Table of Contents

1.0 Objective ................................................................................................................................................. 2
2.0 Considerations ........................................................................................................................................... 2
  2.1 Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) – Midtown Study Area ........................................... 3
  2.2 Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS) ......................................... 3
  2.3 Urban Design Guidelines (UDG) ............................................................................................................ 3
  2.4 Cultural Heritage Landscape Study and Implementation ................................................................... 5
3.0 Process Timeline ....................................................................................................................................... 31
4.0 Public Consultation Materials .............................................................................................................. 33
  4.1 Open House #1 .................................................................................................................................. 33
     Notice of Open House ........................................................................................................................... 34
     Staff Presentation ............................................................................................................................... 36
     Existing and Proposed Land Use Maps ............................................................................................... 45
     3-D Renderings .................................................................................................................................. 49
     Neighbourhood Character .................................................................................................................. 57
     Cultural Heritage ............................................................................................................................... 65
     Scanned Sign In Sheets ....................................................................................................................... 71
     Scanned Comment Forms ................................................................................................................... 71
     Public Comments received by Email .................................................................................................. 71
  4.2 Open House #2 ................................................................................................................................ 118
     Notice of Open House .......................................................................................................................... 119
     Information Panels/Maps ..................................................................................................................... 121
     Scanned Sign In Sheets ....................................................................................................................... 146
     Scanned Comment Forms ................................................................................................................... 148
     Public Comments Received by Email ................................................................................................ 150
5.0 Public Comments and Staff Responses ............................................................................................. 242
6.0 Justification and Summary .................................................................................................................... 263

APPENDIX C – CEDAR HILL AND SCHNIEDER CREEK SECONDARY PLAN
1.0 Objective

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

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

1.1 Location Map
2.0 Considerations

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

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

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

2.2 Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

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

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

2.3 Urban Design Guidelines (UDG)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fieldwork and Analysis

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

- Topography
- Narrow streetscapes
- Consistent street edge
- Variety of housing types
- Common characteristics among single detached dwellings
- Range of dates of construction and a mingling of early and late housing, high rise structures and institutional buildings
- Gateway entrances into the neighbourhood
- Significant views and vistas within and beyond the neighbourhood.
- A team of City staff with expertise in heritage planning, policy planning and urban design conducted several site visits and used the evaluation form to record existing conditions on each street within the Secondary Plan area boundary. Notable areas were identified, including groupings or collections of streets and properties having similar significant or unique heritage characteristics. Some of the working maps generated from these on-site visits are illustrated below.
Review of Land Use & Zoning

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Courtland and Madison looking northeast**

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

Courtland and Cedar looking northeast

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Engagement & Comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Measure to be considered in the Official Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

  Zoning and land use applied to properties on Cedar Street from the top (or crest) of the hill southward toward and including properties at the intersection with Courtland Avenue East; should regulate building height, setbacks and built form to maintain and protect the long view of the City and countryside beyond. Properties contained within the Cedar Hill viewshed as identified on Map 2, are considered to be of specific CHL interest. Development proposed on such property and which may impact the Cedar Hill viewshed, may be subject to a Heritage Impact Assessment (see discussion on Properties of Specific CHL Interest below). Properties of specific CHL interest and contained within the Cedar Hill viewshed include:
  - 128 St. George St.; and
  - 148 and 160 Courtland Ave. E.

- **Encourage development to maintain terminating vista views**

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

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

the terminating vista to 105 Cedar Street South looking southeast from St. George Street; and,

the terminating vista toward 63 Courtland Avenue East looking southwest from Hebel Place.

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

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

While the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Cultural Heritage Landscape boundary encompasses the majority of the Secondary Plan area, it is not the City’s intent to potentially require a HIA for development on any and all property within the CHL boundary. Rather, it is recommended that within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek CHL, the ability to require a HIA be limited to planning and development applications having the potential to impact property identified as being of *specific CHL interest*. Such properties are identified on Map 2 and include the following:

- protected heritage property designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- property “listed” on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register under Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- property identified as being of cultural heritage interest and recommended for listing on the Municipal Heritage Register (until such time as a decision is made by Council on formally listing the property);
- property located adjacent protected and listed heritage property;
- property within and forming part of an identified gateway; and,
- property on Cedar Street South, St. George St. and Courtland Avenue East within and forming part of the identified view shed of the long view atop Cedar Hill.

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

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

• The following additional properties are identified as being of cultural heritage interest and should be further reviewed and considered for listing on the Municipal Heritage Register through the City’s 4-step listing process:
  
  o Stamped concrete houses on Peter Street between Whitney Place and the footbridge at Schneider Creek, municipally addressed as 123, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, and 146 Peter Street;

  o 49 and 53 Courtland Avenue East which reportedly have direct ties to the J.M. Schneider and Ahrens families, who were prominent industrialists and community leaders; and,

  o 157-159 Benton Street at the northeast corner of Benton Street and Martin Street, reportedly the oldest house in the Benton, Cedar, Courtland and Mill Street area, built c. 1879.
Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan - Secondary Plan and Cultural Heritage Landscape Boundaries
### 3.0 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Staff Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td><strong>Staff Action</strong>&lt;br&gt;Staff begins Neighbourhood Planning Reviews and commences the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan. This review incorporates the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017/18 - May 2018</td>
<td><strong>Staff Action</strong>&lt;br&gt;Staff prepare material with relation to specific neighbourhood character topics to present to the public for feedback about what works well within their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29, 2018</td>
<td><strong>Public Information Meeting #1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Public were asked to answer questions interactively using stickers regarding neighbourhood character topics including: front porches; garages; built form transition; building design, materials and colours; setbacks; view (Cedar Hill); and, terminating vistas. Public feedback collected through a “dot-mocracy” exercise and by written submissions following the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018 – October 2018</td>
<td><strong>Staff Action</strong>&lt;br&gt;Using data collected from the public meeting Staff identified what tools could be used to regulate each of the topics and developed how each could be incorporated considering the level of importance as identified by the participants at the public meeting. Staff prepare material to present a draft of the land use plan and zoning map at the next public information meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30, 2018</td>
<td><strong>Public Information Meeting #2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Staff present information in an open house setting with the draft land use designations and zones for the neighbourhood. The public have the opportunity to ask staff questions and submit any further comments by comment form or through e-mail following the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2018 – December 2019</td>
<td><strong>Staff Action</strong>&lt;br&gt;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><strong>Staff Action</strong>&lt;br&gt;Internal City Staff review of all draft secondary plan policies and mapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 2019</td>
<td><strong>Staff Action</strong>&lt;br&gt;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 #3</strong>&lt;br&gt;Staff present all draft maps for six secondary plans, including land use and zoning maps for Cedar Hill Schneider Creek. The public have the opportunity to as staff questions and submit final comments by comment form or e-mail following the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2019</strong></td>
<td>Staff conduct a final review of all secondary plan maps with public comments received and prepare a report for council. Final draft maps are finalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2020</strong></td>
<td>Secondary Plans Report to Committee/Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Public Consultation Materials

4.1 Open House #1
   Notice of Open House
   Staff Presentation
   Existing and Proposed Land Use Maps
   3-D Renderings
   Neighbourhood Character
   Cultural Heritage
   Scanned Sign In Sheets
   Scanned Comment Forms
   Public Comments received by Email
May 8, 2018

To: Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

RE: Public Open House – Neighbourhood Specific Secondary Plan Review
New Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan
The First Step in the Process of Applying Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations

The City would like to formally invite you to participate in the Neighbourhood Specific Review of the City’s Secondary Plans. We are starting with the review of what will become the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. The boundary of this new secondary plan would combine the existing Cedar Hill Secondary Plan with a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan (see location map below).

A Public Open House is scheduled as outlined below:

WHEN: Tuesday, May 29, 2018
6:30 pm – 8:30 pm (Drop-in and working stations)
7:00 pm (15 minute staff presentation)
Location: Kitchener Market – Community Room
300 King Street East
An updated land use framework within the City’s Secondary Plan areas was deferred as part of the review of our new 2014 Official Plan. The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters. A ‘Secondary Plan’ is a more detailed land use and policy document that forms part of the Official Plan, and is used by the City to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city.

The Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study. The City is now in a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans. This will begin with the review of the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan and a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan, proposed to become the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.

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

We want to canvass your opinions on the preferred land uses, and understand your opinions on the character that you would like to see in your neighbourhood. This will help us determine what regulatory tools should be implemented to protect these features. These tools can include traditional planning tools like zoning regulations and urban design guidelines, and/or other tools such as heritage listings and designations.

The Public Open House will include a number of working stations to provide an opportunity to discuss and share your input on the land uses proposed for the new Secondary Plan and the character that you would like to see in the secondary plan area. The evening will include a brief staff presentation at 7:00 pm to provide some background information, the format of the Open House, and next steps.

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

Help guide the implementation of land use, zoning, heritage conservation and urban design in your neighbourhood by attending our public open house on May 29th!

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

Yours truly,

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

Brandon Sloan, Manager, Long Range and Policy Planning
Alain Pinard, Director of Planning
Janette MacDonald, Community Engagement Consultant
Councillor Frank Etherington
Neighbourhood Specific Reviews
Proposed New Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan

Open House
May 29, 2018
Agenda and Format

6:30 p.m.  Arrival, Sign-in
Rotating around room with individual opportunity to write down information and ideas and discuss study with staff

7:00 p.m.  Overview Presentation
Rotating around room with individual opportunity to write down information and ideas and discuss study with staff

8:30 p.m.  Conclusion
The Secondary Plans were deferred as part of the new Official Plan (2014)

- Station Area Planning – PARTS Central Plan
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Cultural Heritage Landscape Study
- RIENS Study
Process

• In a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans through a process called a Neighbourhood Specific Review

• The implementation of various studies; i.e. PARTS, CHLS, RIENS

• Starting with the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan and a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan
Secondary Plans (1994 OP)
Proposed Boundary
How Can You Provide Input?

Station 1: Sign-In and Information

Station 2: Existing Land Use and Proposed Land Use

Station 3: Neighbourhood Character (Urban Design/Cultural Heritage)

Station 4: 3D Modelling
Process/Next Steps

• Work has begun on the review of the first new Secondary Plan
• This is the first Open House/Engagement Session on the preliminary work
• Will take all the information back from this session
• Apply land use designation and zoning to lands with the new proposed Secondary Plan boundary
• Further consultation/engagement
• No Council decisions in 2018
FOR ONGOING AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION on this project or to provide written comments at any time, please view the City’s website at https://www.kitchener.ca/en/planning-and-development-consultations.aspx

Email comments to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca

or contact the Project Manager
Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP, Project Manager/Senior Planner
519-741-2200 x7765 (TTY:1-866-969-9994)
tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
Current Land Use Policies in Existing Secondary Plan Areas

Legend

Existing Land Use
- Low Rise Conservation
- Low Rise Multiple Residential
- Low Density Multiple Residential
- Medium Density Multiple Residential
- High Density Multiple Residential
- Convenience Commercial
- Low Density Commercial Residential
- Medium Density Commercial Residential
- High Density Commercial Residential
- Neighbourhood Institutional
- Community Institutional
- Major Institutional
- General Industrial
- Mixed Use Corridor
- Neighbourhood Park
- Open Space

Existing Special Policy Area

Proposed Secondary Plan Boundary

Regulatory Flood Line

Floodplain
- Floodway
- Flood Fringe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Uses</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range of Permitted Uses</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Maximum Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential Conservation</strong></td>
<td>Within these areas, the existing built form and streetscape character within these established neighbourhoods is intended to be retained and conserved. Adaptive reuse of existing housing stock strongly encouraged. New dwelling construction will respect and be compatible with the established character of the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>Low density housing types including single detached dwellings, duplexes, multiple dwellings and small-scale multiple dwellings.</td>
<td>FSR: 0.6</td>
<td>Maximum: 3 storeys (4 if onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Suitable for low density urban settings, existing built form and streetscape character within these established residential are intended to be retained and conserved. Adaptive reuse of existing housing stock strongly encouraged. New dwelling construction will respect and be compatible with the established character of the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>Low density housing types including single detached dwellings, duplexes, multiple dwellings and small-scale multiple dwellings.</td>
<td>FSR: minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 2</td>
<td>Maximum: 8 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Suitable for low density urban settings, existing built form and streetscape character within these established residential are intended to be retained and conserved. Adaptive reuse of existing housing stock strongly encouraged. New dwelling construction will respect and be compatible with the established character of the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>Low density housing types including townhouse dwellings in a cluster development, multiple dwellings, and special needs housing.</td>
<td>FSR: minimum of 1 / maximum of 4</td>
<td>Maximum: 8 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>High density multiple dwellings and special needs housing to achieve a high intensity of residential use.</td>
<td>High density multiple dwellings and special needs housing.</td>
<td>FSR: minimum of 1 / maximum of 4</td>
<td>Maximum: none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Density Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.</td>
<td>Retail, office uses, day care, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, artist-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.</td>
<td>FSR: minimum of 1 / maximum of 2</td>
<td>Maximum: 24 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation Employment</strong></td>
<td>Recognizes a growing demand for employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers:’ Predominantly office and high-tech manufacturing.</td>
<td>Creative production industries, artisan’s establishment, studio (art and music), craftman shop, live/work space, shared facilities, galleries, studios, office space for creative professionals, and retail sales associated with production of goods and materials.</td>
<td>FSR: minimum of 1 / maximum of 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land use, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Density Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.</td>
<td>Retail, office uses, day care, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, artist-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.</td>
<td>FSR: minimum of 1 / maximum of 4</td>
<td>Maximum: none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature.</td>
<td>Secondary and post-secondary educational facilities; long-term care facilities; social, cultural, and administrative facilities; small-scale institutional uses compatible with surrounding uses such as public and private elementary schools, libraries, day care centers, and places of worship.</td>
<td>FSR: minimum of 1 / maximum of 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Heritage</strong></td>
<td>These natural heritage features are intended to be protected and/or conserved for their ecological functions. Natural heritage features can include provincially or locally significant wetlands, valleys, woodlands, threatened or endangered species habitat, and lands subject to natural hazards or flooding. No new development is permitted in these areas.</td>
<td>Conservation activities; forest, fish, and wildlife management; and small scale passive recreation activities (i.e. trails).</td>
<td>FSR: minimum of 1 / maximum of 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Flooding Hazard Overlay

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

In the Flooding Hazard Overlay, no new development or site alteration will be permitted. Development is limited to land uses that, by their nature, must locate within the floodway, including flood and/or erosion control works, structures necessary for conservation, water supply, wastewater management, or minor additions or passive non-structural uses which do not affect flood flows. Generally, these lands are intended to be designated Natural Heritage Conservation.

In the Flood Fringe, development, redevelopment, or site alteration may be permitted, subject to appropriate floodproofing standards to the flooding hazard elevation or another flooding hazard standard approved by the Minister of Natural Resources.

### Ecological Restoration Areas Overlay

Ecological Restoration Areas are lands and waters that have the potential to be enhanced, improved, or restored to a more natural state, contributing to the overall diversity and connectivity of the Natural Heritage System. Ecological Restoration Areas are identified by the City in order to enhance the diversity and connectivity of the Natural Heritage System and to provide habitat supportive of the overall sustainability of the system.

Development, redevelopment or site alteration will not be permitted unless an Environmental Impact Study or another appropriate study evaluates the area’s ecological functions in its optimal ecological state and demonstrates to the satisfaction of the City, Region, Grand River Conservation Authority and/or Province, as appropriate, that there will be no adverse environmental impacts on the restored feature or the ecological functions of the feature in its optimal ecological state.

### What is Floor Space Ratio (FSR)?

Floor Space Ratio (FSR) is the amount of building floor area that may be developed on a property and is dependent on the lot area. The value is calculated by dividing the building floor area by the lot area.

**Flooding Hazard Overlay**
- Flooding Hazard Overlay
- Flooding Hazard Overlay

**Ecological Restoration Areas Overlay**
- Ecological Restoration Areas Overlay

**What is Floor Space Ratio (FSR)?**
- What is Floor Space Ratio (FSR)?

**Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan – Land Uses**
- Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan – Land Uses

[Diagram showing floor space ratio and examples of building densities]
The purpose of this station is to:

1. Describe the existing and desired 'look and feel' of the neighbourhood

2. Determine what level of regulation should be applied in order to maintain and achieve the desired 'look and feel' of the neighbourhood

Neighbourhood character refers to the 'look and feel' of a specific area. It is shaped by a combination of public and private elements, such as buildings, topography and natural features. Heritage conservation measures and urban design guidelines contribute to neighbourhood character. More specifically, they may provide direction on such things as such things as: architecture and urban design; variety of eras of construction; scale of buildings; vistas and views; condition of buildings; streetscape design and amenities; hard and soft landscaping; wayfinding; and, colour.
POTENTIAL TOOLS TO PROTECT NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER IN CEDAR HILL-SCHNEIDER CREEK

OFFICIAL PLAN/SECONDARY PLAN POLICIES

An Official Plan serves as a roadmap for managing future growth, land use, and environmental protection. An Official Plan is prepared with input from the community and contains objectives and policies to balance social, economic and environmental interests. The policies deal with matters such as land uses, housing, natural heritage & environmental management, urban design and cultural heritage resources. A Secondary Plan is part of the Official Plan and contains more detailed policies and land uses for a specific geographic area.

ZONING BY-LAW REGULATIONS

A Zoning By-law establishes and regulates the use of land by implementing the policies of the Official Plan, such as:

- the use of land or buildings or structures (e.g. residential, commercial)
- The location of buildings or structures on a lot (e.g. distance of buildings from lot lines)
- the height and amount of floor area that can be developed on a lot
- the number, size and location of parking spaces

A Zoning By-law cannot:

- Distinguish on the basis of ownership or occupancy
- Regulate architectural design, landscaping, construction materials, or colours
- Preserve natural environment features such as trees
SITE PLAN CONTROL

Site Plan Control is the process that is used to regulate the various features on the site of an actual development. The goal is to improve the image of the City through better individual developments by applying consistent standards and guidelines. The process reviews features such as building and site design, building location, shadows, buffers and landscaping, grading and drainage, storm water management, lighting, garbage and loading areas, parking and access by pedestrians and vehicles.

Before making improvements to a property, Site Plan Control may be required if you are planning to:
- Construct a new building or addition
- Undertake major building renovations, which substantially increase the size or usability of a building or structure
- Establish a commercial parking lot
- Make alterations to an already approved site plan

A municipality must pass a Site Plan Control By-law outlining the types of development that require site plan approval. At present, Kitchener’s Site Plan Control By-law does not apply to:
- A single-detached dwelling
- A semi-detached dwelling
- A duplex

URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES

Urban Design Guidelines establish the objectives, priorities and expectations for urban design in the City. In Kitchener, the guidelines are consolidated into the Urban Design Manual, which contains urban design guidelines, design briefs and design standards. The guidelines apply to projects across the City and address such things as building types, streetscapes and accessible features. The design briefs provide detailed design guidance for specific types of development, areas or land uses (e.g. PARTS, Tall Buildings). The design standards address matters such as parking, lighting and landscaping. The manual is used by City staff and the development industry in the review and approval of specific types of development applications, such as official plan amendments, zone change applications and site plan control applications. The guidelines are flexible and do not have the same regulatory power as other tools such as the Zoning By-law.
HERITAGE DESIGNATION OF INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES

Heritage designation is a tool that municipalities use to protect heritage properties. It recognizes the importance of a property to the local community; protects the property’s cultural heritage value; encourages good stewardship; and, promotes knowledge and understanding about the property. It involves the adoption of a Designating By-law, which applies to the real property and provides a description of the property, a statement of cultural heritage value or interest, a description of the heritage attributes, and a legal description of the property. If an owner of a designated property wishes to make alterations that affect the heritage attributes then the owner must apply for a Heritage Permit from the municipality.

HERITAGE LISTING OF INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES

Listing is a tool that municipalities use to identify properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest to the municipality. It recognizes the importance of a property to the local community; provides an interim protection from demolition; and, enables the City to require a Heritage Impact Assessment with the submission of a Planning Act application such as a Site Plan.

Unlike designating an individual property, listing does not provide protection under the Heritage Act. Owners are not required to apply for a Heritage Permit to alter the heritage attributes of their property.
Select up to three (3) images that best reflect the character that you want to see in your neighbourhood.

Based on the image(s) you selected above, how important is it that the City regulates this feature?
BUILT FORM TRANSITION

Select up to two (2) images where you think the built form transition (e.g. the difference in height between buildings) has been done well.

Based on the image(s) you selected above, share your comments about what you like and what you don’t like related to the built form transition.

BUILDING DESIGN, MATERIALS & COLOURS

Select up to two (2) images that best reflect the building design, materials and/or colours that you want to see in your neighbourhood.

Based on the image(s) you selected above, share your comments about what you like and what you don’t like related to the building design, materials and/or colours.
How important is this view from the top of Cedar Street near St. George?

Would this view be more important if you had an opportunity to spend time here in a parkette or seating area?

TERMINATING VISTAS

How important is it to maintain the built form at the end of streets?
SETBACKS

Select up to two (2) images that best reflect the character that you want to see in your neighbourhood.

How important is it that buildings form a consistent street edge?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

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

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

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

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

Other Tools
• Corridor Management Plans
• Park Management Plans
• Stewardship Activities
• Public Education
• Commemoration and Interpretation
Existing Built Heritage Resources

Legend
- Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Boundary
- Heritage Conservation District (HCD)
- Municipal Heritage Register
  - Listed
  - Part IV (Individual Property)
  - Part V (Victoria Park Area HCD)

Examples of Heritage Properties
- 90 Church St (Part IV)
- 160 Courtland Ave (Listed)
Proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) Boundary and Heritage Attributes

Legend

- Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Boundary
- Cultural Heritage Landscape Study Boundary
- Proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape Boundary
- Ground Elevation (in metres)
  - < 322
  - 322 - 325
  - 325 - 330
  - 330 - 345
  - > 345
- Terminating Vistas
- View at Top of Hill
- Entrance Views
- Grouping of Buildings on Peter St
Cedar Hill Neighbourhood Cultural Heritage Landscape

Proposed Heritage Attributes

- Topography of land
- Variety of housing types
- Common housing design characteristics
  - Front porches
  - Peak roofs
  - Detached rear yard garages
  - Brick or appearance of brick
- Range of construction dates
- Mingling of early and late housing, high-rise structures, and institutional buildings
- Variety of density that blends within the predominantly low rise built form
- Consistent street edge (front yard & exterior side yard setbacks)
- Grouping of buildings on Peter Street between Whitney Place and the dead end
- Narrow street design
  - Narrow right-of-way
  - One-way streets
  - Narrow road width
  - Narrow or no sidewalks
  - Narrow or no boulevards
  - Public street trees
  - Private front yard trees that contribute to streetscape
  - Shallow front yard and exterior side yard setbacks
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.
Proposed New Listings on the Municipal Heritage Register

Legend
- Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Boundary
- Proposed Properties to be Listed on the Municipal Heritage Register
- Grouping of Buildings on Peter St between Whitney Pl and dead end
- 123-146 Peter St

- Bonnie Stuart Building
  - 141 Whitney Pl

- Entrances off of Benton St and Charles St into the neighbourhood
  - 40 Madison Ave S
  - 35 Cedar St S
  - 101 Charles St E
  - 76 Charles St E
  - 93-99 Benton St/39-43 St George St
  - 135 Benton St/46 Courtland Ave E
  - 37-39 Courtland Ave E
Well I don't think I have heard a planning/zoning meeting referred to as "fun" however I think that is great that you think that Brandon.

I am a tad remiss is not responding earlier about the meeting.

I would like to add my appreciation to the City for coming out and doing such a great job helping us to get a better understanding of the complexities of a Secondary Planning process. It is daunting to realize just how much work must go into developing the plan plus figuring out how to present the plan in a way that residents can understand both the process and the plan. As I am quite familiar with many of the other residential areas, I am glad our meeting was "fun".

I was not present at the initial meeting so I did not understand that Schneider Creek is linked to Cedar Hill but in reviewing the explanation, that link makes total sense.

I very much appreciate the efforts to listen and hear what we have been saying for so many years and that "hearing" is clearly reflected in the plan.

It is important that residents understand that any plan is just that...a plan and can be changed through other committees such as the Committee of Adjustments so we need to be vigilant and contribute when we are aware that the "Plan" is being challenged.

It was exciting to see that every street was represented with people clearly invested in their "little corner" of Cedar Hill.

Looking forward to the next meeting.

Kind regards
Karen

On Fri, 2 Nov 2018 at 08:55, <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca> wrote:

| It was a fun night. |
| -we require tree management as part of the site plan process |
| -I made the Director of Transportation aware of the traffic comments |

**Brandon Sloan**

Manager, Long Range & Policy Planning | Planning Division | City of Kitchener

519-741-2200 x7648 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | brandon.sloan@kitchener.ca
Tina:

Thanks very much.

I do actually have a question from a neighbour who wasn't able to attend but is very interested. He is really concerned that there are a number of very old trees at the back of the properties on Courtland and that these might all go with redevelopment. He sent me a photo and I think he was looking particularly at the properties between Peter and Benton, some of which are quite deep although it may be all of the area. No doubt this is something that might be expected in an older area. Would you be able to explain how plans such as these take the tree inventory of the area into account? Thanks very much.

One other thing -- one of the people at the meeting asked about the development that seems to have started on Benton close to Courtland. I walked past and it seems to be a work site. However, I think this is actually storage for the Arrow project.

Sally

On 11/1/2018 9:10 PM, Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca wrote:

Thank you Sally and Lori for your email and comments. Thank you to all for organizing this meeting.

It was our pleasure to come out to your neighbourhood meeting and provide more information on the Secondary Plan Review for the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek area. It was great to see the turn out and the amount of interest in this project.

Transportation Planning will be consulted on the new Secondary Plan and land uses,
and in consultation with them, we will consider how best we can deal with the traffic concerns during the planning process.

We appreciate the input and look forward to the process ahead.

In the interim, please let me know if there are any further questions or comments.

Thank you again for your participation thus far.

Regards,

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

From: Lori Gove
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 9:46 AM
To: 'Sally Gunz' <Sally.Gunz@kitchener.ca>; Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Cc: Brandon Sloan <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Zoning meeting thank you and traffic on Church street

My thanks for the great meeting also.

I want to echo Sally’s comments re traffic in the neighbourhood. I am on Church and the traffic has intensified since the work started on the LRT. Vehicles race down Church between Benton and Cedar, and as there is no traffic calming/bumps or stop signs they travel very fast. We feel like we live beside a hiway. Requests to the councillor and the city for some action have met with deaf ears I am afraid. WE have 3 bus stops on Church and I am afraid the day will come when one of those kids, or a
senior trying to get across the street, will get hit.

Traffic; it’s speed and number of vehicles going down Church is our number one concern these days! Please pass this on to your colleagues when you discuss traffic in the Cedar Hill neighbourhood.

Lori Gove

From: Sally Gunz
Sent: October 31, 2018 8:30 AM
To: Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca; Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca; Lori Gove
Cc: Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca
Subject: Re: Another change to flyer---directions to Community Room

Tina:

Thanks again very much for the meeting last night. This was the best kind of community meeting so far as I am concerned. People clearly are really interested and they could ask what they wanted. Thanks also for meeting with our friends the Watsons at the end. They have a perfectly maintained home and have been dealing with some really crappy owners near them probably speculating. Not unlike some of the bad times in the Cedar/Eby block. I think they feel scared obviously about possible change and any thoughts about how design features etc might impose more thoughtful development when it happens and allow for them to live where they are and as they live as long as they wish.

I wanted to mention a couple of things as I fear I sounded like a traffic nut (i.e. no change ever because of traffic). I am not. I drive and I use public transit. Two things though:

1. Re Peter St: my only concern is that the engineering people work closely with you and your plans. We were given a choice of no parking or one way on Peter St St. G to Courtland. Stark choices. Our argument was any change on Peter will affect other streets and St. G and Church in particular. It will affect how people live. Our request was simply for the city to consider changes more holistically. As I think of your very good goals of ensuring the protection of existing neighbourhoods, I think we must consider any change that affects that. So, e.g., if Peter becomes one way I will have always to use either St. G or
Church to access my home by car. Now maybe that reduces some through traffic. Not sure (and it won't affect St. G as that is one way so people won't now be turning left from Peter). But it needs thinking through along with your plans. Note: right now the engineering plans are on hold for at least another year. The rationale for not taking a very small allowance (to allow wider sidewalks) was trees but apparently the one relevant tree (corner of Courtland) is slated for removal soon anyway. Not sure this is the answer but it is one of several options here.

2. Re Courtland: the changes to traffic there recently are quite remarkable. And however much we want to divert to public transit I think we have to be realistic about what will happen on Courtland. This is a major thoroughfare to the downtown and particularly since Charles is less useable by cars. Right now, at peak times it is actually hard to make a right turn out of Peter. I don't know anyone who tries to make left turns -- too much going on. We have seen several nasty accidents at what were earlier very minor intersections. What complicates things is the two schools. Maplegrove adds a good deal of traffic to Cedar and Courtland to the lower half of Peter and I suspect that is why we have more bumps.

I am not suggesting no intensification on Courtland. However, real care will have to be taken to make sure cars can exit the properties. I know the Watsons have a lot of difficulty now and have all kinds of alternate approaches including parking on Peter which itself now has little parking available most of the time. I don't know what design features can be used but I think it will be important to consider. I am always afraid for the pedestrians with cars making a quick turn in breaks of traffic. Right now the problem is mainly peak times but I cannot imagine with the lack of alternate routes that this will not change.

Thanks again.

Sally (not a traffic nut!!)

On 2018-09-28 12:59 PM, Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca wrote:

No issues with the flyer.

