed by Staff. Updated draft maps for land use and zoning are finalized. Final recommendations for this secondary plan will be brought forward to council in Fall/Winter 2019.                                                                                     |
| **December 2019**  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| **September – October 2019** | Internal City Staff review of all draft secondary plan policies and mapping.                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| **October 11, 2019** | All property owners within the Secondary Plan area are sent notice of a Statutory Public Meeting.                                                                                                                                                                             |
| **December 9, 2019** | **Public Information Meeting #2**  
Staff present all draft maps for six secondary plans, including land use and zoning maps for Civic Centre. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit final comments by comment form or e-mail following the meeting. |
| **December 2019**  | Staff conduct a final review of all secondary plan maps with public comments received and prepare a report for council. Final draft maps are finalized.                                                                                                                           |
| **Spring 2020**    | **Secondary Plans Report to Committee/Council**                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
4.0 Public Consultation Materials

4.1 Open House #1
   Notice of Open House
   Information Panels/Maps
   Scanned Sign In Sheets
   Scanned Comment Forms
   Public Comments Received by Email
To: Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

RE: Public Open House – Neighbourhood Planning Review
New Civic Centre Secondary Plan
Process of Updating and Applying Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations

The City would like to formally invite you to participate in the Neighbourhood Planning Review of the new Civic Centre Secondary Plan and updated zoning. It is scheduled as follows:

Date/Time: Wednesday, December 12th, 2018, 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm (Drop-in)
Location: Lower Level Room A, Kitchener Public Library – 85 Queen Street North

For the boundary of this new secondary plan see map below.

An updated land use framework within the City’s Secondary Plan areas was deferred as part of the review of our new 2014 Official Plan. The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters. A ‘Secondary Plan’ is a more detailed land use and policy document that forms part of the Official Plan, and is used by the City to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city.
The Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study. The City is now in a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans.

We are getting into the details of land use, zoning, heritage conservation, and urban design.

We want to canvass your opinions on the preferred land uses, and understand your opinions on the character that you would like to see in your neighbourhood. This will help us determine what regulatory tools should be implemented to protect these features. These tools can include traditional planning tools like zoning regulations and urban design guidelines, and/or other tools such as heritage listings and designations. A portion of the new Secondary Plan is already designated as a Heritage Conservation District and identified as a significant Cultural Heritage Landscape.

The Public Open House will include a number of stations to provide an opportunity to discuss and share your input with the City planners on the land uses proposed for the new Secondary Plan and the character that you would like to see in the secondary plan area.

Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you!

Help guide the implementation of land use, zoning, heritage conservation and urban design in your neighbourhood by attending our public open house on December 12th!

Information shared at the meeting will also be available online (posted on the project website after the meeting). If you are unable to attend this meeting, you are welcome to provide your input through the project website: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR or to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Yours truly,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner – Policy

c. Brandon Sloan, Manager, Long Range and Policy Planning
   Alain Pinard, Director of Planning
   Erin Power, Communications & Marketing Associate
   Councillor Debbie Chapman
City Council adopted a new Official Plan in June 2014.
- The Ontario Planning Act requires municipalities to amend Zoning By-laws within three years of a new Official Plan being in effect.

The Official Plan is a legal document granted authority under the Planning Act that contains goals, objectives and policies to manage and direct physical and land use change, and their effects on the cultural, social, economic and natural environment within the City.

- Official Plan policies:
- Direct growth and development decisions in the City;
- Govern all aspects of community growth and development, community services, movement of goods and people, conservation and protection of the cultural and natural environment, and the preservation of agricultural resources; and,
- Include population and employment forecasts and density and residential intensification level targets.
Secondary Plans are used to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city, indicating the manner in which the goals, objectives, policies and land use designations of the Official Plan will be implemented within respective areas.

In the past Secondary Plans have generally been prepared for existing Built-Up Areas in the city but they may also be prepared in the Designated Greenfield Area.

Once approved, these Plans are incorporated into the Official Plan by formal amendment. Existing secondary plans were created 25-30 years ago.

These were deferred from being incorporated into the new Official Plan (2014) until LRT Station Area Planning was completed (2016-2017).
The City of Kitchener is undertaking a detailed review of the land use and planning framework for many specific neighbourhoods. These are typically locations where there are outdated secondary plans or community plans created 25-30 years ago to help guide the use of land (e.g. where new housing could go, commercial businesses, environmental conservation land, parks, etc.) and policies for new development or redevelopment. To help implement new directions from the Province, Region, City and other agencies, we are evaluating and updating existing plans to create new ones.

- This process involves creating new policies and mapping that will be added to our Official Plan, updating Zoning, considering new Urban Design Guidelines and implementing our Cultural Heritage Landscapes. The locations we will review are primarily in the central neighbourhoods, but there are also several other places in the city where we will be engaging with landowners and the neighbourhood to help update these plans. Through this, we will be implementing the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study/Plans, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).
Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) are areas that reflect the interaction of people with the landscape over time, and may include groupings of built heritage, landscape features and archaeological sites that together comprise a significant heritage form.

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes Should:**

- Have historical value or interest (tell a story)
- Have historic integrity (be authentic)
- Be valued by the community

Cultural Heritage Landscapes are a combination of three layers that include:

- The land
- Street & lot layout - the public realm
- Buildings & other built form

The Province of Ontario has identified the conservation of cultural heritage resources including CHLs, as an area of Provincial Interest to be considered under the Planning Act and through the Provincial Policy Statement (2014). The Region of Waterloo Official Plan requires that Area Municipalities designate (identify) Cultural Heritage Landscapes in their Official Plans and establish associated policies to conserve CHLs.
In 2014, the City of Kitchener embarked on the first phase of a multi-phased effort to identify and conserve the City’s significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs). The first phase involved taking an inventory, and led to City Council approving the Kitchener Cultural Heritage Landscape Study which identifies 55 significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes, including several established residential neighbourhoods.

The City is now beginning its second phase of work, aimed at further identifying the attributes which contribute to making certain CHLs significant, and engaging with property owners on appropriate measures to address the conservation of those attributes and CHLs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses *</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a limited range of low density dwelling types in low rise areas.</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION, SHELTERED HOUSING, SENIOR HOUSING</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>The site specific may limit height and FSR depending on property context and heritage attributes (TBD)</td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td>HOME OCCUPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas.</td>
<td>ARTISAN’S ESTABLISHMENT, COMMUNITY FACILITY, CONVENIENCE RETAIL, DAY CARE FACILITY, OFFICE, HOME OCCUPATION, STUDIO</td>
<td>ARTISAN’S ESTABLISHMENT, COMMUNITY FACILITY, CONVENIENCE RETAIL, DAY CARE FACILITY, OFFICE, HOME OCCUPATION, STUDIO</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-7</td>
<td>Accommodate high density dwelling types and a range of complementary non-residential uses in high rise residential areas.</td>
<td>ARTISAN’S ESTABLISHMENT, COMMUNITY FACILITY, CONVENIENCE RETAIL, DAY CARE FACILITY, FINANCIAL ESTABLISHMENT, HEALTH OFFICE, OFFICE, PERSONAL SERVICES, HOME OCCUPATION, STUDIO</td>
<td>ARTISAN’S ESTABLISHMENT, COMMUNITY FACILITY, CONVENIENCE RETAIL, DAY CARE FACILITY, FINANCIAL ESTABLISHMENT, HEALTH OFFICE, OFFICE, PERSONAL SERVICES, HOME OCCUPATION, STUDIO</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 2.0 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses *</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>MIX-1</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a low density residential uses.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment Brewpub, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Community Facility, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Craftsperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Print Shop, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Retail, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>4 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-2</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a medium density.</td>
<td>MIX-1 uses plus Large Residential Care Facility, Payday loan Establishment, Post-Secondary School</td>
<td>8 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 1.0 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a medium density.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Community Facility, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Craftsperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Large Residential Care Facility, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Payday Loan Establishment, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Post-Secondary School, Print Shop, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>10 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 1.0 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings at a high density within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Same as MIX-3</td>
<td>No Limit</td>
<td>Min – 2.0 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>OSR-1</td>
<td>To provide a comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system.</td>
<td>Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation and Community Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>To provide a comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system.</td>
<td>Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation and Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
### Civic Centre Secondary Plan – Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Description / Range of Permitted Uses</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Maximum Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong>&lt;br&gt;with specific policy area</td>
<td>Same as Low Rise Residential land use, however specific policy area will limit the number of units in a multiple dwelling to three units. Consideration will also be given to further regulating building height and density. Analysis to be completed to confirm the properties to which the specific policy area will apply.</td>
<td>Maximum of 0.6</td>
<td>3 storeys or 11 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Low density housing types, including single detached dwellings, duplex dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, street townhouse dwellings, cluster townhouse dwellings, low-rise multiple dwellings and special needs housing.</td>
<td>Maximum of 0.6</td>
<td>3 storeys or 11 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential Office</strong></td>
<td>Permitted uses are restricted to single detached dwellings, a second dwelling unit, the conversion of existing buildings to multiple dwellings up to a maximum of three units, professional home occupations, private home day care, and small residential care facilities. Residential and non-residential uses may be permitted to locate within the same building.</td>
<td>Maximum of 0.6</td>
<td>3 storeys or 11 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Medium density housing types including Cluster Townhouse Dwellings, Multiple Dwellings, and Special Needs Housing.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>High density multiple dwellings and special needs housing to achieve a high intensity of residential use.</td>
<td>Minimum of 1.0 / Maximum of 4.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, personal services, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses and residential uses.</td>
<td>Minimum of 2.0 / Maximum of 4.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use with specific policy area</strong></td>
<td>These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.</td>
<td>Minimum of 2.0 / Maximum of 4.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ZONING, SITE SPECIFIC REGULATIONS & URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

WHAT IS ZONING?

Zoning is used to regulate:

- Use of land;
- Location of buildings and structures;
- Types of buildings permitted and their associated uses; and
- Lot dimensions, parking requirements, building heights and setbacks from the street/lot lines.

WHAT IS A SITE SPECIFIC PROVISION?

Site specific provisions are added to the base zone to provide additional regulations. Some examples are as follows:

- Garage permissions and location
- Size and location requirements for front porches
- Height limits

WHAT IS AN URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINE:

Urban Design Guidelines establish the objectives, priorities and expectations for urban design in Kitchener. The guidelines apply to projects across the City and address such things as building types, streetscapes and the public realm. The manual is used by City staff and the development industry in the review and approval of specific types of development applications, such as official plan amendments, zone by-law, site plan control and minor variance applications. The guidelines are inherently flexible and negotiable and do not have the same regulatory power as other tools such as the Zoning By-law.
**Examples of Zoning Regulations**

**Achieving a Consistent Building Setback**

Any new (or additions to) single detached, semi-detached or street townhouse dwellings required to have a setback from a street that is based on the average setback of the two neighbouring properties.

A tolerance of 1 metre from the average setback has been incorporated into the regulation to provide flexibility. This regulation is in place already in Central Neighbourhoods (REINS Areas).

**Garage Projections & Permission**

Garage projections & permissions can be implemented using of zoning regulations and/or urban design guidelines

**Sample Urban Design Guideline:** Where the existing streetscape does not contain street facing garages, only detached recessed garages should be permitted.
**HOW IMPORTANT IS IT THAT THE CITY REGULATE ...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Features / Focal Points</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (ie: protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Design, Materials &amp; Colours</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (ie: protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POTENTIAL CONSERVATION TOOLS IDENTIFIED:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Character Element</th>
<th>Secondary Plan Policy</th>
<th>Zoning Regulation</th>
<th>Urban Design Guidelines</th>
<th>Heritage Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Porches</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Form Transitions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design, Materials, Colours</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Features / Focal Points</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City of Kitchener
#### NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER

**HOW IMPORTANT IS IT THAT THE CITY REGULATE ...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Porches</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Should not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e.: requires front porches on all new low-rise infill developments?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garages</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Should not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates garages (i.e.: setback, location on lot etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Built Form Transition</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e.: requires new development to respect existing built form?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setbacks</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e.: requires that buildings form a consistent street edge?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tools To Protect Neighbourhood Character

**Built Heritage Resources**

means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal community. Built heritage resources are generally located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or included on local, provincial and/or federal registers.

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).

**Heritage Act Tools**

- Heritage Conservation Easement Agreements
- Designation of Individual Properties (Part IV)
- Designation of Groups of Properties (Part V – Heritage Conservation District)
- Listing of Individual Properties
- Heritage Funding (Grants and Tax Refunds)

**Planning Act Tools**

- Official Plan/Secondary Plan Policies
- Community Improvement Plans
- Zoning By-law Regulations
- Subdivision Agreements
- Demolition Control
- Site Plan Control
- Urban Design Guidelines

**Other Tools**

- Corridor Management Plans
- Park Management Plans
- Stewardship Activities
- Public Education
- Commemoration and Interpretation
Listed Non-Designated Properties

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can list non-designated properties of cultural heritage value or interest on the Municipal Heritage Register. Listing is the first step the City should take to identify properties that may warrant some form of recognition, conservation and/or protection. Listing provides interim protection from demolition by increasing the amount of time the City has to process a demolition permit under the Ontario Building Code (generally from 10 to 60 business days) to provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the property merits formal designation. Listing also enables the City to ask for Heritage Impact Assessments and/or Conservation Plans with the submission of a complete Planning Act application.

Designated Properties

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can pass by-laws to formally designate properties of cultural heritage value or interest. Formal designation is one way of publicly acknowledging a property’s heritage value to the community. Designation also helps conserve important properties for the enjoyment of present and future generations by ensuring that changes are managed in a way that respects the heritage values. This includes protection from demolition. The City has designated approximately 85 individual properties and 4 heritage conservation districts.
# SIGN-IN SHEET

**Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**

**December 12, 2018**

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 St. Andrew Dr</td>
<td>N2B 1W2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158 Lancaster St E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Margaret Ave</td>
<td>N2H 4H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 Ahrens St W</td>
<td>N2H 4B7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>911-57 Queen St. N.</td>
<td>N2H 6T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>911-57 Queen St W</td>
<td>N2H 6T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88 Fountain St</td>
<td>N2L 3N1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 Ahrens St W</td>
<td>N2H 4B7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SIGN-IN SHEET

**Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**

**December 12, 2018**

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1165 Dow Village Rd, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2P 1A7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 Ahrens St W.</td>
<td>N2H 4B7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83 Ahrens St W</td>
<td>N2H 4B8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 Ellen St W.</td>
<td>N2H 4K1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 Margaret Unit 101</td>
<td>N2H 4H1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Martin St.</td>
<td>N2G 2Y2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*optional*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 Strange St., Kitchener, ON</td>
<td>N2G 1P8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 Strange St., Kitchener, ON</td>
<td>N2G 1R5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Oak K.</td>
<td>N2G 2X8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Oak K.</td>
<td>N2G 2X8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170 Queen ST N</td>
<td>N2H 2S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104 Water St. N</td>
<td>N2H 5R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Ellen ST, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2H 4K1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Civic Centre Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before January 18, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   
   [Handwritten text: I would like churches to remain community institutional.]

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   
   [Handwritten text: Why is water st out of the plan boundaries?]

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?
   
   [Handwritten text: Keep the ideas of the existing special policies.
   Keep St Margaret as low rise residential.
   Special policy for Formie Lane & designate on Victoria Buildings on Part of cultural heritage resources.]
Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

Like the decreased density in the eastern part along Lancaster

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 55 Margaret Ave
Email: [Redacted]
Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Civic Centre Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before January 18, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   
   Some of the proposed buildings are allowed to go be too tall, I'm concerned about traffic and parking issues

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   
   not enough green space in this district

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

   I'm concerned any development will decrease diversity within the community: the 3+ bedroom apartments/townhouses. There is currently the case with current developments

   Are these going to be affordable for middle class? My guess is not without the city stepping in

   This is a community we want it to be family friendly and accessible to people, not just the rich.
Write your additional comments here:


Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: 

Mailing Address: 53 Ahrens St W

Email: 

Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review
Thank you for attending the Civic Centre Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before January 18, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   A very brief overview of the plan makes me very happy to see some attempts, especially by downzoning, to protect the heritage neighbourhood. + CTL

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

   I didn't look at specific areas - so there are no doubt problem juxtapositions eg. mixed-use 8 storeys backing on to Hermes Place.
Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

Also very happy to see steps to implement the Cultural Heritage landscape to go beyond simply naming/identifying it.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: ____________________________
Mailing Address: 88 Feuchterin St, Waterloo ON N2L 3N1
Email: ____________________________
Hello,

Thank you for your comments and feedback on the new Civic Centre Secondary Plan, particularly the property at 54 Margaret Avenue.

The land use designation and zone category for this property that is proposed and was shown at the Open House was to reflect the existing land use and zoning permissions that the property currently enjoys in the Civic Centre Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law 85-1. The reason for not including this property in the site-specific policy area for 30-40 Margaret Avenue, was again to reflect that none exist now and the one adjacent and applicable to the property at 30-40 Margaret Street is to reflect the site-specifics that were approved by the Ontario Municipal Board for these lands. The exclusion of these lands from any site-specific policies does not reflect any less heritage protection.

