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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.

### VICTORIA PARK

**General Guidelines**

| Note_ These guidelines were developed by the Victoria Park neighbourhood as part of an Urban Design Charrette held on February 20, 2019. They reflect the vision, goals and objectives set out in the PARTS Central Plan and in the Neighbourhood Secondary Plan. |

- Improve access, visibility and wayfinding to the Iron Horse Trail, particularly to the connection running south along West Avenue from Victoria Park.
- Explore programming opportunities for the Henry Sturm Greenway (open space along the Iron Horse Trail next to the bridge). This area should be master planned as part of a greater Victoria Park planning exercise to improve the future design and useability of this space.
- Where new development is proposed along Victoria Street, vehicular access and site servicing should be prioritized via Victoria Street.
- Provide strengthened connections from surrounding neighbourhoods, the downtown and mixed use areas to Victoria Park.
- New development along Victoria Street should be better connected to Victoria Park via a pedestrian crossing on Victoria.
- Additional crosswalks should be explored on David Street and Water Street, to provide better connections to Queen Street, the Iron Horse Trail and the Downtown.
- Additional crosswalks should be explored across Queen Street to improve the pedestrian and cyclist connections between the Victoria Park neighbourhood and the community centre and pool on the east side of Queen Street.

**Parks & Open Spaces**

- A Master Plan should be prepared for Victoria Park to plan for and address opportunities for change in a way that is consistent with the objectives of the Victoria Park Area Heritage Conservation District Plan. This may include making improvements to underutilized spaces to address the needs and expectations of park patrons, better connecting the park with the surrounding neighbourhood, streets, commercial areas and trails; as well as identifying areas of the park that should be preserved as is and remain unchanged.
- Investigate opportunities to extend Victoria Park towards Victoria Street.
- Create and enhance key gateways to Victoria Park from the surrounding area. This should be strengthened through landscape design and pedestrian access to the park.

**Heritage**

- Low rise development outside of the Victoria Park Area Heritage Conservation District boundary should reference and consider the Victoria Park Area Heritage Conservation District Plan policies and guidelines in order to encourage building design which reflects the existing historic character of the neighbourhood including verandas, gabled roofs, and the use of brick as the dominant building material.
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.
Victoria Park 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 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, 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 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, Jubliee 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.

*Page From 2014 Kitchener CHL Study on Victoria Park Neighbourhood CHL*
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.

Existing development on Homewood Avenue (above)

Existing development on Schneider Avenue within the Victoria Park Area Heritage Conservation District
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 VPAHCD 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 VPAHCD (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.
### 3.0 Process Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>Staff begins Neighbourhood Planning Reviews and commences the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 - May 2018</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>December 4, 2018</td>
<td><strong>Public Information Meeting #1</strong>&lt;br&gt;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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018 – December 2019</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>September – October 2019</td>
<td>Internal City Staff review of all draft secondary plan policies and mapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 2019</td>
<td>All property owners within the Secondary Plan area are sent notice of a Statutory Public Meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 2019</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 Victoria Park. 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>December 2019</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>Spring 2020</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
   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](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
Janette MacDonald, Community Engagement Consultant
Erin Power, Communications & Marketing Associate
Councillor Debbie Chapman
Victoria Park Secondary Plan – Land Use Categories

Low Rise Residential

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: Minimum of 0.6

MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 3 storeys or 11 metres

Low Rise Residential with specific policy area

DESCRIPTION: 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.

Medium Rise Residential

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

Mixed Use

DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, personal services, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses and residential uses.

FSR: Minimum of 2.0 / Maximum of 4.0

MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: None

Mixed Use with specific policy area

DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Same as Mixed Use, however specific policy area will limit to medium intensity form of development.

FSR: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0

MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 8 storeys

Mixed Use with specific policy area

DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES: Same as Mixed Use, however specific policy area will limit to lower intensity form of development surrounding residential neighbourhoods, district character or for cultural heritage reasons. Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, personal services, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses and residential uses.