Thanks,

Tina
If everyone is ok I will arrange for flyer to be printed.

Karen

--

Karen Taylor-Harrison
Cedar Hill Community Group

--

Karen Taylor-Harrison
Cedar Hill Community Group
Brandon:

Sorry for taking so long to reply. Thanks and I will pass this on to my neighbour.

Sally

On 2018-11-02 8:55 AM, Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca wrote:

It was a fun night.
- we require tree management as part of the site plan process
- I made the Director of Transportation aware of the traffic comments

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

Tina:

Thanks very much.

I do actually have a question from a neighbour who wasn't able to attend but is very interested. He is really concerned that there are a number of very old trees at the back of the properties on Courtland and that these might all go with redevelopment. He sent me a photo and I think he was looking particularly at the properties between Peter and Benton, some of which are quite deep although it may be all of the area. No doubt this is something that might be expected in an
older area. Would you be able to explain how plans such as these take the tree inventory of the area into account? Thanks very much.

One other thing -- one of the people at the meeting asked about the development that seems to have started on Benton close to Courtland. I walked past and it seems to be a work site. However, I think this is actually storage for the Arrow project.

Sally

On 11/1/2018 9:10 PM, Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca wrote:

Thank you Sally and Lori for your email and comments. Thank you to all for organizing this meeting.

It was our pleasure to come out to your neighbourhood meeting and provide more information on the Secondary Plan Review for the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek area. It was great to see the turn out and the amount of interest in this project.

Transportation Planning will be consulted on the new Secondary Plan and land uses, and in consultation with them, we will consider how best we can deal with the traffic concerns during the planning process.

We appreciate the input and look forward to the process ahead.

In the interim, please let me know if there are any further questions or comments.

Thank you again for your participation thus far.

Regards,

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

From: Lori Gove
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 9:46 AM
To: 'Sally Gunz' <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>; Tina MaloneWright
Cc: Brandon Sloan <Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Zoning meeting thank you and traffic on Church street
My thanks for the great meeting also.
I want to echo Sally’s comments re traffic in the neighbourhood. I am on Church and the traffic has intensified since the work started on the LRT. Vehicles race down Church between Benton and Cedar, and as there is no traffic calming/bumps or stop signs they travel very fast. We feel like we live beside a hiway. Requests to the councillor and the city for some action have met with deaf ears I am afraid. We have 3 bus stops on Church and I am afraid the day will come when one of those kids, or a senior trying to get across the street, will get hit. Traffic; it’s speed and number of vehicles going down Church is our number one concern these days! Please pass this on to your colleagues when you discuss traffic in the Cedar Hill neighbourhood.

Lori Gove

From: Sally Gunz  
Sent: October 31, 2018 8:30 AM  
To: Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca; Lori Gove  
Cc: Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca  
Subject: Re: Another change to flyer---directions to Community Room

Tina:

Thanks again very much for the meeting last night. This was the best kind of community meeting so far as I am concerned. People clearly are really interested and they could ask what they wanted. Thanks also for meeting with our friends the Watsons at the end. They have a perfectly maintained home and have been dealing with some really crappy owners near them probably speculating. Not unlike some of the bad times in the Cedar/Eby block. I think they feel scared obviously about possible change and any thoughts about how design features etc might impose more thoughtful development when it happens and allow for them to live where they are and as they live as long as they wish.

I wanted to mention a couple of things as I fear I sounded like a traffic nut (i.e. no change ever because of traffic). I am not. I drive and I use public transit. Two things though:

1. Re Peter St: my only concern is that the engineering people work closely with you and your plans. We were given a choice of no parking or one way on Peter St St. G to Courtland. Stark choices. Our argument was any change on Peter will affect other streets and St. G and Church in particular. It will affect how people live. Our request
was simply for the city to consider changes more holistically. As I think of your very good goals of ensuring the protection of existing neighbourhoods, I think we must consider any change that affects that. So, e.g., if Peter becomes one way I will have always to use either St. G or Church to access my home by car. Now maybe that reduces some through traffic. Not sure (and it won't affect St. G as that is one way so people won't now be turning left from Peter). But it needs thinking through along with your plans. Note: right now the engineering plans are on hold for at least another year. The rationale for not taking a very small allowance (to allow wider sidewalks) was trees but apparently the one relevant tree (corner of Courtland) is slated for removal soon anyway. Not sure this is the answer but it is one of several options here.

2. Re Courtland: the changes to traffic there recently are quite remarkable. And however much we want to divert to public transit I think we have to be realistic about what will happen on Courtland. This is a major thoroughfare to the downtown and particularly since Charles is less useable by cars. Right now, at peak times it is actually hard to make a right turn out of Peter. I don't know anyone who tries to make left turns -- too much going on. We have seen several nasty accidents at what were earlier very minor intersections. What complicates things is the two schools. Maplegrove adds a good deal of traffic to Cedar and Courtland to the lower half of Peter and I suspect that is why we have more bumps.

I am not suggesting no intensification on Courtland. However, real care will have to be taken to make sure cars can exit the properties. I know the Watsons have a lot of difficulty now and have all kinds of alternate approaches including parking on Peter which itself now has little parking available most of the time. I don't know what design features can be used but I think it will be important to consider. I am always afraid for the pedestrians with cars making a quick turn in breaks of traffic. Right now the problem is mainly peak times but I cannot imagine with the lack of alternate routes that this will not change.

Thanks again.

Sally (not a traffic nut!!)

On 2018-09-28 12:59 PM, Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca wrote:

No issues with the flyer.
Thanks,
Tina

From: Karen Taylor-Harrison
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 12:45 PM
To: Gunz Sally; Lori Gove
Subject: Another change to flyer---directions to Community Room

If everyone is ok I will arrange for flyer to be printed.
Karen

--
Karen Taylor-Harrison
Cedar Hill Community Group
Wonderful. Thanks

John MacDonald
Principal
John MacDonald Architect inc.

On Sep 19, 2018, at 9:26 AM, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

John,

We do not have a date as to when a next or final draft will be available for comment. This is one of three new Secondary Plans that I am working on.

Our aim is to bring final drafts of plans/policies of the Secondary Plans to Committee/Council in the last quarter of 2019.

It is the City’s practice as well as a Planning Act requirement to provide a commenting period when considering new or amendments to Secondary Plans and corresponding zoning. Accordingly, there will be notification and an ability to comment at a future date in time.

Regards,

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

From: John MacDonald <john@johnmacdonaldarchitect.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2018 12:09 PM
To: Tina Malone-Wright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Cc: Greg Hayton <haytongreg@gmail.com>, Leon Bernaison <Leon.Bernaison@kitchener.ca>, Preet Kohli <Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Re: 141 Whitney Place - Secondary Plan for Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek

Thanks Tina. That’s great.

What is the date of issue for these next drafts or final package? Will we be notified and sent the draft? We’d like to receive any further draft or final in time to comment.

John

On Sep 18, 2018, at 11:19 AM, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

John,

I apologize if my email implied that Michelle had responded to you previously before my email this morning. I know she did not. My email is the first communication that you have received from the City.

Michelle did not get a chance to before she left early on maternity leave and asked that I send the reply to you on her behalf being the Project Manager of the new Secondary Plan. I simply quoted her email so that you would know that the comments were provided by Michelle in response to the email that you directed to her. My comment "in the interim" refers to the fact that we are still working through the comments and making revisions to the land uses, policies and zoning in advance of coming back to the community. Typically, the comments that we receive on draft plans and policies and the responses to them, are usually reflected as a whole in a next draft or final package. We have taken a slightly different approach with this process and are providing individualized responses in advance of a next draft or final package for approval.

Thank you for your additional comments. We will take them into consideration as we move forward with the new Secondary Plan and policies.

Regards,

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

From: John MacDonald <john@johnmacdonaldarchitect.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2018 10:37 AM
To: Tina Malone-Wright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Cc: Greg Hayton <haytongreg@gmail.com>, Leon Bernaison <Leon.Bernaison@kitchener.ca>, Preet Kohli <Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca>
Subject: Re: 141 Whitney Place - Secondary Plan for Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek

Tina,

Thanks for that. We had not received any reply to our e-mail of July 16. Your communication is the first.

Within your communication you appear to be quoting Michelle Drake with quotation marks as though it’s from some form of communication to me, and state: In the interim, Michelle Drake provided the following in response to your email before she left on maternity leave.

Please be advised that we have received no such communication from Michelle Drake or anyone else on this matter, in response to the July 16 e-mail to Michelle with copy to yourself.

It is most disturbing that the City believes it has replied, when it has not.

Cultural Heritage Landscape Study

Regarding the view down Cedar as it pertains to 141 Whitney, we continue to disagree that such a view constitutes any different a vista than in hundreds of locations across the City where a street turns or there is a T-intersection. We assume that the City is not going to list every one of these and see no reason for the property to be on a list under the Heritage Act.

Perhaps the Cultural Heritage Landscape Study more generally looks at the vista from the top of the hill at Cedar near St. George? In that instance the City may wish to discuss height limitations to properties in the immediate lands to the south and east on the shoulder of the hill, but I suggest it hardly applies to 141 Whitney in the bottom distance without reference to any other property on such a list.

Can the City please specifically identify the statements in the CHL Study that name our property please, given that Michelle appears to be citing the Study with direct reference to just our property or its importance in the vista. I do not see any reference in the Study to 141 Whitney nor to a vista or condition that pertains. In the case that the City is citing more generalized statements in support of its position, I believe that reinforces the point that the City surely doesn’t wish to list all such properties because they happen to be located at the end of the street. This makes little sense to us, as being having singled out.

With Respect to Making Our Neighbourhood Great, Schneider Creek Document

It is the particular nature of the Schneider Creek neighbourhood that the road structure and topography creates a nice sense of enclosure and a bit of a contrasting openness in the two orientations of the grid of streets in the neighbourhood. This is hardly a heritage matter to be listed but a matter of character that should be taken into account whenever development is proposed. I suggest that the appropriate response to this character, if restrictions need to be in place formally, is to place some restriction on the City to not change its street pattern without considering this character (for instance, by joining Whitney to Madison by expropriating a portion of our and church property), and also not undertaking to change the topography in the rights-of-way by raising or lowering them substantively.
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**Requested Action**

We continue to disagree strongly that any listing be placed upon the 141 Whitney property. Please remove it from consideration.

Thank you.

---

**John MacDonald,**

**CityWorks**

---

**On Sep 18, 2018, at 10:00 AM,**  

< Tina Malone-Wright@kitchener.ca >; Tina Malone-Wright@kitchener.ca wrote:

Hi John,

Thank you for your email and for the comments that you provided in response to the information that we presented at the Community Engagement Session on the proposed new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan on May 29th, 2018.

We have been working through the comments and work is still progressing on the land use plans, associated policies and zoning.

In the interim, Michelle Drake provided the following in response to your email before she left on maternity leave.

"John,

Staff have identified important terminating vistas that contribute to the cultural heritage landscape within the proposed Cedar Hill Schneider Creek secondary plan area. These terminating vistas were initially identified based on the Kitchener Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood: Making our Neighbourhood Great! document identified as a community asset and view, and various site visits and discussions among the staff working team. At the May 29, 2018 public open house, the majority of residents responded that terminating vistas within the neighbourhood were either somewhat important, or very important. One of three examples of a terminating vista provided to residents was that of 141 Whitney Place.

Staff are not proposing to designate 141 Whitney Place. Staff are proposing that terminating vistas be listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. Some of the terminating vistas are already listed while other are not. Currently, 141 Whitney Place is not listed.

It is important to understand the impact of listing on the Municipal Heritage Register. Listing does not provide protection under the Ontario Heritage Act, does not impose restrictions or obligations with respect to obtaining heritage approvals under the Ontario Heritage Act (e.g. a Heritage Permit is not required, review by the City’s Heritage Kitchener committee is not required, etc.), and does not require Council approval to make alterations. Listing has two implications. First, listing does increase the amount of time municipalities have to process demolition applications made under the Ontario Building Code to provide time to evaluate whether a property merits some form of protection, such as designation, under the Ontario Heritage Act, which is subject to a separate legal process with appeal mechanisms. Second, listing does allow the City to ask for a Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan, if necessary, as part of a complete Ontario Planning Act application in order to address conservation policies outlined in the Ontario Planning Act and the Provincial Policy Statement.

Staff will consider your comments along with those of other residents and members of the public as we continue to draft the secondary plan for this area.

There will be future opportunities to provide your comments on the proposed new Secondary Plan and proposed zoning.

Should you have any questions or additional comments at this time please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

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:** John MacDonald <john@johnmacdonaldarchitect.ca>

**Sent:** Monday, July 16, 2018 6:06 PM

**To:** Michelle Drake <michelle.drake@kitchener.ca>; Tina MaloneWright <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>

**Cc:** Greg Hayton <haytongreg@gmail.com>

**Subject:** 141 Whitney Place - Secondary Plan for Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek

Michelle,

I’ve conferred with other building ownership at 141 Whitney Place, based on the City’s potential review of the property at 141 Whitney Place as somehow being worthy of a form of heritage designation. This idea was floated in the recent public meeting for the new Secondary Plan for Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek, which I attended.

We object strongly to the potential for such designation, and see no grounds for it. We ask that the property be removed from any such consideration.

My understanding from conversation is that the criterion for such a designation is that it may end a vista (although not much, as a single storey building at the bottom of a slope). By this criterion there would be an enormous number of properties with heritage designation, at every abrupt turn in street or T-intersection.

We do not believe this is at all grounds for contemplating a designation.

Please do not hesitate to call if you require further clarity regarding our position in this matter.

I’m cc-ing Greg Hayton, who liaises with Globe Studios, for information.

Thank you for your consideration.

On behalf of the property ownership (Globe Studios (K-W) and CityWorks Development and Management Inc.

---

**John MacDonald,**

**CityWorks**
Consider the environment before printing.
This e-mail may contain information that is confidential and is intended for the named recipient. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system.
Hi Tina, thanks for confirming receipt and that you will be reviewing and considering them as the project moves forward. I understand on the materials for next week’s meeting and I hope to be there!

Bryan

From: Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca>
Sent: November 14, 2018 2:01:58 PM
To: SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca; Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca; Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca
Cc: SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca; Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca; Brandon.Sloan@kitchener.ca
Subject: FW: Schneider Creek/Cedar Hill Secondary plan

Hi Bryan,
Thank you for the attached compiled comments on behalf of some of the residents within the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood.

We will definitely review the comments but given the timing of the comments and the meeting on Tuesday, November 20, 2018, they may or may not be reflected in the visuals and other materials that are proposed to be presented at the meeting.

Moving forward, these comments and any comments that we receive with respect to the visuals/materials presented on Tuesday evening will be considered in the final draft of the new Secondary Plan and Zoning when it goes to Committee in the Fall of 2019. If I have any questions or need further clarification on your neighbourhood’s comments, I will definitely be in touch.

Hopefully you and the residents of the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood will be able to attend on Nov. 20th. See you then.

Regards,
Good evening Tina,

Please find attached compiled comments on behalf of some residents within the Schneider Creek neighbourhood. If you have any questions on the attached or would like to discuss further please let me know.

Thank you

Bryan

Hi Bryan,

Thank you for letting me know.

I look forward to receiving the comments and feedback on the consultation materials that were presented at the Open House.

Regards,

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

I wanted to let you know that neighbours in the Schneider Creek neighbourhood have met to discuss comments on the proposed secondary plan for the area. We are still finalizing comments and will have them sent to you shortly.

Thanks, happy Canada day!

Bryan Cooper
Proposed Secondary Plan – Comments provided by residents within the “Schneider Creek” neighbourhood:

● **Boundary of Secondary Plan:**

  Why was the corner of Courtland Ave and Benton (148 Benton St) not included in the boundary of the secondary plan? This land is currently vacant and treed and forms a natural boundary of the neighbourhood. This property should be included in the boundary of the secondary plan and appropriate land use designations and zoning applied. Consideration of extending the secondary plan to the limits of property ownership (25 Courtland Ave) would make sense.

● **Existing site specific policies – former Schneider Factory and Courtland Ave public school:**

  Current secondary plan has site specific policies for these lands. Are these policies intended to be eliminated with the new secondary plan or will they be carried forward? Site specific policies should be provided for these lands since they represent likely redevelopment opportunities in the neighbourhood. Access prohibitions from any local roads (Benton, Martin, Peter, Cedar) should be incorporated into the policy and zoning as well as site specific standards for building setbacks (stepbacks and terracing), landscaping and buffering of parking areas. City should consider a proactive neighbourhood design charette for these sites in advance of completion of the secondary plan to guide the long term redevelopment of these lands.

● **Benton St and Martin St- land use designations:**

  In order to maintain the low rise residential character of Benton St, 145, 147, 149 Benton St should be designated low rise residential conservation as is proposed on the opposite side of Benton St.

  Similarly 26 Martin St and the Martin St frontage of 63 Courtland Ave should be designated low rise residential conservation and zoned accordingly to ensure that any new development completes what is currently a disrupted low rise residential streetscape.

● **Building height and regulations along Courtland Ave:**

  Agree with including height restrictions along Courtland Ave; however, careful consideration of the interface between existing homes along Martin St and Cedar St. is required including accounting for the grade changes between Courtland Ave and Martin St. This difference in topography should be considered in determining
the overall building height. For example, the maximum building height of a development fronting on Courtland Ave. in this area should be determined from the lowest point of the shared rear lot line of the properties on Martin St. that back onto properties fronting on Courtland Ave. This will assist in mitigating the impact of taller buildings and provide for the continued enjoyment of the private backyard space of the Martin Street residences which is important since the proximity of our homes to the street, or public space, means that our private spaces are limited to our rear yards. These much needed and valued spaces add great benefit to our residents in terms of liveability.

There are concerns that with Bonusing permissions a developer may be able to exceed any height restriction applied in the secondary plan. This is of particular concern due to the above mentioned grade changes between Courtland Ave. and Martin St.

The maximum height regulations for Courtland Ave should be a metric measurement rather than measured in “storeys” since the ceiling height of each storey can have a significant impact on the overall height of the building (e.g Breithaupt Block 3). This also gives greater certainty to the public in how tall a building may be.

Zoning standards such as stepbacks should be applied to any new multi storey building so that the building heights are at the lowest height at the interface of existing low rise buildings and property. Building massing and height should be oriented towards Courtland Ave rather than existing single detached dwellings and local streets.

Parking areas and structures need to be carefully managed particularly at the interface of existing low rise residential areas. The overall building height should include any parking structure. Parking structures should not project above grade to avoid blank walls backing onto to homes or streets.

Building setbacks to Courtland Avenue - front yard setbacks should be measured from the existing limits of this Regional road rather than from any future road widening taken by the Region. This will avoid pushing a building closer to the rear yard area of homes on Martin St.

- **Severance/minor infilling criteria:**
  Criteria should be developed to consider any new severance applications within the neighbourhood. Criteria should include whether the lot has sufficient frontage to properly accommodate a new building, parking and landscaping. Properties in
the neighbourhood have very narrow frontages and the lack of boulevard means that any landscaping needs to be provided within the front yard of private property. Wide driveways and attached garages within the front yard should not be permitted.

Some form of architectural control or site plan approval should be required for new infilling of severance lots (or rebuilding of an existing lot) to ensure building style is compatible with surrounding building stock (materials, roof pitch, etc). Garages should be limited to being detached and in the rear yard. Policies should be developed that require new developments to be respectful of the character of the streetscape of this unique neighbourhood - with the open porches, the front doors facing the street, the narrow lots, tightly squeezed houses, tiny front yards, the rooflines, etc.

- **Front yard landscaping in new developments:**
  A suggestion was made by staff at the neighbourhood meeting about the possibility of publicly owned trees within private front yard space for new developments. This should be implemented since there is no opportunity for trees to be installed within the City owned road. Financial securities should be taken for the publicly owned trees with an extended hold period post construction to ensure that they are established and thrive.

- **Zoning Standards:**
  Minimum front yard landscaped open space standard should be incorporated in the zoning of the area to maintain limited front yard landscaping. Maximum driveway width standards that account for the very narrow lot frontages of the area should also be applied. A minimum landscaping strip along the side lot lines within the front yard to eliminate driveways being installed across the frontage of a property or connecting with adjoining lots should also be applied. This is particularly important for any home that is duplexed to ensure that already small front yards of the neighbourhood are not paved over.

- **Transportation:**
  Courtland Ave currently functions as a barrier between the Schneider Creek and Cedar Hill neighbourhoods. The PARTS plan indicates some streetscaping enhancements are intended for this Regional road - how will this implemented and coordinated with the Region and new development in the area and what opportunity for public involvement will there be.

Parking - zoning standards require too much parking for new multi-unit developments and as a result too much of a site is often dedicated to surface
parking when it could be better utilized as amenity space and landscaping. Consider reducing parking standards.

**General Comments on the neighbourhood and new development:**

**Diversity:**
The community would like to see new developments provide spaces for families as well as single people and couples - in doing this we will continue to support this community allowing it to remain vibrant and diverse. Families will also ensure that existing infrastructure, such as schools, remain useful. Consider standards that would require a developer to incorporate some family sized dwelling units.

**Streets:**
Concerns have been raised regarding the often very narrow, yet charming, streets in this area with regard to their ability to handle increased traffic - it would be inappropriate or undesirable to have any new developments use these streets as a back door access - - part of the charm of our community are these often one way, narrow streets which greatly enhance and encourage our social engagement. This close proximity of homes and street provides a unique opportunity to gather, chat and play on the street itself. This makes the community feel safe because we have eyes on the street and know our neighbours.

**Walkability:**
It is a great community asset to be able to walk or bike the iron horse trail or amble around to our parks and downtown. Not always needing a car is something we hope to see supported through the new growth. - - the experience at street level will be key to encouraging foot traffic, so scale of buildings, materials used and a mix of uses including shops and retail needs to be planned. Potential destinations are needed.

Residents understand the need to move traffic along but suggest lowering the speed limit on regional roads and streets in the core to improve walkability since it contributes to the enjoyment of living in the core.

**Sidewalks:**
The current sidewalks on some side streets are quite narrow and result in many pedestrians choosing to walk on the street. In addition, steeply angled driveways create slants that make it difficult to maintain your balance and can lead to overturned strollers, childrens’ tricycles and wagons, as well as slips and falls, particularly in poor weather conditions. This can be especially problematic for anyone with a mobility challenge or the elderly. In addition the narrow sidewalks leave very little space to put snow or garbage/green bin/blue bins which results in an additional mobility barrier.
Residents acknowledge that the streets in the area were relatively recently reconstructed and therefore there may not be an immediate solution to this issue but wanted to highlight the problem to the City and would like some direction on what process to engage the City in when the time comes for reconstruction of the streets. When the time comes for reconstruction it will be important to consider alternative designs to address this issue but that is still respectful of the character of the neighbourhood.

Trees and green spaces:
The community would like to see an increase in the minimum allotment of green space around new buildings - more lawns, gardens, trees make for a pleasing streetscape and add to community enjoyment. We know this helps promote overall goals that the city has already indicated wanting to achieve.
Good afternoon Tina,

Please see attached our comments for the proposed Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.

If you have any questions or would like any further clarification, please do not hesitate to ask.

Thank you and have a good long weekend.

Regards,

Amanda Stellings
Planner | Polocorp Inc.

379 Queen Street South | Kitchener, ON | N2G 1W6
P: 519-745-3249, ext. 203 | C: 519-591-9704
amanda@polocorpinc.com
June 29, 2018

VIA e-mail

Attention: Tina Malone-Wright, Senior Planner

Reference: Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review
19-41 Mill Street, Kitchener

Dear Ms. Malone-Wright,

In review of the proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan, Polocorp Inc. wishes to provide comments on the information provided as part of the Public Information Meeting #1 held on May 29, 2018. As part of our comments, the following documents have been reviewed:

- Notice of Meeting;
- Staff Presentation;
- Existing & Proposed Land Use;
- 3-D Rendering;
- Neighbourhood Character;
- Cultural Heritage.

While the goals and directions of the Plan are consistent with those for the Region and City, we would request a revision to the plan as it relates to the lands municipally addressed as 19-41 Mill Street.

In review of the documents, alongside the policies contained within the PPS (2014), Growth Plan (2017), Regional Official Plan (2015), and City of Kitchener Official Plan (2014), we wish to formally recommend that the land use designations for the above-noted lands be changed from 'Medium Rise Residential' to 'High Density Mixed Use' to accommodate future growth while providing both residential and commercial (live/work) uses within the community.

1.0 SITE CONTEXT

The subject lands are municipally addressed as 19-41 Mill Street within the City of Kitchener and are located within 800 metres of a Light Rail Transit station and approximately 300 metres away from the identified urban growth centre for Downtown Kitchener in the Growth Plan (2017).

To the north of the subject lands is Victoria Park, accessed via Queen Street South and the Iron Horse Trail. Victoria Park is the oldest park within the City and is approximately 45 acres (18
hectares) in size, providing recreational and active transit opportunities to the public, including future residents of the proposed development.

To the northeast, accessed via Queen Street South, is the Downtown core for the City of Kitchener, containing a variety of public recreational, retail, and hospitality services, as well as City Hall. The Downtown, identified as an urban growth centre within the 2017 Growth Plan, is approximately 300 metres from the subject lands.

Directly to the east, and across the street on Mill Street, is Mike Wagner Green, a trail and green space that connects to the Iron Horse Trail.

The southern property boundary of the subject lands is shared with the Iron Horse Trail, connecting to the City of Waterloo and Victoria Park to the west, and continuing towards Rockway Golf Course to the east. South of the Iron Horse Trail are CN rail tracks, bordering a commercial/industrial complex to the south.

The properties along Queen Street are designated as ‘Mixed Use Corridor’ within the Mill Woodside Park Neighbourhood Plan for Land Use as well as the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Central Plan. This designation is intended to allow for future development along Queen Street South, an arterial road into the Downtown core of Kitchener.

Figure 1: Subject lands
The subject lands are within close proximity to existing tall buildings (illustrated in Figure 2), including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Image ID</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>588 &amp; 600 Queen Street South</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11 storeys</td>
<td>Zone Change Application Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Horse Towers</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14 storeys</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park Towers</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>14 storeys</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barra on Queen Condos</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6 storeys</td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow Lofts</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10 storeys</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Existing and proposed tall buildings

2.0 PLANNING CONTROLS


The Province released an updated Growth Plan in 2017 that provided significant density goals for the Region of Waterloo and its lower-tier municipalities, requiring that the majority of growth be directed to settlement areas. Within this plan, 60% of new development must occur within a delineated built-up area, while maintaining a strategy to meet the policies of section 2.2.2 delineated built-up areas within the Growth Plan. In the 2017 Growth Plan has increased the targets for residential development occurring with the delineated built-up area from 40% to 60%, which are required for consideration as part of the Regional Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review in 2019.
A major transit station area is defined as an, “area including and around any existing or planned higher order transit station or stop within a settlement area; or the area including and around a major bus depot in an urban core. Major transit station areas generally are defined as the area within an approximate 500 metre radius of a transit station, representing about a 10-minute walk”.

While the subject lands are outside of the 500 metre radius of a transit station, they are located within 800 metres of the transit station, which the City has used a criteria for inclusion within their Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) plans. The proximity of the subject lands to higher-order transit provides an opportunity to provide residential dwellings that have access to multiple modes of transit, while also maintaining a location in close proximity to outdoor recreational space. These factors result in an opportunity to contribute to a complete community, in alignment with policy 2.2.1.2. of the Growth Plan.

City of Kitchener Official Plan

Queen Street South is identified as a ‘Transit Corridor’ within the City’s Official Plan, supporting the designation as an Urban Corridor, as per policy 3.C.2.37. As such, the Queen Street South Mixed Use Corridor is considered a Primary Intensification Area as per policy 3.C.2.3., defined as, “lands intended by City, Region or the Province that are to be the focus for accommodating intensification. Primary Intensification Areas include the Urban Growth Centre (Downtown), Reurbanization Corridors, Major Transit Station Areas, Major Local Node, City Nodes, Community Nodes, and Urban Corridors.”

The subject lands are adjacent to the identified Transit Corridor and Primary Intensification Area, which supports intensified development.

Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Central Plan

The City of Kitchener adopted the PARTS Central Plan in April 2016, which includes the subject lands. The preferred land use plan contained within the PARTS Central Plan is to be implemented through a new Secondary Plan/Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.

The subject lands have been identified for ‘Medium Rise Residential’ within the Plan, which permits an FSR of 0.6 to 2.0, and a maximum height of 8-storeys.

Land use designations within the PARTS Central Plan are intended for the achievement of a minimum density of 160 persons/jobs per hectare, which is required to support rapid transit. The PARTS Central Plan identified the subject lands as an area for increased density, adding height and density to the land use designations.

Since the adoption of the PARTS Central Plan, density targets from the Province have significantly increased within the Growth Plan (2017), resulting in a need to amend the PARTS Central Plan plans and guidelines to accommodate the increased growth.

Mill Courtland Woodside Neighbourhood Plan for Land Use

The subject lands are contained within the Mill Courtland Woodside Secondary Plan as ‘Low Density Commercial Residential’. This plan has been identified as a Secondary Plan requiring updates from the City, to conform to existing policy direction from the Region and City, as well as to implement the vision of the PARTS Central Plan.
3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT & PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A Pre-Submission Consultation Meeting application has been submitted to the City of Kitchener to facilitate the development of a twenty (20) storey multiple residential dwelling consisting of a two (2) storey podium and eighteen (18) storey tower (Figure 3).

Additional street frontage access is provided through the inclusion of live/work units, allowing for a mix of uses and to allow for visual compatibility with the surrounding low-density neighbourhood.