We are open to reviewing and revising the proposed land use designation and zone category to reflect the current built form and existing use, rather than maintaining current land use and zoning permissions.

We have your contact information and have added it to our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

Thank you again for your feedback and participation in this process.

If you have any additional questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

Tina

--- Original Message ---

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, April 17, 2019 8:42 PM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Cc: bradon.sloan@kitchener.ca; julianevonwesterholt@kitchener.ca
Subject: Zoning concerns from residents

Hello to All Concerned,

Please find the aforementioned concerns outlined in the attached letter for your perusal.
April 16, 2019

To Whom it May Concern,

My name is [Name], and my partner/co-owner’s name is [Name]. We are the new owners of 54 Margaret Avenue as of June of 2018. We are contacting you today in order to open discussions surrounding the proposed secondary plan for our neighbourhood and identify some changes to our house’s proposed zoning that are a cause for concern on our part.

54 MARGARET - ZONING

Firstly, as communicated in the OBTNHA consultation (on March 30, 2019), the current zoning for 54 Margaret is R-8 and the proposed new zoning is RES-6, which does not seem to fit the property as well as a RES-3 zoning would. Since the house is a single detached family home, and is a protected Class A heritage home, we feel the RES-6 zoning does not reflect the heritage importance of this house and the character of the neighbourhood and may encourage inappropriate development on the property in the future. We feel a “RES-3” designation may be a more appropriate.

We realize the land has potentially more value zoned as RES-6 since there are more options to develop, however we are now the custodians of this amazing house and feel its long-term protection is paramount. Further, we are hoping that a RES-3 designation would afford us better protections against inappropriate transitions from our neighbouring properties.

Our property falls outside the black dotted zone on the maps shown at the consultation identified as the “specific policy zone.” We are not clear on why our property was left outside the proposed zone, and what that means for 54 Margaret’s inclusion with respect to heritage protections. Was this an oversight? Was it purposely left out of the specific policy zone, and if so, why?

Many thanks in advance for your response and explanation of these issues. If it would be easier to discuss in person, please let us know. We would be more than happy to meet with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,
Thank you, again, Brandon, for listening to our neighbourhood comments and concerns. Attached is a copy of the sign-in sheet and the notes.

Thank you,

Hal

Hal Jaeger
Notes from March 30, 2019 consultation with Brandon Sloan Regarding Proposed Re-Zoning of Civic Centre (Olde Berlin)

The comments are numbered in the order they were recorded by the neighbourhood association. Due to time limitations, only a few of the comments were discussed. The ordering of the comments for discussion was determined by the OBTNA Heritage and Development Committee.

The following opinions do not reflect the views of the Olde Berlin Town Neighbourhood Association. The opinions belong to individuals who attended the consultation. No request for registration from local residents, property or business owners was denied.

17. Can we zone 54 Margaret Ave RES-3 as opposed to RES-6? It is a Class A heritage building inside the Heritage District.
   - Detached houses of this significance have been identified for RES-3 zoning.
   - Would re-zoning ensure a more appropriate transition?
   - RES-3 zoning would better ensure the house and its context are preserved than would RES-6.
   - As the last Class A house on the north side of Margaret, it plays an important role in providing context to the neighbours on the south side of Margaret.
   - It’s a problem when the heritage plan recommendations are at odds with the zoning. Let’s not tempt the arsonists and those that wish to demolish via neglect.

30. What is the definition of an “appropriate transition”, as required by the Official Plan Objective 3.2.5.?
   - Objective 3.2.5. of Kitchener’s Official Plan: “To maintain a compatible interface between Intensification Areas and surrounding areas and achieve an appropriate transition of built form”
   - How will planning documents ensure an appropriate transition, from the low-rise residential interior of Civic Centre across Queen, Victoria, Water and Weber into more intensified zones?
   - Precedent A) Special Regulation 565 (applies to 103-125 Water St N, which have a rear yard neighbour inside the Heritage District): a) the minimum rear yard setback shall be 15.0 metres; and b) the maximum building height shall be 16.5 metres; however, the building height may be increased to a maximum of 24.0 metres provided that for each additional metre of building height beyond 16.5 metres a minimum of 1.5 metres of additional setback from the rear lot line is provided for those portions of the building with a height in excess of 16.5 metres.
   - Precedent B) Page 60 of Civic Centre Heritage district Conservation Plan regarding 30-40 Margaret Ave: 15m rear yard setback, 3 storey height at street and maximum 5 storey height mid-block. Step back at 45 degrees above third floor.
   - Example from the Victoria Park Area Heritage district. The properties within this district on Joseph Street are currently zoned R-5 with a maximum height of 10.5 m. On the opposing side of Joseph Street, the land is proposed to be zoned UGC-1 which allows a height only limited by maximum floor space ratio. If you use this as a guide, then the zoning on Queen, Victoria, Water and Weber should allow for higher maximum heights.
- Example from Hamilton. Lots of 35+ m frontage and 45+ m depth, allow for a point tower of 13+ stories or 50+ m. Lot depths on Queen are approximately 34 m, Victoria 47m, Water 51m and Weber 30-50m. Hamilton would allow considerable more height than what Kitchener is allowing.
- Hamilton’s building guidelines state, “To ensure the new development is sensitive and compatible with the existing or planned open space areas buildings should be designed to: I) transition to the height of the existing residential development. The portion of the building base or what our zoning calls the podium that is adjacent to the low-rise residential building should not exceed the height of the adjacent development and ii) the tower portion of the building should be set back 12.5m from the property line adjacent to the residential neighbourhood to mitigate shadow impact and protect privacy and overlook. The setbacks required on Water St N are more restrictive than what is required in Hamilton.
- Properties with these lot sizes are scarce, and Water and Victoria streets are primary corridors within the Major Transition Station Area.
- Likely the biggest single general issue to be resolved.
- Need to ensure that the benefits that come from putting limitations on a property are guaranteed to the owner as well as the neighbours.
- Need to ensure that benefits currently enjoyed are not stripped away without consent or appropriate compensation.
- Need to recognize that the surrounding context of a property is inherent to its value.
- Must not engage in expropriation of value.
- Need to recognize that we are not planning on a blank canvas; that we have made many decisions in the past and that people have made life-changing commitments on the basis of these past decisions.

3. Can we include a statement in the Secondary Plans clarifying that RES-3 is the zoning for all lands within the Heritage District, except for a. 103 Ahrens St W, 94 Ahrens/151&153 Victoria St N, 277 Victoria St N and 33 St Leger, b. all properties fronting Weber St W, and c. churches, and that d. the lands zoned more intensively are exceptions, so zoned to reflect existing conditions pre-dating this Secondary Plan?
- Point 3.a. may be redundant.
- Important to ensure that no one mistakes the existing, more intensive zoning as a precedent for what may be built in the future.
- Important to recognize the legally accrued benefits currently enjoyed by property owners.

5. Can we ensure that no property is subjected to more shadowing than its height and setback limits permit it to throw onto its neighbours? Can we also have a city-wide rule on shadowing, using Mississauga’s plan as a starting point?
- This would safeguard existing uses such as the collection of solar energy and gardening.
- Page 3.10 of the CCHDCP states “Any buildings proposed over 5 storeys in height may be required to undertake shadow studies where they abut existing residential uses, to
demonstrate that they will not unreasonably impact on access to sunlight in rear yard amenity areas.”

- What is a reasonable and satisfactory target for sunlight?
- Mississauga’s guidelines regarding shadowing on private and public streets and spaces are very specific. How do other cities evaluate shadowing?
- Other factors to evaluate shadowing include: no net new shadows, number of hours in a defined period of time, and percentage of sun coverage all the time.
- Whichever factors we adopt, we must consider the balancing of sunlight access with growth, development and achieving density targets.
- An issue of moving from one zone to another and is one necessary condition of an appropriate transition.
- Rule should apply to the zoned limits as opposed to the existing builds.
- Not advocating to reduce FSRs or height permitted under present zoning – without the owners’ consent
- Don’t want to see new zoning infringe upon the benefits to which another zone is entitled.

7. Why does the proposed zoning recommend a maximum of two units in the RES-3 zones instead of the currently permitted maximum of three units as per the Secondary Plan provision 13.1.2.1? 
- 13.1.2 Land Use Designations
  1. Low Rise Residential - Preservation

The Low Rise Residential - Preservation designation has been applied to areas where it is the aim of this Plan to retain the existing single detached residential character of the Neighbourhood. Existing houses and streetscapes are to be preserved wherever possible. Permitted residential uses are restricted to single detached dwellings and the conversion of those structures which existed as of the date of the adoption of this Plan to duplexes or multiple dwellings to a maximum of 3 units. Residential conversions will be permitted only where there is sufficient floor area for the conversion, where the site is capable of providing adequate off-street parking in accordance with by-law requirements, and where no structural alterations are required to the exterior of the building. Any exterior stairs or fire escapes are to be enclosed, and kept away from the facade of the structure. Minor exterior alterations and additions to single detached dwellings shall be permitted provided such alterations are not within any front or side yard.
- If change not made, could a developer apply for a variance or zone change anyway?
- Would buildings with more than 3 units be grandfathered?
- Will RES-1 and RES-2 zoning be applied?
- What is the definition of “sufficient floor area” to permit conversion to up to 3 units?
- Concerned this could de-stabilize neighbourhood.
- Permitting three units, within the RES-3 houses, could allow intensification while preserving the exterior built form and without compromising the neighbourhood.
- A maximum of 3 units is the status quo, and the neighbourhood has not suffered.

56. Can we have 30-40 Margaret Ave zoned RES-5 as opposed to RES-6?
- RES-6 only permits cluster townhouses and multi-residential buildings.
RES-5 permits detached houses, semi-detached houses, street townhouses, cluster townhouses and multi-residential buildings. If RES-5 zoning was approved, the ownership could retain the right to avail itself of the Ontario Municipal Board ruling as a site specific regulation, but could also choose to build other forms.

- Affords flexibility
- Would allow Margaret Ave to be restored.
- Would create the possibility of neighbours on the south side of Margaret to have their built form mirrored across the street.
- Would not limit the interests of the 30-40 Margaret ownership.

12. Can we increase the minimum lot width (frontage on street) for MIXED 2 zones to 25 metres? Do MIXED 3 and 4 zones need even wider widths?
- Would prevent the situation at 122 Courtland Ave E, where a property breaks the cadence of the street.
- Ensures that the front, animated face of the building can be facing the street.
- Builders may be forced to assemble multiple properties to meet the requirements which might stifle development.
- The current minimum lot width for MIX-2 zoning is 15 m. Only 2 properties just outside the Civic Centre Heritage District have frontages that exceed 25 meters.
- Builders may favour buying one property over trying to assemble multiple properties. May inadvertently cause a negative impact on where development occurs.
- Smaller parcels of land could be stranded and end up losing value.
- May lead to larger-sized buildings.
- If the minimum lot width for the MIX zones is to be increased, then the minimum lot widths for the UGC zones should also be increased to reflect a unified, cohesive policy.

8. Can we allocate required additional green space within a 10-minute walk of the development which generates the requirement?
- Civic Centre Secondary Plan General Policy 13.1.1.7.
  “Any redevelopment will take into account the limited amount of park space available within the Civic Centre Neighbourhood. All redevelopment proposals will be evaluated to determine their ability to provide parkland dedication or cash payment for park purposes under the provisions of the Planning Act. The possibility of using monies from the Park Trust Fund for the purchase and development of properties for park purposes may be explored in cooperation with the Civic Centre Neighbourhood Association.”
- Would we allow a builder to destroy a home within the heritage neighbourhood to fulfil this requirement?
- The neighbourhood has been using 30-40 Margaret as a dog walking area. When it is redeveloped, there will be a significant loss of open usable green space and a simultaneous increase in number of residents needing green space.
- Could the allotted green space requirement be provided within the development?
- Expecting a 200-300% increase in population with no increase in space for kids to play.
10. Can we ensure that “as of right” zoning is interpreted to reflect all legislation, including heritage, shadowing, transition, wind tunnels, etc., and not simply the zoned Floor Space Ratio, setback and height limits?
- The more rigid we are with our regulations the less likely we are to see development and change.
- Need to jettison idea of certain laws “trumping” others. Need to adhere to all laws and regulations.
- Without clarity, the Committee of Adjustment could grant relief of zoning regulations at the expense of other legislation to the contrary.

15. Can we ensure that the churches are zoned to retain a primary use that serves all society – community facility, cultural facility, place of worship, etc.?
- The request that the churches remain under Institutional zoning was suggested by several people.
- Concern regarding demolition of the churches.
- Preserves cultural and community hub, anchor for community
- If the Church of Good Shepherd is to be assigned MIX-2 zoning, want lower height limit
- Each church should be evaluated on its location and the surrounding uses of the area properties. The Church of the Good Shepard should keep its I-2 zoning whereas, St. Andrews Presbyterian Church could be zoned to allow commercial or residential uses.
- The policies and guidelines of the CCHCDP should apply.
- Focus should be on primary use. Ancillary uses could also be permitted so as to re-purpose the existing buildings according to current needs.

Individual Closing Comments and Questions
- Is city trying to meet UN sustainable development goals?
- Looking forward to seeing the complete draft of the Secondary Plan
- Why are we asking property owners to provide the community with an architectural museum without preserving the context that makes the houses sensible?
- Should we continue to invest in our properties?
- Enjoyment of a residential property hinges, in part, upon context, and may include the capacity to garden, collect solar energy, and interact with neighbours and the community.
Compromising the context is expropriation of value. If owners cannot derive enjoyment, they may not invest in their properties or the community, which may lead to the sort of neighbourhood neglect from which we have only recently emerged.
- Can a height limit matching the existing building height be applied to 108 Queen St N (Sonneck House) given that it is a Part IV designated property inside the CCHDCP, so as not to mislead owners as to its potential use? Its proposed zoning is MIX-2, which allows up to 24 metres of height.
- Can the properties currently zoned CR-1 along Queen between Weber and Ahrens be zoned MIX-1? MIX-2 would impose on Queen St and on the low-rise residential interior of the neighbourhood.
- Concern re: urban sprawl
- Do these consultations have any impact?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>54 Margaret Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>59 Avenue W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>55 Margaret Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>95 Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>54 Margaret Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>51 Athens St. W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>55 Margaret Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>710-715 Queen St. W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>80 W 6th Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>103-107/11 Water St. N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for providing this opportunity to respond to the initial public presentation of Civic Centre Secondary Plan on December 12, 2018. Some comments are below.

Email to: secondaryplans@kitchener.ca

March 31, 2019

1. **CHANGE the name of the Secondary Plan**

Please change the name of the Civic Centre Secondary Plan to Olde Berlin Town Secondary Plan. The use of the words “civic centre” is detrimental to our predominantly residential neighbourhood. This term in the title of our Secondary Plan is misleading and is totally inappropriate.

This is a residential area. The buildings on the lands in the Civic Centre Secondary Plan are mainly single dwelling units and they cover the majority of the actual acreage. This is an extensive Heritage Conservation District where people live. People have lived here for over 150 years.

Here are some definitions of ‘Civic Centre’.

The NORTH AMERICAN dictionary definition of ‘civic centre’ is:
- a municipal building or building complex, often publicly financed, with space for conventions, sports events, and theatrical entertainment.

The COLLINS ENGLISH dictionary defines ‘civic centre’ as
- “the public buildings of a town, including recreational facilities and offices of local administration”

The CAMBRIDGE ENGLISH dictionary defines ‘civic centre’ as
- “a large building or group of buildings used for entertainment, social, and business events”

Wikipedia defines ‘civic centre’ as
- “A civic center or civic centre is a prominent land area within a community that is constructed to be its focal point or center. It usually contains one or more dominant public buildings, which may also include a government building. Recently, the term "civic center" has been used in reference to an entire central business district of a community or a major shopping center in the middle of a community. In this type of civic center, special attention is paid to the way public structures are grouped and landscaped.”

An on-line dictions [https://www.dictionary.com/browse/civic-center](https://www.dictionary.com/browse/civic-center) defines ‘civic centre’ as *noun*
- a building complex housing a theater or theaters for the performing arts and sometimes exhibition halls, a museum, etc., and usually constructed or maintained by municipal funds.
- a building or building complex containing a municipality's administrative offices, various departmental headquarters, courts, etc., and sometimes an auditorium, libraries, or other
community or cultural facilities.
- a theater, meeting hall, or the like for community or public use.

You must notice that in ALL of these definitions there is no mentioned of residences or private home. Therefore, there must a change in the name of this Secondary plan.

2. **Preservations**
   - A ‘preservation’ designation continues to be very important for this historical area
   - Will the transition requirements between new developments/buildings and the older homes be strong enough protection?
   - Will quality of life be preserved for the people and their homes?