FSR: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 1.0

MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 3 storeys

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 Conservation

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></td>
<td>RES-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a limited range of low density dwelling types on smaller lots in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Proposed Permitted 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>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="image" alt="Proposed Permitted Residential Uses" /></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><img src="image" alt="Proposed Permitted Residential Uses" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM-1</td>
<td>Accommodate complementary commercial uses within residential neighbourhoods in Community Areas.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Proposed Permitted Residential Uses" /></td>
<td>Artisan's Establishment, Brewpub, Catering Service Establishment, Convenience Retail, Craftsperson Shop, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Office, Personal Services, Propane Retail Outlet, Restaurant</td>
<td>3 storeys</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="image" alt="Proposed Permitted 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>
</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><strong>Mixed Use</strong></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><strong>Mixed Use</strong></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 Services Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>10 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 1.0 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<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>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><strong>Open Space</strong></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><strong>Natural Heritage Conservation</strong></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 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.
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 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.
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
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
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
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.
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...

### 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>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>
<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>
</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...

#### Front Porches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<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>Importance</th>
<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>Importance</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? (i.e. requires new development to respect existing built form?)

#### Setbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</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? (i.e. requires that buildings form a consistent street edge?)
<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>379 Queen St. S.</td>
<td>N2C 1W6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133 Foxboro Dr. BADER</td>
<td>N3B 3W2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 ROLAND ST.</td>
<td>N2G 1K5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 Schneider Ave</td>
<td>N2G 1K7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158 Benton</td>
<td>N2G 3H8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58 THERESA N</td>
<td>N2G 1N1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Oak St. Fit</td>
<td>N2C 1L3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 Schneider Ave</td>
<td>N2G 1K8</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>Email Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63 Heinz Ave, Rd. N2G 1Z7</td>
<td>N2G 1Z7</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>775 Queen St S Kitchener N2N 1A5</td>
<td>N2N 1A5</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 Michael St.</td>
<td>N2G 1L8</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Richmond</td>
<td>N2G 1Z1</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 Brock St.</td>
<td>N2M 1K3</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 Dill St.</td>
<td>N2G 1L1</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93 David St</td>
<td>N2G 1Y1</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93 David St</td>
<td>N2G 1Y1</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</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>Email Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104 WATER ST. S.</td>
<td>N2G 1Z5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69 Brock St.</td>
<td>N3M 1X2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600 PARK ST.</td>
<td>N2G 1M3</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>N2G1PS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 HEINJ</td>
<td>N2G 1Z2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1505 - 221 Queen St. S</td>
<td>N2G 1W5</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>54 Monteagle Cres</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 Bruck St</td>
<td>N2M 1X2</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>12/16 - 310 Queen 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>184 David Street</td>
<td>N2G 1Y5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176 David St.</td>
<td>N2G 1X5</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 neighbour hood character?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
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Write your additional comments here:

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: [redacted]
Mailing Address: 184 David Street
Email: [redacted]
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 neighbourhood

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   I 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 neighbourhood character?

   Smart building design

Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
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
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 info 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 Stipends and Opportunities for Public Input should be provided. Is this the last chance for public input? Seems like a Don’t 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

Aviod Another Planning Debacle

Like the Drewlo Iron Horse Tower
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 TO 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: 100 DILL ST, ABB G 1L
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 Jubiliee 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.

Figure 2. David Street Apartments
Thank you Tina and Brandon for the feedback and the really helpful clarification.

It appears there was just a simple typo, and changing the notation to ‘Mix-4’ as you noted should resolve our confusion.

Katie - can you please ensure the Pre-Submission Consultation Meeting record include a note on this? Also, can you please add us to the distribution list for any future updates on the Secondary Plan moving forward?

Over the coming weeks we will be looking into alternatives for the site based on the clear feedback received at the Pre-Submission Consultation Meeting and will be in touch with Katie and Dayna towards the refinement of a concept.

Thanks again, and we look forward to working on this project with you all.

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.
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 required 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 Donegan <Tim.Donegan@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>
Subject: New Victoria Park Secondary Plan - Implications on Park and Victoria Block

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 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 the 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 and 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 1-866-966-9994 | 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’ -  

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.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

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 VHPCD 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. 19). 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 Vrbanić 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.