![Figure 3: Proposed development](image)

The proposed development is adjacent to properties identified for high density development along Queen Street, an area subject to increased development pressure as a direct route to the Downtown. Furthermore, the proposed Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan has identified the lands municipally addressed as 585 Queen Street South for High Density Mixed Use (Figure 3).

In the future, the subject lands will be adjacent to high density development. The proposed development allows for a transition to the low-density neighbourhood to the south, through the use of a two-storey podium. The tower has been placed towards Queen Street, for compatibility to the existing and future urban landscape.

Furthermore, the topography of the adjacent sites to the west, along Queen Street will be developed on a higher topography, requiring an appropriate transition to the surrounding neighbourhood to the east. This transition has been incorporated into the proposed development through the use of a podium and through appropriate and compatible architectural and urban design elements.
4.0 REQUESTED REVISIONS TO THE CEDAR HILL SCHNEIDER CREEK SECONDARY PLAN

The intent of the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan is to implement the direction of the PARTS Central Plan, which was approved by Council in 2016, prior to the release of the 2017 Growth Plan.

The proposed land use within the Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Area is for 'Medium Rise Residential'. Within this plan, 'Medium Rise Residential' would permit, "medium density housing types including townhouse dwellings in a cluster development, multiple dwellings, and special needs housing" with an FSR between 0.6 and 2.0, and a maximum building height of 8 storeys.

To permit the proposed development, Polocorp Inc. is formally requesting a change in designation within the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan to 'High Density Mixed Use' to permit, "a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building" and a range in uses. This designation would permit an FSR between 1.0 and 4.0, with no maximum building height.

The revision to the plan represents good planning as it reflects the goals of the Province and Region to provide density in areas that have access to transit. This particular site is adjacent to an identified Transit Corridor which is also a Primary Intensification Area within the City’s Official Plan.

The lands to the southwest of the site, along Queen Street South (municipally addressed as 585 Queen Street) were identified in the PARTS Central Plan as ‘Medium Density Mixed Use’ and have been transitioned into the proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Area as ‘High Density Mixed Use’, understanding that development pressures along Queen Street will
reflect the need to bring residential and commercial development into the Downtown from Queen Street, where existing municipal services and infrastructure currently exist.

5.0 MOVING FORWARD

Polocorp Inc. formally requests that the land designation for the subject lands be changed to ‘High Density Mixed Use’ to accommodate the changes in planning policies on the provincial, regional, and local levels. This is in alignment with the proposed development for the subject lands, as submitted for a Pre-Submission Consultation Meeting. Development in this area is ongoing, and the land uses within the Secondary Plan should be consistent to reflect the changes that will occur within, and adjacent to Queen Street South, identified as a Transit Corridor and Primary Intensification Area.

Furthermore, we would request that you include us on any future correspondence as it relates to this Secondary Plan.

Regards,

Paul Puopolo, President, MCIP, RPP, OALA
Polocorp Inc.

Amanda Stellings, Planner

CC: Pam Tolton, ABA Architects
    Mike Puopolo, Polocorp Inc.
Hi

Good to hear from you. All the info, including 3D renderings are posted here:


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

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 28, 2018 3:40 PM
To: Brandon Sloan
Subject: Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek area

Hi Brandon,

My name is [Redacted] and we met at the public open house secondary review plan for the new Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek area. I am emailing you to see if you could provide me a digital package of some or all the information that was presented during the open house. I own the house at 49 Courtland Ave East, so ideally information that applies to the houses on Courtland/Benton would be beneficial.

In addition to the new proposed zoning, if you could send a few of artistic drawings you presented at the open house showing the vision, it would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,

[Redacted]
Thanks Tina.

John

On Jun 27, 2018, at 11:26 AM, tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca wrote:

Hi John,
Thank you for your question. The 3D renderings that were prepared for the May 29th Open House have been placed on the City's website, along with the other information presented at the meeting, and can be found at the link below.


The renderings and modelling that were prepared for the meeting on the 29th were based on the extensive modelling work that was completed for the PARTS Central Plan. The proposed land uses in the new Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan that were shown at the meeting are based on this work and the approved PARTS Central Plan.

I have copied Adam Clark, who was involved in the PARTS Central Plan, attended the May 29th Open House, and created the 3D model and renderings for both projects. For any specific questions, I would suggest contacting Adam. He will be able to assist you in your analysis of potential massing and heights in the proposed secondary plan boundary.

Regards,
Tina

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

Thank you for attending the Open House that was held on Tuesday, May 29th.

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

The timelines for further community engagement have not been set but we do know that no decisions will be made in 2018.

I have the sign in sheets from the Open House and your email address and will be able to keep you informed.

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

Regards,

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

Greetings,

I was at the general meeting around changes in the neighbourhood.

My household and many of our neighbours are not in favour of the zoning change for the west side of Mill street. We would not like to see apartment buildings here.
There are many families here...it's already a nice neighbourhood.
There are many historic buildings here...many century homes.

Sorry for the tardy response...busy times.

Don Featherstone
Hi Tina,

Thank you so much for getting back to me, as well as answering my questions so quickly and thoroughly. I found it really helpful. Thank you again.

Have a great day!

Mindy Constantinou

On Mon, Jun 11, 2018 at 4:54 PM, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hi Mindy,

Thank you for your email and for your interest in the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. For those that were unable to attend the Open House on May 29th, all the information that was presented can be found on the City’s website at the following location.


I have provided answers to your questions noted below.
Hi Tina,

I was unable to attend the Secondary meeting since I have a one and three year old that go to bed around that time, so please forgive me if I’m asking questions that were already answered.

First, I must say that the design of ‘Cedar Hill’ is impressive. The questions I have come more from a parental perspective and I do understand if you don’t have answers at this time, but it doesn’t hurt to ask.

1. How soon do these projects intend to be started?

Tina Malone-Wright] I am not quite sure what you mean by ‘projects’? The City-initiated new Secondary Plan or proponent-driven development applications?

The Open House that was held on May 29th, was the initial meeting to ‘kick off’ the review of the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. We mailed letters advising of the review and this initial meeting to just over 650 properties. The Open House was the starting point to present a draft map of proposed land uses based on the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Central Plan for comment, and to ask for input related to community features and character to inform the development of the Secondary Plan policies and other tools that may be required to assist in the implementation of the Secondary Plan. i.e. zoning, urban design guidelines, cultural heritage tools (listing, designation), site plan control.

Once we have a new draft Secondary Plan, implementing zoning and any appropriate tools, with input from the neighbourhoods, we will be further engaging with the neighbourhoods before anything is brought before Committee/Council.

We advised at the Open House that there would be no Council decisions in 2018.

If your question is with respect to proponent-initiated developments, these are not within the City’s control and the City cannot predict when a particular property will develop/redevelop, if at all.
2. Will all of these new developments happen or are they just ideas at this point?

[Tina MaloneWright] The new Secondary Plan and Zoning will assign land uses and provide zoning regulations to indicate what the maximum permitted development of lands with the secondary plan can be. Any 3D modelling that was presented at the Open House is a representation of “what could be” under the proposed land use designation that were shown at the Open House. Again, proponent-initiated developments cannot be anticipated/predicted. However based on the proposed land use and zoning one can have an idea of what the development potential of a property is.

3. Will residents be made aware of future meetings on development progress?

[Tina MaloneWright] With respect to the new Secondary Plan, there will be additional meetings and community consultation. Proponent-initiated developments would only be made aware to residents if the proponent was seeking an Official Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Minor Variance application to facilitate the development (looking to develop something that is not permitted by the land use designation and/or zoning by-law). Site Plan applications to develop a property within the existing provisions of the zoning by-law are not circulated to the public.

4. Where do the men’s shelters intend to be moved to?

[Tina MaloneWright] The new Secondary Plan will indicate proposed land use and what uses would be permitted in a particular land use designation. If the men’s shelter is not permitted in the new land use designation in the Secondary Plan then this use would become legal non-conforming and be permitted to continue until such time as they relocate to another property. Their decision to stay or relocate based on the proposed land use is theirs and I am not aware of their future plans.

5. Are there plans for new schools as a result of the increased population?

[Tina MaloneWright] The new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan proposes to retain the existing Institutionally designated lands and is not proposing any new lands be designated Institutional. The need for a new school would be determined by the appropriate school boards.

6. Are there ‘green space’ provisions being considered for this mass number of new residents?

[Tina MaloneWright] The provision of ‘Green space’ is a consideration in the development of the new Secondary Plan. Parkland dedication is a requirement of the redevelopment of properties and it can be given in the form of land or monies.

If you have answers or any direction for me regarding these questions, it would be greatly appreciated. And again, I only ask since my main concern is whether this new vision of the downtown has a ‘family friendly’ perspective, or if I should start looking on MLS to potentially relocate.

Thank you again,

Mindy Constantinou
Hi Karen,

Sounds good. We can touch base later this summer, early September to set something up with the Neighbourhood Association.

To answer your question about when the plan became a public document, I am going to assume you meant the Secondary Plan. In short, we have not prepared the formal Secondary Plan for public consultation. We are not there yet.

The City’s ten (10) Secondary Plans were deferred, as part of the review of the new 2014 Official Plan, to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework in these areas. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study and Plans, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).

Now that these studies are done, the City is in a position to commence review of the existing Secondary Plans with a view of bringing them into the new 2014 Official Plan.

The Open House that was held on May 29th, was the initial meeting to ‘kick off’ the review of the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. We mailed letters advising of the review and this initial meeting to just over 650 properties. The Open House was the starting point to present a draft map of proposed land uses based on the PARTS Central Plan for comment, and to ask for input related to community features and character to inform the development of the Secondary Plan policies and other tools that may be required to assist in the implementation of the Secondary Plan. i.e. zoning, urban design guidelines, cultural heritage tools (listing, designation), site plan control.

Once we have a new draft Secondary Plan, implementing zoning and any appropriate tools, with input from the neighbourhoods, we will be further engaging with the neighbourhoods before anything is brought before Committee/Council.

We advised at the Open House that there would be no Council decisions in 2018.

The information presented at the May 29th Open house is posted on the City’s website and I have attached the link for easy reference.

Any comments and/or feedback that the Neighbourhood Association can provide in advance of staff being able to attend a meeting and facilitate is very much welcomed.

Thanks Karen. I hope you and your family have a wonderful summer as well.

Regards,
Tina

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

From: Karen Taylor-Harrison
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2018 12:16 PM
To: Tina MaloneWright; Brandon Sloan
Subject: Thank you

Hi Tina:
Thank you for your response. I think at this juncture, we may have to leave the meeting until September.

Tina, can you please tell me when the plan became a public document?

When will the secondary plan go back to Council?

In the meantime, hope you and your families have a wonderful summer.

Regards
Karen

--
Karen Taylor-Harrison

“Never choose not to do something because it will take too much time; time passes anyway.”

—Anonymous
Hello,

Thank you for attending the Open House that was held last Tuesday, May 29th.

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

The timelines for further community engagement have not been set but we do know that no decisions will be made in 2018.

I have the sign in sheets from the Open House and your email address and will be able to keep you informed.

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

Regards,

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

From: [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, June 03, 2018 8:34 PM
To: Tina MaloneWright
Subject: Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review - Comment Form

Dear Tina,

Please find attached our comments regarding the Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review from the open house.

Thank you,
Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review
Open House Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan Review Open House. Please provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff before 9 pm on May 29, 2018 or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118.

Write your Comments here:

Please consider not including the lots for 11 Mill St & 15 Mill St in the new medium density residential zoning. These two lots are not deep enough for apartment or townhouse development. In addition, we have a commercial business registered at 11 Mill St. so it is imperative that we maintain the mixed residential and commercial zoning for our lot.

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

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 11 Mill St., Kitchener
Email: [Redacted]

Cedar Hill Secondary Plan Review
Thanks Tina for your very thorough response. That makes things much clearer (I was struggling to hear questions and responses at the public meeting as some people were on the quiet side :) This makes much more sense though. Thanks again :)

On 5 June 2018 at 10:57, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Hi Melissa,

Good question and I talked about a number of pieces of the puzzle last Tuesday evening.

The hierarchy of documents under the Planning Act is the Official Plan and Zoning By-law which implements the Official Plan.

The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters for a 20 year timeframe. A ‘Secondary Plan’ is a more detailed land use and policy document that forms part of the Official Plan, and is used by the City to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city. The City’s Zoning By-law (currently By-law 85-1) is a tool that implements the City’s Official Plan. The Zoning By-law contains regulations to state what uses can be developed on a property, the size of a building, its location of a lot and parking requirements, among other things.

The City’s ten (10) Secondary Plans were deferred, as part of the review of the new 2014 Official Plan, to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).

Now that these studies are done, the City is in a position to commence review of the existing Secondary Plan with a view of bringing them into the new 2014 Official Plan.
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On 5 June 2018 at 10:57, <Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca> wrote:
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Good question and I talked about a number of pieces of the puzzle last Tuesday evening.

The hierarchy of documents under the Planning Act is the Official Plan and Zoning By-law which implements the Official Plan.

The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters for a 20 year timeframe. A ‘Secondary Plan’ is a more detailed land use and policy document that forms part of the Official Plan, and is used by the City to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city. The City’s Zoning By-law (currently By-law 85-1) is a tool that implements the City’s Official Plan. The Zoning By-law contains regulations to state what uses can be developed on a property, the size of a building, its location of a lot and parking requirements, among other things.

The City’s ten (10) Secondary Plans were deferred, as part of the review of the new 2014 Official Plan, to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).

Now that these studies are done, the City is in a position to commence review of the existing Secondary Plan with a view of bringing them into the new 2014 Official Plan.
Since the approval of the 2014 Official Plan, the City has also commenced the review of the City’s new Zoning By-law known as the CRoZBy project (Comprehensive Review of the Zoning By-law). The CRoZBy has not applied new zone categories to the lands in the deferred Secondary Plans.

The City has also commenced the review of its Urban Design Manual. A draft of the City’s Urban Design Guidelines will be considered at a meeting on June 18, 2018. The City uses Urban Design Guidelines to assist in the review of development applications but it does not have authority under the Planning Act like a Zoning By-law.

The PARTS, CHL and RIENS studies/plans may have different land uses and suggest different regulations, but they have no legal status under the Planning Act until they are incorporated into an Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

As mentioned, we have commenced the review of the Secondary Plans to update them based on the studies that have been completed and apply new zoning. There could be other tools that the City applies; i.e. new urban design guidelines, tools under the Ontario Heritage Act, and these will be determined through the consultation process.

Hopefully this answers your question. Let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Regards,

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

I attended the open house Tuesday evening and appreciated the opportunity for input. The one question I thought of later was this: with PARTS, CHL, CROZBY, urban guidelines, the OP, RIENS, etc, how do those all fit together? Is there a hierarchy of some sort? I picture them as all pieces to the same puzzle but I am guessing at some point there may be a conflict between some of them. In which case, does something, like the OP, 'trump' the others?

--

Melissa Bowman
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To: Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

RE: Second (2nd) Public Open House – Neighbourhood Specific Secondary Plan Review
New Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan
Process of Updating and Applying Land Use Designations and Zoning Regulations

The City would like to invite you to participate in a Second (2nd) Neighbourhood Meeting for a New Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan and updated zoning. It is scheduled as follows:

Date/Time: Tuesday, November 20, 2018, 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm (Drop-in)
Location: Kitchener City Hall – Rotunda, 200 King Street West

The boundary of this new secondary plan would combine the existing Cedar Hill Secondary Plan with a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan (see location map below).
The City’s Secondary Plans were deferred to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods (RIENS) Study. The City is now in a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans. This will begin with the review of the Cedar Hill Secondary Plan and a portion of the Mill Courtland-Woodside Park Secondary Plan, proposed to become the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.

The City started the review of the Secondary Plans earlier this year. A first meeting was held on Tuesday, May 29, 2018 at the Kitchener Market to introduce the project and identify that we are in an early stage of updating the land use and zoning in the area. At the first meeting, staff provided an overview of the study area, what information is already known, and details on the process and timelines. There was also an opportunity for residents and stakeholders to provide feedback on the proposed land uses and opinions on neighbourhood and streetscape character by providing input on a number of pictures and visuals. The display boards, presentation, questions and comments sheets are on the project website at http://www.kitchener.ca/cedarhill.

The Second Public Open House will provide further opportunities to discuss and share your input on the land uses proposed for the new Secondary Plan and the character that you would like to see in the secondary plan area. In addition, you will obtain more information on zoning regulations and urban design guidelines, and/or other tools such as heritage listings and designations which are proposed to be implemented to protect the character of your neighbourhood.

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

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

Yours truly,

T. Malone-Wright

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

c. Brandon Sloan, Manager, Long Range and Policy Planning
   Alain Pinard, Director of Planning
   Janette MacDonald, Community Engagement Consultant
   Councillor Frank Etherington
   Councillor Debbie Chapman
The Official Plan is a legal document that contains goals, objectives and policies to manage and direct physical and land use change and their effects on the cultural, social, economic and natural environment within the city.

Official Plan policies:
- direct growth and development decisions in the city.
- governs all aspects of community growth and development, community services, movement of goods and people, conservation and protection of the cultural and natural environment, and the preservation of agricultural resources.
- also includes population and employment forecasts and density and residential intensification level targets

City Council adopted a new Official Plan in June 2014
- Ontario Planning Act requires municipalities to amend Zoning By-laws within 3 years of a new Official Plan being in effect
Secondary Plans

Secondary plans are used to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city, indicating the manner in which the goals, objectives, policies and land use designations of the Official Plan will be implemented within respective areas.

In the past Secondary Plans have generally been prepared for existing Built-Up Areas in the city but they may also be prepared in the Designated Greenfield Area.

Once approved, these Plans are incorporated into the Official Plan by formal amendment. Existing secondary plans were created 25-30 years ago.

These were deferred from being incorporated into the new Official Plan (2014) until LRT Station Area Planning was completed (2016-2017)
The City of Kitchener is undertaking a detailed review of the land use and planning framework for many specific neighbourhoods. These are typically locations where there are outdated secondary plans or community plans created 25-30 years ago to help guide the use of land (e.g. where new housing could go, commercial businesses, environmental conservation land, parks, etc.) and policies for new development or redevelopment. To help implement new directions from the province, region, city and other agencies, we are evaluating and updating existing plans to create new ones.

This process involves creating new policies and mapping that will be added to our Official Plan, updating zoning, considering new urban design guidelines and implementing our cultural heritage landscapes. The locations we will review are primarily in the central neighbourhoods, but there are also several other places in the city where we will be engaging with landowners and the neighbourhood to help update these plans. Through this, we will be implementing the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study/Plans, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).
Cultural Heritage Landscapes

In 2014, the City of Kitchener embarked on the first phase of a multi-phased effort to identify and conserve the City’s significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs). The first phase involved taking an inventory, and resulted in City Council approving the Kitchener Cultural Heritage Landscape Study which identifies 55 significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes, including several established residential neighbourhoods.

The City is now beginning its second phase of work, aimed at further identifying the attributes which contribute to making certain CHLs significant, and engaging with property owners on appropriate measures to address the conservation of those attributes and CHLs.
Cultural Heritage Landscapes (cont’d.)

Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) are areas that reflect the interaction of people with the landscape over time, and may include groupings of built heritage, landscape features and archaeological sites that together comprise a significant heritage form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES ARE A COMBINATION OF THREE LAYERS THAT INCLUDE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• THE LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• STREET &amp; LOT LAYOUT - THE PUBLIC REALM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BUILDINGS &amp; OTHER BUILT FORM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES SHOULD:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• HAVE HISTORICAL VALUE or INTEREST (TELL A STORY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HAVE HISTORIC INTEGRITY (BE AUTHENTIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BE VALUED BY THE COMMUNITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Province of Ontario has identified the conservation of cultural heritage resources including CHLs, as an area of Provincial Interest to be considered under the Planning Act and through the Provincial Policy Statement (2014). The Region of Waterloo Official Plan requires that Area Municipalities designate (identify) Cultural Heritage Landscapes in their official plans and establish associated policies to conserve CHLs.
Listed Non-Designated Properties

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

Designated Properties

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, the City can pass by-laws to formally designate properties of cultural heritage value or interest. Formal designation is one way of publicly acknowledging a property’s heritage value to the community. Designation also helps conserve important properties for the enjoyment of present and future generations by ensuring that changes are managed in a way that respects the heritage values. This includes protection from demolition. The City has designated approximately 85 individual properties and 4 heritage conservation districts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Description / Range of Permitted Uses</th>
<th>FSR</th>
<th>Maximum Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Same as Low Rise Residential land use, however specific policy area will limit the number of units in a multiple dwelling to three units. Consideration will also be given to further regulating building height and density. Analysis to be completed to confirm the properties to which the specific policy area will apply.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>11 metres, 3 storeys (4 storeys if fronting onto a Regional Rd or City Arterial St)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>Low density housing types, including Single Detached Dwelling, Duplex Dwelling, Semi-Detached Dwelling, and where appropriate and compatible, other low density dwelling types such as Street Townhouse Dwellings and small-scale Multiple Dwellings.</td>
<td>Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0</td>
<td>25 metres (8 storeys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>High density Multiple Dwellings and special needs housing.</td>
<td>Minimum of 1.0 / Maximum of 4.0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation Employment</strong></td>
<td>Recognizes a growing demand for employment lands for 'start-ups' and 'makers'. Predominantly office and high-tech manufacturing. Creative Production Industries, Artisan’s Establishment, Studio (art and music), Craftsman Shop, Live/Work Space, Shared Facilities, Galleries, Studios, Office Space for creative professionals, and Retail Sales associated with production of goods and materials.</td>
<td>Maximum range between 0.6 and 2.0</td>
<td>6 storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner. Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation, Community Facility and Cemeteries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Heritage</strong></td>
<td>These natural heritage features are intended to be protected and/or conserved for their ecological functions. Natural heritage features can include provincially or locally significant wetlands, valleys, woodlands, threatened or endangered species habitat, and lands subject to natural hazards or flooding. No new development is permitted in these areas. Conservation activities; forest, fish, and wildlife management; and small scale passive recreation activities (i.e. trails).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Residential (RES) Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas**</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St**</td>
<td>Max – 0.6**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas</td>
<td>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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-7</td>
<td>Accommodate high density dwelling types and a range of complementary non-residential uses in high rise residential areas</td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Health Office, Office, Personal Services, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 2.0 Max – 4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to regulations that specify requirements such as: minimum lot width; minimum setbacks of buildings from front, side and rear yard; maximum building height, etc. See draft zoning by-law for specific regulations

** Site specific zoning provisions to be drafted to limit building height and density and the number of dwellings in multiple dwellings to 3 units on properties proposed to receive site specific policy

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Employment</td>
<td>EMP-6</td>
<td>Accommodate the employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers.’</td>
<td>Creative Production Industries, Artisan’s Establishment, Studio (Art and Music), Craftsman Shop, Live/Work Space, Galleries, Studios, Office Space For Creative Professionals, High-Tech Manufacturing, Retail Sales associated with High-Tech Manufacturing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>INS-1</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses intended to serve surrounding residential communities</td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Auditorium, Cemetery, Community Centre, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Health Office, Hospice, Place of Worship, Residential Care Facility, Elementary School</td>
<td>4 Storeys (Max. height – 14 metres)</td>
<td>Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INS-2</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses that are intended to serve a region and/or city-wide population</td>
<td>Auditorium, Cemetery, Community Centre, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Funeral Home, Health Office, Hospice, Place of Worship, Residential Care Facility Large, Secondary School, Health Clinic, Health Office, Hospital, Post-Secondary School, Social Service Establishment</td>
<td>A base shall be required for buildings greater than 14 metres in height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>MIX-1</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a low density</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Cluster Townhouse Dwelling, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Craftsperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Print Shop, Restaurant, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>4 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-2</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings and mixed use developments at a medium density</td>
<td>Uses allowed in MIX-1 plus Large Residential Care Facility, Payday Loan Establishment, Post-Secondary School</td>
<td>5 Storeys**</td>
<td>Min – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings at a high density within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-2</td>
<td>Min – 2.0</td>
<td>Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>Accommodate comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system</td>
<td>Outdoor active recreation, outdoor passive recreation and cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>NHC-1</td>
<td>protect and/or conserve natural heritage features and their ecological functions</td>
<td>Existing Agriculture and Natural Heritage Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EUF-1</td>
<td>Recognize existing uses within a floodway or floodplain.</td>
<td>Existing uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uses/zones subject to regulations that specify requirements such as: minimum lot width; minimum setbacks of buildings from front, side and rear yard; maximum building height, etc. See draft zoning by-law for specific regulations

** Site specific zoning provisions to be drafted to limit the max number of storeys to 5 on Courtland Ave E on properties proposed to receive specific policy.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlay</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flooding Hazard (flood way and flood fringe)</td>
<td>identify lands that are susceptible to flooding hazards and prevent injury or the loss of life, minimize property damage and social disruption, and the aggravation of existing hazards and the creation of new ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope Erosion Hazard</td>
<td>identify lands that are susceptible to slope erosion hazards and prevent injury or the loss of life, minimize property damage and social disruption, and the aggravation of existing hazards and the creation of new ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Restoration Areas</td>
<td>identify lands within Ecological Restoration Areas that are subject to an Environmental Impact Study or other appropriate study prior to development, redevelopment, or site alteration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Building Massing – Floor Space Ratio (FSR)

Floor Space Ratio (FSR) is the amount of building floor area that may be developed on a property and is dependent on the lot area. The value is calculated by dividing the building floor area by the lot area.
Existing Built Heritage Resources

Legend
- Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Boundary
- Heritage Conservation District (HCD)
- Municipal Heritage Register
  - Listed
  - Part IV (Individual Property)
  - Part V (Victoria Park Area HCD)

Examples of Heritage Properties
- 90 Church St (Part IV)
- 160 Courtland Ave (Listed)
Existing Built Heritage Resources

Legend
- Proposed Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Boundary
- Proposed Properties to be Listed on the Municipal Heritage Register
- Grouping of Buildings on Peter St between Whitney Pl and dead end
  - 123-146 Peter St
- Bonnie Stuart Building
  - 141 Whitney Pl
- Entrances off of Benton St and Charles St into the neighbourhood
  - 40 Madison Ave S
  - 35 Cedar St S
  - 101 Charles St E
  - 75 Charles St E
  - 93-99 Benton St/39-43 St George St
  - 135 Benton St/46 Courtland Ave E
  - 37-39 Courtland Ave E
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Proposed Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) Boundary and Heritage Attributes
Proposed Heritage Attributes

- Topography of land
- Variety of housing types
- Common housing design characteristics
  - Front porches
  - Peak roofs
  - Detached rear yard garages
  - Brick or appearance of brick
- Range of construction dates
- Mingling of early and late housing, high-rise structures, and institutional buildings
- Variety of density that blends within the
- Predominantly low rise built form
- Consistent street edge (front yard & exterior side yard setbacks)

- Grouping of buildings on Peter Street between Whitney Place and the dead end
- Narrow street design
  - Narrow right-of-way
  - One-way streets
  - Narrow road width
  - Narrow or no sidewalks
  - Narrow or no boulevards
  - Public street trees
  - Private front yard trees that contribute to streetscape
  - Shallow front yard and exterior side yard setbacks
**Tools To Protect Neighbourhood Character**

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

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

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

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

**Other Tools**
- Corridor Management Plans
- Park Management Plans
- Stewardship Activities
- Public Education
- Commemoration and Interpretation
Zoning, Site Specific Regulations & Urban Design Guidelines

WHAT IS ZONING?

Zoning is used to regulate:
- Use of land;
- Location of buildings and structures;
- Types of buildings permitted and their associated uses; and
- Lot dimensions, parking requirements, building heights and setbacks from the street/lot lines.

WHAT IS A SITE SPECIFIC PROVISION?

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

WHAT IS AN URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINE:

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

Achieving a Consistent Building Setback

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

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

Garage Projections & Permission

Garage projections & permissions can be implemented using 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.
WHAT WE HEARD?

Front porches are an important character defining element

Maintaining the terminating view at the end of streets is somewhat important

New buildings should reflect the character of existing buildings; use of good building materials that are already present in neighbourhood.

Preserving the view from the top of Cedar Hill is very important

Consistent front yard setbacks are preferred over varied setbacks

Tall buildings in low rise areas are bad ideas

No garage or a garage in the rear yard is preferred

strong preference for transition in height; framing and maintaining entrance views; lower overall height and respect for the existing built form.

POTENTIAL CONSERVATION TOOLS IDENTIFIED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Character Element</th>
<th>Potential Conservation Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Plan Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porches</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Form Transitions</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Design, Materials, Colours</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View (Cedar Hill)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance View/Terminating Vistas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEXT STEPS:

- Input to Secondary Plan Policies and Zoning for Secondary Plan Area
- Prepare Urban Design Guidelines for Central Neighbourhoods (draft available for review) + unique area specific guidelines
- List certain properties on the Municipal Heritage Register
How important is it that the City regulate...

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

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

Potential Conservation Tools Identified:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Should not Regulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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></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></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></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>10 Whitney Pl.</td>
<td>N2C 2X5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185 Benton St.</td>
<td>N2G 3S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2135 Countrystone Place</td>
<td>N2N 3L7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9A Courtland Ave E.</td>
<td>N2G 2T8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119 Courtland Ave East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Oak Dr.</td>
<td>N2H 4H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Margaret Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Martin St</td>
<td>N2G 2Y1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Margaret Ave</td>
<td>N2H 4H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Highland Rd W</td>
<td>N2M 3B6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141 Whitney Pk</td>
<td>N2G 2X8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review
Open House #2 Comment Form

Thank you for attending the Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review Public Meeting. Please answer the following 4 questions and provide your feedback using this comment sheet. Please return the form to staff via e-mail to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca or alternatively mail this comment letter to City Hall at 200 King Street West, P.O. Box 1118 before December 10, 2018.