3. **HEIGHT LIMITS**
   - The lack of a height limit on some Mixed Use buildings and the limited number of parking spaces allowed is worrisome. This will lead to parking issues in the interior.
   - An excessive number of highrise buildings ringing around the edges of the Civic Centre will overwhelm the neighbourhood and can cause destabilization.
   - There is very limited greenspace in the area; Hibner Park is a small gem, but it is ‘handkerchief-sized! The projected additional residents in the new developments will only make this problem more difficult to solve
   - Why is bonusing, a hidden strategy in zoning? this can mean that extra storeys can be added and exceed the actual legal zoning height
   - Buffer zones are critical to manage the space between highrises and low rise buildings

Donna Kuehl
Just making sure we’re keeping the official lines of communication in the loop. My apologies for any duplication.

Thank you,

Hal

Hal Jaeger
Thank you for your interest in the OBTNA consultation on the proposed neighbourhood re-zoning (Secondary Plan review) with the Planning Department.

Our consultation will be held from 1-3pm on Saturday, March 30, 2019 in the Conestoga Room on the main floor of Kitchener City Hall. Please arrive on time, as we will all need to sign in -- with name and an address of residency or property ownership within the Olde Berlin neighbourhood -- and hear the opening remarks in order to participate. The consultation is only for those who have already reserved a seat at the table.

**How will this consultation work?**

Our neighbourhood association received more than 55 individual comments in response to the proposed new zoning. We will only address a few of the comments, included below my signature, as our time is limited. Our goal is to have the Planning Department understand our perspectives and for us to understand the Planning Department’s intent. We are not aiming to achieve agreed-upon decisions at this time. We will:

1. Display one comment at a time. Questions/comments may be accompanied by explanatory PowerPoint slides.
2. Offer Brandon Sloan, Manager of Long Range & Policy Planning, opportunity for an initial comment and/or to ask for additional information.
3. Record key points on the flipchart.
4. Allow each participant opportunity, in clockwise turn, to offer clarification and express his or her perspective on the issue. The first speaker position will rotate.
5. Record key points on flipchart.
6. Hear any additional comment that Brandon may share.
7. Record key points on flipchart.
8. Proceed to the next question/comment and repeat.

We will cover as many questions and comments as possible until 2:45pm, at which time we will allow each participant opportunity for a brief comment (likely 1 minute) of their own choosing.

**Ground Rules**

We will each need to be disciplined, if we are to cover much ground. Please:

- Come prepared with notes on the questions/comments you wish to address
- Keep your comments short and to the point. No anecdotes!
- If you don’t have anything that needs to be said, please say nothing at all. If your comment
was already covered by someone else, just indicate so and we will move to the next person. 
-Unlike the study sessions, this will not be a forum to ask about the meaning of a comment –
unless your name is Brandon Sloan! If you have questions about the meaning of a comment, 
record your question and ask at the next study session.

We are each likely to have additional comments/questions about the proposed re-zoning. In 
addition to the brief, personal comment at the end of the meeting, we can all submit 
comments in writing to the Planning Department (by March 31, 2019) and can request an 
appointment. We have been informed that a second draft of the re-zoning proposal will be 
released in June 2019, and we may choose to comment on the second draft or to delegate 
before Council.

If you have questions about the form of our March 30th neighbourhood consultation, please 
be in touch.

Thank you,

Hal

Hal Jaeger

The following questions/comments are numbered in the order they were recorded by the 
neighbourhood association. The order of the questions/comments has been determined by 
the OBTNA Heritage and Development Committee and may be altered.

17. Can we zone 54 Margaret Ave RES-3 as opposed to RES-6? It is a Class A heritage building 
like its neighbours across the street.
30. What is the definition of an “appropriate transition”? How will planning documents 
ensure an appropriate transition, as required by the Official Plan, from the low-rise residential 
interior of Civic Centre across Queen, Victoria, Water and Weber into more intensified zones?
3. Can we include a statement in the Secondary Plans clarifying that RES-3 is the zoning for 
all lands within the Heritage District, except for
   a. 103 Ahrens St W, 94 Ahrens/151&153 Victoria St N, 277 Victoria St N and 33 St 
       Leger,
   b. all properties fronting Weber St W, and
   c. churches
   d. and that the lands zoned more intensively are exceptions, so zoned to reflect 
      existing conditions pre-dating this Secondary Plan?
5. Can we ensure that no property is subjected to more shadowing than its height and
setback limits permit it to throw onto its neighbours? This would safeguard existing uses such as the collection of solar energy and gardening. Can we also have a city-wide rule on shadowing, using Mississauga’s plan as a starting point?

7. Why does the proposed zoning recommend a maximum of two units in the RES-3 zones instead of the currently permitted maximum of three units as per the Secondary Plan provision 13.1.2.1?

56. Can we have 30-40 Margaret Ave zoned RES-5 as opposed to RES-6?

12. Can we increase the minimum lot width (frontage on street) for MIXED 2 zones to 25 metres? Do MIXED 3 and 4 zones need even wider widths?

8. Can we allocate required additional green space within a 10-minute walk of the development which generates the requirement? See Civic Centre Secondary Plan General Policy 13.1.1.7.

10. Can we ensure that “as of right” zoning is interpreted to reflect all legislation, including heritage, shadowing, transition, wind tunnels, etc., and not simply the zoned Floor Space Ratio, setback and height limits?

15. Can we ensure that the churches are zoned to retain a primary use that serves all society – community facility, cultural facility, place of worship, etc.? The request that the churches remain under I-2 zoning was one of the most frequent comments.

7. Can we ensure that no properties are stranded in intensified zones (i.e. single house surrounded by developed, consolidated lots)? Do we need holding provisions to do so?

13. Can we institute a 15 metre setback on MIX-2 properties abutting a Low-Rise Residential zone in the CCHDCP?

24. Can we include 64 Margaret and 33 St Leger among the list of properties subject to Special Policies 13.1.3.? As the properties are already consolidated with frontage on Victoria St N, can we note that the provisions are to be effected through the Site Plan process? In general, how can we ensure that re-developed properties do not direct their servicing and traffic into the interior of the Civic Centre neighbourhood?

25. Can the CR-1 properties along Queen between Weber and Ahrens be zoned MIX-1? MIX-2 would impose on Queen St.

14. Why are we proposing to prohibit semi-detached dwellings in the RES-3 zones? We already have a few heritage semis.

4. Can we define maximum height in terms of meters? Can we ensure that meters be used as the units of physical measurement? This might be best applied city-wide.

23. Why is a MIX-2 designation being applied to a portion of the 64 Margaret lands, which are within the Heritage District with current zoning MU-1 167U 561R? Can that portion of 64 Margaret be zoned MIX-1?

33. Do we want to encourage more lane houses/coach houses? What criteria could be required for coach houses? Is any change necessary to the proposed regulations? This issue was controversial in the neighbourhood.

2. Can we include a statement in the Secondary Plans that the recommendations in sections 4.0-4.5 and 6.9.0-6.9.4, inclusive, of the Heritage District Conservation Plan are to be
read as requirements, with the words “recommended/recommend/recommends” and other such variants to be read as “shall”, etc.? Doing so would eliminate misunderstandings and ensure the value of the public consultations and commissioned reports.

1. Can we have all the land-use documents (Secondary Plan, Urban Design Manual, Heritage Conservation District Plan, Self-guided tour information, etc.) refer to the neighbourhood as “Olde Berlin Town” as opposed to “Civic Centre” so as to eliminate confusion?

6. Can we designate all properties with frontage on Victoria not planned for MIX-2 zoning as Low Rise Residential Office RES-3?

9. Can we ensure that properties are capable of storing snow on their own land or appropriate sized boulevards?

26. Can a height limit matching the existing building height be applied to 108 Queen St N (Sonneck House) given that it is a Part IV designated property inside the CCHDCP, so as not to mislead owners as to its potential use?

28. Can we have, within the flanking UGC zones, height limits and/or stepback requirements, so that undue shadowing and inappropriate transitions are not created inside Civic Centre?

31. Can we have a height limit on the block encircled by Weber-Water-Victoria that affords the properties on the south-eastern side of Water St N an appropriate transition?

20. Why is 277 Victoria St N proposed to receive a MIX-2 designation? It is land included in the Heritage District Plan with existing zoning MU-1 162U 401U 562R. It is part of the gateway to St Leger from Victoria, as per the CCHCDP. Can it be designated MIX 1?

21. Why is the portion of 33 St Leger included in the Heritage District being proposed to receive a MIX-2 designation? It currently zoned MU-1 162U 559R. Can it be designated MIX-1?

29. Along Queen St N and Ellen St E, in the UGC, can we have a minimum 6m front and exterior sideyard setback, as opposed to the proposed 3m?

55. How can we ensure that the Committee of Adjustment and Zone Change applications processes do not undermine these communally-achieved Secondary Plans?
Has some relation to the ‘interface’ of water/weber lands w/ CC nhbd and new zoning

Brandon Sloan  
Manager, Long Range & Policy Planning | Planning Division | City of Kitchener  
519-741-2200 x7648 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | brandon.sloan@kitchener.ca

From: Dave Galbraith <dave.galbraith@ibigroup.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 8:58 AM  
To: Crozby <Crozby@kitchener.ca>; Alain Pinard <Alain.Pinard@kitchener.ca>; Brandon Sloan  
<Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca>  
Cc:  
Subject: 88-90 Weber Street - Submission on Zoning By-Law Review (FANZ)

Good morning Alain and Brandon -

On behalf of our client, please accept this letter relating to the on-going Comprehensive Review of the City’s Zoning By-Law (CROZBY) as it applies to our client’s property, municipally known as 88-90 Weber Street West, Kitchener.

We have reviewed the new Zoning proposed for our client’s lands and offer the attached comments on their behalf. For your ease of review, comments and recommendations begin on page 4.

Should you have any questions, I’m more than happy to discuss. We kindly ask that we be notified of any decision on the by-law and be added to the circulation list for the FANZ exercise.

Thank you.

Dave Galbraith  
Planner

IBI GROUP  
410 Albert Street, Suite 101  
Waterloo ON N2L 3V3 Canada  
tel +1 519 585 2255 ext 63209
March 21, 2019

Mr. Alain Pinard, MCIP RPP
Director of Planning
City of Kitchener
200 King Street W., Kitchener,
ON N2G 4G7

Dear Mr. Pinard:

COMMENTS ON COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF ZONING BY-LAW
FURTHER APPLICATION OF NEW ZONING BY-LAW
88-90 WEBER STREET, KITCHENER

On behalf of our client, [Client Name Redacted], please accept this letter relating to the on-going Comprehensive Review of the City’s Zoning By-Law (CROZBY) as it applies to our client’s property, municipally known as 88-90 Weber Street West, Kitchener. We have reviewed the new Zoning proposed for our client’s lands and offer the following comments on their behalf.

Subject Property

The Subject Property is municipally known as 88-90 Weber Street W., Kitchener, which is located south of the intersection of Water Street and Weber Street W. In total, the site has an area of 1,159 sq. m. The Subject Property is shown on Figures 1 and 2.

Figure 1: Subject Property (Source: Google Earth)
Our client purchased the subject property in 2018 to use the existing buildings for office/commercial uses associated with his business, with the intention to develop the property in the future.

**Existing Land Use Planning Controls**

The use and development of the Subject property is guided by a range of Provincial, Regional and City policies, plans and legislative controls. This includes the Planning Act, Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Region of Waterloo Official Plan, City of Kitchener Official Plan, the Secondary Plan for the Civic Centre Neighbourhood, and Zoning By-Law. The following provides a brief overview of the existing municipal (City planning controls) that apply to the site.

**City of Kitchener Official Plan / Secondary Plan for the Civic Centre Neighbourhood**

The subject property is designated by the City of Kitchener Official Plan as being within the boundaries of the Secondary Plan for the Civic Centre Neighbourhood and is subject to the policies and designations of the plan.

The Secondary Plan for the Civic Centre Neighbourhood currently designates the property “Mixed Use Corridor” as shown on Figure 3. In accordance with the Secondary Plan:

"Mixed Use Corridors are linear in form and recognize the evolution of uses along major corridors in the inner city. These corridors are primarily intended to serve the adjacent residential neighbourhoods and employment areas and allow for intensive, transit supportive development. Mixed Use Corridors provide residential redevelopment opportunities together with appropriate commercial and institutional uses that primarily serve adjacent residential neighbourhoods. Over time it is intended that the Mixed Use Corridors shall intensify and provide a balanced distribution of commercial, multiple residential and institutional uses. Individual properties within Mixed Use Corridors shall be zoned to achieve this distribution of uses.”
The Secondary Plan provides where properties abut arterial or major collector roads – such as Weber Street - the City of Kitchener may impose a minimum Floor Space Ratio of 1.0 and a maximum Floor Space Ratio of 4.0. We note that this is the current standard in the City’s existing Zoning By-Law.

![Figure 3: Secondary Plan Land Use Designations](image)

**Existing Zoning By-Law 2008-154**

The City of Kitchener’s existing Zoning By-Law (By-law 2008-154) zones the Subject Property “Medium Intensity Mixed Use Corridor Zone” (MU-2). This Zone permits a broad range of residential, commercial and institutional uses including: Artisan’s Establishments, Commercial Entertainment/Recreation, Day Care Facility, Duplex Dwellings, Financial Establishment, Multiples and Retail.

This Zoning permits development up to a maximum FSR of 4.0 and includes regulations to site buildings within close proximity to the street-line (1.5 m setback). The MU-2 Zone also restricts the height of buildings to a minimum height of 6 m (approximately 2 storeys) and a maximum of 24 m (approximately 8 storeys).

**Assessment of Proposed New Zoning By-Law – Further Application of New Zoning (FANZ)**

The City of Kitchener is undertaking a review of its Comprehensive Zoning By-Law, which is being implemented through a multi-stage process.

As part of this Comprehensive Review, the City is proposing to re-zone the property “Mixed Use 2” (MIX-2). The intention of the proposed MIX-2 Zone as set out in the Draft By-Law is “to accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a medium density on certain lands within the Urban Growth Centre, Major Transit Station Areas, and Urban Corridors.” Based on our review, the MIX-2 Zone will permit a similar quantum of land uses as the existing MU-2 Zone, which includes residential, commercial and institutional land uses typically found in a downtown area.
To assess the impact of the proposed MIX-2 Zoning of the Subject Property, the following table summarizes regulations of the existing MU-2 Zone and the proposed MIX-2 Zone for multiple dwellings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGULATION</th>
<th>EXISTING MU-2 REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED MIX-2 REQUIREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot width</td>
<td>15 m</td>
<td>15 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum front yard setback</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum exterior side yard setback</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum rear yard setback</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum building height</td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>11 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum building height</td>
<td>24 m</td>
<td>24 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number of storeys</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum number of storeys in the base of a building</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number of storeys in the base of a building</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum step-back for mid-rise buildings and tall buildings</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum FSR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum FSR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum non-residential GFA</td>
<td>1,000 sq. m (retail)</td>
<td>7,500 sq. m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Façade width as a percent of the width of the abutting street line</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Percent of Ground Floor Façade Openings</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Distance between ground floor façade openings</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaped Area</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the analysis above, and our understanding of the underlying direction set out in the Secondary Plan for the Civic Centre Neighbourhood, we offer the following comments:

**Comment 1:** The MIX-2 Zone proposes to limit the FSR to 2.0, whereas the existing MU-2 Zone permits an FSR of up to 4.0. The Secondary Plan for the Civic Centre Neighbourhood currently permits an FSR of up to 4.0 in areas “which abut arterial or major collector roads, are well separated from low rise residential development and have adequate municipal infrastructure.”

Given the location of the Subject Property within the downtown core, its proximity to the future ION LRT Hub, location along Weber Street (a major arterial road), and that the site is buffered from lands designated for low density residential purposes, it is our opinion that the existing FSR of 4.0 is appropriate.
for this site, and the proposed reduced FSR standard is premature and not in conformity with the Secondary Plan’s policy direction for the area.

Based on email correspondence from my client’s realtor with City staff (Garett Stevenson, Development Planner), it is understood that the City intends on applying a Site-Specific Regulation to the Subject Property which will allow for an FSR of 4.0. This would appear to be an acceptable solution, reflective of the Secondary Plan policy direction for sites located along major roads.

Comment 2: The MIX-2 Zone will require buildings to have a taller minimum height (11 m) than the existing MU-2 Zone (6 m). We support this proposed change as it will support the development of mid-rise buildings within the area, but note that this seems to conflict with the changes the MIX-2 Zone proposes which will only allow for half of the FSR of the existing MU-2 Zone.

In order to foster the development of mixed use buildings and to provide flexibility for the conversion of uses to commercial purposes in the future, the City may wish to consider establishing a minimum ground floor height for the MIX-2 Zone of 4.5 metres or a similar standard.

Comment 3: The proposed MIX-2 Zone will require an increased percentage of landscaped area (15% proposed, whereas 10% is currently required). Given the location of the property within the Downtown Area, we question whether a portion of this landscaped area could be provided as rooftop gardens. We note that the proposed definition of “landscaped area” (means any portion of a lot which has no building, that is accessible from a building or street on which the lot is located, and is used for the purpose of landscaping and/or an outdoor swimming pool area) seems to preclude this.