Hi Tina,

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?

The first few panels provide more information on the process and the hierarchy of documents.

Specifically, I would like more explanation of the document "Information Panels."

Questions:

1. Is there a descriptive document of overall objectives and changes?

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/development 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.

2. The boundaries of the VHPCD do not align with the Secondary Plan, so what plans are being made that would impact on the VHPCD plan?

The boundaries of the VHPCD do not currently align with the existing Victoria Park Secondary Plan. The proposed new boundary of the Victoria Park Secondary Plan would impact the VPHCD plan.

3. How does the Parks Plan relate to the Secondary Plan?
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

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

Ecological Restoration Areas Overlay
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
2. Medium Density Mixed Use
3. 187 Queen St N
4. 189 Queen St N
5. 30-40 Margaret Ave

Possible 2-3 story buildings
800 units

Big change will have dramatic effect on property value
Not consistent with current vision or natural growth patterns

From HCDO
What does this look in practice?
Existed
Habitat House
Low Rise R-3
Intent to Intensify?

BIG CHANGE WILL HAVE DRAMATIC EFFECT ON PROPERTY VALUE
NOT CONSISTENT WITH CURRENT VISION OR NATURAL GROWTH PATTERNS
Webber is a high-density urban corridor; it connects downtown to Waterloo and all other routes. This is the new post-WWII densification. Sites of future high-density development.
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

Please find my comments on this plan review attached.

Kind regards,

23 and 27 Herlan Ave., Kitchener
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?
   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
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: ________________________________
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
E  Stephen.Hurlburt@manulife.com
T  519 747 7000 x244693

500 King St N
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2J4C6

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 current land use designations. Primary concern is with new builds being in line with the current neighborhood styles/setbacks.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   - Proposed zoning 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.

Victoria Park Secondary Plan Review
Hello

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
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 your 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</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|    | Written: August 28, 2018 | 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 | 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. |

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 "C" - 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 | Written: December 3, 2018 | **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? | 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. I.e. 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?  
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. |
| 3 | 805 Queens Boulevard  
Written: December 6, 2018 | 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. | 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. |
| 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>6</td>
<td>184 David Street</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>Thank you for your interest and participation in the Victoria Park Secondary Plan review process. Most 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></td>
<td>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></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. Proposed zoning largely makes sense. Strongly opposed to the building vertically in the area surrounding the park. 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 esthetics 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</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. I also support the proposed zoning change from RES-7 to RES-5 along the same Victoria Street corridor mentioned above. 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. 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 notifies 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>Written: January 24, 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>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.</td>
<td>Staff to review additional modeling for these properties and consider which zone is most appropriate for this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 Water Street South</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>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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 10 Water Street South
Written: February 20, 2019

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. 19). 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 Urbanovic 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. So, 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

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? |

| | 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. |
| | 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. |

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.
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 the 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.

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

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 required site-specific Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment Applications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15 | 23 Richmond Avenue Written: January 30, 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? | 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. |
|          |                  | Additional Comments |                                                                |
|          | 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. | 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. | |
<p>| 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. |
|          |                  | 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. | This area is part of the Urban Growth Centre and subject to the land use designation policies in the Urban Growth Centre. |
|          |                  | 2. This area is excluded from the Victoria Park Plan. Will it be an area for expansion of high rise (10+)? | 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. |
|          |                  | 3. Currently low rise, subsidized housing is scheduled to be high rise | This area is designated Low Rise Residential and cannot be developed with high rise buildings. |
|          |                  | 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 part of the Urban Growth Centre and subject to the land use designation policies in the Urban growth Centre. |
|          |                  | 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 floodplain and fully regulated by the GRCA. |
|          |                  | 6. This triangle is wild and often wet. There needs to be more parkland for the vastly increased numbers of downtown residents. | The undesignated trail is located in 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? | |</p>
<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? 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</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>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>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>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></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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17 | Written: December 4, 2018 | 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 | 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. |

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.
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.