1. What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed land uses?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?
   Please look at the consistent use of the mid rise plan at Madison and Church. The original plan was for mid rise on the church corner of Charles but now is low rise.

3. What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?
   Can you please change these properties to medium density like the one across the street?

________________________________________________________________________

4. What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?
   The neighbours on Church and Madison do not like the fact it goes from high density 58 Madison to Madison and up the street but they should have medium density for their lots.

Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review
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: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review
OK, Bergen messed up everything (well page numbering). Please use this version of the report.

Thanks.

Sally

On 2019-06-27 1:22 p.m., Sally Gunz wrote:
> Here is the final e-version. We say early on that this is a 'living
document' and it sure is. It is being sent to you now as there will
> undoubtedly be more updates needed next week given the pace of change
> here. But all of us have other lives so it is time to stop.
> 
> > You will see that I am sending you two separate documents. The second
> > has sketches for the Benton St vision prepared by John Bergen. These
> > will be printed in the right place in the final hard copy that all of
> > you will receive. However, for now it wasn't easy to insert these
> > without messing up various other things. These are new to this final
> > report.
> >
> > > Thanks to everyone who has helped in this project. All errors are
> > > without doubt my own.
> >
> > > Sally
> >
Visioning Report of the Cedar Hills Community Prepared for the City of Kitchener Planning Staff

June, 2019
This Visioning Report for the Cedar Hills community is provided to the City of Kitchener Planning Staff as input into the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support proposed new zoning.
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I. **Project Summary**

This project is provided to the City of Kitchener Planning Staff as input into the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support proposed new zoning.

Cedar Hills (CH) is the site of the original town of Sand Hills. The name accurately describes both the topography and the golden sand found under the topsoil in CH. The neighbourhood is one of the key components of historic Berlin/Kitchener. Many of the original houses remain and the steep hills provide vistas stretching as far as Baden.

Key to understanding the CH vision is knowing its recent history. This is a proud and stable community but also one that has had to face many challenges. Through the Cedar Hill Community Group (CHCG), residents have consistently worked diligently with City and Regional staff to identify and implement solutions. This has consumed extraordinary time and energy on the part of residents.

The primary purpose for this Report is to capture the vision for CH that might in turn, be translated into the new urban design guidelines. The Report reflects the opinions of the residents. It results from community meetings and the circulation of drafts with resulting revisions. Key elements are:

- While CH has experienced much success in fighting challenges, it remains a community facing continued and significant vulnerability. CH is grateful for its strong working relationships with the City. However, it still suffers the effects of past poor planning decisions and, often, changes to infrastructure being made ‘on the cheap’. There is a strong desire that this time round, no street shall be left behind and the very best of design and innovation should be applied.
- Urban intensification inevitably brings challenges, particularly at the transition stage. CH has borne these costs perhaps more than most communities both in the past and still today. Regulations must be both implemented and enforced that effectively protect CH (and other communities) during transitions. What exist today are not fully effective.
- Families and people of all ages and incomes have chosen to move to CH/continue to live in CH because of its proximity to downtown, access to public transit and ethnic and socio-economic diversity. Above all else, this is a walking community yet the state/width of sidewalks and landscaping is often poor and streetscapes are unattractive. Intensification must only occur in conjunction with improved infrastructure that supports social interactions between residents. This applies to all major streets in CH.
- The neighbourhood is generally not opposed to intensification. Rather, its focus is upon *how* intensification should occur. There is real concern that already redevelopment is squeezing out families and offers few lower cost units. There is little evidence that the current draft proposals will reverse or slow this trend. Family housing on Madison St. is currently being replaced by projects with single bedroom units as is much of the rental property at 86 Cedar St. Most recent new development in CH has been of higher priced, small, rental or condominium units. Further, there is major concern (from both the CH and Schneider Creek communities) that planning descriptions for Courtland Avenue seriously threaten the stability of existing, stable housing stock and the vision for the neighbourhood.

---

1 Cedar Hills residents wish to acknowledge the work of John MacDonald and Elyn Lin of John MacDonald Architect in leading the original visioning exercise upon which this Report is based. As always, John has been willing to support our community and for this we thank him most sincerely.
This Report presents street by street analysis of current conditions with strong vision recommendations. The community is excited by the potential for improvement and presents its vision with the goal not only of improving living conditions for CH but for the entire Downtown. CH has always considered the latter as critical to any design or infrastructure improvements. We highlight some of the key elements of our recommendations:

- The community sees enormous potential for relatively simple infrastructure improvements to the major arteries that would significantly enhance CH in its role as gateway to the City. See proposals for Benton St. in particular.
- There are areas where traffic presents major problems and the community urges serious analysis by both City and Regional experts. For example, the Cedar and Church St intersection is a serious concern. Courtland presents real difficulties for both CH and SC.
- CH urges the City (and, where relevant, the Region) to enhance walkability. In part this can come from side-walk improvements. Essential to these will be coordination with Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro. Currently the placement of large light standards prevents the widening of sidewalks (and narrowing of streets) in a manner that is evident elsewhere in the City. Compare, for example, the effects of light standard type and placement on Joseph or Queen Streets with any in CH. There also exist serious concerns for pedestrian crossings of major streets; in particular Courtland, Benton and Charles. While streets carried lower levels of traffic, these problems were ignored. They no longer can be, particularly with intensification. Proposals are presented.
- Again with intensification comes the need for increased, useable greenspace. CH has two resources. First, the relatively small Sandhills Park facilities which are currently being improved following a major park improvement visioning exercise conducted by the City with the community. Second, the under resourced Cameron/Kaufman Park facilities. An exciting proposal is presented for relatively low cost improvements to the Cameron/Kaufman Park facilities. This could and should become a major resource for adults and children providing major sports (track, tennis, swimming, soccer/football/cricket fields/volley ball, baseball, stair running) and parkland/playground facilities. Most resources already exist but currently access is poorly marked and maintained and the track, in particular, is unusable (other than as the highly innovative cricket pitch). With relatively little cost, this could become a major attraction for the entire Downtown.
- The high concentration of social service uses in CH has reached the point where real harm is happening to the community. The community is not opposed to lower cost housing. Indeed it is concerned that it may be left with not enough. But CH is currently under real stress from some of effects of the existing social service uses and cannot absorb more. CH urges the City to consider replacing some of the lower density properties on Charles St. (and, in particular between Benton and Eby) with mixed market cost rental/condominiums, higher density developments. These should include some units large enough to house families.

We conclude with one caveat. Although there was a concerted effort to ensure this Report represents the views of the entire community, it was far more difficult to gain input from renters, and, in particular, those with limited English language skills, than from home owners. While the authors have done their best to infer the needs of those who didn’t participate directly, we acknowledge this limitation.
II. INTRODUCTION

This report builds on the work of the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood\(^2\) ("SCN") in which that community came together to understand how they collectively defined their neighbourhood and to identify goals for the future. In the course of this exercise, SCN references its relationship with Cedar Hill ("CH"). The two neighbourhoods abut and today the City of Kitchener is combining the two for planning purposes.

CH has long been represented by the Cedar Hills Community Group ("CHCG") and has also always had close associations with the area now represented by SC. As is mentioned in the SC report, the two communities were historically linked by the major employers in the area and CH is an obvious primary route for anyone in SC going downtown. In 1981, the provincial government funded the Ontario Neighbourhood Improvement Project ("ONIP"). The main offices for this project were located near the corner of Benton and Mill Streets and the studied area encompassed all of what today would be SC and CH (and parts of Highland-Stirling). Several major improvements resulted from this project including the closing of Benton Street to Mill (with the replacement by the foot bridge), the creation of Sandhills Park, and the proposal that led to the City creating the Mill-Courtland Community Centre. When there was no formal SC community group, CH incorporated the entire area into its meetings wherever possible. It also actively argued against the Benton Street Realignment project from the early 1980s until relatively recently when the Region sold off its houses on Benton Street and the project was formally shut down. This included participating in a number of City and Regional level studies including those relating to the north-south traffic assessments.

There is no doubt that the growth and effectiveness of the SCN group has enhanced not only SC but also CH and now combining the two areas for planning purposes makes a lot of sense. CH residents enjoy the programming developed by SC. They walk through SC to get to all the amenities identified in the SC report including, most obviously, the Iron Horse Trail, Mill-Courtland Community Centre, the Harry Class Pool, and on to Victoria Park and St. Mary’s Hospital. Likewise, SC residents continue to use CH as a key thoroughfare to the downtown.

There are many similarities between the two areas. Although parts of the CH neighbourhood are older than SC, the issues arising for many of the residential streets in CH are similar to those identified in the SC report. There are, however, also differences and some of these were alluded to in the SC report. Most obvious is topography. The dominant feature of CH is its hills, peaking at St. George and Church Streets and sloping down to Courtland and Charles Streets, and to Cameron Heights Collegiate Institute ("Cameron") and Kauffman Park from Madison. More important is the greater proximity to downtown of CH. A number of the properties in CH are large. There is already real mixed use in terms of scale of buildings. There has, particularly since the 1980s, been a significant increase in institutional use of properties. There is a far higher proportion of rentals in CH compared with SC. There has been recurring and significant land speculation in CH that, over the years led to property degradation and depreciation, urban crime, and social disruption. While SC has not been immune to some of these same issues, there is no doubt that the scale is different.\(^3\)

The most important consequence of the differences for present purposes is that the focus of the two communities has inevitably been different. CH was actively involved in land use issues from the early

---

\(^2\) Making Our Neighbourhood Great!, Kitchener, December 18, 2015.

\(^3\) This is not in any way to minimize the issues SC has itself had to face; for example, those affecting Martin Street residents and the industrial uses leading to Courtland as well as some issues on Benton St.
1980s including involvement in a very lengthy secondary planning project at that time. It faced major intensification pressures on St. George and Cedar Streets that resulted in the community becoming very active in planning processes. The negative pressures in the downtown that spilled over into CH, lead to the CHCG spending a good deal of its time working with downtown businesses, the police, city and regional authorities, on very troubling urban issues. In some ways CH was engaged in a seemingly endless fight for its own preservation and that of its very precious downtown and inevitably looked far more in a northerly than southerly direction, other than for the Benton St. realignment issues which it saw as directly threatening the health of both SC and CH.

Today, as we have developed this current report, many of the prior pressures CH faced continue and inevitably inform our perspective. Further land speculation began immediately the LRT was announced and years before it was approved. Institutional land use continues to be a significant part of the neighbourhood and rental properties bring different issues from those of home ownership. All this said, CH is immensely proud of what it has achieved since the early 1980s and is very grateful for the approach adopted by the City in this current planning process and in many other respects. Real care is being taken to listen to what the community wants and needs. There exists respect for the positions of the community and, as a result, the sense that we can make a difference. For this we thank all staff who are involved in the current projects.

III. BACKGROUND TO KEY ISSUES IN CEDAR HILL

The SC report provides a sound basic description of CH and what follows builds on that account.

The naming of our community as Cedar Hills is a relatively recent occurrence. The neighbourhood as it is now defined was created out of the larger Mill-Courtland/Highland Stirling neighbourhoods in order to provide focus for addressing the unique issues facing this particular community, largely the consequences of the crack epidemic in the 1980s and the decline in quality of housing stock caused by land speculation. The boundaries are typically considered to be Charles, Madison, Courtland and Benton streets, although at times we include what is now known as SC and would extend the area to Stirling Street.

If we can legitimately define the character of any neighbourhood, the driving forces that motivated both the creation of CH and the CHCG at least in its modern history have been predominantly political. From the early 1980s, there was a series of events that seriously affected the social fabric of the community and which required resident response. Throughout the 1980s the serious degradation of rental housing with associated problems lead residents, working with the City of Kitchener, Mill-Courtland Neighbourhood Association, and The Waterloo Regional Police Service to create the CHCG to address local issues. The drug and prostitution crisis from the early 1990s was a critical driver of activism, but it was a broader range of unrelated events that encouraged residents to become politically engaged and ultimately, to come together to create the CHCG. In particular:

- The ONIP project introduced many of us to each other for the first time and allowed us to engage in what today would be described as visioning exercises about the future of our community.
- The closure of Victoria School lead to a multi-year dispute with the Waterloo Region School Board. Here CH community members joined members of the Victoria Park neighbourhood (as well as...
parents from across all the downtown elementary schools including J. F. Carmichael, Queen Elizabeth, and Suddaby) to fight the school board’s desire to close what was a very historic resource for our community. While the school was ultimately closed, this period forged very close relationships between community members. More importantly perhaps, it brought the community together with key politicians at all levels and the City in particular. School closure fights became a very unpleasant side effect of living in the city core and at some stage and to various degrees, CH residents were involved in no less than 11 different battles with one or other school board (some schools were evaluated two and three times). In each case, residents had to work together closely.

- The Lost Sea project on St. George Street in the early 1980s was the first exposure the CH group had to a major planning dispute. The essence of the project was the placement of a major high rise on the north side of St. George Street that would fill a large lot between St. George and Church streets. The design was simply a replication of one used by the same developer in London and, while, there was no zoning to prevent the project, it would have destroyed the low-rise streetscape on St. George St. The community argued against the project at the Planning Committee of Council and, to everyone’s surprise, the committee rejected the project with the chair stating ‘let them sue us’. This in fact happened and the legal settlement resulted in the City acquiring the property from the developer with the Kitchener Housing project on Church and St. George streets ensuing. This particular project continues to be cited as an excellent example of sympathetic intensification particular in terms of the St. George Street frontage.

- A very lengthy secondary zoning project ran throughout the 80s. The fiercest arguments arose over intensification on St. George and Peter Streets. A couple from the GTA had consolidated a large number of properties on these streets and sought zoning that would have allowed for major intensification. Since these properties in part backed on to the Wellington Place condominiums, the argument used by both the developers and the city planners was that further tower projects would be appropriate. If this had happened, the entire character of CH would have changed as, at this stage, all the properties subject to rezoning were single unit homes, albeit sometimes broken into more than one rental unit. This secondary planning project was at times very painful. At this time the voice of residents was not considered to be particularly relevant or welcome. However, in the end, the argument for today’s zoning prevailed. The developers sold off the individual houses over time and, as with Bingeman Street in the Central Frederick Street neighbourhood, the properties were then carefully restored and now are generally well maintained by owner-occupiers. Perhaps more importantly, this process educated residents about the need for involvement in their community and gradually cemented respectful relationships with city staff.

- Before the secondary plan was fully implemented a zoning crisis was identified on Cedar Street that demonstrated how exposed the community was to poor development. A group of local lawyers built a somewhat problematic rental complex and the community understood just how little they could do to provide input and protect CH from the kind of development that had already occurred on Madison Avenue. City planners worked with residents and these efforts lead to what was known as conservation zoning throughout much of CH. It is likely this zoning that did more to stabilize the part of CH south of St. George Street than anything else.

The consequence of all these issues was a community that was reasonably well-educated in civic matters and well-position to defend itself against negative forces. Unfortunately, despite the hundreds of hours spent up until then, little would prepare it for the real crisis that came with the crack cocaine epidemic. Whole reports have been written about this period. The area most directly affected was north of St. George Street and, in particular, from Church to Charles Streets. However, there were times when the

---

5 See, for example, the Pierre Filion Report to the City.
negative consequences of what was happening in this fragile part of our community spilled over to the balance of CH and the entirety of CH was seriously at risk. There had been land speculation leading to ownership by landlords with no interest in the well-being of the properties, tenants or community ever since the City rezoned parts of CH for high density development. What became obvious was that, if CH was to survive at all, residents would have to work closely with all City and Regional service providers.

It is not the place here to go through the years of grindingly hard work on the part of CHCG and the City/Region that followed in order to overcome both the actual dangers to the community and the stigma it suffered. CH is grateful to the City for the Interim Control By-law, a temporary down-zoning imposed in order to prevent further development that was exploitative of renters and the community as a whole. While ultimately that zoning was reversed by the Ontario Municipal Board, it bought CH critical time. Today the economic conditions that drive much of the proposed redevelopment are entirely different from those that existed in that period.

The key take away from these events is the observation made at the beginning of this section. CH for all of its recent history has been required to think politically as much as socially. That is not to say it has not engaged in the latter, but when it did (see below), its efforts were focused very much on enhancing the reputation of CH as a healthy and safe place to live. And while there have been extraordinary successes, none of us yet rests easy. It is for this reason we are particularly grateful for the opportunity to continue to work with the City on the current visioning and zoning exercises.

IV. THE SOCIAL ROLE OF CEDAR HILL COMMUNITY GROUP

When CH residents are asked to describe their community, one of the terms most often used is ‘stable’. This is somewhat ironic in light of the obvious threats alluded to above and it is also a reflection of how the community is in fact comprised of quite distinct parts. But even in its most vulnerable areas, CH has a lengthy history of stable home ownership and it is likely this, more than anything else, that has ultimately allowed it to survive and in fine form. So, for example, one of the Peter St. residents is only the third owner of their house built in the 1880s. While they have lived there for 38 years (and the prior owner 57 years), they have current neighbours who were there when they moved in.

There is little doubt that one of the most difficult things for CH residents to handle was and even continues to be the denigration of their community by outsiders. It was not uncommon to have taxi drivers ask residents why they live in such a bad area. Police, real estate agents, and teachers have been quoted as saying how ‘bad’ the area was. CH and the downtown in general were described by outsiders as being dangerous and run-down.

At different times, and sometimes in direct response to the criticism of outsiders, the community engaged in initiatives to reinforce what they saw to be the strengths of CH (and the downtown) including:

- Visioning exercises with real estate agents to provide materials that accurately described CH. Key elements that residents valued were its economic, social and racial diversity, its proximity to downtown, its affordability, and its cohesiveness.
- Working with the City of Kitchener to improve communication between Property Standards, planning and zoning.
- Establishing, with the police and others, key programs including the Citizens on Patrol Program and the John School.
• Receiving 5 year funding (2004-09) from the Trillium Foundation for a project called the Downtown East, Ya Gotta Love It (DEYGLI). In 2009 CH applied for and received an Annual Grant from the City of Kitchener that allowed DEYGLI to extend the work that had been done during the duration of the Trillium Funding to other downtown neighbourhoods.

• Establishing a small committee made up of Property Standard Enforcement, Police and DEYGLI to work with landlords and tenants to resolve issues and effect improvements to the properties.

• CH was awarded funding through the Festival of Neighbourhoods program and used it for two purposes. First, it built a concrete pad with electrical hook ups in Sandhills Park. For a period, CH held an annual folk festival using this facility. Second, it created a very successful loan program to assist with improvements to house facades.

• When the blocks north of Church street were particularly vulnerable to drugs and prostitution, a street party was held on Eby Street to bring all residents together, including the most disadvantaged and transient.

• For many years there was a community garden off the pathway leading to Cameron Heights School. This was very successful and only ended as those who lead the project gradually no longer needed the garden space.

• As part of the East End project, an annual soccer program was created at Courtland School. All children attending downtown schools were invited and the program was run by volunteers from the community for at least 10 years. Up to 70 and more children would gather once a week in May and June for informal soccer games. Parents would bring their children and meet their neighbours, often for the first time. Often parents were new to Canada, coming from countries where soccer was highly popular. The Community Centre has ensured the program continues today and works with community volunteers from CH and SC.

• There are regular and active get-togethers between large groups of neighbours. For example, an annual holiday potluck with a large group has been running for at least 28 years and each year brings in new participants.

Reviewing the success of social gatherings and events in CH, there are certainly some real, long-term successes such as the soccer program. But other events such as the folk festival did not continue. With the benefit of hindsight, there are some fairly obvious reasons for this. First, the seemingly endless political exercises in which the community was required to engage consumed the energy and focus of most of the leaders in the community and there was simply no bandwidth available for organizing events unless they had a very specific goal such as the Eby Street party. Second, although we think of CH as homogeneous and small, it actually covers a reasonably large and certainly diverse area and this will be discussed below. Within the particular segments of the community, there is not a large number of people not otherwise occupied who are available for the intense work required for events such as the folk festival. It is our hope that as CH is now more stabilized, more people will step forward in a leadership role for these type of activities. Indeed, part of the project to revitalize Sandhills Park included interest in activities using that space and there are now a number of younger residents actively planning the kind of activities a healthy community requires. There is now a real sense of generational change in the very best sense of the expression. CH continues to be a healthy and thriving community.

V. Vision for Cedar Hills

CH engaged in a visioning exercise through the spring of 2019. This in part began with the consultation process for Sandhills Park that took place in 2018 but the primary driver was the City holding a number of meetings relating to new zoning and secondary planning. Most importantly in February, the City
conducted a charrette for the combined SC and CH communities to discuss drafting urban design guidelines. It was at this meeting that the CH representatives committed to engaging in an equivalent exercise to that resulting in the SC Report. This began with a meeting (March 27, 2019) in which John Macdonald and Elyn Lin of John Macdonald Architect led members of the SC community through a series of exercises where they were required to consider the relative priorities of different uses in the SC streetscape; in particular, pedestrians, public transportation, private vehicles, neighbourhood activities, and social interaction within the streetscape. Community members were asked to evaluate and rank the significance of each aspect for all the major streets in CH.

This visioning exercise took place within the context of the proposed new zoning for CH. This is not the place to discuss the zoning changes in any depth, but what is particularly important from the perspective of the community as a whole, is both the stabilization of existing uses for the majority of the area and also recognition of higher density on the perimeter roads. While much of this zoning was already in place, there is no doubt that the current plans brought likely intensification of Courtland properties, for example, very much to the fore-front of residents’ minds.

We begin our summary of the visioning exercise with the over-riding impressions the community has of CH. People genuinely enjoy living here. This is their home, they choose to live here and they are, by and large, happy that they do so. There are important features that residents value; diversity and socio-economic diversity in particular, proximity to the downtown with all its amenities and the Market in particular, and stability and age of the housing. One of the most important features is the walkability of CH and this is reflected in much of the focus of the vision for the future. This is a community committed more to walking and the use of public transit than to their cars.

We did not spend time preparing a formal ‘vision statement’. However, when we told community members the statement from the old East End Project, it resonated. That statement was: Downtown East, you Gotta Love It. While obviously this would require adaption to CH, it does reflect a certain feistiness and resilience that has always defined who we are.

We now turn to the specific streets examined in our review process:

1. **Boundary Streets**

The boundary streets were classified as Courtland, Benton, Charles and Madison. We have also included Stirling for brief comment as it is highly relevant to CH but is often ignored.

The key element of all these streetscapes is how, generally speaking, they fail to meet the needs of both CH and the City in terms of providing an attractive and welcoming environment for a walking population accessing the Downtown and CH. It is one of the long-standing major concerns of CH residents that little attention has ever been given to the attractiveness of the main arteries (including these boundary roads) in the East End. Comparing these with the very attractive streetscapes on, for example, Queen, Joseph and much of King streets, roads such as Benton and Courtland are remarkably unattractive. There is little attention to attractive lighting. Sidewalks are often narrow and in a poor repair, there are few trees and limited natural shade, light standards are often in sidewalks, there are limited safe places for crossing streets, and generally everything appears to be geared to cars. Encouraging the use of bikes is seen as an important part of CH but bike lanes are, mostly problematic. There are limited points where pedestrians can cross any of the boundary roads safely. The key plus for CH has been the addition of the LRT which is generally acknowledged to be a significant improvement.
We now turn to the individual streets. For each we will begin with a short summary of key elements envisaged for the future.

a. Benton Street

**Summary:**

- **Real and exciting potential as gateway to CH and downtown.** See Sketches pages 11a-c.
- **Requires sidewalk improvements and greater width in particular.**
- **Replacement of light standards to ensure consistency with other major downtown streets will allow for greater sidewalk width and enhance overall visual appeal.**
- **More green space is needed and tree planting required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness.**
- **Good bike lanes are needed.**
- **Place boulevard in street centre to enhance attractiveness.**
- **Reduce lanes to one each way other than at corners.**
- **Crosswalk required, likely near top of hill. No current crossing from Courtland to Charles.**
- **Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.**

Benton Street is, in a sense, a major thoroughfare without a purpose. Residents recall the major changes that occurred when it was intended this would be a key north-south access route for the City. The road was widened and trees were removed. Today the street is dominated by construction at the Arrow site and, opposite, vacant lots between Courtland and St. George. It lacks any pedestrian crossing between Courtland and Charles. Sidewalks are narrow, in a poor state if repair, and have large light standards within them in most parts. There is some public transit but no stops within the CH boundaries. There is a LRT stop at Benton and Charles.

In terms of social interaction, there is little that exists on Benton St. that encourages interaction. People do attend churches and there now is the new medical centre on the corner of Benton and Church. But the general sense from the community is that social interaction is minimal. This is not a street you tend to expect to stop and talk to neighbours. It is primarily a way of moving cars and, for the most part, cars from outside CH. There is no safe crossing place between Courtland and Charles. Walking, particularly in winter is unpleasant and often unsafe (narrow, un-cleared side-walks).

What is the community vision for Benton Street? Comments were remarkably consistent and generally there was a sense of enormous potential. One observation was representative of many: **It could stay as an artery for traffic, but it could be a point of pride and beauty in downtown Kitchener with greenery etc. and bike paths.** People are genuinely excited about the potential for retail/commercial use in the ground floors of new buildings. One suggested this could become like Belmont Village. The current Arrow building is a fine example of design that took an old industrial building and appears to have used real care to make the building visually attractive from the street.

In order to achieve many of the improvements proposed for Benton, it is assumed that there should be a reduction of traffic lanes by one each way other than for turning lanes at the major corners. This would be consistent with two of the major streets that feed Benton, Charles and Courtland. For some time it has
also been the current position with one lane used for parking and another, southbound, closed for construction. There has been no particular negative effect felt from this reduction.

Residents have bought into the new planning vision that encourages more public spaces and this includes thoughtful building design. This should be a major pedestrian thoroughfare and wider sidewalks on both sides would be important. In order to achieve this, however, light standards must be moved. Residents want more shade trees and green space at the sidewalks and areas adjacent to them including for any new development sites. They suggest a boulevard in the centre of the street to reinforce these design features. They also encourage proper bike lanes to complement sidewalks and boulevard. There is concern that intensification could provide barriers to the streetscape so real care must be taken in the design guidelines to ensure appropriate heights and interaction with the public spaces. To repeat the comments about the initial Arrow development, there is a desire for new development to be part of our community and interact with our community. It is critical it not present as a closed door space.

In sum, perhaps for Benton Street more than any other there was real excitement for its potential. In part this is no doubt because of how poorly it supports the community now. But people accept the need for redevelopment and they really want this street to become not only a gateway to CH but also a gateway to the City and one that makes us all proud. See sketches 11a-c.

Images of narrow side-walks with intruding light standards, Benton St.

The following 3 pages illustrate one strong vision for the future of Benton Street, prepared by John Bergen and reflecting the views of the community.
b. Charles St.

Summary:

- **Invest in improvements to enhance both downtown and CH.**
- **Green space and tree planting required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness, particularly near LRT stations.**
- **Good bike lanes (if possible)**
- **Address access to Madison with well-designed stairway.**
- **High priority need for cross-walk at Eby.**
- **Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.**
- **Encourage mixed cost housing for intensification projects.**
- **No additional social service uses.**

Many of the observation about Benton are mirrored with Charles with the exception that some of the expensive infrastructure has already been done. The sidewalks in the CH stretch are, for the most part, in good shape and reasonably wide. The LRT slows down traffic and presents a less car dominated vista.

There are consistent negative comments from the community about this street, however. Most obviously, there has been almost nothing done in terms of allowing for green spaces and there are few if any trees. It is a hot and not particularly attractive street to walk along. There are concerns that the bike lane is somewhat randomly marked and then seems to end suggesting this is clearly not a priority. There are concerns that people perceive this not to be a particular safe street to walk along because of the congregation at times of users of some of the social services agencies. CH has never complained about the location of the men’s shelter per se. Indeed, its placement on Charles predated most of us moving here (although the present usage of the shelter is quite different from the original vision). However, there is no doubt that clients of the various social services are often congregating in this area and residents can feel threatened as they make their way past the various buildings and through groups of people who are often loud and may seem aggressive. Further, parking lots on Charles become gathering places for people both at day and night and they are very disruptive for residents, particularly on Church St.

The most important social use that directly relates to Charles Street is access to the Market and here there was a unanimous desire for a cross-walk at Eby Street. This is a primary access route for many in CH and SC. At other corners controlled by lights there are pleasing cross walk markings. There is nothing at Eby Street and the LRT presents a low barrier which is easy enough to cross for a person but can be difficult when pulling a shopping trolley.

The stretch of Charles that leads to the ramp to Madison is particularly problematic for pedestrians. The sidewalk appears narrower. It is dark and while the mural is an attractive addition it only partially addresses the issue of the massive concrete wall.
There is a pedestrian access to Madison via a flight of very steep steps. These are far from ideal for pedestrians. They are narrow and poorly lit. There is no winter maintenance and instead rough boards are nailed across the entrance to close off the stairs. While the City does its best to maintain them, they attract graffiti and garbage.

Because of the perception of lack of safety, pedestrians often walk beyond the steps and walk up the ramp. Again, this ramp does not give a real sense of safety with poor lighting and little traffic. Many in the community would feel very uncomfortable walking up either the steps or ramp at night by themselves.
Finally, while the north side of Charles is not part of CH, it is highly problematic from a design perspective. There is redevelopment happening and so it is perhaps unfair to judge the attractiveness of some of the streetscape, but the stretch at the back of the Crowne Plaza (parking) is no doubt permanent and inherently unattractive.