Comment 4: The proposed MIX-2 Zone regulations establish requirements for 50% ground floor façade openings and a maximum distance of 4 m between openings. These standards will help to ensure visibility into buildings and onto the street, the creation of a vibrant public realm, and support the design principles of CPTED.

Comment 5: The MIX-2 Zone proposes to increase the permitted maximum GFA of non-residential uses. We are supportive of this proposed change as it will provide additional flexibility for mixed use developments.

Recommendations and Conclusions

On behalf of our client, [redacted], we are pleased to contribute to the City’s ongoing review of its Comprehensive Zoning By-Law and offer the following recommendations in conclusion:

1. That the MIX-2 Zone maintain the existing maximum FSR of 4.0 as currently permitted by the MU-2 Zone;

OR

2. That a Site-Specific Regulation be applied to the Subject Property to allow for its development up to an FSR of 4.0.

3. That within the MIX Zones, particularly within the downtown area, landscaped area calculations include landscaped areas provided on rooftops / terraces.
4. That the City consider implementing a minimum ground floor height of 4.5 metres to provide flexibility in the conversion of uses in the future.

Should you have any questions about the foregoing or should you wish to discuss, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

IBI GROUP

[Signature]

David Galbraith,
Planner
Hi Katie,
Thank you for your email and comments on the Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review.

They will be considered in the process moving forward.

We have added your contact information to our email distribution list.

The timelines for further community engagement have not been set but it is anticipated the new Secondary Plans and Zoning will be brought to a Committee/Council meeting later this year for their consideration.

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Secondary Plan Review process.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

From: Katie Anderl
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2019 1:54 PM
To: Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Civic Centre District Secondary Plan Comments

Thank you for providing the opportunity to review the proposed changes to Land Use in the Civic Centre District. Based on the information provided on the Civic Centre Information Panels I would like to offer the following feedback:

1. The split designation and zoning approach for the block bound by Weber St, Young St, Roy St and Queen St is positive.
   a. The proposed Low Rise Residential Office designation and zoning along the south side of Roy Street will help to ensure that the existing built form, heritage and neighbourhood characteristics are maintained and preserved, while allowing for conversions to uses that are compatible within a residential neighbourhood. The
proposed maximum height of 3 storeys or 11 metres (max FSR of 0.6) is consistent with a low rise neighbourhood and helps to provide a transition between the proposed Mixed Use area fronting Weber Street and the adjacent low rise residential uses.

b. The proposed Medium Density Mixed Use designation and the MIX-2 regulations, are appropriate for those properties fronting onto Weber Street West. The proposed maximum height of 8 storeys and a maximum FSR of 2.0 will help to ensure an appropriate density and built form along the periphery of the Civic District, and is more compatible with the low rise heritage neighbourhood than the existing designation and zoning regulations which permit an unlimited height and maximum density of 4.0. The proposed 8 storey building height will likely still cast shadows onto nearby residential properties located north of Weber Street and microclimate considerations (wind and shadow) should be considered through Urban Design guidelines.

c. There is concern with a number of the uses which would be added to the lands by the proposed MIX2 zone. Several new uses (which are currently not permitted by the CR-3 zone) such as restaurant, commercial entertainment and brewpub are of concern as there may be nuisance types of impacts associated with these which are not compatible with residential dwellings. Such nuisance activities include noise and music from restaurants/bars, entertainment venues and any associated outdoor spaces such as patios, as well as appropriate management of garbage and food waste, food and drink deliveries etc. This is of special concern given the very large size of a number of the existing buildings which may seek adaptive reuse in the future (e.g. sites of large institutional buildings such as Zion Church at 32 Weber Street West). Should significant portions of such building be redeveloped for some of these uses, there would be concerns to surrounding residential property owners. However, such uses at a smaller scale could potentially be appropriate and compatible within a mixed use area.

2. The proposed Low Rise Residential (with Specific Policy Area 1) designation and RES-3 zone proposed for the north side of Roy Street is appropriate for the existing low rise residential areas of the heritage conservation district.

3. With respect to the current Civic District Secondary Plan designation, Special Policy Area 1 applies to the property at 32 Weber St W. It appears that many elements of this policy are proposed to be carried forward in some form through the proposed designations and zoning. I suggest that the policy stating that “no vehicular access to Roy Street will be permitted from 32 Weber Street West” be carried forward. Should this site be redeveloped it would likely be most appropriate for the development to be designed to front onto and have primary access to Weber Street rather than from the local road.

4. In the context of the new CROZBy regulations and lot line definitions, I suggest that further consideration be given to how a front lot line is determined for “through lots” located in the Secondary Plan Areas. While in some cases it may make sense for the shortest lot line abutting a street to be the front lot line, for many ‘through lots’ it may be preferable for the City to be able to deem a certain lot line the front lot line, for example to deem the high order street the front lot line (i.e. Weber Street or Victoria Street) and not the local street. This is the approach taken in By-law 85-1. Depending on the zoning of the site, there will be
implications for setbacks, patio regulations etc. where the property has frontage on an arterial as well as a local road. This comment has been made to the Zoning By-law review team for general consideration, and is not necessarily specific to the Civic Centre district, although this scenario is observed to occur at the property at 32 Weber St.

Please let me know if you require any further comment or clarification,

Katie Anderl
Hi Jenna,
This should go to Secondary Plans email: SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca.
Thanks,
Preet

From: Jenna Daum <Jenna.Daum@kitchener.ca> On Behalf Of Internet - Planning
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 1:34 PM
To: Crozby <Crozby@kitchener.ca>
Subject: FW: Proposed Civic Centre Secondary Plans - 32 Weber Street

Hi there,

I think the below is for you. I am not exactly sure what they are asking, are we changing the Secondary Plans? The letter sounds more like an objection to the zone but not entirely sure.

Thanks!
Jenna Daum
Technical Assistant (Planning & Zoning) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7760 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | jenna.daum@kitchener.ca

From: Mathew Glowacki <mpg@govedaris.com>
Sent: Friday, March 08, 2019 1:05 PM
To: Internet - Planning <planning@kitchener.ca>
Cc: 'Gregory Govedaris' <gg@govedaris.com>; cs@govedaris.com
Subject: RE: Proposed Civic Centre Secondary Plans - 32 Weber Street

Good Afternoon:

Please see attached letter concerning the Proposed Civic Centre Secondary Plans.

Thanks,

Mathew Glowacki, B.A. (Hons), LL.B., LL.M.
Student-at-Law
GOVEDARIS PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
Barrister(s) & Solicitor(s)
44 Upjohn Road
Toronto, ON CANADA M3B 2W1

Tel.: (416) 384-1333 ext. 304
Fax.: (416) 384-0333
Toll Free #: 1-866-737-4775
e-mail: mpg@govedaris.com
VIA FAX, EMAIL and REGULAR MAIL

8 March 2019

To: City of Kitchener
   Planning Division
   200 King Street West
   Kitchener, Ontario
   N2G 4G7

Dear Planning Division:

RE: 32 Weber Street West, Kitchener, Ontario
     Proposed Civic Centre Secondary Plans

We are lawyers, acting on behalf of the registered owner of 32 Weber Street West, Kitchener, Ontario ("client’s property").

We have been advised that the City of Kitchener (the “City”) has provided a schedule for putting the revised Zoning to Council in April and are currently holding a comment period.

Our client formally puts forth their objection to the Proposed Civic Centre Secondary Plans ("Secondary Plans").

Impact on Property

The following are ways in which the Secondary Plans will dramatically impact our client’s property:

1. Property to be re-zoned as “Mixed-Use”;
2. FSR to be reduced to 2.0; and
3. Limited to a height of 8 storeys;

Notwithstanding the above noted, our client was unaware of any Secondary Plans when the property was purchased. The Secondary Plans will dramatically jeopardize our client’s intentions for the property and will significantly decrease any future profit potentials.

The height restriction is particularly critical to our client’s property given that there is very little area to develop on because of an existing church on our client’s property.

Our client’s property is currently zoned as “High Density Commercial Residential” and a re-zoning of “Mixed Use” would dramatically limit our client’s future plans for the property.
Our client fully intends on attending the council meeting where the Secondary Plans are expected to be presented.

Please notify the writer of any scheduled dates concerning this matter.

If you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact the writer.

We look forward to your reply.

Yours very truly,
GOVEDARIS PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Gregory Govedaris
Good afternoon,

Please find the attached correspondence sent on behalf of Paul Britton.

Kind regards,

Catherine Elliott | Executive Assistant to Paul Britton

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture
540 Bingemans Centre Drive, Suite 200 | Kitchener | ON | N2B 3X9 | T 519 576 3650 X 703 | F 519 576 0121 | celliott@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: Webpage | Linkedin | Facebook | Twitter | Vimeo

This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.
March 2, 2019

Ms. Tina Malone-Wright  
City of Kitchener  
200 King Street West  
Kitchener, ON N2G 4G7

Dear Ms. Malone-Wright:

RE:  22 Weber Street West, Kitchener and Proposed Revisions to the  
Civic Centre Secondary Plan  
OUR FILE: 1961A

We act on behalf of the owners of lands municipally addressed as 22 Weber Street West, Kitchener and identified on the attached plan. Our clients have asked that we review the proposed amendments to the Civic Centre Secondary Plan and provide input to the process on their behalf.

As you are aware, land use planning for the Civic Centre Secondary planning area has a lengthy history. The land use designation and related policies that are now in effect are outcomes of a hearing and related determinations by what was then referred to as the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).

The subject lands are now designated as “High Density Commercial Residential.” This designation recognizes the proximity of the subject lands to downtown Kitchener (Urban Growth Centre) as well as the property’s frontage on Weber Street. Weber Street is a Regional Arterial Road and has been designated as a Planned Transit Corridor.

The “High Density Commercial Residential” designation permits a range of residential, commercial and retail uses within free standing buildings or mixed use buildings. Official Plan policies provide for a maximum floor space ratio of 4.0 and permit high density residential development. Approved Official Plan policies have been implemented by the Commercial Residential 3 Zone (CR-3) of By-law 85-1.

The subject lands back onto lands fronting the southerly side of Roy Street and that are now designated Office Residential Conversion. The intent of the Office Residential Conversion designation and related built form is to buffer high density development fronting Weber Street from Low-Rise Residential uses located internal to the Civic Centre Neighbourhood.

The existing land use designation and zoning have been in place for a considerable period of time. Our client’s acquired the subject lands with an awareness of existing permissions. We understand staff are proposing to amend the secondary plan to redesignate our clients lands from “High Density Commercial
Residential” to “Medium Density Mixed Use.” We also understand the Medium Density Mixed Use designation is proposed to be implemented by the MIX-2 Zone as set-out in the City’s draft zoning by-law (CROZBy). The MIX-2 zoning category would have the effect of reducing the maximum permitted floor space ratio from 4.0 to 2.0 (50% reduction), impose a maximum height restriction of 8 storeys (currently there is no restriction), limit the range of permitted uses and impose more restrictive zoning regulations (multiple dwelling is proposed to be restricted to a mixed use building). Needless to say, our clients are concerned with the proposed restrictions, particularly given the locational and planning context of the subject lands, including proximity to downtown amenities, proximity to LRT and adjacency to a Planned Transit Corridor.

We would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you together with our clients and thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yours truly,
MHBC

[Signature]

Paul R. Britton, M.C.I.P., R.P.P
PRBce

Attach

Cc: [Redacted]
Hi Tina,

I’m attending the Civic Centre Neighbourhood urban design charrette this Wednesday with Dayna. I suspect Hal from the NA will be there.

Hal sent me the email below a few weeks ago.

I’d like to prepare a response before the meeting on Wednesday and wanted to touch base with you first.

Will try to come by your office sometime today to discuss.

Thanks

Leon

Leon Bensason, MCIP, RPP, CAHP
Coordinator, Cultural Heritage Planning | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
P. 519-741-2200 Ext. 7306 | TTY. 1-866-969-9994 | leon.bensason@kitchener.ca

---

From: H Jaeger
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2019 11:29 AM
To: Leon Bensason <Leon.Bensason@kitchener.ca>
Cc: writeus@oldeberlintonw.ca; Sam Hossack
Subject: FW: Secondary Plans

Good day, Leon. I hope this message finds you well.

We have many general questions about the proposed new zoning, but I’ll ask just three specific questions of you at this time:

1. Should the Secondary Plans note that the recommendations of the Heritage District Conservation Plans are to be read as requirements, with the words “recommended/recommend/recommends” and other such variants to be read as “shall”? Would we want to only address sections 4.0-4.5 and 6.9.0-6.9.4, inclusive, for such treatment? Is there another means by which Council’s acceptance of the Heritage District Plan is to be converted to legislation?
2. Do we want 54 Margaret Avenue to be zoned RES-3 as opposed to RES-6?
3. Do we want 277 Victoria St N and the portion of 33 St Leger included in the Heritage District to receive a MIX-2 designation?

Are there any issues with which you would like the neighbourhood’s assistance?
Thank you,

Hal

Hal Jaeger

From: H Jaeger
Sent: January 11, 2019 9:39 AM
To: Leon.Bensason@kitchener.ca
Subject: RE: Secondary Plans

Thank you, Leon.

We are trying to understand at what points we need to perform a comprehensive comparison of the recommendations of the HDP against the Secondary Plan proposal. I wonder if it is a duplication of effort to have the community pore over the documents at the same time you/your staff are doing so. It is also my understanding that details of the Secondary Plans were not yet available with the information presented at the Open House on Dec 12th. Do you advise awaiting these details?

Thank you,

Hal

Hal Jaeger

From: Leon.Bensason@kitchener.ca  
Sent: January 11, 2019 9:17 AM
To:   
Subject: RE: Secondary Plans

Hi Hal,

Our work on the Secondary Plan is ongoing. If there is a specific section or recommendation you are inquiring about, please let me know.

Leon

Leon Bensason, MCIP, RPP, CAHP
From: H Jaeger  
Sent: Friday, January 11, 2019 8:49 AM 
To: Leon Bensason <Leon.Bensason@kitchener.ca> 
Subject: Secondary Plans

Good day, Leon.

Are you satisfied that the Civic Centre Heritage District Conservation Plan’s recommendations are adequately integrated into the new Secondary Plan proposal? Are you reviewing this matter?

Thank you,

Hal

Hal Jaeger
See attached

--
Rental Manager
Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Civic Centre Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before February 01st, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

   Look at each property in your classified.
   IP FANCAST ARE FOS 6. VICTORIA ST. RES 3. MIX 2.
   SEAN SANS OTHER PROPERTIES OR BEING PUT INTO ANOTHER
   LAND USE

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   MIX 3 AN FSR OF 1.2? HOW CAN YOU BUILD 8 STORIES WITH A FSR OF 1.2?
   MAKE IT 8 STORIES AND A FSR OF 4.
   THIS WILL AFFECT PROPERTY VALUES ALONG WEASEL
   PATHS OR VICTORIA. (SEE NEXT PAGE)

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

   LAND VALUES WITH YOUR PROPOSED CHANGES.
   WEASEL STREET NOW IS A MAJOR ANTERY TO WATCH.
   MORE THOUGHT ON YOUR PART.

Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review
Write your additional comments here:

MIX-3 This is a huge change for the west end.

What happened to the City's intention to intensify?

Residential office - some houses are larger than 4 units. Why limit it to 3? We are back to the City's desire to intensify the downtown. Why the change?

With the LRT taking up King St, Weber is now a major route to Waterloo and should be used for high density urban growth.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [redacted]
Mailing Address: 99 College St, Kitchener
Email: [redacted]
Good morning Sandra,

Thank you for your comments with respect to the new Civic Centre Secondary Plan.

We are in receipt of your comments. They will be considered in the process moving forward.

Thanks again for your interest and participation in the Secondary Plan Review process.

Regards,
Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994

Hi there,

Happy New Year and I hope you had a wonderful holiday. I attended the Civic Centre Secondary Plan Review Public Open House back in December and I have only one suggestion on proposed land use, so I didn't want to complete/scan the entire comment form; I hope that's okay.

I'd like to suggest that that the site of Church of the Good Shepherd, located at the corner of Margaret Ave and Queen St N, be designated as Institutional, vs. Mixed Use as proposed.

If I can clarify further, please don't hesitate to let me know.

With thanks and best wishes for a Happy 2019,

Sandra
Thank you, Tina.

Are the following comparisons of current and proposed use and regulations charts up to date? Any changes I should note?

Is there a chart comparing the regulations for current and proposed mixed used zones?

Is the proposed Res-3 Low-Rise Residential Office zone subject to the same regulations as the proposed Res-3 Residential zone -- aside from the broader business uses?

Have a good holiday,

Hal

-----Original Message-----
From: Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca [mailto:Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca]
Sent: December 20, 2018 12:11 PM
To: 
Subject: RE: Neighbourhood Planning Review

-----Original Message-----
From: H Jaeger
Sent: Monday, December 17, 2018 10:39 AM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Cc: Brandon Sloan <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca>; Dayna Edwards <Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Neighbourhood Planning Review

Greetings,

I just wanted to let you know that I will compile the comments received from the open house with the comments that will be coming in response to the posting of the files on the internet.