The community is almost unanimous in terms of what it would like for Charles St. It wants this to become an attractive and healthy place for the community to walk and bike. There is real enthusiasm for the LRT and people ask that the two stations (at Benton and at Cedar) become more neighbourhood places. This might be achieved by enhancing the number of trees and green spaces by the sidewalk. Just having more people walking to use public transit will enhance the streetscape. The addition of a crossing at Eby Street is a high priority for the community. While the blocks are not long, the lack of any recognition that this is the primary access point to the Market is striking and changing this will do a lot to link the two sides of Charles Street with the CH and SC communities.

It is not clear where the primary redevelopment of Charles St will take place given the many existing social services buildings. However, assuming the economic incentive to intensify, the community urges the design specialists to take real care to impose design rules that enhance the street experience. Critical will be ensuring that buildings do not present as a barrier and have sufficient green space and trees on the sidewalk side to enhance the walking experience. Overall, as with Benton, this will be a primary route for the City and it will be how many traveling through the community by car or by LRT will judge the East End. This is the opportunity to insist on really well-thought out and pleasing design.

The lack of adequate bike lanes should be addressed if possible (it is acknowledged that this might be difficult with the LRT).

Finally, the City should be sensitive to the impact of the social service providers on the neighbourhood. While the existing providers are part of our community, it is important that the impact on the community of some of their uses be considered and that there be no expansion. For example, there have been some
rumours (true or otherwise) that more of the older houses closer to Benton might be converted to social service housing.

Elsewhere in this Report concern is expressed for the reduction in availability of family and lower cost housing in CH. CH sees the lots on Charles St as being particularly well suited to more mixed cost (market and subsidized/lower cost) housing units including family suitable housing as intensification takes place. The emphasis here is on ‘mixed’ use and likely private sector housing and not solely either market rental or subsidized cost housing.

c. Madison Avenue

Summary:
- High priority given to improving current stair access from Charles to Madison
- High priority to infrastructure improvements to primary access to greenspace, parkland and exercise facilities from Madison to Cameron Heights School. This could become the major recreational site for CH and SC combining the stairs, running track, tennis courts, pool and playing fields.
- Serious concerns exist about the degree of intensification proposed by the draft Secondary Plan.
- Sidewalk improvements, green space and tree planting are required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness.
- Ensure any development protects churches/public buildings.
- Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.
- Ensure sound maintenance of existing apartment buildings.

Madison Avenue is an unusual choice of ‘boundary’ street since it is in fact not a through road and certainly not a major road. Its issues are so unique it was actually inadvertently omitted from the materials provided at the initial CH meeting. While it has generally been considered a boundary for CH, Stirling Avenue is much more similar to the major boundary streets surrounding CH than Madison ever will be. Nonetheless, since it has generally been accepted as a boundary for CH, Madison will be included within this grouping.

Changes to Madison over the last 30 plus years have long been considered by CH to be the exemplar of all that the balance of the neighbourhood did not want to see happen elsewhere, fairly or unfairly. It has a very historic position in CH, having been where a major windmill was located for much of CH’s history, being the site of the first synagogue that served Berlin/Kitchener, the location of the very important St. Joseph’s Church and rectory, providing access to Kaufman Park. Cameron Heights School, and having some of the first experiments with intensification. Madison was affected dramatically by the building of the high school with the resulting steep hill and need for steps and a path to the school. Finally, the change to the road system that divided the road at Charles St. and resulted in the one-way ramp to Charles St. and creating a major barrier to the downtown and seriously affecting land use on the eastern/northerly sides of the road. Generally, Madison might be described as a road where planners and road builders experimented (or perhaps simply took the path of least resistance in their desire to meet other goals) and no one seemed to care too much about streetscape or quality of life for residents.
For many years the CH community and residents of Madison were very concerned about the quality and maintenance of the major apartment buildings. While most of these have improved significantly in the last 10 years, residents note that the building that best defines everything bad from a design perspective for the community is a relatively new addition at # 118. It presents to the street as a plain, square, dark red brick building with smallish windows, no front doors or balconies and poorly maintained landscaping at the street frontage. The entire design appears to be motivated by maximizing the number of units and parking spaces and that this could be built within the last (approximately) five years once more motivates the community to urge for the kinds of design changes that are being studied by this current project.

The proposed zoning provides for intensification for the entire street, both sides from Courtland to Charles. This is despite the fact that the north/western part of the street from Church St to its end, has far more in common with the rest of CH that will be protected from change, than the balance of the street. There are also single family homes with smallish lots close to Courtland that are probably better suited to existing use than any form of intensification. There is a real sense that CH will lose valuable single family housing with these zoning proposals.

Already there are serious issues for the residents from boarded houses on the north-western side of Madison (at the top of the hill backing on the Cameron). All the negative effects felt in prior periods from poor maintenance of properties awaiting redevelopment in CH have recurred and are particularly serious in light of the current drug crisis. This has become a heavy use of both City and police resources and
neighbours are experiencing high level of disturbance from transient (non-legal) users of these properties. Redevelopment is a slow process and meantime the neighbourhood suffers badly.

The street does not have high levels of traffic, mainly because it is reasonably self-contained. It suffers from the same problems of poorly maintained, narrow sidewalks as does the balance of the community. The street is bleak and not easy particularly in winter from a pedestrian perspective. The steep grades and the narrowness of the street itself makes likely intensified traffic a serious concern not only for Madison but also for the obvious access street, Church St. (with the infamous Cedar/Church intersection).

There is little that can be done to improve existing apartment buildings other than ensuring they are well maintained. The concern is for the future. At meetings held by the City, little has been said about the vision by planners for intensification. The community urges City planners to review the proposal for uniform intensification and, in particular, for the stretch at the top of the hill, west side. This seems completely out of character with what is planned for the streetscape immediately around the corner on Church. The question becomes, how much more can one small street with no two-way access take without totally destroying its character.

The path and stairs to Cameron Heights School open up an important part of CH from a social interaction perspective. The school is part of our community. The hill is a primary toboggan run. This is an important access to the playing fields, swimming pool, tennis courts and Kaufman Park. The playing fields are already used frequently for football, soccer, cricket, and volley ball as well as obvious informal uses such as frisbee. The track, when it was maintained, was an important resource for the community. The stairs are in reasonable shape and the school maintains attractive ‘graffiti’ art on the wall.

There is little lighting or signage at the access points and the path can feel isolated. Yet if basic changes particular at the access routes were made, this could become a major facility for the community and the entire downtown. With intensification, this access to the only large green space for CH will become critical. Pedestrians must feel safe at any time accessing their green space and park and put bluntly, right now the path and stairs do not feel very safe at any time. Further, the failure of either the City or the School Board to maintain the running track at the bottom of the hill has created a major barrier to the use of the green space. At different times of year you simply cannot walk on it as you sink deep into mud.
Path to Cameron hill and path across to stairs

Main access from the hill to the stairs
Looking down the hill with Kaufman Park on right

Playing fields with severely damaged track

Cricket and adjacent volleyball game on Cameron playing fields

Despite all the issues that exist currently with Madison, the community sees real potential for improvement but this calls for a serious role on the part of the City. While this will cost money, the
consensus is that this street has already done far more than any should for the overall downtown and it is now pay-back time. Further, if there is to be major development/intensification, it will be important that infrastructure improve.

As the number of residents on Madison increases it will be critical that the social interaction that a streetscape provides be enhanced. One of the most obvious elements is the redesign of the stairs from Charles to Madison. These must be available year round. They cannot continue to present as physically threatening. If this street is to absorb intensification, it must have broad and welcoming access stairs. These would be a major improvement not only for Madison but also for the Charles street design. The message will be that up this hill is a healthy and attractive community that is part of the downtown.

The community urges design of buildings to be sympathetic to the character of the rest of CH. They need well planned frontages and scaling in heights. Perhaps the easiest goal to set is to take what was built at #118 and do almost the opposite.

On a positive side, there have also been carefully created, recent projects; for example, the seniors complex (#143) opposite the church rectory which retained the original house and built behind. Good maintenance of apartment buildings on the eastern side will improve the message that these are well-cared for and even, in some cases, attractive examples of architecture from the 1970s and 1980s.

Real consideration must be given for how traffic will be managed with intensification. This is not a simple street because of access, narrowness and the steep hill. Sidewalks should be widened and there should be better allowances for greenspaces and trees.

The community urges planners to preserve the integrity of the two very important church sites on Madison Street. By creating a buffer around these buildings, avoiding poorly designed intensification, and with the addition of trees and green spaces, their importance to the community will be reinforced and the overall streetscape enhanced.

The City (with or without the School Board) must take full ownership of the access to the green space at Cameron Heights and Kauffman Park. There is the potential to create a major fitness and sporting facility.
on these properties with very little additional cost. This could be a major feature for the community, particular with younger people living in existing and new apartments. The stairs are already a part of many people’s fitness program and having a sound running track would be an amazing facility for the entire community. This does not have to be Olympic standard; just a sound surface with good maintenance (and why not continue the highly innovative, existing joint use as track and cricket pitch?). Further, this would also allow easy access to the tennis courts, pool, playing fields and playground. There is a need for the pathway to be improved with good lighting, renewed paving, lighting, and regular maintenance. The stairs are in reasonable repair although they also need on-going maintenance.

d. Stirling Avenue

Summary:
- Improve corner with Courtland as a gateway to CH and to the downtown.
- Improve access to Iron Horse Trail at this intersection.
- Improve pedestrian experience. Consider changes to the wall along the school property or enhancements to the sidewalk itself.
- Preserve the ‘triangle’ of housing by Courtland.
- Improve access to Kauffman Park.

Since this is only partially within CH, we do not spend a lot of time discussing it. However, it is a street many of us use as pedestrians and there are obvious improvements needed.

The Iron Horse Trail is a very important facility for residents and this is the one place where it falls (almost) within the technical boundaries of CH. However, the entire intersection with Courtland and the interruption of the Trail at that intersection signals strongly that this is car territory and not part of the very important City and community walking experience. A lot of the public and City focus on the Trail has been for the stretch between Queen St and Belmont although the stretch from Queen to Stirling is now closed for upgrades. An excellent next stage will be addressing how the Trail is enhanced at this intersection.

The access to the playing fields and Kauffman Park is, to put it politely, bad. The park is a secret to most in the community there being almost no marking of its existence. The paths in are about as half-baked as any paths could be. This would not be a costly improvement but it would significantly improve the quality of life for residents and increase usage.

The ‘triangle’ coming off of Courtland to Stirling is CH’s ‘little gem’ with well-maintained and stable housing. Real care should be taken to ensure it is protected by the City and CH is committed to ensuring it be included within its borders.

The pedestrian experience walking towards Charles is miserable. There is a high wall on one side and it is a busy road with a good deal of traffic. It is not clear to the community what can be done. It is a wind tunnel in winter and hot in summer. The community encourages the City to consider design improvements.
e. Courtland Avenue

Summary:

- Volume of traffic and lack of safe, pedestrian crossings are major issues. A real commitment must be made by the City and Region to come up with creative methods of making Courtland a more welcoming and pedestrian-friendly street.
- It is important to enhance the sidewalks, greenspaces, and maintain/increase trees.
- Reconsider what intensification looks like. Real harm will come to the community and a major city road if only smallish, box-like developments that are unsympathetic to existing architecture prevail.
- Do not let properties fall prey to the negative effects of land speculation. Existing single unit homes must be protected and there must also be recognition that these may stay in place for many years. They are a healthy part of the community.
- Ensure sound bike lanes.
- Ensure protection of the existing tree canopy as this enhances the community as a whole.
- Commercial use at ground floors is viewed positively but ensure that this is also practical. Will units be leased?

Courtland is a primary focus for CH and, just as for the SC community, more attention was given to this street than any other.

We begin with an observation of just how powerful but in a negative way, materials presented by planners can be. Much of Courtland within the CH boundaries that is not of institutional use, has owner occupied homes that are well maintained and very much cared for (e.g. there is a major investment being made currently on a single family home near the corner with Benton). Residents looked at the pictures presented by planners and could only observe My home doesn’t exist anymore. CH understands that the City is planning for the long term. But there has to be recognition that much of Courtland today is very stable. Yes, there are parts where intensification will happen in the short term, but it would be tragic for the community if the message was that existing single family homes do not belong, speculators should come in immediately, run down the properties (as they already have done with a few), and build. These are real people and it is a real community that is being affected.

Major renovations currently underway for house near the corner of Courtland and Benton
The most obvious difficulty with Courtland is its use as a major thoroughfare despite it being relatively narrow and in many ways ‘dead ending’ at Victoria Park. With the changes to Charles (LRT), Courtland has been called on to carry far more traffic than it did in the past. From the perspective of SC and CH, it divides our communities. It is difficult for pedestrians to cross other than at traffic lights which are far apart. The addition of the Maple Grove school has increased traffic at the Cedar Street intersection as most students are driven by private car to the school and daycare. There are always pressures at the Peter St. corner with access to Courtland School. There has long been a general sense that there is no will to address these issues and the fact that it is a regional and not city road is a major concern. Residents don’t know to whom to talk and how anything can change.

For the purposes of this report we will only reference the north side of Courtland. The only exception to this is the impact the community feels from some of the negative uses at different times at the old dairy site backing on to Martin Street.

Overall, the current design of the street presents as if this is where cars are the priority. Even bike lanes are so narrow and dead end making it hard for cars to navigate bikers safely.

In terms of social interaction, generally there is little sense of this existing. There is a certain amount of foot traffic because of the schools and church and people accessing public transit. However, as with the other streets, people remark on it not being a particularly pleasant walking experience with lack of shade trees, the conditions of the side-walks in places, and the amount of traffic. In terms of neighbourhood activities, Courtland provides major social institutions. Children from our neighbourhood and the other side of King come through CH and cross Courtland to get to Courtland Senior Public School. High school students often use Courtland to access Cameron. Both SC and CH residents must access Courtland to get to other parts of the City. There are two small grocery shops that are important to the community (Madison and Courtland and Benton and Courtland).

Store and small restaurant on corner of Courtland and Benton. Significant improvements currently taking place

One of the biggest concerns from the community is how intensification would actually work. There has been consistent displeasure with some of the recent projects. Two examples will describe what residents fear: buildings at 103 and 122 Courtland. It is really puzzling that a builder is allowed to present a wall of hydro meters to the streetscape, have lighting that has negative impacts on neighbours, and ignore any windows on the side of the building that looks over a park. 103 presents as a plain block/wall with no connection in terms of design features to the rest of the community. Given house prices and the stability
of home ownership, there is concern that most developments will be on one or two lots only and then repeat the design features of these particular buildings. Of major concern is how residents in any new building will access the street by car. Already this is a major problem for residents. How will this work as traffic continues to intensify?

Existing stable single family housing on Courtland

There are real concerns that City plans will increase land speculation. At present there are 2 or 3 properties between Peter and Benton streets that are poorly maintained and have been subject to the same issues with drugs and prostitution that have been felt in other parts of the community. Despite a lot of work with City staff by neighbours, the problems have not effectively abated. It is critical that we all take into account just how fragile CH remains wherever there is pressure to intensify but where that might not occur for a number of years.

There are real concerns about how the zoning for Courtland is being described. To be blunt, the real fear is a repeat of either the properties at 103 and 122 Courtland. Perhaps higher rise with greater maintenance of green space would be preferable but this should be discussed fully with residents.
Finally, there was support for the notion of shops/commercial use on the ground floor but not a lot of faith that this will occur. Taking the King Street experience (e.g. even the Market) it just seems to be very hard to encourage this use in practice. But if it could occur, it would be very positive for CH.

Courtland is used by buses. It is not known if this will continue following activation of the LRT. Currently it is used by out of town buses as well and this may change if the bus station ultimately moves.

The community spent a good deal of time considering what the future should look like. These considerations include:

- Seeking lower speed limits on Courtland itself or other traffic calming measures.
- Adding protected cross walks, likely at Peter or Cedar Streets. Note, care should be taken with such projects not to exacerbate the difficulty residents already have to get out of their driveways.
- Do anything and everything to encourage foot traffic including improving sidewalks, expanding greenspace, adding trees (balancing act for sight lines for driveway access).
- Maintain public transit and bus stops.
- Improve bike lanes.
- It is very important to the community to maintain all public uses and, in particular, the schools and religious buildings. These are places people to which walk (including to the synagogue at Stirling). It is very important that sidewalks and crossings be designed to ensure safety and enhance general well-being.
- Thought must be given to the practicalities of how intensification might occur, when it will occur, and what it will look like. People are encouraged by the thought of more small businesses and particular ones that might serve the community. Is this practical? Will the building lots be big enough (can there be sufficient land consolidation) for a really well designed project? What happens to properties while we wait for projects to happen?
- There are mixed thoughts about height of the projects. Again, it may well be more a question of actual design quality than height per se. Consideration should be given to those who will be backing on to the projects as well.
- Courtland has lost a number of trees. With any new development, existing trees should be preserved so far as is possible and new trees planted.

2. Other Major Streets

The proposed zoning for each of the following major streets will remain primarily as is or, in the case of Church St. be downzoned. For this reason, we will not discuss building design other than to say, should any existing building be replaced, it will be important to ensure that the design be sympathetic to the surrounding neighbourhood and the streetscape generally maintained. Properties should have good greenspace, trees, and buildings be of a height, location on site, and shape that are consistent with those nearby.

a. Church St.

Summary:

- A key issue is high volumes of traffic and speed of traffic.
- The intersection with Cedar is dangerous and must be addressed by the appropriate experts. This is becoming increasingly urgent with the growth of population through redevelopment in the area.
• Overall, the primary vision is to enhance the pedestrian experience with more green space, trees, benches and even garbage bins particularly for dog waste. Improved access to Cameron is important.

• There is still a need to protect some fragile properties and continued support from the City and Region will be required.

• Historic buildings must be protected.

• Means must be developed to protect Church St. properties from the negative consequences of uses on Charles St. properties.

This street is likely the most important for the community in terms of accessing the downtown and other services. It is a primary walking route and there is always foot traffic. The biggest problem it faces come from the increased traffic, both in terms of volume and speed. With the changes from the LRT project, Church is the primary access point for CH. It is also used as a through way by people wanting short cuts through the community. Combined with traffic is the increasing number of parked cars on the south side of the road which also means not ideal snow maintenance in winter and also poor sight lines for drivers and pedestrians. This is a primary street for school bus stops.

The street is divided by the intersection with Cedar St. which is one many residents fear. Because of increased traffic on both streets, this is a major intersection. The sight lines are poor and cars often speed on Cedar St (the street with the right of way). It is a nasty corner for pedestrians and cars.

While Church street has no public transit other than for school children, it does provide a major access point for bus and LRT. Foot traffic to public transit will undoubtedly increase.

There are already high rise buildings on Church St. and this has created a wind tunnel effect, particularly around Wellington Place.

For a street that is dominated by the needs of pedestrians, sidewalks are narrow, there are few trees, little green space, and the only bench is at the corner of Benton and Church. This is a street for social interaction – where you meet your friends – yet there is little space you can comfortably stop and talk. Light standards are large, unattractive and in the boulevard making expansion of the sidewalk difficult.
Church St. has traditionally either had churches on it or provided direct access to them. These are important to the community both for religious and historic reasons. The new medical centre will be increasingly important and attract more foot traffic. The east end of Church St. provides the primary access point to Cameron Heights School and the park/recreational greenspace.

Historic Jacob C. Shelly house, Church St.

There are some very historic buildings on Church St. both single occupancy and apartment buildings. Residents appreciate the efforts to stabilize the street through the downzoning and avoiding creating the barrier to the rest of the community that higher intensity buildings would have created. There have been some long standing issues with certain buildings on Church St. although many have stabilized over the last few years. The new zoning should reduce the land speculation that was a dominant feature in the 1980s in particular. Of continued concern is, however, the use of land on Charles St. that backs on to the Church St. properties. There is a tendency for the large parking lots to become a noisy gathering place that is very disruptive for residents on Church.

The visions for the future for Church St. primarily address the needs of pedestrians and traffic concerns. The key will be to ensure that the message of the downzoning resonates and that it is widely understood that this is a street for stability not speculation and the community is generally supportive of this City initiative. The community will continue to depend on the various City and Regional resources to ensure appropriate property maintenance etc. as well as defending the proposed zoning against requests for variance.

Residents are anxious for stabilization to occur on Charles St. They are fearful of any further growth in the social sector and strongly believe that for the neighbourhood to be healthy and secure, there can be no expansion either to social sector housing or services. They want development there to be sympathetic to the needs of Church street properties and the community as a whole. In particular, respecting light and privacy and avoiding further large expanses of parking lots where people gather particularly at night and on weekends. They would encourage the City to consider alternative land uses including mixed (economically) housing as suggested elsewhere in this report.
Residents would very much value working with City experts on how to manage the traffic issues on Church and the intersection with Cedar in particular. Some would also like to see the end of paid parking (although not everyone agreed with this) as this is a message that it is not a street for residents but increasingly for people visiting the downtown. In the long run it might be necessary to implement some form of permit parking project although at this time there is again not unanimous support for this. Certainly there is a feeling that more parked cars may slow down traffic and make it less of a ‘through’ road.

Church and Cedar St. Intersection. Note steep grade in both directions on Cedar St.

There is a strong desire to enhance the streetscape for pedestrians and thereby increase social interaction. Residents see this becoming more and more important. Already intensification in other parts of CH has increased the numbers of dog walkers and again this enhances the social exchanges on the street. However, it is also increasing the amount of garbage and dog feces in particular. Increased trees, green spaces, benches and even garbage cans (which are really needed), would all enhance the sense of Church St. being an important place for social interaction.
Finally, it is important to Church St residents that improvements be made to the access to the Cameron properties.

b.  St. George St.

Summary:
- *This is a very successful street in the community and the primary goal is not to do anything that detracts from this.*
- *Real care must be taken to ensure whatever happens with the Water Tower site is sympathetic to the community. Ideally it would remain public space but if built on, it must be understood that this is one of the most valuable (from both an economic and visual perspective) vacant sites in the community and good design is critical.*
- *Maintaining the pleasant walking experience is essential.*
- *Thought must be given to the long-term impact of non-resident parking.*
- *There is still a need to protect some fragile properties and continued support from the City and Region will be required.*

St. George is the second east-west street in CH and although it is an important access route, it is more limited than Church as it ends at Cedar St and has one-way traffic, west to east.

The interesting result of the community input session was that comments were almost unanimously positive about the street as it currently is. It is clearly considered to be a successful and generally stable place with mostly well cared for, single family homes. The Kitchener Housing project is well integrated into the community from a design perspective. People like the walking experience and the way houses present front porches to the street. They use expressions like ‘pleasant feeling’. They like the access to Sandhills Park which is a valuable part of the community.

There were some concerns expressed. The first relates to the zoning on Benton and the implications for the buildings on the corner of St. George and Benton. Residents are concerned about loss of light and privacy from any redevelopment. The street is currently bright and clearly exudes warmth for pedestrians. There is a real fear that this might be lost. Further, there is concern about increased traffic. This is a road that children play by and sometimes on (hockey). People drive carefully.

The other site that worries people is the Water Tower site. This provides good green space for the community. There is a fear that this will be intensified and put increased pressure on the street from a traffic and parking perspective. Generally, the concern is that what might be build may be poorly designed for such an important site and reduce the neighbourly feel of St. George St.

There is concern for the amount of parking on the street. In the winter, many other streets have no parking. Some of the residents in high rise buildings use this for additional parking and downtown workers are starting to use it as well. Again, this hurts the ambiance of the street and restricts availability for residents. While this is likely manageable today the concern is that it will not be in the future as the downtown flourishes and intensification elsewhere in CH increases.

Finally, there was some concern for the fragility of some parts of the street where housing is less stable and drugs and other criminal acts have been prevalent. As with much of CH there is real fear that some of the difficult problems could easily come back with poor housing maintenance and that some have not entirely left. Some people expressed concern that these issues have and continue to spill into Sandhills
Park and this, combined with dogs running unleashed, diminishes its attractiveness. That said, the community is appreciative of the upgrading proposals for the park in which they participated in 2018 and which should be conducted, summer 2019.

In terms of what vision people have for the future, the over-riding sentiment was to maintain what we have now. Should there ever be housing built on the Water Tower site it is critical that the design be consistent with the balance of the neighbourhood, maximizing frontages to the street and ideally including the traditional front porch look. There should also be adequate on-site parking. While a more modern design would also work, it should be done well and with input from neighbours.

The two corners on Benton where re-development may occur, must have design restrictions included that take into account the impact on properties on St. George as well as Benton. They cannot be loaded towards the back of the properties as that will be immediately adjacent to St. George St. properties. Height rules must be designed to minimize the impact of reduced light on St. George St. Likewise, parking must be designed so lighting etc. does not negatively affect St. George St. properties.

Finally, at some stage proposals must come forward to address parking on St. George St. This may well take the form of some sort of permit system that allows primary use for local residents and their guests.

c. Cedar St.

Summary:
- Address major traffic concerns: speed, intersection with Church, volume of traffic. Have input from traffic experts who address issues from the perspective of enhancing pedestrian rights and experience, protecting community access to roads, reducing use as through road, increasing safety.
- Carry through lighting style from downtown.
- Address sidewalks by increasing width, moving light standards, and increasing tree canopy and green spaces.
- Add mini-park style seating and other features such as garbage containers especially for dog walkers at corner with Church St.
- Enhance walk to LRT including city supported snow clearance particularly from Church to Charles, better and safer sidewalks, and more attractive streetscape.
- Consider Cedar St. as a major throughway for pedestrians using institutional buildings both on Cedar and nearby (including schools). Consider cross walks at Courtland.
- Defend proposed zoning and ensure any intensification is sympathetic to the neighbourhood and enhances green space and ambiance.
- Protect and preserve institutional buildings/uses.

Cedar St. is the major street in CH. It runs north south and continues through CH to the downtown and beyond into SC. It is a narrow street that has become a primary access route for and through the neighbourhood. It carries heavy traffic and this has been exacerbated by the LRT which now means west bound traffic cannot make a left hand turn off Charles into CH at Eby or Benton. In terms of topography, it is dominated by the steep hill that peaks at Church St.

If residents are generally happy with St. George St., the almost exact opposite is true of Cedar. People feel cars are king and they travel at speeds that feel very unsafe. The road is narrow which makes cars feel
even more threatening to pedestrians. Cedar St. has experienced some of the nastiest side effects of land speculation. This is particularly the case on the stretch from Church to Charles but also some properties on the balance of the street are poorly maintained. Some of the tenants are disruptive and can make pedestrians feel unsafe.

Sidewalks are narrow and in poor repair. Again, the placement of light standards within sidewalks restricts the width. Generally, the sense is that cars take priority over pedestrians. The fact that sidewalks are not all cleared well in winter makes them particularly problematic/dangerous given the steepness of the hill, particularly in the stretch leading to the new LRT station. There are few trees and almost no greenspace. The high rise at # 86 has been a major problem in the past although it has improved significantly in recent years. The main concern of residents is whether there will be any lower cost rental or family rental remaining at that property. They do not want to see low cost rental as the primary form of housing in the building (it did cause problems in the past as landlords were reluctant to invest in maintenance) but the community values mixed use and diversity.

Cedar St, narrow and unattractive sidewalks with light poles in walking area

In terms of public transit, Cedar St. is used to access buses on Courtland and the LRT on Charles.

There currently is little social interaction because the street is just not a pleasant walking experience. Obviously it is an access point to the downtown and the Market in particular. There are now new restaurants on the corner of King or nearby. There are also important community resources that exist on the south end of the street in CH:

- Maple Grove school is at the site of the old St. Joseph’s school. This brings considerable additional traffic to the school at peak times, particularly from Courtland. It can make that corner uncomfortable for pedestrians. That said, both the school and the daycare are a very positive addition to the neighbourhood and they also increase the use of Sandhills Park during day-time.
- St. Joseph’s Church parking lot is accessed from Cedar (and goes through to Madison)
- There is an entrance to Sandhills Park off of Cedar. At present this is not particularly well maintained and some have thought the signage is not adequate.
- Sandhills Park is currently undergoing improvement. This process has not been seamless and there is real concern about the need for new tree plantings in the Park.
- Cedar St is a primary access route for children going to Courtland Avenue school. It is also important for high school students going to Cameron Heights.
Sandhills Park itself is not addressed extensively in this Report primarily because it has already been part of a community visioning exercise conducted by the City in 2018. Changes are scheduled to be made in summer 2019. The community has, however, found the follow up process to the final report by the City a little frustrating. Beyond posting notices in the Park, there has been almost no news about what is happening and residents have had to set up a process of communications with City staff themselves. At the time of writing, the Park has had many trees and shrubs removed with much debris remaining (‘clean-up’ was part of the plan). After follow ups with City staff there have been assurances that this will be completed as work progresses but it is still not clear when or even whether new tree plantings will take place (beyond those described in the plan). Since the Park was built in the early 80s the only new tree planted was one donated by Courtland School pupils. Initial discussions with the City staff this spring suggested that there may not be money for new trees since these were not part of the costing of the Park redesign (only the removal of damaged trees) and would have to come from a different budget. It is very
much hoped that this is not correct. The original trees in the Park were often the very fragile Manitoba maples, and after approximately 35 years, more lasting plantings should and must take place in order for the Park to be a viable green space for the community.

The community noted that existing zoning will be retained for much of Cedar Street and there are concerns that speculators have already bought up properties and will push for a variance if the new zoning is approved. People are discouraged by the ability of some property owners to push boundaries and not in a way that helps the community. Once zoning is in place it should be accepted and defended. This street is very fragile and cannot tolerate any more speculation by people with little interest in creating good developments but only wanting a quick economic return.

Of all the streets in CH, this was the one where the community had most difficulty envisaging significant improvements. The following summarizes what residents urge the City to consider:

- What can be done to discourage Cedar St. being considered a through road and a quick alternative to Stirling or Benton Streets? The street cannot be widened. The intersection with Church is dangerous. The community believes it is essential that this issue be addressed for the safety of the community and the well-being of the children who use Cedar St as an access to Maple Grove, Courtland Avenue and Cameron Heights Schools. The residents envisage possible road calming measures. Here, however, they will need the advice of traffic experts.
- Lighting is, by and large, ‘grim’. One strong signal that this is a street that is cared for and is for residents and pedestrians and not just cars would be to continue the lighting from the north side of Charles and take it all the way to Courtland or beyond (as with Queen). These smaller standards would also allow for the widening of sidewalks.
- It is unlikely that Cedar will ever become much of a bike route because of the hill. However, the pedestrian experience should be significantly enhanced. Sidewalks should be widened and having the road slightly narrower might discourage some through traffic. While there is no room for boulevards, tree plantings on adjacent properties should be encouraged.
- An obvious place for enhancing the pedestrian experience is at the top of the hill. Is there scope for a tiny green space setting with a bench that encourages people to stop and talk? Something equivalent to that which exists at the Benton corner.
- With stable zoning there should be real enforcement of property standards and general encouragement of improving existing properties.
- Sandhills Park is a critical resource for the community. CH appreciated the visioning process for improvement and is looking forward to work being completed. However, it is essential that tree plantings take place in order for the Park to remain a pleasing green space for all.
- For the part of Cedar where intensification will take place, there should be care taken to ensure access is not onto Cedar Street but rather Charles. Redevelopment of the properties closest to Charles should be designed to maximize green space and trees on the Cedar St frontage.
- With the LRT stop at Cedar, there will be much more pedestrian traffic and this alone will make people feel safer. However, it also increases the need to improve the pedestrian experience on Cedar itself. No one should feel unsafe walking there and access in winter in particular should be free of ice and other dangers.
- One location for a cross-walk is at the corner of Cedar and Courtland.
d. Peter St.

Summary:
- Important design features of this street are presently under review with the major infrastructure work proposed in the next year or two. These will drive the design of sidewalks, trees and green space and the primary desire of the residents is for them to continue to have real and valuable input to this process. To date City staff have been very responsive to neighbourhood concerns and creative in their design approach.
- With the infrastructure project proposed, this is the perfect opportunity to address the light standard issue that plagues CH as a whole. Given the goal of widening sidewalks, light standards should be replaced and reduced in size plus not placed so as to reduce sidewalk space.
- There is a continued need for support from City and Regional staff with the few remaining fragile properties.
- There should be better signage and access to Sandhills Park.
- Priority should be given to improving the laneway access to Sandhills Park. It is understood that this is part of the proposed infrastructure project.

Peter St. generally is a stable street that residents identified primarily as a major walking route to the downtown or, the opposite way, to the Iron Horse Trail and beyond. It is still used as something of a throughway for traffic but since it stops at Church St. the pressure is not as great as on Cedar St. It has no public transit other than school buses but is an access route to both buses and LRT. It is probably potentially the most congenial north south artery for pedestrians particularly as the hill is not as steep as with Cedar and Madison. Many of the houses on Peter St. are significant historically dating back to the 1880s and earlier.

The primary concerns are once more for the poor quality of the sidewalks, the lack of trees and green space. Generally, it is not viewed as nearly as pleasant a walking experience as it should be. People have mixed thoughts about the width of the sidewalks themselves. They are, however, particularly concerned that infrastructure improvements do not include replacing light standards (Kitchener Wilmot Hydro explained that current standards are adequate) and this closes off a critical opportunity to increase sidewalk space and improve the overall attractiveness of the streetscape. With the road already dug up, underground wiring could be considered. Residents urge the City to use this opportunity as a template for
CH as a whole. The present location of light standards appears to be the primary obstacle to enhancing walkability in much of the downtown. Further, generally, above ground wiring on streets too narrow for wide boulevards and tree plantings makes for a barren and unattractive streetscape.

Residents value the sloped curbs as often it is necessary to ‘slide’ into drive ways in winter. Current City plans for infrastructure changes are sound for both parts of the street.

Peter St. is an important access point to Sandhills Park. The signage, however, to the park is poor. The public laneway is in a very bad state of repair and it is not even clear where the lane ends at the park entrance. This latter part may be addressed by the upgrades that will take place in 2019. While there was some confusion as to whether the laneway will be part of the major infrastructure improvements, it now appears that it is.

There are a few remaining properties that are fragile and these need the continued support of regional and city staff and by-law enforcement in particular.

Overall, for the future residents are really looking forward finally to having infrastructure improvements but only if the design features meet their needs and wishes. Key will be improving the streetscape. Housing is, for the most part in good condition and stable. A more visible entrance and signage way to the park would be valued.

3. Minor streets

There were two minor streets in CH that are discussed here because they have an important role in the neighbourhood and for different reasons:

a. Eby St.

Summary:
- Preserve this as a critical walking route linking CH with the downtown. Increase the width of sidewalks and make road narrower.
- Enhance quality of sidewalks.
- Ensure any intensification on the easterly side does not remove the existing street facing housing but is, instead, behind these buildings.
- Respect the need to enhance feelings of safety for all residents and ensure no expansion of potentially disruptive uses.

Eby St. in CH is one block long but it is most people’s (from CH and SC) primary access route to the Market, other parts of King East, and to the LRT. It carries a high amount of foot traffic. It is generally used as an alternate to Cedar St. because it is far less steep. Car traffic has been reduced with the changes on Charles St. for the LRT.

The street could have been well designed from a pedestrian perspective at the time infrastructure was replaced. However, this was still an era when the primary focus appears to have been, unfortunately, for the car, not pedestrians and there was a total rejection of smaller light standards and underground wiring. The sidewalks are relatively narrow. In many places two people cannot pass without one going onto the road.
Eby St from the corner of Church illustrating narrow sidewalks

There were once serious problems with properties particularly on the eastern side of the street but many of these have been stabilized. There are, however, about what is to come. There are a number of properties behind the street facing houses and these are not always well maintained. Several of the driveways are gravel on this side and these give the impression of being temporary.

The northerly end of Eby is affected by the same pressures as Charles. Again, residents would value no additional social services on this street where there is already a heavy concentration. They do note that most of the properties on Eby St. itself cause few issues and the residents are genuine members of the community as much as anyone else. The primary concern is with the more transient population coming from Charles St.

This is an area that will be subject to some intensification. Where it might occur on Eby St. residents would like it to take place behind the street front houses, in order to preserve the current small-scale look of the street. Careful design guidelines will have to be prepared in order to achieve this goal. Above all else, work must be done to ensure the highly significant role of this street as a primary pedestrian route to the Downtown is maintained.

b. Hebel St.

Summary:
- The key is to preserve the current ambiance of the street.
- The access to the sidewalk must be improved.
- When creating design guidelines for Benton intensification, care must be taken to ensure no negative effects flow through to Hebel.

Hebel St. is a very historic, one block, one-way street between St. George and Courtland. It has a number of very attractive older homes some of which are immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. It is important to the neighbourhood that the character of this street be preserved. There was some redevelopment with a small town house project a number of years ago. While there is nothing wrong with these properties, it would be nice to see any new development be more in keeping with the existing housing as current
design standards would suggest. In particular, the goal should be not having the primary frontage being expansive parking allowances.

Infrastructure improvements are scheduled for the next year or two. As with Peter St. this will be the perfect opportunity to ensure underground wiring and smaller light standards. This is a narrow road with a very narrow sidewalk. It is a walking street for most residents but the experience is not, currently, particularly pleasant.

There are concerns about the following:

- At some stage there will be major redevelopment on the land backing onto Hebel on Benton. This must be done in such a way that it does not destroy the light and ambiance of Hebel.
- The corner property on St. George street has for years had a very poorly built and maintained retaining wall. It is now difficult to walk on the sidewalk at that stretch, and generally not possible in winter. This should be addressed, perhaps at the time of the infrastructure improvements.
- There is an old apartment complex half way down on the east side. While this is currently not presenting any difficulties to the community it has been problematic in the past. Since this leads into a laneway that goes through onto Peter St. this created problems elsewhere in the community as well. The units are small and old and while no one is suggesting they should be changed, real care should be taken to ensure the landlord provides appropriate maintenance and supervision.
VII. CONCLUSION

This concludes this visioning report. As with any such exercise, it should be considered very much as a living document and this iteration captures the community at one particular period of time. Over the next year there will be major improvements: Sandhills Park is scheduled for upgrade incorporating community wishes and both Peter and Hebel Streets will have their long promised infrastructure work conducted. The full impact of the LRT will become known.

Researching and writing this report has allowed all CH residents the opportunity to reassess the vision they have for the community they most deeply love. CH continues to face challenges but it also will continue to work with City and Regional staff and politicians as well as social service providers to find long term solutions that are in the best interests of all members of the community. The history of CH is evidence of just how effective partnerships and hard and creative work can be in protecting this thriving and strong community.

This report provides detailed proposals for improving the streetscape of CH. These are as much for enhancing the downtown as a whole as they are for CH. The major streets are the gateway to our community and the entire downtown.

As we researched our streetscapes for this project, the goal of enhancing the walking experience became paramount. This is a walking community. It is on the streets that we have many of our best social exchanges. Yet currently, most of our sidewalks are narrow and unattractive. Unlike other parts of the inner downtown, there is no room for large boulevards in the road allowance with attractive tree plantings. Much of the infrastructure improvement in CH was conducted at a time when sustaining roadways for vehicular traffic remained paramount. Because light standards are maintained by a separate regulatory body, no one seriously addressed the negative impact of their current positioning and their large size. For planners considering how to improve the infrastructure of downtown communities and CH in particular, addressing this critical obstacle to ensuring wide and welcoming sidewalks should be of the highest priority. Creative solutions are essential.

Finally, the community continues to be grateful for the strong support it receives from City staff. The relationship is, for the most part sound and respectful. Residents commit themselves to work with staff on all issues affecting their community.
Alain, Brandon, Tina and Debbie:

Please find attached a Visioning Report prepared by the Cedar Hills Community as input for the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support the proposed new zoning.

This project began with the work of City staff who encouraged us to prepare our own vision document. We were assisted as we began this project by John Macdonald and Elyn Lin of John Macdonald Architects. John and Elyn led the community in the initial visioning exercise and have shown continued interest throughout spring 2019. The community has been involved throughout.

We will be preparing a print version of this document in due course but in truth we want to let this ‘sit’ for a couple of weeks or so in order that we may back for a final proof-read with fresh eyes. But since we believe the substance is all there, we wanted to get you this almost final version now in e-form so that you can consider its content as you conduct your work. Of course we will ensure you have a final, hard copy version as soon as it is available.

I believe I can speak on behalf of all of the community when I say that we are all most grateful for the City Staff support and the support of you, Debbie. Throughout the recent zoning meetings we have been struck by the openness of everyone we have met to considering the community perspective, even when we are mixed up at times and not always clear. For all of this we thank you.

Of course we hope that this document is a beginning for further discussion. We would be thrilled if suggestions might be incorporated into your proposals. No doubt you will have further suggestions for improvement.

Thanks. And please pass this on to any relevant City staff whom I have inadvertently omitted in this email.

Sally
Visioning Report of the Cedar Hills community Prepared for the City of Kitchener Planning Staff

June, 2019
This Visioning Report for the Cedar Hills community is provided to the City of Kitchener Planning Staff as input into the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support proposed new zoning.
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I. PROJECT SUMMARY

This project is provided to the City of Kitchener Planning Staff as input into the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support proposed new zoning.

Cedar Hills (CH) is the site of the original town of Sand Hills. The name accurately describes both the topography and the golden sand found under the topsoil in CH. The neighbourhood is one of the key components of historic Berlin/Kitchener. Many of the original houses remain and the steep hills provide vistas stretching as far as Baden.

Key to understanding the CH vision is knowing its recent history. This is a proud and stable community but also one that has had to face many challenges. Through the Cedar Hill Community Group (CHCG), residents have consistently worked diligently with City and Regional staff to identify and implement solutions. This has consumed extraordinary time and energy on the part of residents.

The primary purpose for this Report is to capture the vision for CH that might in turn, be translated into the new urban design guidelines. The Report reflects the opinions of the residents. It results from community meetings and the circulation of drafts with resulting revisions. Key elements are:

- While CH has experienced much success in fighting challenges, it remains a community facing continued and significant vulnerability. CH is grateful for its strong working relationships with the City. However, it still suffers the effects of past poor planning decisions and, often, changes to infrastructure being made ‘on the cheap’. There is a strong desire that this time round, no street shall be left behind and the very best of design and innovation should be applied.
- Urban intensification inevitably brings challenges, particularly at the transition stage. CH has borne these costs perhaps more than most communities both in the past and still today. Regulations must be both implemented and enforced that effectively protect CH (and other communities) during transitions. What exist today are not fully effective.
- Families and people of all ages and incomes have chosen to move to CH/continue to live in CH because of its proximity to downtown, access to public transit and ethnic and socio-economic diversity. Above all else, this is a walking community yet the state/width of sidewalks and landscaping is often poor and streetscapes are unattractive. Intensification must only occur in conjunction with improved infrastructure that supports social interactions between residents. This applies to all major streets in CH.
- The neighbourhood is generally not opposed to intensification. Rather, its focus is upon how intensification should occur. There is real concern that already redevelopment is squeezing out families and offers few lower cost units. There is little evidence that the current draft proposals will reverse or slow this trend. Family housing on Madison St. is currently being replaced by projects with single bedroom units as is much of the rental property at 86 Cedar St. Most recent new development in CH has been of higher priced, small, rental or condominium units. Further, there is major concern (from both the CH and Schneider Creek communities) that planning descriptions for Courtland Avenue seriously threaten the stability of existing, stable housing stock and the vision for the neighbourhood.

---

1 Cedar Hills residents wish to acknowledge the work of John MacDonald and Elyn Lin of John MacDonald Architects in leading the original visioning exercise upon which this Report is based. As always, John has been willing to support our community and for this we thank him most sincerely.
This Report presents street by street analysis of current conditions with strong vision recommendations. The community is excited by the potential for improvement and presents its vision with the goal not only of improving living conditions for CH but for the entire Downtown. CH has always considered the latter as critical to any design or infrastructure improvements. We highlight some of the key elements of our recommendations:

- The community sees enormous potential for relatively simple infrastructure improvements to the major arteries that would significantly enhance CH in its role as gateway to the City. See proposals for Benton St. in particular.
- There are areas where traffic presents major problems and the community urges serious analysis by both City and Regional experts. For example, the Cedar and Church St intersection is a serious concern. Courtland presents real difficulties for both CH and SC. CH urges the City (and, where relevant, the Region) to enhance walkability. In part this can come from side-walk improvements. Essential to these will be coordination with Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro. Currently the placement of large light standards prevents the widening of sidewalks (and narrowing of streets) in a manner that is evident elsewhere in the City. Compare, for example, the effects of light standard type and placement on Joseph or Queen Streets with any in CH. There also exist serious concerns for pedestrian crossings of major streets; in particular Courtland, Benton and Charles. While streets carried lower levels of traffic, these problems were ignored. They no longer can be, particularly with intensification. Proposals are presented.
- Again with intensification comes the need for increased, useable greenspace. CH has two resources. First, the relatively small Sandhills Park facilities which are currently being improved. Second, the under resourced Cameron/Kaufman Park facilities. An exciting proposal is presented for relatively low cost improvements to the Cameron/Kaufman Park facilities. This could and should become a major resource for adults and children providing major sports (track, tennis, swimming, soccer/football/cricket fields/volley ball, baseball, stair running) and parkland/playground facilities. Most resources already exist but currently access is poorly marked and maintained and the track, in particular, is unusable (other than as the highly innovative cricket pitch). With relatively little cost, this could become a major attraction for the entire Downtown.
- The high concentration of social service uses in CH has reached the point where real harm is happening to the community. The community is not opposed to lower cost housing. Indeed it is concerned that it may be left with not enough. But CH is currently under real stress from some of effects of the existing social service uses and cannot absorb more. CH urges the City to consider replacing some of the lower density properties on Charles St. (and, in particular between Benton and Eby) with mixed market cost rental/condominiums, higher density developments. These should include some units large enough to house families.

We conclude with one caveat. Although there was a concerted effort to ensure this Report represents the views of the entire community, it was far more difficult to gain input from renters, and, in particular, those with limited English language skills, than from home owners. While the authors have done their best to infer the needs of those who didn’t participate directly, we acknowledge this limitation.
II. INTRODUCTION

This report builds on the work of the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood\(^2\) (“SCN”) in which that community came together to understand how they collectively defined their neighbourhood and to identify goals for the future. In the course of this exercise, SCN references its relationship with Cedar Hill (“CH”). The two neighbourhoods abut and today the City of Kitchener is combining the two for planning purposes.

CH has long been represented by the Cedar Hills Community Group (“CHCG”) and has also always had close associations with the area now represented by SC. As is mentioned in the SC report, the two communities were historically linked by the major employers in the area and CH is an obvious primary route for anyone in SC going downtown. In 1981, the provincial government funded the Ontario Neighbourhood Improvement Project (“ONIP”). The main offices for this project were located near the corner of Benton and Mill Streets and the studied area encompassed all of what today would be SC and CH (and parts of Highland-Stirling). Several major improvements resulted from this project including the closing of Benton Street to Mill (with the replacement by the foot bridge), the creation of Sandhills Park, and the proposal that led to the City creating the Mill-Courtland Community Centre. When there was no formal SC community group, CH incorporated the entire area into its meetings wherever possible. It also actively argued against the Benton Street Realignment project from the early 1980s until relatively recently when the Region sold off its houses on Benton Street and the project was formally shut down. This included participating in a number of City and Regional level studies including those relating to the north-south traffic assessments.

There is no doubt that the growth and effectiveness of the SCN group has enhanced not only SC but also CH and now combining the two areas for planning purposes makes a lot of sense. CH residents enjoy the programming developed by SC. They walk through SC to get to all the amenities identified in the SC report including, most obviously, the Iron Horse Trail, Mill-Courtland Community Centre, the Harry Class Pool, and on to Victoria Park and St. Mary’s Hospital. Likewise, SC residents continue to use CH as a key thoroughfare to the downtown.

There are many similarities between the two areas. Although parts of the CH neighbourhood are older than SC, the issues arising for many of the residential streets in CH are similar to those identified in the SC report. There are, however, also differences and some of these were alluded to in the SC report. Most obvious is topography. The dominant feature of CH is its hills, peaking at St. George and Church Streets and sloping down to Courtland and Charles Streets, and to Cameron Heights Collegiate Institute (“Cameron”) and Kauffman Park from Madison. More important is the greater proximity to downtown of CH. A number of the properties in CH are large. There is already real mixed use in terms of scale of buildings. There has, particularly since the 1980s, been a significant increase in institutional use of properties. There is a far higher proportion of rentals in CH compared with SC. There has been recurring and significant land speculation in CH that, over the years led to property degradation and depreciation, urban crime, and social disruption. While SC has not been immune to some of these same issues, there is no doubt that the scale is different.\(^3\)

---

\(^2\) Making Our Neighbourhood Great!, Kitchener, December 18, 2015.

\(^3\) This is not in any way to minimize the issues SC has itself had to face; for example, those affecting Martin Street residents and the industrial uses leading to Courtland as well as some issues on Benton St.
The most important consequence of the differences for present purposes is that the focus of the two communities has inevitably been different. CH was actively involved in land use issues from the early 1980s including involvement in a very lengthy secondary planning project at that time. It faced major intensification pressures on St. George and Cedar Streets that resulted in the community becoming very active in planning processes. The negative pressures in the downtown that spilled over into CH, lead to the CHCG spending a good deal of its time working with downtown businesses, the police, city and regional authorities, on very troubling urban issues. In some ways CH was engaged in a seemingly endless fight for its own preservation and that of its very precious downtown and inevitably looked far more in a northerly than southerly direction, other than for the Benton St. realignment issues which it saw as directly threatening the health of both SC and CH.

Today, as we have developed this current report, many of the prior pressures CH faced continue and inevitably inform our perspective. Further land speculation began immediately the LRT was announced and years before it was approved. Institutional land use continues to be a significant part of the neighbourhood and rental properties bring different issues from those of home ownership. All this said, CH is immensely proud of what it has achieved since the early 1980s and is very grateful for the approach adopted by the City in this current planning process and in many other respects. Real care is being taken to listen to what the community wants and needs. There exists respect for the positions of the community and, as a result, the sense that we can make a difference. For this we thank all staff who are involved in the current projects.

III. BACKGROUND TO KEY ISSUES IN CEDAR HILL

The SC report provides a sound basic description of CH and what follows builds on that account.

The naming of our community as Cedar Hills is a relatively recent occurrence. The neighbourhood as it is now defined was created out of the larger Mill-Courtland/Highland Stirling neighbourhoods in order to provide focus for addressing the unique issues facing this particular community, largely the consequences of the crack epidemic in the 1980s and the decline in quality of housing stock caused by land speculation. The boundaries are typically considered to be Charles, Madison, Courtland and Benton streets, although at times we include what is now known as SC and would extend the area to Stirling Street.

If we can legitimately define the character of any neighbourhood, the driving forces that motivated both the creation of CH and the CHCG at least in its modern history have been predominantly political. From the early 1980s, there was a series of events that seriously affected the social fabric of the community and which required resident response. Throughout the 1980s the serious degradation of rental housing with associated problems lead residents, working with the City of Kitchener, Mill-Courtland Neighbourhood Association, and The Waterloo Regional Police Service to create the CHCG to address local issues. The drug and prostitution crisis from the early 1990s was a critical driver of activism, but it was a broader range of unrelated events that encouraged residents to become politically engaged and ultimately, to come together to create the CHCG. In particular:

- The ONIP project introduced many of us to each other for the first time and allowed us to engage in what today would be described as visioning exercises about the future of our community.

---

4 The name was the creation of a group including Karen Taylor-Harrison (CHCG), Mark Yantzi (councillor for the ward), John Westbrook (Waterloo Regional Police Service Division 1 commander), and staff from the City. The term reflected Cedar Street being at the peak of the hill, hence Cedar Hill.
The closure of Victoria School lead to a multi-year dispute with the Waterloo Region School Board. Here CH community members joined members of the Victoria Park neighbourhood (as well as parents from across all the downtown elementary schools including J. F. Carmichael, Queen Elizabeth, and Suddaby) to fight the school board’s desire to close what was a very historic resource for our community. While the school was ultimately closed, this period forged very close relationships between community members. More importantly perhaps, it brought the community together with key politicians at all levels and the City in particular. School closure fights became a very unpleasant side effect of living in the city core and at some stage and to various degrees, CH residents were involved in no less than 11 different battles with one or other school board (some schools were evaluated two and three times). In each case, residents had to work together closely.

The Lost Sea project on St. George Street in the early 1980s was the first exposure the CH group had to a major planning dispute. The essence of the project was the placement of a major high rise on the north side of St. George Street that would fill a large lot between St. George and Church streets. The design was simply a replication of one used by the same developer in London and, while, there was no zoning to prevent the project, it would have destroyed the low-rise streetscape on St. George St. The community argued against the project at the Planning Committee of Council and, to everyone’s surprise, the committee rejected the project with the chair stating ‘let them sue us’. This in fact happened and the legal settlement resulted in the City acquiring the property from the developer with the Kitchener Housing project on Church and St. George streets ensuing. This particular project continues to be cited as an excellent example of sympathetic intensification particular in terms of the St. George Street frontage.

A very lengthy secondary zoning project ran throughout the 80s. The fiercest arguments arose over intensification on St. George and Peter Streets. A couple from the GTA had consolidated a large number of properties on these streets and sought zoning that would have allowed for major intensification. Since these properties in part backed on to the Wellington Place condominiums, the argument used by both the developers and the city planners was that further tower projects would be appropriate. If this had happened, the entire character of CH would have changed as, at this stage, all the properties subject to rezoning were single unit homes, albeit sometimes broken into more than one rental unit. This secondary planning project was at times very painful. At this time the voice of residents was not considered to be particularly relevant or welcome. However, in the end, the argument for today’s zoning prevailed. The developers sold off the individual houses over time and, as with Bingeman Street in the Central Frederick Street neighbourhood, the properties were then carefully restored and now are generally well maintained by owner-occupiers. Perhaps more importantly, this process educated residents about the need for involvement in their community and gradually cemented respectful relationships with city staff.

Before the secondary plan was fully implemented a zoning crisis was identified on Cedar Street that demonstrated how exposed the community was to poor development. A group of local lawyers built a somewhat problematic rental complex and the community understood just how little they could do to provide input and protect CH from the kind of development that had already occurred on Madison Avenue. City planners worked with residents and these efforts lead to what was known as conservation zoning throughout much of CH. It is likely this zoning that did more to stabilize the part of CH south of St. George Street than anything else.

The consequence of all these issues was a community that was reasonably well-educated in civic matters and well-position to defend itself against negative forces. Unfortunately, despite the hundreds of hours spent up until then, little would prepare it for the real crisis that came with the crack cocaine epidemic.
Whole reports have been written about this period. The area most directly affected was north of St. George Street and, in particular, from Church to Charles Streets. However, there were times when the negative consequences of what was happening in this fragile part of our community spilled over to the balance of CH and the entirety of CH was seriously at risk. There had been land speculation leading to ownership by landlords with no interest in the well-being of the properties, tenants or community ever since the City rezoned parts of CH for high density development. What became obvious was that, if CH was to survive at all, residents would have to work closely with all City and Regional service providers.

It is not the place here to go through the years of grindingly hard work on the part of CHCG and the City/Region that followed in order to overcome both the actual dangers to the community and the stigma it suffered. CH is grateful to the City for the Interim Control By-law, a temporary down-zoning imposed in order to prevent further development that was exploitative of renters and the community as a whole. While ultimately that zoning was reversed by the Ontario Municipal Board, it bought CH critical time. Today the economic conditions that drive much of the proposed redevelopment are entirely different from those that existed in that period.

The key take away from these events is the observation made at the beginning of this section. CH for all of its recent history has been required to think politically as much as socially. That is not to say it has not engaged in the latter, but when it did (see below), its efforts were focused very much on enhancing the reputation of CH as a healthy and safe place to live. And while there have been extraordinary successes, none of us yet rests easy. It is for this reason we are particularly grateful for the opportunity to continue to work with the City on the current visioning and zoning exercises.

IV. THE SOCIAL ROLE OF CEDAR HILL COMMUNITY GROUP

When CH residents are asked to describe their community, one of the terms most often used is ‘stable’. This is somewhat ironic in light of the obvious threats alluded to above and it is also a reflection of how the community is in fact comprised of quite distinct parts. But even in its most vulnerable areas, CH has a lengthy history of stable home ownership and it is likely this, more than anything else, that has ultimately allowed it to survive and in fine form. So, for example, one of the Peter St. residents is only the third owner of their house built in the 1880s. While they have lived there for 38 years (and the prior owner 57 years), they have current neighbours who were there when they moved in.

There is little doubt that one of the most difficult things for CH residents to handle was and even continues to be the denigration of their community by outsiders. It was not uncommon to have taxi drivers ask residents why they live in such a bad area. Police, real estate agents, and teachers have been quoted as saying how ‘bad’ the area was. CH and the downtown in general were described by outsiders as being dangerous and run-down.

At different times, and sometimes in direct response to the criticism of outsiders, the community engaged in initiatives to reinforce what they saw to be the strengths of CH (and the downtown) including:

- Visioning exercises with real estate agents to provide materials that accurately described CH. Key elements that residents valued were its economic, social and racial diversity, its proximity to downtown, its affordability, and its cohesiveness.

---

5 See, for example, the Pierre Filion Report to the City.
- Working with the City of Kitchener to improve communication between Property Standards, planning and zoning.
- Establishing, with the police and others, key programs including the Citizens on Patrol Program and the John School.
- Receiving 5 year funding (2004-09) from the Trillium Foundation for a project called the Downtown East, Ya Gotta Love It (DEYGLI). In 2009 CH applied for and received an Annual Grant from the City of Kitchener that allowed DEYGLI to extend the work that had been done during the duration of the Trillium Funding to other downtown neighbourhoods.
- Establishing a small committee made up of Property Standard Enforcement, Police and DEYGLI to work with landlords and tenants to resolve issues and effect improvements to the properties.
- CH was awarded funding through the Festival of Neighbourhoods program and used it for two purposes. First, it built a concrete pad with electrical hook ups in Sandhills Park. For a period, CH held an annual folk festival using this facility. Second, it created a very successful loan program to assist with improvements to house facades.
- When the blocks north of Church street were particularly vulnerable to drugs and prostitution, a street party was held on Eby Street to bring all residents together, including the most disadvantaged and transient.
- For many years there was a community garden off the pathway leading to Cameron Heights School. This was very successful and only ended as those who lead the project gradually no longer needed the garden space.
- As part of the East End project, an annual soccer program was created at Courtland School. All children attending downtown schools were invited and the program was run by volunteers from the community for at least 10 years. Up to 70 and more children would gather once a week in May and June for informal soccer games. Parents would bring their children and meet their neighbours, often for the first time. Often parents were new to Canada, coming from countries where soccer was highly popular. The Community Centre has ensured the program continues today and works with community volunteers from CH and SC.
- There are regular and active get-togethers between large groups of neighbours. For example, an annual holiday potluck with a large group has been running for at least 28 years and each year brings in new participants.