We will provide our neighbourhood — most of which did not attend the open house — with links to the planning website and will request feedback. We will hold a neighbourhood meeting on the planning review, and will try to offer an organized submission as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Hal

---
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### 5.0 Public Comments and Staff Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | 55 Margaret Avenue Written: December 12, 2018 | 1. Would like churches to remain community institutional.  
2. Why is Water Street out of the plan boundaries?  
3. Keep the ideas of the existing special policies.  
Keep 54 Margaret as low rise residential. Special policy for Hermie Lane. Designate on Victoria Buildings on Part 4 cultural heritage resources.  
4. Like the decreased density in the eastern part along Lancaster. | The PARTS Plan and study recommended that we designate the lands to MIX-2. The boundary of the secondary plan was amended in 2014 to include Water Street within the Urban Growth Centre boundary which was determined by the Province. 54 Margaret is not low rise residential, the current zoning is R-8 (Medium Rise Residential) and is retaining that designation in accordance with the Ontario Municipal Board decision. Staff are unsure about when is meant by a special policy on Hermie Lane. The buildings on Victoria Street were reviewed as part of the Civic Centre Heritage District Plan and were not warranted designation. |
| 2  | 83 Ahrens Street West Written: December 12, 2018 | 1. Some of the proposed buildings are allowed to be too tall, I’m concerned about traffic and parking issues.  
2. Not enough green space in this district.  
3. I’m concerned any development will decrease diversity within the community: No 3+ bedroom apartments/townhouses? Currently the case with condo developments). Are these going to be affordable for middle class? My guess is not without the city stepping in. This is a community we want it to be family friendly and accessible to people, not just the rich. | There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Central Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between High, Mixed Use, and Low Rise Residential areas. The City plans for a mix of land uses to support a range of housing types for people of all demographics. Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. |
| 3  | 88 Fountain Street, Waterloo Written: December 21, 2018 | 2. A very brief overview of the plan makes me very happy to see some attempts, especially down zoning, to protect the heritage neighbourhood and CHL.  
3. I didn’t look at specific areas - so there are no doubt problem juxtapositions eg. Mixed use 8 storeys backing on to Hermes Place.  
4. Also very happy to see steps to implement the cultural heritage landscape, to go beyond simply naming/identifying. | There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Central Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. |
<p>| 4  | 11 Ellen Street West Written: January 4, 2019 | I’d like to suggest that that the site of Church of the Good Shepherd, located at the corner of Margaret Ave and Queen St N, be designated as Institutional, vs. Mixed Use as proposed. | The PARTS Plan and study recommended that we designate the lands to MIX-2. Staff propose to add a site specific policy to permit other uses in addition to the institutional use of the property. This zoning will allow the church to diversify its uses without altering the built form. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 | 99 College Street  
Written: January 31, 2019 | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments**  
1. Look at each property in your classification i.e. Margaret ave RES-6 & Victoria St. RES-3 & Mix 2, surrounding other properties or being put into another land-use.  
2. MIX-3, an FSR of 2? How can you build 8 storeys with a FSR of 2? Make it 8 storeys and FSR of 4. This will effect property values along Weber and parts of Victoria.  
3. Land values with your proposed changes;  
4. Weber Street now is a major artery to Waterloo;  
5. More thought on your part  
6. MIX-3 This is a huge change for the Weber Street corridor  
   What happened to the city’s intension to intensify? RES3, Low Rise Residential Office – Some houses are large. Enough to accommodate 4 units, why limit to 3? We are back to the City’s desire to intensify the downtown. Why huge change?  
7. With LRT taking up King St., Weber is now a major path to Waterloo and should be used for High Density Urban Growth. |
| 6 | 40 Roy Street  
Written: March 18, 2019 | 1. The split designation and zoning approach for the block bound by Weber St, Young St, Roy St and Queen St is positive.  
a. The proposed Low Rise Residential Office designation and zoning along the south side of Roy Street will help to ensure that the existing built form, heritage and neighbourhood characteristics are maintained and preserved, while allowing for conversions to uses that are compatible within a residential neighbourhood. The proposed maximum height of 3 storeys or 11 metres (max FSR of 0.6) is consistent with a low rise neighbourhood and helps to provide a transition between the proposed Mixed Use area fronting Weber Street and the adjacent low rise residential uses.  
b. The proposed Medium Density Mixed Use designation and the MIX-2 regulations, are appropriate for those properties fronting onto Weber Street West. The proposed maximum height of 8 storeys and a maximum FSR of 2.0 will help to ensure an appropriate density and built form along the periphery of the Civic District, and is more compatible with the low rise heritage neighbourhood than the existing designation and zoning regulations which permit an unlimited height and maximum density of 4.0. The proposed 8 storey building height will likely still cast shadows onto nearby residential properties located north of Weber Street and microclimate considerations. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|    |                  | **Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
*Question 2:* What are your comments about the zoning?  
*Question 3:* What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments** |
|    |                  | (wind and shadow) should be considered through Urban Design guidelines.  
(c. There is concern with a number of the uses which would be added to the lands by the proposed MIX2 zone. Several new uses (which are currently not permitted by the CR-3 zone) such as restaurant, commercial entertainment and brewpub are of concern as there may be nuisance types of impacts associated with these which are not compatible with residential dwellings. Such nuisance activities include noise and music from restaurants/bars, entertainment venues and any associated outdoor spaces such as patios, as well as appropriate management of garbage and food waste, food and drink deliveries etc. This is of special concern given the very large size of a number of the existing buildings which may seek adaptive reuse in the future (e.g. sites of large institutional buildings such as Zion Church at 32 Weber Street West). Should significant portions of such building be redeveloped for some of these uses, there would be concerns to surrounding residential property owners. However, such uses at a smaller scale could potentially be appropriate and compatible within a mixed use area.  
2. The proposed Low Rise Residential (with Specific Policy Area 1) designation and RES-3 zone proposed for the north side of Roy Street is appropriate for the existing low rise residential areas of the heritage conservation district.  
3. With respect to the current Civic District Secondary Plan designation, Special Policy Area 1 applies to the property at 32 Weber St W. It appears that many elements of this policy are proposed to be carried forward in some form through the proposed designations and zoning. I suggest that the policy stating that “no vehicular access to Roy Street will be permitted from 32 Weber Street West” be carried forward. Should this site be redeveloped it would likely be most appropriate for the development to be designed to front onto and have primary access to Weber Street rather than from the local road.  
4. In the context of the new CRoZBy regulations and lot line definitions, I suggest that further consideration be given to how a front lot line is determined for “through lots” located in the... | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Govedaris Professional Corporation</td>
<td>Letter submitted through lawyer: Govedaris Professional Corporation Barrister(s) &amp; Solicitor(s) 44 Upjohn Road Toronto, M3B 2W1</td>
<td>There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Central Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. The decrease in density along Weber Street was a recommendation from the Civic Centre Heritage Conservation District Plan and PARTS Central Plan. Property values are not a land use planning consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>32 Weber Street</td>
<td>Impact on property: 1. property to be zoned as Mixed-Use 2. FSR to be reduced to 2.0 and 3. Limited to a height of 8 storeys 4. Unaware of Secondary Plan when the property was purchased 5. Will significantly decrease any future profit potentials 6. Fully intend on attending the council meeting where the secondary plans are expected to be presented. Notify the writer of any dates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>58 Ahrens Street West</td>
<td>1.CHANGE the name of the Secondary PlanPlease change the name of the Civic Centre Secondary Plan to Olde Berlin Town Secondary Plan. The use of the words “civic centre” is detrimental to our predominantly residential neighbourhood. This term in the title of our Secondary Plan is misleading and is totally inappropriate. This is a residential area. The buildings on the lands in the Civic Centre Secondary Plan are mainly single dwelling units and they cover the majority of the actual acreage. This is an extensive Heritage Conservation District where people live. People have lived here for over 150 years. Here are some definitions of ‘Civic Centre’.</td>
<td>The geographic boundary of Olde Berlin Town does not match the current boundary of the Civic Centre secondary plan and naming it as such would be historically inaccurate. The name of the secondary plan reflects the name of the heritage conservation district plan. The term “preservation” not being included in the terminology does not mean that the built form will not be preserved. The current land use and zoning permissions will be maintained. The heritage conservation plan for this area ensures that regulations under PART V of the Ontario Heritage Act will apply to any changes or development. There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Central Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: March 8, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? Additional Comments</td>
<td>The NORTH AMERICAN dictionary definition of 'civic centre' is: - a municipal building or building complex, often publicly financed, with space for conventions, sports events, and theatrical entertainment. The COLLINS ENGLISH dictionary defines 'civic centre' as - “the public buildings of a town, including recreational facilities and offices of local administration” The CAMBRIDGE ENGLISH dictionary defines 'civic centre' as - “a large building or group of buildings used for entertainment, social, and business events” Wikipedia defines ‘civic centre’ as - “A civic center or civic centre is a prominent land area within a community that is constructed to be its focal point or center. It usually contains one or more dominant public buildings, which may also include a government building. Recently, the term &quot;civic center&quot; has been used in reference to an entire central business district of a community or a major shopping center in the middle of a community. In this type of civic center, special attention is paid to the way public structures are grouped and landscaped.” An on-line dictionary <a href="https://www.dictionary.com/browse/civic-center">https://www.dictionary.com/browse/civic-center</a> defines 'civic centre' as noun - a building complex housing a theater or theaters for the performing arts and sometimes exhibition halls, a museum, etc., and usually constructed or maintained by municipal funds. - a building or building complex containing a municipality’s administrative offices, various departmental headquarters, courts, etc., and sometimes an auditorium, libraries, or other community or cultural facilities. - a theater, meeting hall, or the like for community or public use. You must notice that in ALL of these definitions there is no mentioned of residences or private home. Therefore, there must a change in the name of this Secondary plan.</td>
<td>compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   |                   | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? | 2. Preservations  
- A ‘preservation’ designation continues to be very important for this historical area  
- Will the transition requirements between new developments/buildings and the older homes be strong enough protection?  
- Will quality of life be preserved for the people and their homes?  

3. HEIGHT LIMITS  
- The lack of a height limit on some Mixed Use buildings and the limited number of parking spaces allowed is worrisome. This will lead to parking issues in the interior.  
- An excessive number of highrise buildings ringing around the edges of the Civic Centre will overwhelm the neighbourhood and can cause destabilization.  
- There is very limited greenspace in the area; Hibner Park is a small gem, but it is ‘handkerchief-sized’! The projected additional residents in the new developments will only make this problem more difficult to solve  
- Why is bonusing, a hidden strategy in zoning? this can mean that extra storeys can be added and exceed the actual legal zoning height  
- Buffer zones are critical to manage the space between highrises and low rise buildings |}

|   |                   | Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? |  |
|   |                   | Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? |  |
|   |                   | Additional Comments |  |

<p>| | | | |
|   |   |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9 | 54 Margaret Avenue  
Written: April 17, 2019 | **Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
**Question 2:** What are your comments about the zoning?  
**Question 3:** What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments**  
Firstly, as communicated in the OBTNHA consultation (on March 30, 2019), the current zoning for 54 Margaret is R-8 and the proposed new zoning is RES-6, which does not seem to fit the property as well as a RES-3 zoning would. Since the house is a single detached family home, and is a protected Class A heritage home, we feel the RES-6 zoning does not reflect the heritage importance of this house and the character of the neighbourhood and may encourage inappropriate development on the property in the future. We feel a “RES-3” designation may be a more appropriate.  
We realize the land has potentially more value zoned as RES-6 since there are more options to develop, however we are now the custodians of this amazing house and feel its long-term protection is paramount. Further, we are hoping that a RES-3 designation would afford us better protections against inappropriate transitions from our neighbouring properties.  
Our property falls outside the black dotted zone on the maps shown at the consultation identified as the “specific policy zone.” We are not clear on why our property was left outside the proposed zone, and what that means for 54 Margaret’s inclusion with respect to heritage protections. Was this an oversight? Was it purposely left out of the specific policy zone, and if so, why? | The land use designation and zone category for this property that is proposed and was shown at the Open House was to reflect the existing land use and zoning permissions that the property currently enjoys in the Civic Centre Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law 85-1. The reason for not including this property in the site-specific policy area for 30-40 Margaret Avenue, was again to reflect that none exist now and the one adjacent and applicable to the property at 30-40 Margaret Street is to reflect the site-specifics that were approved by the Ontario Municipal Board for these lands. The exclusion of these lands from any site-specific policies does not reflect any less heritage protection.  
We are open to reviewing and revising the proposed land use designation and zone category to reflect the current built form and existing use, rather than maintaining current land use and zoning permissions. |
| 10 | Paul Britton,  
MHBC  
22 Weber Street West  
Written: March 19, 2019 | The subject lands are designated as High Density Commercial Residential - OMB decision.  
FSR is reduced from 4 to 2.  
Request for meeting. | Staff met with the property owner to discuss the proposed land use designation and zoning. Property owner is to provide further information to support additional density and built form. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Written: March 27, 2019</td>
<td>Please Note late addition comment #56 “Can we have 30-40 Margaret Ave zoned RES-5 as opposed to RES-6”? All others have been previously submitted.</td>
<td>Thank you for your interest in the OBTNA consultation on the proposed neighbourhood rezoning (Secondary Plan review) with the Planning Department. How will this consultation work? Our neighbourhood association received more than 55 individual comments in response to the proposed new zoning. We will only address a few of the comments, included below my signature, as our time is limited. Our goal is to have the Planning Department understand our perspectives and for us to understand the Planning Department’s intent. We are not aiming to achieve agreed-upon decisions at this time. The following questions/comments are numbered in the order they were recorded by the neighbourhood association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Can we have all the land-use documents (Secondary Plan, Urban Design Manual, Heritage Conservation District Plan, Self-guided tour information, etc.) refer to the neighbourhood as “Olde Berlin Town” as opposed to “Civic Centre” so as to eliminate confusion? | The geographic boundary of Olde Berlin Town does not match the current boundary of the Civic Centre secondary plan and naming it as such would be historically inaccurate. The name of the secondary plan reflects the name of the heritage conservation district plan. |

2. Can we include a statement in the Secondary Plans that the recommendations in sections 4.0-4.5 and 6.9.0-6.9.4, inclusive, of the Heritage District Conservation Plan are to be read as requirements, with the words “recommended/recommend/recommends” and other such variants to be read as “shall”, etc.? Doing so would eliminate misunderstandings and ensure the value of the public consultations and commissioned reports. | It is Staff’s opinion that referencing particular sections may wrongly infer other sections in the heritage conservation district plan should be read differently or have different status. Staff can consider including policies in the secondary plan to reference the HCD and state that the CCNHCD Plan has status under the OHA and its own legislative requirements. |

3. Can we include a statement in the Secondary Plans clarifying that RES-3 is the zoning for all lands within the Heritage District, except for a. 103 Ahrens St W, 94 Ahrens/151&153 Victoria St N, 277 Victoria St N and 33 St Leger, b. all properties fronting Weber St W, and c. churches d. and that the lands zoned more intensively are exceptions, so zoned to reflect existing buildings pre-dating this Secondary Plan? | The Official Plan cannot specify what zone category should be applied to properties. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Can we define maximum height in terms of meters? Can we ensure that meters be used as the units of physical measurement? This might be best applied city-wide.</td>
<td>In some cases it is appropriate to regulate height and built form by FSR to allow flexibility in built form to avoid a monotonous streetscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Can we ensure that no property is subjected to more shadowing than its height and setback limits permit it to throw onto its neighbours? This would safeguard existing uses such as the collection of solar energy and gardening. Can we also have a city-wide rule on shadowing, using Mississauga’s plan as a starting point?</td>
<td>There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Central Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. Shadow impacts of development are reviewed through the site plan approval process wherein the exact details of the built form are known.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Can we designate all properties with frontage on Victoria not planned for MIX-2 zoning as Low Rise Residential Office RES-3?</td>
<td>The current low rise residential designation will still permit compatible non-residential uses including home occupation and office. Staff have reviewed the parcel fabric for the remaining low rise residential properties and determined they would not be able to support a Low Rise Residential Office RES-3 zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Why does the proposed zoning recommend a maximum of two units in the RES-3 zones instead of the currently permitted maximum of three units as per the secondary plan provision 13.1.2.1?</td>
<td>A review of the properties has determined that it is not possible to accommodate three units and the required amenity area and parking on a majority of the lots in the secondary plan. At the time the RES zones were applied for the Open House we did not have a RES zone that permitted three units so Staff determined that applying the lesser zone would be more appropriate to reflect the existing built form of the neighbourhood. Staff are reviewing the RES-3 zone for inclusion of a three unit residential use in accordance with Bill 108.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Can we allocate required additional green space within a 10-minute walk of the development which generates the requirement? See Civic Centre Secondary Plan General Policy 13.1.1.7.</td>
<td>Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The City can only require a parkland dedication on a property subject to a Planning Act application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Can we ensure that properties are capable of storing snow on their own land or appropriate sized boulevards?</td>
<td>The City can do this where site plan approval is required/given. Site plan approval is required for non-residential developments and residential developments with at least 3 dwelling units. This is not done in a Zoning By-law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Can we ensure that “as of right” zoning is interpreted to reflect all legislation, including heritage, shadowing, transition, wind tunnels, etc., and not simply the zoned Floor Space Ratio, setback and height limits?</td>
<td>When a proposed development complies with all zoning regulations Staff review all technical studies such as shadowing, wind, servicing, etc. through a site plan approval process. The zoning by-law cannot contain regulations which anticipate the impacts of individual developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | | |
<p>| 11. | Can we ensure that no properties are stranded in intensified zones (i.e. single house surrounded by developed, consolidated lots)? Do we need holding provisions to do so? | The intent of the land use designations is not to frustrate individual property owners and to facilitate the redevelopment of lands where appropriate. In the interim properties may be legal non-conforming with respect to use. Holding provisions historically have proven difficult to utilize to facilitate consolidation of properties. |
| 12. | Can we increase the minimum lot width (frontage on street) for MIXED 2 zones to 25 metres? Do MIXED 3 and 4 zones need even wider widths? | The MIX-2 and MIX-3 zones were recently approved under CRoZBY. Staff will be reviewing the requirements and regulations for the MIX-4 zone. |
| 13. | Can we institute a 15 metre setback on MIX-2 properties abutting a Low-Rise Residential zone in the CCHDCP? | Staff will be conducting 3D modelling to determine the compatibility of MIX-2 properties abutting low rise residential properties within the secondary plan area and appropriate regulations if necessary. |
| 14. | Why are we proposing to prohibit semi-detached dwellings in the RES-3 zones? We already have a few heritage semis. | Staff are reviewing permitted uses and regulations in the RES-3 zone and it is anticipated that a semi-detached dwelling will be permitted in accordance with the direction in Bill 108. |
| 15. | Can we ensure that the churches are zoned to retain a primary use that serves all society - community facility, cultural facility, place of worship, etc.? The request that the churches remain under I-2 zoning was one of the most frequent comments. | The Mix Zones permit Institutional Uses as well as Commercial and Residential Uses. The I-2 is limited in terms of permitted Institutional uses and would not allow the churches to diversify and permit compatible uses from utilizing the property during the “off times”. It is proposed to add a site-specific to protect the existing building, i.e new use is only permitted within the existing building. The churches have expressed an interest in the diversification of uses and it is not reasonable not to permit other compatible uses of the church buildings/properties. |
| 16. | Can sidewalks be widened on Victoria St N? | Victoria Street North is a Regional road and under the jurisdiction of the Region. |
| 17. | Can we zone 54 Margaret Ave RES-3 as opposed to RES-6? It is a Class A heritage building like its neighbours across the street. | Staff is reviewing the land use designation and zoning for the property at 54 Margaret in consultation with the property owners. |
| 18. | Can we retain the properties along the south-east side of Water Street in the Civic Centre Secondary Plan? Having the neighbourhood boundaries break down a rear property line as opposed to at a major street is confusing. | The boundary of the secondary plan was amended in 2014 to include Water Street within the Urban Growth Centre boundary which was determined by the Province. |
| 19. | More specifically, can we retain 127 and 130 Water St N in the Civic Centre Secondary Plan? They are in the Heritage District and form part of the | The boundary of the secondary plan was amended in 2014 to include Water Street within the Urban Growth Centre boundary which was determined by the Province. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? Additional Comments</td>
<td>gateway to Ahrens from Water/Victoria, as per the CCHCDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Why is 277 Victoria St N proposed to receive a MIX-2 designation? It is land included in the Heritage District Plan with existing zoning MU-1 162U 401U 562R. It is part of the gateway to St Leger from Victoria, as per the CCHCDP. Can it be designated MIX 1?</td>
<td>The zoning that was applied corresponds to the urban structure element that was applied to the property as part of the new Official Plan in 2014. Staff will be reviewing 3D modelling to determine compatible transition to low rise residential zones and whether additional regulations are required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Why is the portion of 33 St Leger included in the Heritage District being proposed to receive a MIX-2 designation? It currently zoned MU-1 162U 559R. Can it be designated MIX-1?</td>
<td>The zoning that was applied corresponds to the urban structure element that was applied to the property as part of the new Official Plan in 2014. Staff will be reviewing 3D modelling to determine compatible transition to low rise residential zones and whether additional regulations are required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>People appreciate the re-zoning of a portion of 64 Margaret to Low-Rise Residential.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Why is a MIX-2 designation being applied to a portion of the 64 Margaret lands, which are within the Heritage District with current zoning MU-1 167U 561R? Can that portion of 64 Margaret be zoned MIX-1?</td>
<td>The zoning that was applied corresponds to the urban structure element that was applied to the property as part of the new Official Plan in 2014. 64 Margaret has received site plan approval in accordance with the current zoning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Can we include 64 Margaret and 33 St Leger among the list of properties subject to Special Policies 13.1.3.? As the properties are already consolidated with frontage on Victoria St N, can we note that the provisions are to be effected through the Site Plan process? In general, how can we ensure that re-developed properties do not direct their servicing and traffic into the interior of the Civic Centre neighbourhood?</td>
<td>If it is determined that 64 Margaret and 33 St Leger require site specific policy Staff will include it in the secondary plan. Servicing, vehicular access are considered through the site plan process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Can the CR-1 properties along Queen between Weber and Ahrens be zoned MIX-1? MIX-2 would impose on Queen St.</td>
<td>The PARTS Plan and study recommended that we designate the lands to MIX-2. There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Central Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Can a height limit matching the existing building height be applied to 108 Queen St N (Sonneck House) given that it is a Part IV designated property inside the CCHDCP, so as not to mislead owners as to its potential use?</td>
<td>Staff have not applied site specific height restrictions based on the exact height a cultural heritage resource. Staff continue to have the ability to address acceptable height of alterations and new development through the Heritage Permit process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Within FANZ, why do we want the front yard setbacks at 236 and 264 Victoria St N to be as large as 33.89m and to have parking in the front yard? Do we not want to animate the street? Do we not want parking at the rear of the buildings?</td>
<td>These properties are not included in this secondary plan boundary and have been zoned under CRoZBY.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Can we have, within the flanking UGC zones, height limits and/or stepback requirements, so that undue shadowing and inappropriate transitions are not created?</td>
<td>Staff are not reviewing lands within the Urban Growth Centre as part of the secondary plan review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Along Queen St N and Ellen St E, in the UGC, can we have a minimum 6m front and exterior sideyard setback, as opposed to the proposed 3m?</td>
<td>Staff are not reviewing lands within the Urban Growth Centre as part of the secondary plan review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>What is the definition of an “appropriate transition”? How will planning documents ensure an appropriate transition, as required by the Official Plan, from the low-rise residential interior of Civic Centre across Queen, Victoria, Water and Weber into more intensified zones? Do we take the example of Special Regulation 565 (which applies to a property at 111 Water St, with a rear yard neighbour inside the Heritage District): Notwithstanding Section 54.2 of this By-law, within the lands zoned MU-2 and shown as affected by this subsection on Schedules 83, 84 and 122 of Appendix &quot;A&quot; the following special regulations shall apply: a) the minimum rear yard setback shall be 15.0 metres; and b) the maximum building height shall be 16.5 metres; however, the building height may be increased to a maximum of 24.0 metres provided that for each additional metre of building height beyond 16.5 metres a minimum of 1.5 metres of additional setback from the rear lot line is provided for those portions of the building with a height in excess of 16.5 metres. (By-law 2011-058, S.41) (Victoria Street North Mixed Use Corridor)</td>
<td>Staff will be reviewing the regulations of the mix zones to ensure appropriate transitions. To do this more modelling will be done to determine the appropriate transition regulations to apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Do we take the recommendations of the CCHDCP? The CCHDCP recommends more than 7.5m setbacks as buffers between existing heritage areas and new developments. Take the much contemplated 30-40 Margaret case as the example on transitions: 1. 16.5m maximum height (as an immediate neighbour to 10.5m max. height neighbour). 2. 45 degree stepback above third floor. 3. rear yard setback of 10-15m.</td>
<td>Staff will be reviewing the regulations of the mix zones to ensure appropriate transitions. To do this more modelling will be done to determine the appropriate transition regulations to apply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td>Staff are not reviewing lands within the Urban Growth Centre as part of the secondary plan review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td>Staff are reviewing permitted uses and regulations in the RES-3 zone and it is anticipated that the zone will allow for more housing options such as lane coach houses in appropriate locations subject to all zoning regulations being met. This direction is supported by new Bill 108.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can we have a height limit on the block encircled by Weber-Water-Victoria that affords the properties on the south-eastern side of Water St N an appropriate transition?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One resident believes the FSR limit will ensure a reasonable transition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do we want to encourage more lane houses/coach houses? What criteria could be required for coach houses? Is any change necessary to the proposed regulations? This issue was controversial in the neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why is Lancaster/Mansion RES-5 property not listed as RES-3?</td>
<td>The new RES-5 zoning reflects the existing use of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quote: “I don’t live in the Civic Centre but I take a lot of pleasure from walking through it which I do frequently. It gives me a sense of the history of the city and is a peaceful zone in the core.”</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quote: “I like the lanes for walking and biking. I wish they were better groomed.”</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can we continue the bike lane along Margaret/Otto from Victoria to Frederick?</td>
<td>The City of Kitchener is currently reviewing the Trails and Cycling Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Many neighbours did not receive notice of the planning review because not notified via mail.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The December 12th consultation date was too close to the holidays and competing obligations to permit adequate participation.</td>
<td>There will be future opportunities to provide comments and adequately participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td></td>
<td>How can we include cultural heritage landscape policies?</td>
<td>The Secondary Plans will be brought in the 2014 Official Plan and will be subject to the parent policies of the Official Plan including the Cultural Heritage Resource (Cultural Heritage Landscape) policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td></td>
<td>How can we ensure that the heritage value of the green spaces and trees are protected?</td>
<td>Significant green spaces can be designated and zoned Open Space to provide a level of protection. Development applications are required to submit tree management plans and adjacent trees are protected and require landowner permissions to be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td></td>
<td>How can we add more storey-telling signage?</td>
<td>This opportunity that can be explored and addressed through neighbourhood urban design guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can we improve placemaking in the neighbourhood?</td>
<td>This opportunity that can be explored and addressed through neighbourhood urban design guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can we bring in heritage style street lighting in keeping with the CCHDCP’s recommendations?</td>
<td>This opportunity that can be explored and addressed through neighbourhood urban design guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>How can we add more street furniture?</td>
<td>This opportunity that can be explored and addressed through neighbourhood urban design guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>What are the next steps in the neighbourhood planning review process?</td>
<td>Once Staff address all comments that have been received revisions may be made to the policies, plans and zoning regulations. These will be circulated to the neighbourhood for public comment at a future point in time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>How can we ensure more green space?</td>
<td>Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The City can only require a parkland dedication on a property subject to a Planning Act application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>How do we add more green canopy, on both city land and private property, to prevent heat capture?</td>
<td>&quot;Heat capture&quot; is not a land use planning concern being considered in this process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>How do we ensure that the neighbourhood does not get split into two communities on either side of a more intensified Margaret? Would neighbourhood cohesion be harmed?</td>
<td>Development within the neighbourhood will not affect or change the boundary of this secondary plan neighbourhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>What regulations do we have/need to allow for new porches where an old porch was removed long ago?</td>
<td>The City does not have the ability to retroactively require a property owner to construct a porch that has been removed. The City is looking at zoning regulations to require construction of front porches on new builds on certain streets and/or neighbourhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Can we add requirements for laneway lighting?</td>
<td>This issue is not a land use planning concern being considered in this process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Can we improve lighting on streets where current lights are obliterated by trees?</td>
<td>This issue is not a land use planning concern being considered in this process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>How can we ensure the availability of affordable housing options?</td>
<td>The City plans for a mix of land uses to support a range of housing types for people of all demographics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>How can we ensure that new developments include more 3 bedroom and larger units to ensure that families can remain in the neighbourhood?</td>
<td>The City plans for a mix of land uses to support a range of housing types for people of all demographics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>How does Central Frederick Neighbourhood feel about having properties along Lancaster transferred out of their plan? Are they being consulted?</td>
<td>These property owners and the Central Frederick Neighbourhood are being consulted through this process and will be notified at such time as we review the Central Frederick secondary plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>How can we ensure that the Committee of Adjustment and Zone Change applications processes do not undermine these communally-achieved Secondary Plans?</td>
<td>The City cannot prevent property owners from making applications to the Committee of Adjustment or to Committee/Council to facilitate a change to or a redevelopment of a property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   |                  | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | 57. Can we have 30-40 Margaret Ave zoned RES-5 as opposed to RES-6? |
|   |                  | Notes from March 30, 2019 consultation with Brandon Sloan Regarding Proposed Re-Zoning of Civic Centre (Olde Berlin)  
The following opinions do not reflect the views of the Olde Berlin Ton Neighbourhood Association. The opinions belong to individuals who attended the consultation. No request for registration from local residents, property or business owners was denied. | The property owner was an active participant during the PARTS Central Plan and was very clear that they wanted to maintain their current land use and zoning that was approved through the OMB. PARTS Central recommended a Medium Rise Residential with a site-specific and the proposed RES-6 implements this. |
| 12 | Written: March, 30, 2019 | 17. Can we zone 54 Margaret Ave RES-3 as opposed to RES-6? It is a Class A heritage building inside the Heritage District.  
-Detached houses of this significance have been identified for RES-3 zoning.  
-Would re-zoning ensure a more appropriate transition?  
-RES-3 zoning would better ensure the house and its context are preserved than would RES-6.  
-As the last Class A house on the north side of Margaret, it plays an important role in providing context to the neighbours on the south side of Margaret.  
-It’s a problem when the heritage plan recommendations are at odds with the zoning. Let’s not tempt the arsonists and those that wish to demolish via neglect. | The land use designation and zone category for this property that is proposed and was shown at the Open House was to reflect the existing land use and zoning permissions that the property currently enjoys in the Civic Centre Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law 85-1. The reason for not including this property in the site-specific policy area for 30-40 Margaret Avenue, was again to reflect that none exist now and the one adjacent and applicable to the property at 30-40 Margaret Street is to reflect the site-specifics that were approved by the Ontario Municipal Board for these lands. The exclusion of these lands from any site-specific policies does not reflect any less heritage protection. Staff are reviewing the application of a “Low Rise Residential” designation and to apply the new “RES-3” zone, rather than retaining the existing “Medium Rise Residential” land use designation and zoning permissions for the property at 54 Margaret. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30. | | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | Staff will be reviewing the regulations of the mix zones to ensure appropriate transitions. To do this more modelling will be done to determine the appropriate transition regulations to apply. |

30. What is the definition of an “appropriate transition”, as required by the Official Plan Objective 3.2.5.?  

- Objective 3.2.5. of Kitchener’s Official Plan: “To maintain a compatible interface between Intensification Areas and surrounding areas and achieve an appropriate transition of built form”  

- How will planning documents ensure an appropriate transition, from the low-rise residential interior of Civic Centre across Queen, Victoria, Water and Weber into more intensified zones?  

- Precedent A) Special Regulation 565 (applies to 103-125 Water St N, which have a rear yard neighbour inside the Heritage District): a) the minimum rear yard setback shall be 15.0 metres; and b) the maximum building height shall be 16.5 metres; however, the building height may be increased to a maximum of 24.0 metres provided that for each additional metre of building height beyond 16.5 metres a minimum of 1.5 metres of additional setback from the rear lot line is provided for those portions of the building with a height in excess of 16.5 metres.  

- Precedent B) Page 60 of Civic Centre Heritage district Conservation Plan regarding 30-40 Margaret Ave: 15m rear yard setback, 3 storey height at street and maximum 5 storey height mid-block. Step back at 45 degrees above third floor.  