Reviewing the success of social gatherings and events in CH, there are certainly some real, long-term successes such as the soccer program. But other events such as the folk festival did not continue. With the benefit of hindsight, there are some fairly obvious reasons for this. First, the seemingly endless political exercises in which the community was required to engage consumed the energy and focus of most of the leaders in the community and there was simply no bandwidth available for organizing events unless they had a very specific goal such as the Eby Street party. Second, although we think of CH as homogeneous and small, it actually covers a reasonably large and certainly diverse area and this will be discussed below. Within the particular segments of the community, there is not a large number of people not otherwise occupied who are available for the intense work required for events such as the folk festival. It is our hope that as CH is now more stabilized, more people will step forward in a leadership role for these type of activities. Indeed, part of the project to revitalize Sandhills Park included interest in activities using that space and there are now a number of younger residents actively planning the kind of activities a healthy community requires. There is now a real sense of generational change in the very best sense of the expression. CH continues to be a healthy and thriving community.

V. Vision for Cedar Hills
CH engaged in a visioning exercise through the spring of 2019. This in part began with the consultation process for Sandhills Park that took place in 2018 but the primary driver was the City holding a number of meetings relating to new zoning and secondary planning. Most importantly in February, the City conducted a charrette for the combined SC and CH communities to discuss drafting urban design guidelines. It was at this meeting that the CH representatives committed to engaging in an equivalent exercise to that resulting in the SC Report. This began with a meeting (March 27, 2019) in which John MacDonald and Elyn Lin of John MacDonald Architects led members of the SC community through a series of exercises where they were required to consider the relative priorities of different uses in the SC streetscape; in particular, pedestrians, public transportation, private vehicles, neighbourhood activities, and social interaction within the streetscape. Community members were asked to evaluate and rank the significance of each aspect for all the major streets in CH.

This visioning exercise took place within the context of the proposed new zoning for CH. This is not the place to discuss the zoning changes in any depth, but what is particularly important from the perspective of the community as a whole, is both the stabilization of existing uses for the majority of the area and also recognition of higher density on the perimeter roads. While much of this zoning was already in place, there is no doubt that the current plans brought likely intensification of Courtland properties, for example, very much to the fore-front of residents’ minds.

We begin our summary of the visioning exercise with the over-riding impressions the community has of CH. People genuinely enjoy living here. This is their home, they choose to live here and they are, by and large, happy that they do so. There are important features that residents value; diversity and socio-economic diversity in particular, proximity to the downtown with all its amenities and the Market in particular, and stability and age of the housing. One of the most important features is the walkability of CH and this is reflected in much of the focus of the vision for the future. This is a community committed more to walking and the use of public transit than to their cars.

We did not spend time preparing a formal ‘vision statement’. However, when we told community members the statement from the old East End Project, it resonated. That statement was: Downtown East, you Gotta Love It. While obviously this would require adaption to CH, it does reflect a certain feistiness and resilience that has always defined who we are.

We now turn to the specific streets examined in our review process:

1. Boundary Streets

The boundary streets were classified as Courtland, Benton, Charles and Madison. We have also included Stirling for brief comment as it is highly relevant to CH but is often ignored.

The key element of all these streetscapes is how, generally speaking, they fail to meet the needs of both CH and the City in terms of providing an attractive and welcoming environment for a walking population accessing the Downtown and CH. It is one of the long-standing major concerns of CH residents that little attention has ever been given to the attractiveness of the main arteries (including these boundary roads) in the East End. Comparing these with the very attractive streetscapes on, for example, Queen, Joseph and much of King streets, roads such as Benton and Courtland are remarkably unattractive. There is little attention to attractive lighting. Sidewalks are often narrow and in a poor repair, there are few trees and limited natural shade, light standards are often in sidewalks, there are limited safe places for crossing
streets, and generally everything appears to be geared to cars. Encouraging the use of bikes is seen as an important part of CH but bike lanes are, mostly problematic. There are limited points where pedestrians can cross any of the boundary roads safely. The key plus for CH has been the addition of the LRT which is generally acknowledged to be a significant improvement.

We now turn to the individual streets. For each we will begin with a short summary of key elements envisaged for the future.

a. Benton Street

Summary:

- Real and exciting potential as gateway to CH and downtown.
- Requires sidewalk improvements and greater width in particular.
- Replacement of light standards to ensure consistency with other major downtown streets will allow for greater sidewalk width and enhance overall visual appeal.
- More green space is needed and tree planting required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness.
- Good bike lanes are needed.
- Place boulevard in street centre to enhance attractiveness.
- Crosswalk required, likely near top of hill. No current crossing from Courtland to Charles.
- Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.

Benton Street is, in a sense, a major thoroughfare without a purpose. Residents recall the major changes that occurred when it was intended this would be a key north-south access route for the City. The road was widened and trees were removed. Today the street is dominated by construction at the Arrow site and, opposite, vacant lots between Courtland and St. George. It lacks any pedestrian crossing between Courtland and Charles. Sidewalks are narrow, in a poor state if repair, and have large light standards within them in most parts. There is some public transit but no stops within the CH boundaries. There will be a LRT stop at Benton and Charles.

In terms of social interaction, there is little that exists on Benton St. that encourages interaction. People do attend churches and there now is the new medical centre on the corner of Benton and Church. But the general sense from the community is that social interaction is minimal. This is not a street you tend to expect to stop and talk to neighbours. It is primarily a way of moving cars and, for the most part, cars from outside CH. There is no safe crossing place between Courtland and Charles. Walking, particularly in winter is unpleasant and often unsafe (narrow, un-cleared side-walks).

What is the community vision for Benton Street? Comments were remarkably consistent and generally there was a sense of enormous potential. One observation was representative of many: It could stay as an artery for traffic, but it could be a point of pride and beauty in downtown Kitchener with greenery etc. and bike paths. People are genuinely excited about the potential for retail/commercial use in the ground floors of new buildings. One suggested this could become like Belmont Village. The current Arrow building is a fine example of design that took an old industrial building and appears to have used real care to make the building visually attractive from the street.
Residents have bought into the new planning vision that encourages more public spaces and this includes thoughtful building design. This should be a major pedestrian thoroughfare and wider sidewalks on both sides would be important. In order to achieve this, however, light standards must be moved. Residents want more shade trees and green space at the sidewalks and areas adjacent to them including for any new development sites. They suggest a boulevard in the centre of the street to reinforce these design features. There is concern that intensification could provide barriers to the streetscape so real care must be taken in the design guidelines to ensure appropriate heights and interaction with the public spaces. To repeat the comments about the initial Arrow development, there is a desire for new development to be part of our community and interact with our community. It is critical it not present as a closed door space.

In sum, perhaps for Benton Street more than any other there was real excitement for its potential. In part this is no doubt because of how poorly it supports the community now. But people accept the need for redevelopment and they really want this street to become not only a gateway to CH but also a gateway to the City and one that makes us all proud.
b. Charles St.

Summary:

- Invest in improvements to enhance both downtown and CH.
- Green space and tree planting required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness, particularly near LRT stations.
- Good bike lanes (if possible)
- Address access to Madison with well-designed stairway.
- High priority need for cross-walk at Eby.
- Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.
- Encourage mixed cost housing for intensification projects.
- No additional social service uses.

Many of the observation about Benton are mirrored with Charles with the exception that some of the expensive infrastructure has already been done. The sidewalks in the CH stretch are, for the most part, in good shape and reasonably wide. The LRT slows down traffic and presents a less car dominated vista.

There are consistent negative comments from the community about this street, however. Most obviously, there has been almost nothing done in terms of allowing for green spaces and there are few if any trees. It is a hot and not particularly attractive street to walk along. There are concerns that the bike lane is somewhat randomly marked and then seems to end suggesting this is clearly not a priority. There are concerns that people perceive this not to be a particular safe street to walk along because of the congregation at times of users of some of the social services agencies. CH has never complained about the location of the men’s shelter per se. Indeed, its placement on Charles predated most of us moving here (although the present usage of the Shelter is quite different from the original vision). However, there is no doubt that at peak times for clients coming and going, people can feel threatened making their way past the various buildings and through groups of people who are often loud and may seem aggressive. Further, parking lots on Charles become gathering places for people both at day and night and they are very disruptive for residents, particularly on Church St.

The most important social use that directly relates to Charles Street is access to the Market and here there was a unanimous desire for a cross-walk at Eby Street. This is a primary access route for many in CH and SC. At other corners controlled by lights there are pleasing crosswalk markings. There is nothing at Eby Street and the LRT presents a low barrier which is easy enough to cross for a person but can be difficult when pulling a shopping trolley.

The stretch of Charles that leads to the ramp to Madison is particularly problematic for pedestrians. The sidewalk appears narrower. It is dark and while the mural is an addition it only partially addresses the issue of the massive concrete wall.
Wall between Cedar and Madison Streets on Charles St.

There is a pedestrian access to Madison via a flight of very steep steps. These are far from ideal for pedestrians. They are narrow and poorly lit. There is no winter maintenance and instead rough boards are nailed across the entrance to close off the stairs. While the City does its best to maintain them, they attract graffiti and garbage.

Stairs from Charles to Madison Streets
Because of the perception of lack of safety, pedestrians often walk beyond the steps and walk up the ramp. Again, this ramp does not give a real sense of safety with poor lighting and little traffic. Many in the community would feel very uncomfortable walking up either the steps or ramp at night by themselves.

Finally, while the north side of Charles is not part of CH, it is highly problematic from a design perspective. There is redevelopment happening and so it is perhaps unfair to judge the attractiveness of some of the streetscape, but the stretch at the back of the Crowne Plaza (parking) is no doubt permanent and inherently unattractive.

The community is almost unanimous in terms of what it would like for Charles St. It wants this to become an attractive and healthy place for the community to walk and bike. There is real enthusiasm for the opening of the LRT and people ask that the two stations (at Benton and at Cedar) become more neighbourhood places. This might be achieved by enhancing the number of trees and green spaces by the sidewalk. Just having more people walking to use public transit will enhance the streetscape. The addition of a crossing at Eby Street is a high priority for the community. While the blocks are not long, the lack of any recognition that this is the primary access point to the Market is striking and changing this will do a lot to link the two sides of Charles Street with the CH and SC communities.

It is not clear where the primary redevelopment of Charles St will take place given the many existing social services buildings. However, assuming the economic incentive to intensify, the community urges the design specialists to take real care to impose design rules that enhance the street experience. Critical will be ensuring that buildings do not present as a barrier and have sufficient green space and trees on the sidewalk side to enhance the walking experience. Overall, as with Benton, this will be a primary route for the City and it will be how many traveling through the community by car or by LRT will judge the East End. This is the opportunity to insist on really well-thought out and pleasing design.

The lack of adequate bike lanes should be addressed if possible (it is acknowledged that this might be difficult with the LRT).
Finally, the City should be sensitive to the impact of the social service providers on the neighbourhood. While the existing providers are part of our community, it is important that the impact on the community of some of their uses be considered and that there be no expansion. For example, there have been some rumours (true or otherwise) that more of the older houses closer to Benton might be converted to social service housing.

Elsewhere in this Report concern is expressed for the reduction in availability of family and lower cost housing in CH. CH sees properties on Charles St as being particularly well suited to more mixed cost (market and subsidized/lower cost) housing units including family suitable housing as intensification takes place. The emphasis here is on ‘mixed’ use and likely private sector housing and not solely either market rental or subsidized cost housing.

c. Madison Avenue

Summary:

- High priority given to improving current stair access from Charles to Madison
- High priority to infrastructure improvements to primary access to greenspace, parkland and exercise facilities from Madison to Cameron Heights school. This could become the major recreational site for CH and SC combining the stairs, running track, tennis courts, pool and playing fields.
- Serious issues concerns about the degree of intensification proposed by the draft Secondary Plan.
- Sidewalk improvements, green space and tree planting required to enhance pedestrian experience and visual attractiveness.
- Ensure any development protects churches/public buildings.
- Ensure new buildings are attractive to street and present as open and not barriers to the community.
- Ensure sound maintenance of existing apartment buildings.

Madison Avenue is an unusual choice of ‘boundary’ street since it is in fact not a through road and certainly not a major road. Its issues are so unique it was actually inadvertently omitted from the materials provided at the initial CH meeting. While it has generally been considered a boundary for CH, Stirling Avenue is much more similar to the major boundary streets surrounding CH than Madison ever will be. Nonetheless, since it has generally been accepted as a boundary for CH, Madison will be included within this grouping.

Changes to Madison over the last 30 plus years have long been considered by CH to be the exemplar of all that the balance of the neighbourhood did not want to see happen elsewhere, fairly or unfairly. It has a very historic position in CH, having been where a major windmill was located for much of CH’s history, being the site of the first synagogue that served Berlin/Kitchener, the location of the very important St. Joseph’s Church and rectory, providing access to Kaufman Park. Cameron Heights School, and having some of the first experiments with intensification. Madison was affected dramatically by the building of the high school with the resulting steep hill and need for steps and a path to the school. Finally, the change to the road system that divided the road at Charles St. and resulted in the one-way ramp to Charles St. and creating a major barrier to the downtown and seriously affecting land use on the eastern/northerly sides of the road. Generally, Madison might be described as a road where planners and road builders experimented (or perhaps simply took the path of least resistance in their desire to meet other goals) and no one seemed to care too much about streetscape or quality of life for residents.
For many years the CH community and residents of Madison were very concerned about the quality and maintenance of the major apartment buildings. While most of these have improved significantly in the last 10 years, residents note that the building that best defines everything bad from a design perspective for the community is a relatively new addition at # 118. It presents to the street as a plain, square, dark red brick building with smallish windows, no front doors or balconies and poorly maintained landscaping at the street frontage. The entire design appears to be motivated by maximizing the number of units and parking spaces and that this could be built within the last five years once more motivates the community to urge for the kinds of design changes that are being studied by this current project.

---

The proposed zoning provides for intensification for the entire street, both sides from Courtland to Charles. This is despite the fact that the north/western part of the street from Church St to its end, has far more in common with the rest of CH that will be protected from change, than the balance of the street. There are also single family homes with smallish lots close to Courtland that are probably better suited to existing use than any form of intensification. There is a real sense that CH will lose valuable single family housing with these zoning proposals.
Existing well maintained housing north end of Madison

Already there are serious issues for the residents from boarded houses on the north-western side of Madison (at the top of the hill backing on the Cameron). All the negative effects felt in prior periods from poor maintenance of properties awaiting redevelopment in CH have recurred and are particularly serious in light of the current drug crisis. This has become a heavy use of both City and police resources and neighbours are experiencing high level of disturbance from transient (non-legal) users of these properties. Redevelopment is a slow process and meantime the neighbourhood suffers badly.

The street does not have high levels of traffic, mainly because it is reasonably self-contained. It suffers from the same problems of poorly maintained, narrow sidewalks as does the balance of the community. The street is bleak and not easy particularly in winter from a pedestrian perspective. The steep grades and the narrowness of the street itself makes likely intensified traffic a serious concern not only for Madison but also for the obvious access street, Church St. (with the infamous Cedar/Church intersection).

There is little that can be done to improve existing apartment buildings other than ensuring they are well maintained. The concern is for the future. At meetings held by the City, little has been said about the vision by planners for intensification. The community urges City planners to review the proposal for uniform intensification and, in particular, for the stretch at the top of the hill, west side. This seems completely out of character with what is planned for the streetscape immediately around the corner on Church. The question becomes, how much more can one small street with no two-way access take without totally destroying its character.

The path and stairs to Cameron Heights School open up an important part of CH from a social interaction perspective. The school is part of our community. The hill is a primary toboggan run. This is an important access to the playing fields, swimming pool, tennis courts and Kaufman Park. The playing fields are already used frequently for football, soccer, cricket, and volley ball as well as obvious informal uses such as frisbee. The track, when it was maintained, was an important resource for the community. The stairs are in reasonable shape and the school maintains attractive ‘graffiti’ art on the wall.

There is little lighting or signage at the access points and the path can feel isolated. Yet if basic changes particular at the access routes were made, this could become a major facility for the community and the entire downtown. With intensification, this access to the only large green space for CH will become critical. Pedestrians must feel safe at any time accessing their green space and park and put bluntly, right now the path and stairs do not feel very safe at any time. Further, the failure of either the City or the
School Board to maintain the running track at the bottom of the hill has created a major barrier to the use of the green space. At different times of year you simply cannot walk on it as you sink deeply into mud.

Path to Cameron hill and path across to stairs

Main access from the hill to the stairs
Looking down the hill with Kaufman Park on right

Playing fields with severely damaged track

Cricket and adjacent volley ball game on Cameron playing fields
Despite all the issues that exist currently with Madison, the community sees real potential for improvement but this calls for a serious role on the part of the City. While this will cost money, the consensus is that this street has already done far more than any should for the overall downtown and it is now pay-back time. Further, if there is to be major development/intensification, it will be important that infrastructure improve.

As the number of residents on Madison increases it will be critical that the social interaction that a streetscape provides be enhanced. One of the most obvious elements is the redesign of the stairs from Charles to Madison. These must be available year round. They cannot continue to present as physically threatening. If this street is to absorb intensification, it must have broad and welcoming access stairs. These would be a major improvement not only for Madison but also for the Charles street design. The message will be that up this hill is a healthy and attractive community that is part of the downtown.

The community urges design of buildings to be sympathetic to the character of the rest of CH. They need well planned frontages and scaling in heights. Perhaps the easiest goal to set is to take what was built at #118 and do almost the opposite.

On a positive side, there have also been carefully created, recent projects; for example, the seniors complex opposite the church rectory (#143) which retained the original house and built behind. Good maintenance of apartment buildings on the eastern side will improve the message that these are well cared for and even, in some cases, attractive examples of architecture from the 1970s and 1980s.

Real consideration must be given for how traffic will be managed with intensification. This is not a simple street because of access, narrowness and the steep hill. Sidewalks should be widened and there should be better allowances for greenspaces and trees.

The community urges planners to preserve the integrity of the two very important church sites on Madison Street. By creating a buffer around these building from poorly designed intensification, and with the addition of trees and green spaces, their importance to the community will be reinforced and the overall streetscape enhanced.
The City (with or without the School Board) must take full ownership of the access to the green space at Cameron Heights and Kauffman Park. There is the potential to create a major fitness and sporting facility on these properties with very little additional cost. This could be a major feature for the community, particular with younger people living in existing and new apartments. The stairs are already a part of many people’s fitness program and having a sound running track would be an amazing facility for the entire community. This does not have to be Olympic standard; just a sound surface with good maintenance (and why not continue the highly innovative, existing joint use as track and cricket pitch?). Further, this would also allow easy access to the tennis courts, pool, playing fields and playground. There is a need for the pathway to be improved with good lighting, renewed paving, lighting, and regular maintenance. The stairs are in reasonable repair although they also need on-going maintenance.

d. Stirling Avenue

Summary:
- Improve pedestrian experience. Consider changes to the wall along the school property or enhancements to the sidewalk itself.
- Preserve the ‘triangle’ of housing by Courtland.
- Improve access to Kauffman Park.

Since this is only partially within CH, we do not spend a lot of time discussing it. However, it is a street many of us use as pedestrians and there are obvious improvements needed.

The access to the playing fields and Kauffman Park is, to put it politely, bad. The park is a secret to most in the community there being almost no marking of its existence. The paths in are about as half-baked as any paths could be. This would not be a costly improvement but it would significantly improve the quality of life for residents and increase useage.

The little ‘triangle’ coming off of Courtland to Stirling is CH’s ‘little gem’ with well-maintained and stable housing. Real care should be taken to ensure it is protected by the City and CH is committed to ensuring it be included within its borders.

The pedestrian experience walking towards Charles is miserable. There is a high wall on one side and it is a busy road with a good deal of traffic. It is not clear to the community what can be done. It is a wind tunnel in winter and hot in summer. The community encourages the City to consider design improvements.

e. Courtland Avenue

Summary:
- Volume of traffic and lack of safe, pedestrian crossings are major issues. A real commitment must be made by the City and Region to come up with creative methods of making Courtland a more welcoming and pedestrian friendly street.
- It is important to enhance the sidewalks, greenspaces, and maintain/increase trees.
- Reconsider what intensification looks like. Real harm will come to the community and a major city road if only smallish, box-like developments that are unsympathetic to existing architecture prevail.
• Do not let properties fall prey to the negative effects of land speculation. Existing single unit homes must be protected and there must also be recognition that these may stay in place for many years. They are a healthy part of the community.
• Ensure sound bike lanes (if possible).
• Ensure protection of the existing tree canopy as this enhances the community as a whole.
• Commercial use at ground floors is viewed positively but ensure that this is also practical. Will units be leased?

Courtland is a primary focus for CH and, just as for the SC community, more attention was given to this street than any other.

We begin with an observation of just how powerful but in a negative way, materials presented by planners can be. Much of Courtland within the CH boundaries that is not of institutional use, has owner occupied homes that are well maintained and very much cared for (e.g. there is a major investment being made currently on a single family home near the corner with Benton). Residents looked at the pictures presented by planners and could only observe My home doesn’t exist anymore. CH understands that the City is planning for the long term. But there has to be recognition that much of Courtland today is very stable. Yes, there are parts where intensification will happen in the short term, but it would be tragic for the community if the message was that existing single family homes do not belong, speculators should come in immediately, run down the properties (as they already have done with a few), and build. These are real people and it is a real community that is being affected.

The most obvious difficulty with Courtland is its use as a major thoroughfare despite it being relatively narrow and in many ways ‘dead ending’ at Victoria Park. With the changes to Charles (LRT), Courtland has been called on to carry far more traffic than it did in the past. From the perspective of SC and CH, it divides our communities. It is difficult for pedestrians to cross other than at traffic lights which are far apart. The addition of the Maple Grove school has increased traffic at the Cedar Street intersection as most students are driven by private car to the school and daycare. There are always pressures at the Peter St. corner with access to Courtland School. There has long been a general sense that there is no will to address these issues and the fact that it is a regional and not city road is a major concern. Residents don’t know to whom to talk and how anything can change.

For the purposes of this report we will only reference the north side of Courtland. The only exception to this is the impact the community feels from some of the negative uses at different times at the old dairy site backing on to Martin Street.

Overall, the current design of the street presents as if this is where cars are the priority. Even bike lanes are so narrow and dead end making it hard for cars to navigate bikers safely.

In terms of social interaction, generally there is little sense of this existing. There is a certain amount of foot traffic because of the schools and church and people accessing public transit. However, as with the other streets, people remark on it not being a particularly pleasant walking experience with lack of shade trees, the conditions of the side-walks in places, and the amount of traffic. In terms of neighbourhood activities, Courtland provides major social institutions. Children from our neighbourhood and the other side of King come through CH and cross Courtland to get to Courtland Senior Public School. High school students often use Courtland to access Cameron. Both SC and CH residents must access Courtland to get to other parts of the City. There are two small grocery shops that are important to the community (Madison and Courtland and Benton and Courtland).
One of the biggest concerns from the community is how intensification would actually work. There has been consistent displeasure with some of the recent projects. Two examples will describe what residents fear: buildings at 103 and 122 Courtland. It seems inconceivable that a builder is allowed to present a wall of hydro meters to the streetscape, have lighting that has negative impacts on neighbours, and ignore any windows on the side of the building that looks over a park. 103 presents as a plain block/wall with no connection in terms of design features to the rest of the community. Given house prices and the stability of home ownership, there is concern that most developments will be on one or two lots only and then repeat the design features of these particular buildings. Of major concern is how residents in any new building will access the street by car. Already this is a major problem for residents. How will this work as traffic continues to intensify?
There are real concerns that City plans will increase land speculation. At present there are 2 or 3 properties between Peter and Benton streets that are poorly maintained and have been subject to the same issues with drugs and prostitution that have been felt in other parts of the community. Despite a lot of work with City staff by neighbours, the problems have not effectively abated. It is critical that we all take into account just how fragile CH remains wherever there is pressure to intensify but where that might not occur for a number of years.

There are real concerns about how the zoning for Courtland is being described. To be blunt, the real fear is a repeat of either the properties at 103 and 122 Courtland. Perhaps higher rise with greater maintenance of green space would be preferable but this should be discussed.

Finally, there was support for the notion of shops/commercial use on the ground floor but not a lot of faith that this will occur. Taking the King Street experience (e.g. even the Market) it just seems to be very hard to encourage this use in practice. But if it could occur, it would be very positive for CH.

Courtland is used by buses. It is not known if this will continue following activation of the LRT. Currently it is used by out of town buses as well and this may change if the bus station moves.
The community spent a good deal of time considering what the future should look like. These considerations include:

- Seeking lower speed limits on Courtland itself or other traffic calming measures.
- Adding protected cross walks, likely at Peter or Cedar Streets. Note, care should be taken with such projects not to exacerbate the difficulty residents already have to get out of their driveways.
- Do anything and everything to encourage foot traffic including improving sidewalks, expanding greenspace, adding trees (balancing act for sight lines for driveway access).
- Maintain public transit and bus stops.
- Improve bike lanes if possible.
- It is very important to the community to maintain all public uses and, in particular, the schools and religious buildings. These are places people walk (including to the synagogue at Stirling). It is very important that sidewalks and crossings be designed to ensure safety and enhance general well-being.
- Thought must be given to the practicalities of how intensification might occur, when it will occur, and what it will look like. People are encouraged by the thought of more small businesses and particular ones that might serve the community. Is this practical? Will the building lots be big enough (can there be sufficient land consolidation) for a really well designed project? What happens to properties while we wait for projects to happen?
- There are mixed thoughts about height of the projects. Again, it may well be more a question of actual design quality than height per se. Consideration should be given to those who will be backing on to the projects as well.
- Courtland has lost a number of trees. With any new development, existing trees should be preserved so far as is possible and new trees planted.

2. Other Major Streets

The proposed zoning for each of the following major streets will remain primarily as is or, in the case of Church St. be downzoned. For this reason, we will not discuss building design other than to say, should any existing building be replaced, it will be important to ensure that the design be sympathetic to the surrounding neighbourhood and the streetscape generally be maintained. Properties should have good greenspace, trees, and buildings be of a height, location on site, and shape that are consistent with those nearby.

a. Church St.

Summary:

- A key issue is high volumes of traffic and speed of traffic.
- The intersection with Cedar is dangerous and must be addressed by the appropriate experts. This is becoming increasingly urgent with the growth of population through redevelopment in the area.
- Overall, the primary vision is to enhance the pedestrian experience with more green space, trees, benches and even garbage bins particularly for dog waste. Improved access to Cameron is important.
- There is still a need to protect some fragile properties and continued support from the City and Region will be required.
- Historic buildings must be protected.
Means must be developed to protect Church St. properties from the negative consequences of uses on Charles St. properties.

This street is likely the most important for the community in terms of accessing the downtown and other services. It is a primary walking route and there is always foot traffic. The biggest problem it faces come from the increased traffic, both in terms of volume and speed. With the changes from the LRT project, Church is the primary access point for CH. It is also used as a through way by people wanting short cuts through the community. Combined with traffic is the increasing number of parked cars on the south side of the road which also means not ideal snow maintenance in winter and also poor sight lines for drivers and pedestrians. This is a primary street for school bus stops.

The street is divided by the intersection with Cedar St. which is one many residents fear. Because of increased traffic on both streets, this is a major intersection. The sight lines are poor and cars often speed on Cedar St (the street with the right of way). It is a nasty corner for pedestrians and cars.

While Church street has no public transit other than for school children, it does provide a major access point for bus and LRT. Foot traffic to public transit will undoubtedly increase.

There are already high rise buildings on Church St. and this has created a wind tunnel effect, particularly around Wellington Place.

For a street that is dominated by the needs of pedestrians, sidewalks are narrow, there are few trees, little green space, and the only bench is at the corner of Benton and Church. This is a street for social interaction – where you meet your friends – yet there is little space you can comfortably stop and talk. Light standards are large, unattractive and in the boulevard making expansion of the sidewalk difficult.

Narrow sidewalks and barren sidewalks, Church St.

Church St. has traditionally either had churches on it or provided direct access to them. These are important to the community both for religious and historic reasons. The new medical centre will be
increasingly important and attract more foot traffic. The east end of Church St. provides the primary access point to Cameron Heights School and the park/recreational greenspace.

There are some very historic buildings on Church St. both single occupancy and apartment buildings. Residents appreciate the efforts to stabilize the street through the downzoning and avoiding creating the barrier to the rest of the community that higher intensity buildings would have created. There have been some long standing issues with certain buildings on Church St. although many have stabilized over the last few years. The new zoning should reduce the land speculation that was a dominant feature in the 1980s in particular. Of continued concern is, however, the use of land on Charles St. that backs on to the Church St. properties. There is a tendency for the large parking lots to become a noisy gathering place that is very disruptive for residents on Church.

The visions for the future for Church St. primarily address the needs of pedestrians and traffic concerns. The key will be to ensure that the message of the downzoning resonates and that it is widely understood that this is a street for stability not speculation and the community is generally supportive of this City initiative. The community will continue to depend on the various City and Regional resources to ensure appropriate property maintenance etc. as well as defending the proposed zoning against requests for variance.

Residents are anxious for stabilization to occur on Charles St. They are fearful of any further growth in the social sector and strongly believe that for the neighbourhood to be healthy and secure, there can be no expansion either to social sector housing or services. They want development there to be sympathetic to the needs of Church street properties and the community as a whole. In particular, respecting light and privacy and avoiding further large expanses of parking lots where people gather particularly at night and on weekends. They would encourage the City to consider alternative land uses including mixed (economically) housing as suggested elsewhere in this report.