- Example from the Victoria Park Area Heritage district. The properties within this district on Joseph Street are currently zoned R-5 with a maximum height of 10.5 m. On the opposing side of Joseph Street, the land is proposed to be zoned UGC-1 which allows a height only limited by maximum floor space ratio. If you use this as a guide, then the zoning on Queen, Victoria, Water and Weber should allow for higher maximum heights. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td><em>Example from Hamilton. Lots of 35+ m frontage and 45+ m depth, allow for a point tower of 13+ stories or 50+ m. Lot depths on Queen are approximately 34 m, Victoria 47m, Water 51m and Weber 30-50m. Hamilton would allow considerable more height than what Kitchener is allowing. -Hamilton’s building guidelines state, “To ensure the new development is sensitive and compatible with the existing or planned open space areas buildings should be designed to: i) transition to the height of the existing residential development. The portion of the building base or what our zoning calls the podium that is adjacent to the low-rise residential building should not exceed the height of the adjacent development and ii) the tower portion of the building should be set back 12.5m from the property line adjacent to the residential neighbourhood to mitigate shadow impact and protect privacy and overlook. The setbacks required on Water St N are more restrictive than what is required in Hamilton. -Properties with these lot sizes are scarce, and Water and Victoria streets are primary corridors within the Major Transition Station Area. -Likely the biggest single general issue to be resolved. -Need to ensure that the benefits that come from putting limitations on a property are guaranteed to the owner as well as the neighbours. -Need to ensure that benefits currently enjoyed are not stripped away without consent or appropriate compensation. -Need to recognize that the surrounding context of a property is inherent to its value.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td><em>Must not engage in expropriation of value.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td><em>Need to recognize that we are not planning on a blank canvas; that we have made many decisions in the past and that people have made life-changing commitments on the basis of these past decisions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td>The Official Plan cannot specify what zone category should be applied to properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Can we include a statement in the Secondary Plans clarifying that RES-3 is the zoning for all lands within the Heritage District, except for a. 103 Ahrens St W, 94 Ahrens/151&amp;153 Victoria St N, 277 Victoria St N and 33 St Leger, b. all properties fronting Weber St W, and c. churches, and that d. the lands zoned more intensively are exceptions, so zoned to reflect existing conditions pre-dating this Secondary Plan? -Point 3.a. may be redundant. -Important to ensure that no one mistakes the existing, more intensive zoning as a precedent for what may be built in the future. -Important to recognize the legally accrued benefits currently enjoyed by property owners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Can we ensure that no property is subjected to more shadowing than its height and setback limits permit it to throw onto its neighbours? Can we also have a city-wide rule on shadowing, using Mississauga’s plan as a starting point? (www6.mississauga.ca/onlinemaps/planbldg/Urban Design/FinalStandards_ShadowStudies_July2014.pdf) -This would safeguard existing uses such as the collection of solar energy and gardening. -Page 3.10 of the CCHDCP states “Any buildings proposed over 5 storeys in height may be required to undertake shadow studies where they abut existing residential uses, to demonstrate that they will not unreasonably impact on access to sunlight in rear yard amenity areas.” -What is a reasonable and satisfactory target for sunlight? -Mississauga’s guidelines regarding shadowing on private and public streets and spaces are very specific. How do other cities evaluate shadowing? -Other factors to evaluate shadowing include: no net new shadows, number of hours in a defined period of time, and percentage of sun coverage all the time. -Whichever factors we adopt, we must consider the balancing of sunlight access with growth, development and achieving density targets. -An issue of moving from one zone to another and is one necessary condition of an appropriate transition. -Rule should apply to the zoned limits as opposed to the existing builds. -Not advocating to reduce FSRs or height permitted under present zoning – without the owners’</td>
<td>There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Central Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. Shadow impacts of development are reviewed through the site plan approval process wherein the exact details of the built form are known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td>- Don’t want to see new zoning infringe upon the benefits to which another zone is entitled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Why does the proposed zoning recommend a maximum of two units in the RES-3 zones instead of the currently permitted maximum of three units as per the Secondary Plan provision 13.1.2.1?</td>
<td></td>
<td>A review of the properties has determined that it is not possible to accommodate three units and the required amenity area and parking on a majority of the lots in the secondary plan. At the time the RES zones were applied for the Open House we did not have a RES zone that permitted three units so Staff determined that applying the lesser zone would be more appropriate to reflect the existing built form of the neighbourhood. Staff are reviewing the RES-3 zone for inclusion of a three unit residential use in accordance with Bill 108.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 13.1.2 Land Use Designations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Low Rise Residential - Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Low Rise Residential - Preservation designation has been applied to areas where it is the aim of this Plan to retain the existing single detached residential character of the Neighbourhood. Existing houses and streetscapes are to be preserved wherever possible. Permitted residential uses are restricted to single detached dwellings and the conversion of those structures which existed as of the date of the adoption of this Plan to duplexes or multiple dwellings to a maximum of 3 units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | **Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
**Question 2:** What are your comments about the zoning?  
**Question 3:** What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments** |  
Residential conversions will be permitted only where there is sufficient floor area for the conversion, where the site is capable of providing adequate off-street parking in accordance with by-law requirements, and where no structural alterations are required to the exterior of the building. Any exterior stairs or fire escapes are to be enclosed, and kept away from the facade of the structure. Minor exterior alterations and additions to single detached dwellings shall be permitted provided such alterations are not within any front or side yard.  
-If change not made, could a developer apply for a variance or zone change anyway?  
-Would buildings with more than 3 units be grandfathered?  
-Will RES-1 and RES-2 zoning be applied?  
-What is the definition of “sufficient floor area” to permit conversion to up to 3 units?  
-Concerned this could de-stabilize neighbourhood.  
-Permitting three units, within the RES-3 houses, could allow intensification while preserving the exterior built form and without compromising the neighbourhood.  
-A maximum of 3 units is the status quo, and the neighbourhood has not suffered. |  
56. Can we have 30-40 Margaret Ave zoned RES-5 as opposed to RES-6?  
-RES-6 only permits cluster townhouses and multi-residential buildings.  
-RES-5 permits detached houses, semi-detached houses, street townhouses, cluster townhouses and multi-residential buildings.  
-If RES-5 zoning was approved, the ownership could retain the right to avail itself of the Ontario Municipal Board ruling as a site specific regulation, but could also choose to build other forms.  
-Affords flexibility  
-Would allow Margaret Ave to be restored.  
-Would create the possibility of neighbours on the south side of Margaret to have their built form mirrored across the street.  
-Would not limit the interests of the 30-40 Margaret ownership. | The property owner was an active participant during the PARTS Central Plan and was very clear that they wanted to maintain their current land use and zoning that was approved through the OMB. PARTS Central recommended a Medium Rise Residential with a site-specific and the proposed RES-6 implements this. |  
12. Can we increase the minimum lot width (frontage on street) for MIXED 2 zones to 25 metres? Do MIXED 3 and 4 zones need even wider widths?  
-Would prevent the situation at 122 Courtland Ave E, where a property breaks the cadence of the MIX. | The MIX-2 and MIX-3 zones were recently approved under CRoZBY. Staff will be reviewing the requirements and regulations for the MIX-4 zone. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
<td>街</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | When a proposed development complies with all zoning regulations Staff review all technical studies such as shadowing, wind, servicing, etc. through a site plan approval process. The zoning by-law cannot contain regulations which anticipate the impacts of individual developments.  
All Committee of Adjustment applications are required to pass the four tests as set out in the Planning Act. |
| 10. | | 10. Can we ensure that “as of right” zoning is interpreted to reflect all legislation, including heritage, shadowing, transition, wind tunnels, etc., and not simply the zoned Floor Space Ratio, setback and height limits?  
- The more rigid we are with our regulations the less likely we are to see development and change.  
- Need to jettison idea of certain laws “trumping” others. Need to adhere to all laws and regulations.  
- Without clarity, the Committee of Adjustment could grant relief of zoning regulations at the expense of other legislation to the contrary. | |
| 15. | | 15. Can we ensure that the churches are zoned to retain a primary use that serves all society – community facility, cultural facility, place of worship, etc.?  
- The request that the churches remain under Institutional zoning was suggested by several people.  
- Concern regarding demolition of the churches.  
- Preserves cultural and community hub, anchor for community  
- If the Church of Good Shepherd is to be assigned MIX-2 zoning, want lower height limit  
- Each church should be evaluated on its location and the surrounding uses of the area properties.  
The Church of the Good Shepard should keep its I-2 zoning whereas, St. Andrews Presbyterian Church could be zoned to allow commercial or residential uses.  
- The policies and guidelines of the CCHCDP should apply.  
- Focus should be on primary use. Ancillary uses could also be permitted so as to re-purpose the existing buildings according to current needs. |  
The Mix Zones permit Institutional Uses as well as Commercial and Residential Uses. The I-2 is limited in terms of permitted Institutional uses and would not allow the churches to diversify and permit compatible uses from utilizing the property during the “off times”. It is proposed to add a site-specific to protect the existing building, i.e new use is only permitted within the existing building. The churches have expressed an interest in the diversification of uses and it is not reasonable not to permit other compatible uses of the church buildings/properties. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Individual Closing Comments and Questions | -Is city trying to meet UN sustainable development goals?  
-Looking forward to seeing the complete draft of the Secondary Plan  
-Why are we asking property owners to provide the community with an architectural museum without preserving the context that makes the houses sensible?  
-Should we continue to invest in our properties?  
-Enjoyment of a residential property hinges, in part, upon context, and may include the capacity to garden, collect solar energy, and interact with neighbours and the community. Compromising the context is expropriation of value. If owners cannot derive enjoyment, they may not invest in their properties or the community, which may lead to the sort of neighbourhood neglect from which we have only recently emerged.  
-Can a height limit matching the existing building height be applied to 108 Queen St N (Sonneck House) given that it is a Part IV designated property inside the CCHDCP, so as not to mislead owners as to its potential use? Its proposed zoning is MIX-2, which allows up to 24 metres of height.  
-Can the properties currently zoned CR-1 along Queen between Weber and Ahrens be zoned MIX-1? MIX-2 would impose on Queen St and on the low-rise residential interior of the neighbourhood.  
-Concern re: urban sprawl  
-Do these consultations have any impact? | Thank you for your closing comments and questions. All the considerations and questions previously posed to Staff have been and will continue to be reviewed through the secondary plan process. The consultation process, which involves a number of stakeholders, is valued by Staff and we will continue to engage with the neighbourhoods, and internal and external stakeholders. |
| 13 | Jeanette  
Written: August 15, 2019 | As new condo plans for Margaret St and also the high-rise on Duke and Frederick St. has there been any mention of integrating a dog park in the downtown area? Two new structures with pets welcome, along with the many other buildings in the area which allow pets although don’t provide space for their tenants or owners of pets to urinate or defecate. Margaret streets empty lot has been used by many dog owners and will not be available once the building begins.  
Has there been any consideration in the downtown for a dog park? The intensifying the downtown area will only increase the pet culture that is already here. Or dog culture. And to mention at this time the Civic Centre park is overly used by dog owners urinating and dedicating. Would you want your child to play in this park? Thank you for considering my suggestion to add one or multiple dog parks in the downtown core. | Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The City can only require a parkland dedication on a property subject to a Planning Act application. |
6.0 Justification and Summary

General Justification:

- The boundary of the secondary plan was amended in 2014 to include Water Street within the Urban Growth Centre boundary which was determined by the Province.
- Introduction of a site specific policy proposed to allow for diversification of uses within an existing building located on a property designated as Institutional. This provision applies to properties addressed as 54 Queen Street North and 12 Margaret Avenue/116 Queen Street North within this secondary plan area.
- Properties with frontage on Victoria Street North that are not MIX-2 will maintain the proposed Low Rise Residential (57-61 Ellen Street West/231 Victoria Street North, 56 Ellen Street West/239 Victoria Street North, and 46 St Leger Street) and Low Rise Residential Limited Office (71 and 74 Victoria Street North) designation as it will still permit compatible non-residential uses including home occupation and office in some locations.
- Additional consideration was given to recognize and appropriately plan for any development given that the majority of this neighbourhood is a designated heritage district. A limited designation and zoning have been applied to established residential areas of this plan to protect the heritage value and character.

Site Specific Justification:

- 54 Margaret Avenue: The proposed zoning reflected the existing permissions of the property and retained a Medium Rise Residential land use designation. The PARTS Plan recommended that this property be given a Mixed Use designation and MIX-2 zone. Staff determined that an increase of that level and the suggestion of down-zoning to Low Rise Residential are not appropriate for this property and will retain its existing permissions with Medium Rise Residential and a RES-6 zone.
- 277 Victoria Street North: Concerns expressed over the MIX-2 zone applied to this property designated as Mixed Use. Staff have determined that a MIX-1 zone would not be appropriate for this property given the urban structure element that was applied to this property as part of the new Official Plan in 2014.
- 33 St Leger Street: Concerns expressed over the MIX-2 zone applied to this property designated as Mixed Use. Staff have determined that a MIX-1 zone would not be appropriate for this property given the urban structure element that was applied to this property as part of the new Official Plan in 2014.
- 64 Margaret Avenue: Concerns expressed over the MIX-2 zone applied to this property designated as Mixed Use. Staff have determined that a MIX-1 zone would not be appropriate for this property given the urban structure element that was applied to this property as part of the new Official Plan in 2014. A portion of the site fronting along Margaret Avenue is also proposed to be designated as Low Rise Residential to maintain compatibility.
- 30-40 Margaret Avenue: The property owner was an active participant during the PARTS Central Plan and wanted to maintain their current land use and zoning that was approved through the Ontario Municipal board. PARTS Central recommended a Medium Rise Residential designation with a site specific and the proposed Medium Rise Residential designation and RES-6 zoning implements this.
Appendix G – Victoria Street
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January 21, 2019

Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

RE: Public Open House – Neighbourhood Planning Review
Victoria Street Secondary Plan
Process of Applying Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations

The City would like to formally invite you to participate in the Neighbourhood Planning Review of the City’s Secondary Plans. We are commencing the review of Victoria Street Secondary Plan and in the process of applying new Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations.

See location map below for the boundary of this study area.

A Public Open House is scheduled as outlined below:

WHEN: Tuesday, February 5th, 2019
7:00 pm – 9:00 pm (Drop-in format)
Location: Kitchener City Hall – Conestoga Room
200 King Street West.
An updated land use framework within the City’s Secondary Plan areas was deferred as part of the review of our new 2014 Official Plan. The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters. The Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study. The City is now reviewing the Secondary Plans and in the process of applying new Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations.

As a result of the background studies and work that has been done, a small portion of the Victoria Street Secondary Plan is recommended to add to the Victoria Park Secondary Plan. The remaining portion of the Victoria Street Secondary Plan is proposed to be merged with the parent policies of the Official Plan.

Draft Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations have been applied to the properties in the boundary of the study area for your consideration and review at the Open House scheduled for February 5th, 2019.

Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you on February 5th!

Information shared at the meeting will also be available online (posted on the project website after the meeting). If you are unable to attend this meeting, you are welcome to provide your input through the project website: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR or to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Yours truly,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner – Policy

c. Brandon Sloan, Manager, Long Range and Policy Planning
   Alain Pinard, Director of Planning
   Erin Power, Communications & Marketing Associate
   Councillor Debbie Chapman
Victoria Street Secondary Plan - Existing Zoning
### Victoria Street Secondary Plan – Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Rise Residential</th>
<th>Medium Rise Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** Low density housing types, including Single Detached Dwelling, Duplex Dwelling, Semi-Detached Dwelling, Street Townhouse Dwellings, Cluster Townhouse Dwellings, low rise Multiple Dwellings and Special Needs Housing.  
FSR: Maximum of 0.6  
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 3 storeys or 11 metres | **DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** Medium density housing types including Cluster Townhouse Dwellings, Multiple Dwellings, and Special Needs Housing.  
FSR: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0  
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 8 storeys |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed Use</th>
<th>Major Infrastructure and Utility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **DESCRIPTION/RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building. Retail, Office Uses, Day Care, Health Office/Clinic, Personal Services, Religious Institution, Commercial Entertainment, Restaurant, Studio, Artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.  
FSR: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 1.0  
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 3 storeys | **DESCRIPTION/RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** The purpose of this land use is to provide for large scale infrastructure and utilities for public uses. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Natural Heritage Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **DESCRIPTION:** These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.  
**RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation, Community Facility and Cemeteries. | **DESCRIPTION:** These natural heritage features are intended to be protected and/or conserved for their ecological functions. Natural heritage features can include provincially or locally significant wetlands, valleys, woodlands, threatened or endangered species habitat, and lands subject to natural hazards or flooding. No new development is permitted in these areas.  
**RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** Conservation Activities; Forest, Fish, and Wildlife Management; and Small-Scale Passive Recreation Activities (i.e. Trails). |
### Proposed Residential (RES) Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/diagram" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/diagram" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>The site specific may limit height and FSR depending on property context and heritage attributes (TBD)</td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas.</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/diagram" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Office, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

* Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
## Proposed Non-Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Infrastructure and Utility</td>
<td>MIU-1</td>
<td>Provide for large scale infrastructure and utilities for public uses.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Community Facility, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Crafts-person Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Large Residential Care Facility, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Print Shop, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Retail, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>4 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>MIX-1</td>
<td>Accommodates a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a low density and scale in Neighbourhood Nodes and other areas that are adjacent to proper with low density residential uses.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Community Facility, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Crafts-person Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Large Residential Care Facility, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Print Shop, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Retail, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>4 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>To provide a comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system.</td>
<td>Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation and Cemeteries</td>
<td>4 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>NHC-1</td>
<td>To protect and/or conserve natural heritage features and their ecological functions.</td>
<td>Existing Agriculture and Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>4 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EUF-1</td>
<td>Recognize existing uses within a floodway or floodplain.</td>
<td>Existing Uses</td>
<td>4 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics.

- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
Zoning is used to regulate:

- Use of land;
- Location of buildings and structures;
- Types of buildings permitted and their associated uses; and
- Lot dimensions, parking requirements, building heights and setbacks from the street/lot lines.

**WHAT IS A SITE SPECIFIC PROVISION?**

Site specific provisions are added to the base zone to provide additional regulations. Some examples are as follows:

- Garage permissions and location
- Size and location requirements for front porches
- Height limits

**WHAT IS AN URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINE:**

Urban Design Guidelines establish the objectives, priorities and expectations for urban design in Kitchener. The guidelines apply to projects across the City and address such things as building types, streetscapes and the public realm. The manual is used by City staff and the development industry in the review and approval of specific types of development applications, such as official plan amendments, zone by-law, site plan control and minor variance applications. The guidelines are inherently flexible and negotiable and do not have the same regulatory power as other tools such as the Zoning By-law.
Achieving a Consistent Building Setback

Any new (or additions to) single detached, semi-detached or street townhouse dwellings required to have a setback from a street that is based on the average setback of the two neighbouring properties.

A tolerance of 1 metre from the average setback has been incorporate into the regulation to provide flexibility. This regulation is in place already in Central Neighbourhoods (REINS Areas).

Garage Projections & Permission

Garage projections & permissions can be implemented using of zoning regulations and/or urban design guidelines

Sample Urban Design Guideline: Where the existing streetscape does not contain street facing garages, only detached recessed garages should be permitted.
**NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER**

### HOW IMPORTANT IS IT THAT THE CITY REGULATE...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Features / Focal Points</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (ie: protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Design, Materials &amp; Colours</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (ie: protect the built form contributing to significant views within and into the neighbourhood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POTENTIAL CONSERVATION TOOLS IDENTIFIED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Character Element</th>
<th>Potential Conservation Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Porches</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Form Transitions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design, Materials, Colours</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Features / Focal Points</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER

## HOW IMPORTANT IS IT THAT THE CITY REGULATE ...

### Front Porches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Should not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e.: requires front porches on all new low-rise infill developments?)

### Garages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Should not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** How important is it that the City regulates garages (i.e.: setback, location on lot etc.)

### Built Form Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e.: requires new development to respect existing built form?)

### Setbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Do not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question:** How important is it that the City regulates this feature? (i.e.: requires that buildings form a consistent street edge?)
**Built Heritage Resources**

means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal community. Built heritage resources are generally located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or included on local, provincial and/or federal registers.

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).

### Heritage Act Tools

- Heritage Conservation Easement Agreements
- Designation of Individual Properties (Part IV)
- Designation of Groups of Properties (Part V – Heritage Conservation District)
- Listing of Individual Properties
- Heritage Funding (Grants and Tax Refunds)

### Planning Act Tools

- Official Plan/Secondary Plan Policies
- Community Improvement Plans
- Zoning By-law Regulations
- Subdivision Agreements
- Demolition Control
- Site Plan Control
- Urban Design Guidelines

### Other Tools

- Corridor Management Plans
- Park Management Plans
- Stewardship Activities
- Public Education
- Commemoration and Interpretation
Listed Non-Designated Properties

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can list non-designated properties of cultural heritage value or interest on the Municipal Heritage Register. Listing is the first step the City should take to identify properties that may warrant some form of recognition, conservation and/or protection. Listing provides interim protection from demolition by increasing the amount of time the City has to process a demolition permit under the Ontario Building Code (generally from 10 to 60 business days) to provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the property merits formal designation. Listing also enables the City to ask for Heritage Impact Assessments and/or Conservation Plans with the submission of a complete Planning Act application.

Designated Properties

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can pass by-laws to formally designate properties of cultural heritage value or interest. Formal designation is one way of publicly acknowledging a property’s heritage value to the community. Designation also helps conserve important properties for the enjoyment of present and future generations by ensuring that changes are managed in a way that respects the heritage values. This includes protection from demolition. The City has designated approximately 85 individual properties and 4 heritage conservation districts.
## SIGN-IN SHEET

**Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**

**February 05, 2019**

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 MARGARET AVE</td>
<td>N2H 4H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67 Agnes St.</td>
<td>N2G 2E9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3-170 Cherry</td>
<td>N2G 5A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 Victoria St North</td>
<td>N2H 5C6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>238 Victoria St South</td>
<td>N2N1R5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>304 Victoria Street South</td>
<td>N2M 3A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110 Strange St., Kitchener N2G 1R3</td>
<td>N2G 1R3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>301 Victoria St, Kitchener Wilmot Hy W</td>
<td>N2G 4L2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 Talbot St, Kitchener N2M 2A8</td>
<td>N2M 2A8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47 Talbot St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O. Box 284 Cambridge</td>
<td>N1A 5V6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>386 Victoria St.</td>
<td>N2M 3A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162 Victoria St. South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151 Brighton St. Waterloo</td>
<td>N2T 3G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>270-310 Main St S</td>
<td>N2E 4S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>410 Cheeky St.</td>
<td>N2G 2C6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>410 Cherry St</td>
<td>N2G 2C6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 Herlan Ave.</td>
<td>N2G 2C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-199 Mansion St</td>
<td>N2M 2V41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Victoria Street Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before February 28, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

⇒ The property is now in Vic Park Sec Plan. did not get any notice or information regarding Vic. Park Sec Plan review.

Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: _____________________________________________________________

Mailing Address: ____________________________________________________

Email: _____________________________________________________________

Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Victoria Street Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before February 28, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   I think that the land use designations need to take low income housing into account. By keeping Patricia Avenue as low rise residential is important to this in my opinion.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   I think the zoning appropriately reflects the existing neighbourhood and prevents increased density (high rise buildings).

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?
   The area needs a community centre that appropriately reflects the neighbourhood's diversity.

Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:


Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 47 Talbot Street, N2M 2AB
Email: [Redacted]

Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Victoria Street Plan Review Public Open House #1. Please answer the following 3 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before February 28, 2019.

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   It is difficult to get the big picture of a Secondary Plan development.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   What are alternative tools beside zoning? What are the pros and cons of alternative tools?

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?

Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Victoria Street Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

It is difficult to understand how City of Kitchener / Region of Waterloo work together.

How Kitchener has control over, and what is outside of Kitchener control.

My understanding is that secondary plan means it is a focus area within the City, while other area are not a focus area.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this form. To ensure that we receive only one set of comments from each individual, staff can only consider comments if they include a name and address.

Name: (Redacted)

Mailing Address: 2210 176 Cherry St, Kitchener N2G 5A5

Email: (Redacted)
Hi there, my comment is that I am generally supportive of higher density to enable simpler redevelopment throughout the city because it makes housing more affordable, makes the city more lively and walkable, and increases the tax base. For this specific neighbourhood, I would support a change of all the RES-5 zones to RES-6. It would also make a lot of sense to change the RES-4 area along Victoria Street to RES-5. - Jeremy Krygsman

On Mon, Feb 25, 2019 at 8:50 AM <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Good morning Neighbourhood Residents and Community Members,

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Public Open House – Neighbourhood Specific Secondary Plan Review for Victoria Park Secondary Plan dated February 05, 2019

Here is the link to the information presented in the open house:

Please note that the comments are due by March 15th. Your input is important and Planning Staff look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
Hi Preet Kohli  
Technical Assistant (Policy) / Planning division/ city of Kitchener:  
Thank you for the information.  
Sincerely, [Name]

On Wed, Feb 6, 2019 at 2:27 PM <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hello [Name] wrote:

Thank you for your interest in Victoria Street Secondary Plan reviews.

The City is undertaking a detailed review of the land use and planning framework for many specific Kitchener neighbourhoods, known as Neighbourhood Planning Reviews (link below). These are typically locations where there are outdated secondary plans or community plans created 25-30 years ago to help guide the use of land and policies for new development or redevelopment. To help implement new directions from the province, region, city and other agencies, we are evaluating and updating existing secondary plans to create new ones.

As per our conversations from yesterday at the Victoria Street Secondary Plan open house. Below are the links to the information you had requested. The areas within line-hatch is for all the secondary plans. Some of the secondary plans are currently under review and the timing of other Secondary Plans is yet to be determined, you can find more information in the second link below.

Land Use Map:  


Please note, your property, 170 Cherry St. is not located within any of the new and old secondary plans.
If you have any questions, please feel free to let us know.

Regards,

Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP

Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
Hello

Thank you for your interest in Victoria Street Secondary Plan reviews.

The City is undertaking a detailed review of the land use and planning framework for many specific Kitchener neighbourhoods, known as Neighbourhood Planning Reviews (link below). These are typically locations where there are outdated secondary plans or community plans created 25-30 years ago to help guide the use of land and policies for new development or redevelopment. To help implement new directions from the province, region, city and other agencies, we are evaluating and updating existing secondary plans to create new ones.

As per our conversations from yesterday at the Victoria Street Secondary Plan open house. Below are the links to the information you had requested. The areas within line-hatch is for all the secondary plans. Some of the secondary plans are currently under review and the timing of other Secondary Plans is yet to be determined, you can find more information in the second link below.


Please note, your property, 170 Cherry St. is not located within any of the new and old secondary plans.

If you have any questions, please feel free to us know.
Regards,
Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
Hello

Thank you for your interest in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review. I am following up on our conversations from yesterday at the Victoria Street Secondary Plan. Below is the link to the notice, panels and comment form presented during Victoria Park Secondary Plan.


Please feel free to contact us if you have any question.

Regards,

Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
Hi Tina,

Thanks for the update. I hope you are feeling better. Regards,

Dave

Sent from my iPhone

> On Feb 7, 2019, at 11:16 AM, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:
> Hi Dave,
> Thank you for your emails. I apologize for the delay in response. I have been out of the office sick and was not able to even attend my own meeting on Tuesday night. All the information that was presented at the Open House on Tuesday, February 5th will be posted to the City's website shortly under Victoria Street tab. Here is the link.
> If your mother's property is located in the shaded area, it is likely proposed to be part of the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan. For the proposed land use and zoning information, I would refer you to the Victoria Park tab at the link.
> With respect to plans and the risk of expropriation, Victoria Street South is a Regional Road and under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo and not the City of Kitchener. You may want to contact the Transportation Planning Staff at the Region's Office for more information related to future plans and risks to your mother's property.
> Please let me know if you have any further questions or comments.
> Thank you for your interest in the Victoria Street/Victoria Park Planning Reviews.
> Regards,
> Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
> Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
> 519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
> ---Original Message-----
> From: Dave Pejic
> Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 6:22 PM
> To: Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
> Subject: Re: Victoria St secondary plan
> Hi Tina,
> Thank you for the information. Are the house on the street in the shaded area at risk of expropriation?
> I am not opposed to selling the property but I would have to make arrangements for my elderly mother who lives there. Regards,
> Dave
> Sent from my iPhone
On Jan 31, 2019, at 3:25 PM, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hello David,

The grey shaded area on the location map in letter you received is the area/boundary of the existing Victoria Street Secondary Plan which was approved as part of the City's Official Plan in 1994. The Victoria Street Secondary Plan is the land use plan for this area. The land use plan informs the zoning that is applied to lands.

The City's new Official Plan was approved in 2014, however the Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener's Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study.

Now that these studies are done, the City is now reviewing all of the Secondary Plans and in the process of updating and applying new Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations.

Draft Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations have been applied to the lands in the Victoria Street Secondary Plan for your consideration and review at the Open House scheduled for February 5th, 2019. The purpose of the Open House is to present this updated information and receive your comments on same.

Information shared at the meeting will also be available online (posted on the project website after the meeting). If you are unable to attend this meeting, you are welcome to provide your input through the project website: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR or to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca

Hopefully this answers your question. If a phone call would assist, please let me know.

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Pejic
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 7:15 AM
To: Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Victoria St secondary plan

Hello Tina,

I received a letter about the Victoria St secondary plan study. My house is in the shaded area on the map. Could you please explain what the plan is all about? I look forward to hearing from you soon.

David Pejic

Sent from my iPhone
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Individual Response Sent</th>
<th>Landowner in Victoria Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Victoria St S</td>
<td>August 28, 2018</td>
<td>The zoning was changed to RU-5 in 2018; then again in 2012. I believe there were some changes made to certain properties on the street. I was sent a LR697 notification of this but at the time I thought because draft was written across every page that this was not a final change. I didn’t receive any follow up after. Anyway, I put it up for sale in April as I retired and no longer needed it for my business. As I’m waiting for a buyer and after a couple of people inquired about living there, I started to think that it doesn’t sell so maybe I should do a couple of small renovations and rent it out. After checking this out with my real estate agent, he informed me that things had changed and I was no longer able to do that because it needed an environmental study done before the city would allow it. That section of the information I have is APPENDIX C - SPECIAL USE PROVISIONS - 401. I now feel like my hands are tied if it doesn’t sell so I would like to possibly use it for that purpose but can’t. My question is, was there ever an environmental study done on this land, and if so, what was the determination OR what would it require to go about finding out if the zoning could ever be changed to residential and the cost of doing the things that are required? I hope I have explained this properly so that you understand the guidance I am looking for to help me proceed. I am more than willing to come in and discuss my options with you to determine what I can or can’t do with the property. Right now I am forced to pay pretty high property taxes and insurance and a handful of other expenses just to keep everything up to date on this building. The subject property was zoned MU-1, 401U in 2012. At that time this property was identified by the Region of Waterloo as requiring further environmental consideration. This means that, residential uses and day care facilities including a single detached dwelling may be permitted upon receipt of a Record of Site Condition. The subject property is proposed to retain the mixed use zoning and in consultation with the Region of Waterloo it will be determined if the provisions in 401U need to be retained. The current MU-1 zone does permit low rise residential uses but the proposed MU-4 zone will not permit a single detached dwelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No address provided.</td>
<td>Jan. 31, 2019</td>
<td>Received a letter about the Victoria St secondary plan study. My house is in the shaded area on the map. Could you please explain what the plan is all about?</td>
<td>The grey shaded area on the location map in letter you received is the area/boundary of the existing Victoria Street Secondary Plan which was approved as part of the City’s Official Plan in 1994. The Victoria Street Secondary Plan is the land use plan for this area. The land use plan informs the zoning that is applied to lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No address provided.</td>
<td>Jan. 31, 2019</td>
<td>Are the house on the street in the shaded area at risk of expropriation? Am I not opposed to selling the property but I would have to make arrangements for my elderly mother who lives there.</td>
<td>If your mother’s property is located in the shaded area, it is likely proposed to be part of the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan for the proposed land use and zoning information, I would refer you to the Victoria Park tab at the link. With respect to plans and the risk of expropriation, Victoria Street South is a Regional Road and under the jurisdiction of the Region of Waterloo and not the City of Kitchener. You may want to contact the Transportation Planning Staff at the Region’s Office for more information related to future plans and risks to your mother’s property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47 Talbot Street</td>
<td>February 5, 2019</td>
<td>The zoning has not been changed. The street is residential. My understanding is that secondary plan means it is a focus areas within the City, which other area are not a focus area. The area needs a community centre that appropriately reflects the neighbourhood’s diversity.</td>
<td>There is information on our website to explain the Neighbourhood Planning Review process. In summary our Secondary Plans and Zoning for these neighbourhoods is out of date as some of these plans are 25-30 years old. The review is necessary to implement new legislation and direction from the Province, Region and City and other agencies. The City also uses Urban Design Guidelines to guide growth and development in addition to zoning regulations. You are correct in that there are some services that are under the jurisdiction of the Region and others that are under the jurisdiction of the City. Planning is one service that is provided at both the Regional and City level. Our plans must conform to the higher order Regional plans. Secondary Plans are done to guide growth and development for a specific geographic area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21-170 Cherry St</td>
<td>February 5, 2019</td>
<td>It is difficult to get the big picture of “secondary plan” development. Are the house on the street in the shaded area at risk of expropriation? Am I not opposed to selling the property but I would have to make arrangements for my elderly mother who lives there. The area needs a community centre that appropriately reflects the neighbourhoods diversity.</td>
<td>It is difficult to get the big picture of “secondary plan” development. What are alternative tools beside zoning? What are the pros and cons of alternative tools? It is difficult to understand how City of Kitchener / Region of Waterloo work together. How Kitchener has control, and what is outside of Kitchener control. My understanding is that secondary plan means it is a focus areas within the City, which other area are not a focus area. There is information on our website to explain the Neighbourhood Planning Review process. In summary our Secondary Plans and Zoning for these neighbourhoods is out of date as some of these plans are 25-30 years old. The review is necessary to implement new legislation and direction from the Province, Region and City and other agencies. The City also uses Urban Design Guidelines to guide growth and development in addition to zoning regulations. You are correct in that there are some services that are under the jurisdiction of the Region and others that are under the jurisdiction of the City. Planning is one service that is provided at both the Regional and City level. Our plans must conform to the higher order Regional plans. Secondary Plans are done to guide growth and development for a specific geographic area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No information.</td>
<td>February 25, 2019</td>
<td>I am generally supportive of higher density to enable simpler redevelopment throughout the city because it makes housing more affordable, makes the city more lively and walkable, and increases the tax base. For this specific neighbourhood, I would support a change of all the RES-5 zones to RES-6. It would also make a lot of sense to change the RES-4 area along Victoria Street to RES-5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10