Residents would very much value working with City experts on how to manage the traffic issues on Church and the intersection with Cedar in particular. Some would also like to see the end of paid parking (although not everyone agreed with this) as this is a message that it is not a street for residents but increasingly for people visiting the downtown. In the long run it might be necessary to implement some form of permit parking project although at this time there is again not unanimous support for this.
Certainly there is a feeling that more parked cars may slow down traffic and make it less of a ‘through’ road.

Church and Cedar St. Intersection. Note steep grade in both directions on Cedar St.

There is a strong desire to enhance the streetscape for pedestrians and thereby increase social interaction. Residents see this becoming more and more important. Already intensification in other parts of CH has increased the numbers of dog walkers and again this enhances the social exchanges on the street. However, it is also increasing the amount of garbage and dog feces in particular. Increased trees, green spaces, benches and even garbage cans (which are really needed), would all enhance the sense of Church St. being an important place for social interaction.

Finally, it is important to Church St residents that improvements be made to the access to the Cameron properties.
b. St. George St.

Summary:

- **This is a very successful street in the community and the primary goal is not to do anything that detracts from this.**
- **Real care must be taken to ensure whatever happens with the Water Tower site is sympathetic to the community. Ideally it would remain public space but if built on, it must be understood that this is one of the most valuable (from both an economic and visual perspective) vacant sites in the community and good design is critical.**
- **Maintaining the pleasant walking experience is essential.**
- **Thought must be given to the long-term impact of non-resident parking.**
- **There is still a need to protect some fragile properties and continued support from the City and Region will be required.**

St. George is the second east-west street in CH and although it is an important access route, it is more limited than Church as it ends at Cedar St and has one-way traffic, west to east.

The interesting result of the community input session was that comments were almost unanimously positive about the street as it currently is. It is clearly considered to be a successful and generally stable place with mostly well cared for, single family homes. The Kitchener Housing project is well integrated into the community from a design perspective. People like the walking experience and the way houses present front porches to the street. They use expressions like ‘pleasant feeling’. They like the access to Sandhills Park which is a valuable part of the community.

There were some concerns expressed. The first relates to the zoning on Benton and the implications for the buildings on the corner of St. George and Benton. Residents are concerned about loss of light and privacy from any redevelopment. The street is currently bright and clearly exudes warmth for pedestrians. There is a real fear that this might be lost. Further, there is concern about increased traffic. This is a road that children play by and sometimes on (hockey). People drive carefully.

The other site that worries people is the Water Tower site. This provides good green space for the community. There is a fear that this will be intensified and put increased pressure on the street from a traffic and parking perspective. Generally, the concern is that what might be build may be poorly designed for such an important site and reduce the neighbourly feel of St. George St.

There is concern for the amount of parking on the street. In the winter, many other streets have no parking. Some of the residents in high rise buildings use this for additional parking and downtown workers are starting to use it as well. Again, this hurts the ambiance of the street and restricts availability for residents. While this is likely manageable today the concern is that it will not be in the future as the downtown flourishes and intensification elsewhere in CH increases.

Finally, there was some concern for the fragility of some parts of the street where housing is less stable and drugs and other criminal acts have been prevalent. As with much of CH there is real fear that some of the difficult problems could easily come back with poor housing maintenance and that some have not entirely left. Some people expressed concern that these issues have and continue to spill into Sandhills Park and this, combined with dogs running unleashed, diminishes its attractiveness. That said, the community is appreciative of the upgrading proposals for the park in which they participated in 2018 and which should be conducted, summer 2019.
In terms of what vision people have for the future, the over-riding sentiment was to maintain what we have now. Should there ever be housing built on the Water Tower site it is critical that the design be consistent with the balance of the neighbourhood, maximizing frontages to the street and ideally including the traditional front porch look. There should also be adequate on-site parking. While a more modern design would also work, it should be done well and with input from neighbours.

The two corners on Benton where re-development may occur, must have design restrictions included that take into account the impact on properties on St. George as well as Benton. They cannot be loaded towards the back of the properties as that will be immediately adjacent to St. George St. properties. Height rules must be designed to minimize the impact of reduced light on St. George St. Likewise, parking must be designed so lighting etc. does not negatively affect St. George St. properties.

Finally, at some stage proposals must come forward to address parking on St. George St. This may well take the form of some sort of permit system that allows primary use for local residents and their guests.

c. Cedar St.

Summary:
- Address major traffic concerns: speed, intersection with Church, volume of traffic. Have input from traffic experts who address issues from the perspective of enhancing pedestrian rights and experience, protecting community access to roads, reducing use as through road, increasing safety.
- Carry through lighting style from downtown.
- Address sidewalks by increasing width, moving light standards, and increasing tree canopy and green spaces.
- Add mini-park style seating and other features such as garbage containers especially for dog walkers at corner with Church St.
- Enhance walk to LRT including city supported snow clearance, better and safer sidewalks, and more attractive streetscape.
- Consider Cedar St. as a major throughway for pedestrians using institutional buildings both on Cedar and nearby (including schools). Consider cross walks at Courtland.
- Defend proposed zoning and ensure any intensification is sympathetic to the neighbourhood and enhances green space and ambiance.
- Protect and preserve institutional buildings/uses.

Cedar St. is the major street in CH. It runs north south and continues through CH to the down town and beyond into SC. It is a narrow street that has become a primary access route for and through the neighbourhood. It carries heavy traffic and this has been exacerbated by the LRT which now means west bound traffic cannot make a left hand turn off Charles into CH at Eby. In terms of topography, it is dominated by the steep hill that peaks at Church St.

If residents are generally happy with St. George St., the almost exact opposite is true of Cedar. People feel cars are king and they travel at speeds that feel very unsafe. The road is narrow which makes cars feel even more threatening to pedestrians. Cedar St. has experienced some of the nastiest side effects of land speculation. This is particularly the case on the stretch from Church to Charles but also some parts on the
balance of the street where houses and properties are poorly maintained. Some of the tenants are disruptive and can make pedestrians feel unsafe.

Sidewalks are narrow and in poor repair. Again, the placement of light standards within sidewalks restricts the width. Generally, the sense is that cars take priority over pedestrians. The fact that sidewalks are not all cleared well in winter make them particularly problematic/dangerous given the steepness of the hill, particularly in the stretch leading to the new LRT station. There are few trees and almost no greenspace. The high rise at # 86 has been a major problem in the past although it has improved significantly in recent years. The main concern of residents is whether there will be any lower cost rental remaining. They do not want to see this as the primary form of housing in the building (it did cause problems in the past as landlords were reluctant to invest in maintenance) but the community values mixed use and diversity.

Cedar St, narrow and unattractive sidewalks

In terms of public transit, Cedar St. is used to access buses on Courtland and the LRT on Charles.

There currently is little social interaction because the street is just not a pleasant walking experience. Obviously it is an access point to the downtown and the Market in particular. There are now new
restaurants on the corner of King or nearby. There are also important community resources that exist on the south end of the street in CH:

- Maple Grove school is at the site of the old St. Joseph’s school. This brings considerable additional traffic to the school at peak times, particularly from Courtland. It makes that corner uncomfortable again for pedestrians. That said, both the school and the daycare are a very positive addition to the neighbourhood and they also increase the use of Sandhills Park during day-time.
- St. Joseph’s Church parking lot is accessed from Cedar (and goes through to Madison)
- There is an entrance to Sandhills Park off of Cedar. At present this is not particularly well maintained and some have thought the signage is not adequate.
- Cedar St is a primary access route for children going to Courtland Avenue school. It is also important for high school students going to Cameron Heights.

Sandhills Park with children playing and Maple Grove School, on opposite sides of Cedar St
The community noted that existing zoning will be retained for much of the street and there are concerns that speculators have already bought up properties and will push for a variance if the new zoning is approved. People are discouraged by the ability of some property owners to push boundaries and not in a way that helps the community. Once zoning is in place it should be accepted and defended. This street is very fragile and cannot tolerate any more speculation by people with little interest in creating good developments but only wanting a quick economic return.

Of all the streets in CH, this was the one where the community had most difficulty envisaging significant improvements. The following summarizes what residents urge the City to consider:

- What can be done to discourage Cedar St. being considered a through road and a quick alternative to Stirling or Benton Streets? The street cannot be widened. The intersection with Church is dangerous. The community believes it is essential that this issue be addressed for the safety of the community and the well-being of the children who use Cedar St as an access to Maple Grove, Courtland Avenue and Cameron Heights Schools. The residents envisage possible road calming measures. Here, however, they will need the expertise of traffic gurus.

- Lighting is, by and large, ‘grim’. One strong signal that this is a street that is cared for and is for residents and pedestrians and not just cars would be to continue the lighting from the north side of Charles and take it all the way to Courtland (as with Queen). These smaller standards would also allow for the widening of sidewalks.

- It is unlikely that Cedar will ever become much of a bike route because of the hill. However, the pedestrian experience should be significantly enhanced. Sidewalks should be widened and having the road slightly narrower might discourage some traffic. While there is no room for boulevards, tree plantings on adjacent properties should be encouraged.

- An obvious place for enhancing the pedestrian experience is at the top of the hill. Is there scope for a tiny green space setting with a bench that encourages people to stop and talk? Something equivalent to that which exists at the Benton corner.

- With stable zoning there should be real enforcement of property standards and general encouragement of improving existing properties.

- For the part of Cedar where intensification will take place, there should be care taken to ensure access is not onto Cedar Street but rather Charles. Redevelopment of the properties closest to Charles should be designed to maximize green space and trees on the Cedar St frontage.

- With the LRT stop at Cedar, there will be much more pedestrian traffic and this alone will make people feel safer. However, it also increases the need to improve the pedestrian experience on Cedar itself. No one should feel unsafe walking there and access in winter in particular should be free of ice and other dangers.

- One location for a cross-walk is at the corner of Cedar and Courtland.

Summary:

- Important design features of this street are presently under review with the major infrastructure work proposed in the next year or two. These will drive the design of sidewalks, trees and green space and the primary desire of the neighbours is to continue to have real and valuable input to this process. To date City staff have been very responsive to neighbourhood concerns and creative in their design approach.
• With the infrastructure project proposed, this is the perfect opportunity to address the light standard issue that plagues CH. Given the goal of widening sidewalks, light standards should be replaced and reduced in size plus not placed so as to reduce sidewalk space.

• There is a continued need for support from City and Regional staff with the few remaining fragile properties.

• There should be better signage and access to Sandhills Park.

• Priority should be given to improving the laneway access to Sandhills Park. This could be part of the infrastructure project.

Peter St. generally is a stable street that residents identified primarily as a major walking route to the downtown or, the opposite way, to the Iron Horse Trail and beyond. It is still used as something of a throughway for traffic but since it stops at Church St. the pressure is not as great as in Cedar St. It has no public transit other than school buses but is an access route to both buses and LRT. It is probably potentially the most congenial north south artery for pedestrians particularly as the hill is not as steep as with Cedar and Madison. Many of the houses on Peter St. are significant historically dating back to the 1880s and earlier.

The primary concerns are once more for the poor quality of the sidewalks, the lack of trees and green space. Generally, it is not viewed as nearly as pleasant a walking experience as it should be. People have mixed thoughts about the width of the sidewalks themselves. They are particularly concerned that infrastructure improvements do not include replacing light standards (Kitchener Wilmot Hydro explained that current standards are adequate) and this closes off a critical opportunity to increase sidewalk space. With the road already dug up, underground wiring would not be a major issue. Residents urge the City to use this opportunity as a template for CH as a whole. Right now, the location of light standards appears to be the primary obstacle to enhancing walkability in communities.

Residents value the sloped curbs as often it is necessary to ‘slide’ into drive ways in winter. Current City plans for infrastructure changes are sound for both parts of the street.

Peter St. is an important access point to Sandhills Park. The signage, however, to the park is poor. The public laneway is always in a very bad state of repair and it is not even clear where the lane ends at the
park entrance. This latter part may be addressed by the upgrades that will take place in 2019. But the laneway itself is outside of that process and continues to decline even though snow clearance is good.

There are a few remaining properties that are fragile and these need the continued support of regional and city staff.

Overall, for the future residents are really looking forward finally to having infrastructure improvements but only if the design features meet their needs and wishes. Key will be improving the streetscape. Housing is, for the most part in good condition and stable. A more visible entrance and signage way to the park would be valued.

3. Minor streets

There were two minor streets in CH that were discussed because they have an important role in the neighbourhood and for different reasons:

a. Eby St.

Summary:

- Preserve this as a critical walking route linking CH with the downtown. Increase the width of sidewalks and make road narrower.
- Enhance width of sidewalks.
- Ensure any intensification on the easterly side does not remove the existing street facing housing but is behind these buildings.
- Respect the need to enhance feelings of safety for all residents and ensure no expansion of potentially disruptive uses.

Eby St. in CH is one block long but it is most people’s (from CH and SC) primary access route to the Market, other parts of King East, and shortly to the LRT. It carries a high amount of foot traffic. It is generally used as an alternate to Cedar because it is far less steep. Car traffic has been reduced with the changes on Charles for the LRT.

The street could have been well designed from a pedestrian perspective at the time infrastructure was replaced. However, this was still an era when the primary focus was, unfortunately, for the car, not pedestrians and there was a total refusal to consider smaller light standards and underground wiring. The sidewalks are relatively narrow. In many places two people cannot pass without one going onto the road.
Eby St from the corner of Church illustrating narrow sidewalks

There were once serious problems with properties particularly on the eastern side of the street but many of these have been stabilized. There are, concerns, however, about what is to come. There are a number of properties behind the street facing houses and these are not always well maintained. Driveways are often gravel on this side so give the impression of being temporary.

The northerly end of Eby is affected by the same pressures as Charles. Again, residents would value no additional social services on this street where there is already a heavy concentration. They do note that most of the properties on Eby St. itself cause few issues and the residents are genuine members of the community as much as anyone else. The primary concern is with the more transient population on Charles St.

This is an area that will be subject to some intensification. Where it might occur on Eby St. residents would like it to take place behind the street front houses, in order to preserve the current small-scale look of the street. Careful design guidelines would have to be prepared in order to achieve this goal. Above all else, work must be done to ensure the highly significant role of this street as a primary pedestrian route to the Downtown is maintained.

b. Hebel St.

Summary:
- The key is to preserve the current ambiance of the street.
- The access to the sidewalk must be improved.
- When creating design guidelines for Benton intensification, care must be taken to ensure no negative effects flow through to Hebel.

Hebel St. is a very historic, one block, one-way street between St. George and Courtland. It has a number of very attractive older homes some of which are immediately adjacent to the sidewalk. It is important to the neighbourhood that the character of this street be preserved. There was some redevelopment with a small town house project a number of years ago. While there is nothing wrong with these properties, it would be nice to see any new development be more in keeping with the existing housing as current
design standards would suggest. In particular, not having the primary frontage being expansive parking allowances.

Infrastructure improvements are scheduled for the next year or two. As with Peter St. this will be the perfect opportunity to ensure underground wiring and smaller light standards. This is a narrow road with a very narrow sidewalk. It is a walking street for most residents but the experience is not, currently, particularly pleasant.

Hebel St from the cnr. of St. George

Historic housing on Hebel

There are concerns about the following:
- At some stage there will be major redevelopment on the land backing onto Hebel on Benton. This must be done in such a way that it does not destroy the light and ambiance of Hebel.
- The corner property on St. George street has for years had a very poorly built and maintained retaining wall. It is now difficult to walk on the sidewalk at that stretch, and generally not
possible in winter. This should be addressed, perhaps at the time of the infrastructure improvements.

- There is an old apartment complex half way down on the east side. While this is currently not presenting any difficulties to the community it has been problematic in the past. Since this leads into a laneway that goes through onto Peter St. this created problems elsewhere in the community as well. The units are small and old and while no one is suggesting they should be changed, real care should be taken to ensure the landlord provides appropriate maintenance and supervision.
Hi Bob,

I understand that you were in attendance at the Urban Design Charrette/Discussion for the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan and had a question with respect to the timing of the proposed new zoning regulations.

This discussion that was had on Feb. 11th will guide the preparation of the neighbourhood specific guidelines and assist in developing new zoning regulations for the lands in the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.

As well, we will also be reviewing and considering the feedback that yourself and others in the neighbourhood have provided, in responses to the 2 Open Houses that have been held, to be able to bring final land use designations, policies and zoning to a Committee/Council meeting late fall 2019.

We have your contact information and will be able to notify you when we have more details on the zoning and the timing of consideration.

In the meantime, if you have any additional questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact myself or Dayna.

Regards,

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

Hi Bob,

Thank you for the follow up email.

232
I’m sorry we were not able to touch base after the meeting. I have forwarded your email to Tina Malone-Wright who will respond regarding the timing of zoning moving forward.

Thanks for your participation in the discussion with respect to the ‘motel’ like buildings. We will work on crafting some zoning regulations in addition to urban design guidelines that will discourage this form of building.

Dayna

---

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

From: Bob Neskovic  
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2019 7:57 PM  
To: Dayna Edwards <Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca>  
Subject: Re: You're Invited to a Schneider Creek/Cedar Hill Urban Design Charrette

Hi Dayna,

Thanks for hosting the urban design meeting last night. Unfortunately, I was not able to stay for the group sessions as I had other other obligations that I needed to attend to.

I was hoping there would have been a small break to ask you when we will be able to get the specifics regarding the new proposed zoning. As an owner of three properties on Courtland/Benton, I'm specifically interested in finding out what limitations of any there will be around building along Courtland Ave East.

During the meeting one of the home owners asked how we could avoid developers from building "motel" like buildings along Courtland. I was pleased to hear this concern and suggested that the city should look to encourage developers to assemble lands along Courtland by having new zoning to allow developers to for example build higher with the more lots they assemble. I've already formally shared this feedback with the city but I was glad to hear that this was also a concern of other living in the neighborhood.

Do you have any information on when we can expect to hear the final details regarding zoning?

Regards,
Bob Neskovic

---

On Tue, Jan 15, 2019 at 3:59 PM <Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca> wrote:

Good Afternoon Schneider Creek and Cedar Hill Neighbours,

As part of the Neighbourhood Secondary Planning process that is currently underway for the Schneider Creek/Cedar Hill area—City staff will be developing a set of urban design guidelines for ‘Residential Infill in Central Neighbourhoods’.

This document will apply to all neighbourhoods within the central city area, and in
addition, we hope to have a section that contains guidelines unique to each
neighbourhood. As it stands, the general guidelines have been drafted that will
apply to all neighbourhoods—these guidelines will address things like building
placement, setbacks, garage projects, landscaping, building design and massing,
etc.

We would like to invite you to join staff in a design charrette intended to develop the
unique set of Schneider Creek/Cedar Hill guidelines. The 2 hour design charrette will take place at the following time/location:

**Monday, February 11th 2019 from 6:30pm – 8:30pm at City Hall 2nd Floor
Schmaltz Room**

Please see the attached poster invitation—please feel free to share with your
neighbours.

I’m hoping you will join planning and urban design staff to share your experience,
vision and ideas for Schneider Cree/Cedar Hill. Your RSVP prior to February 8th would be greatly appreciated.

Let me know if you have any questions,

Relevant Links:


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

Thank you for your email and for clarifying your concerns in writing.

These comments are very useful and will inform future consideration of the zoning regulations that will be applied to future developments in the neighbourhood. Part of the reason for the zoning review is to ensure new developments and future infill are compatible in scale and character with surrounding properties, the streetscape and overall neighbourhood. Some of the issues/concerns that you have expressed were also shared by other property owners/neighbourhoods before and during the RIENS (Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods) Study. The RIENS Study is one of the reasons for the review of the zoning regulations in our central neighbourhoods.

As I mentioned in my last email I would encourage you to attend Dayna’s Urban Design Charrette session on February 11th, 2019. It will be held here at City Hall in the Schmalz Room on the 2nd Floor starting at 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm. It will be a great opportunity to discuss several of the items of concern in your email and how they can be potentially addressed either through a guideline, a zoning regulation or both.

Thank you again.

We look forward to discussing further with you as we progress in the Official Plan and Zoning By-law review for the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek neighbourhood.

Regards,

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

Thank you for taking the time to address my concerns.

In regards to our last conversation, I wanted to clarify my concerns with future developments and the adjacent property built by the Madison group.

My concern with the new proposed set back regulations; is they will be misused by developers. The guidelines discussed in the planning departments proposal allows developers a legal loop whole to tear down existing structures and put new structures at the same side and front set back distance as old structures. The builders will use the closest point of old structure to the neighbouring property. While making the new structure larger in length and width; of coarse to maximize profits their roofs will not slope and be more box like to increase living space. The windows of any adjacent properties that face new build are now all negatively affected. For example: my home for instance does not get any direct sunlight after mid morning on the main floor. Three of my large windows currently look at solid brick wall and 15 gas meters. I know you can't tear down what has been built, but you shouldn't allow this to happen to anyone else either.

My concern with the proposed zone changes are adjacent property now can build up higher with new categories. It may not be your intention with the current developments, but if the city amends their policies as outlined. Any developer will use them to their advantage to maximize their profits. They don't care about history and that my home was built in the late 1800's.

As I stated on the phone. I don't fault the current planning committee for previous decissions, but when you indicated that you sent an individual to check that the build generally complies with the approved building papers and he said that it does; that's very difficult to understand. My main concern is for the safety of my family. Here are the issues I stated over the phone. I'd like to mention a lot of these issues can be fixed without tearing down the existing structure.

1)15 gas meters placed under 7 feet from my driveway without any real safe guards put in place. (there are no metal posts in ground protecting these meters from any possible impact)

2)The roof that is slanted towards my property on the building closest to Cedar street builds up with snow whenever there is a large snowfall. That snow comes crashing down all at once due to slope of roof. It falls directly into my driveway due to close proximity. My main concern there is for the safety of my children.

3)The landscaping of the property has also been sloped towards my property, so all rain and snow; melt or pour into my driveway. Even the downspouts are placed to go onto there grass where it is sloped towards my property and the water comes directly into my driveway.

4) poor visibility for getting out of my driveway as well; minimum 14-foot visibility triangle not given (especially being on top of hill. visibility is already hindered.)

5) Where the fence begins to go on angle in back end of my property; it begins to encroach on my land. Importance of this is that the second structure is built closer than first structure. It has overhanging built out lofts. (Overhang is less than two feet from my property line)

I'd further like to clarify, when I spoke about the 8 air conditioners and the over hanging balconies; I was stating how these things should not be ever allowed to happen again.

1)8 air conditioners were placed on the fence line beside what at that point was the master
bedroom to my property. These air conditioners were removed three years after installation for reasons I'm not fully aware of.

2) When I mentioned the balconies, I said luckily; I'm not the poor old man on Madison Street where the Madison group also built another building with balconies that are directly above his fence line, his massive back yard is worthless now.

In our conversation I also mentioned that the cities interactive mapping system is inaccurate in many areas with regards to my property and adjacent new build (81 Cedar St. S. and 87 Cedar ST S) The Interactive Mapping System displays the building that was built; as being set in more than my property. 87 Cedar St. S is set back less than 3 feet from the sidewalk; my home is 14 feet and 1 inch set back from the sidewalk. If there are any decisions or discussions, the individuals involved need to see the sites in person. I am more than willing to forward pictures and bring in a copy of my official survey or any information requested.

Thank you again,

From: Tina.MaloneWright@kitchener.ca
Sent: January 24, 2019 5:59 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Debbie.Chapman@kitchener.ca; Sarah.FitzPatrick@kitchener.ca; Dayna.Edwards@kitchener.ca; Preet.Kohli@kitchener.ca; SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca
Subject: 81 Cedar Street South and 87 Cedar Street South

Good afternoon [redacted]

I am following up on our phone conversations from January 16th and this past Monday, January the 21st.

As discussed the zoning of your property with respect to uses is not intended to change. Between the existing Zoning by-law 85-1 and the new CRoZBy Zoning By-law there are some differences in the names of the respective zones. I believe you are zoned R5 now under Zoning By-law 85-1 and the proposed zoned category in CRoZBy is R4 which is essentially the same zone category with respect to use.

We are still reviewing the setback regulations that will be contained in the new CRoZBy Residential zones. The proposed regulations relate to some of the questions that we asked at the Open House on May 29th, 2018, with respect to the location of garages, front porches and some of the views in the neighbourhood. Dayna Edwards is holding an Urban Design Charrette on Monday, February 11th, which results from this Charrette may also impact the regulations proposed to be contained in the Zone Categories.

With respect to the adjacent property at 87 Cedar Street South, the land use designation and zone category to be applied, are not intended to give more development rights to this property. We will review this further and make the necessary revisions.

As promised, I did ask the Urban Designer that worked on the file, to visit the property at 87 Cedar
Street South to ensure that it was developed in accordance with the approved Site Plan, File 
SP13/028/C/AP. He visited the site yesterday, January 23rd, and sent me the following:

“As per our conversation I went out to inspect the above noted site and I can confirm that the 
building and site has been built in general conformity to the approved plans.

I can also confirm that no balconies or air conditioning units are affixed to the exterior of the 
buildings on the rear/side facades facing the adjacent properties.

Let me know if you require any further information.”

Once we have the Final Draft Land Use Designation and Zone Categories determined and applied to 
the Secondary Plans, there will be additional consultation before any decisions are made at 
Committee/Council.

I would encourage you to attend Dayna’s Urban Design Charrette session on February 11th, 2019. It 
will be held here at City Hall in the Schmalz Room on the 2nd Floor starting at 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm.

In the interim if there are any additional concerns or questions, please do not hesitate to contact 
me.

Regards,

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

Thank you for your interest and participation in the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan Review process.

Your comments are logged and will be considered moving forward.

Regards,
Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
assemble the properties and ultimately make a profit. We are afraid that the effects of this, will unfortunately lead to some single houses sandwiched in-between newer buildings. If this were to occur, the City of Kitchener and the residents of that neighborhood would miss the opportunity to fulfill the vision that the City of Kitchener has worked hard in developing and that were demonstrated via the 3-D renderings at the open house.

While it is important to take the local residents concerns into consideration when making this plan, we feel that it is also vital that your decisions take into considerations the developers to whom you will be relying on to fulfill the vision for this area. Limiting the height of buildings (according to developers), will lead to an incomplete vision of the area. Please reconsider removing the limit of 5 floors and allowing the maximum height of the MIX-2 zoning to 8 floors as currently allowed for MU-2 zoning.

If you would like to talk to us further about this, please feel free to reach out to us.

Regards,
Hi folks,

As I do not live in the neighbourhood, I will not attempt a comment on Questions 1, 2 or 4.

3. Regarding the UDM Guidelines
There may be situations in which a transition in height may be achieved by increasing the separation between buildings. Often, increasing the separation may not be enough. Having a portion of the new development match the neighbour’s setback and height can help reduce the impact of the taller neighbouring elements.

Other Issues:
We still need to establish clearer communally-accepted rules governing transitions and shadowing. I believe appropriate transitions are based on mirroring the built form limitations of the less intensively used property and then scaling up beyond. If a sloped building is deemed unacceptable, the “treads” of the steps can be widened. As to shadowing, Mississauga’s rules may offer some ideas. Please see


Thank you,

Hal Jaeger
## 5.0 Public Comments and Staff Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | 181 Madison Avenue South  
Written: May 28, 2018 | Can we please have more traffic calming measures on our increasingly busy streets? I live on Madison South, near Courtland and since the ion construction began, traffic has increased in volume and speed! It is dangerous for our children to walk from our front door, the sidewalk in front of our house to our driveway. As the proposed Secondary Plan would greatly increase the number of people in the neighbourhood and therefore cars, we would appreciate this being taken into consideration. | As more density is added to the neighbourhood, it is hoped that there is increased use of the ION by the residents of and visitors to the neighbourhood rather than an increase in vehicular traffic. Zoning and Urban Design guidelines can assist by requiring new developments to address the street to create, support and/or enhance pedestrian-friendly streets with the provision of wide sidewalks and street furniture and trees and in the case of Mixed Use buildings ground floors that address the public realm through their use, enhanced glazing and design treatment. |
| 2 | 212 Stirling Avenue South  
Written May 28, 2018 | Thank you for doing this, citizens involvement is very important for me. I think one things that wasn’t addressed is the mixing of the neighbourhood. Improvements are great but I think it’s important that the people that live in the neighbourhood can afford to live there. I think you should be careful about having rentals, condos and affordable housing. | The PARTS Central Plan reviewed the land uses in the areas around the ION stops to ensure a mix of uses and densities to support the ION. Housing that is affordable is an important planning consideration, particularly in proximity to public transit. The PARTS Central Plan recommended that Bonusing for additional height and density could be used to encourage the provision of affordable housing, but this approach has been changed through provincial legislation. This will be examined and reviewed further through the Secondary Plan review as well as through additional work that the City is doing with respect to an Affordable Housing Strategy. |
| 3 | 11 Mill Street  
Written: June 5, 2018 | Please consider not including the lots for 11 Mill St. and 15 Mill St. in the new medium density residential zoning. These two lots are not deep enough for apartment or townhouse development. In addition, we have a commercial business registered at 11 Mill St. So it is imperative that we maintain the mixed residential and commercial zoning for our lot. | The properties at 11 and 15 Mill Street are currently designated ‘Low Density Commercial Residential’ and zoned ‘CR-1’. The proposed land use and zoning that was shown at the Open House was ‘Medium Rise Residential’ to implement the recommendation for land use in the PARTS Central Plan. Given these parcel’s size and proximity/adjacency to the Mixed Use properties on Queen Street, it is proposed that these 2 properties be designated ‘Mixed Use’ and zone ‘MU-1’. This is consistent with the recommendation for the lots on Queen Street in the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan. The properties at 19-41 Mill Street will continue to be recommended for Medium Rise Residential, while the listed property at 45 Mill Street and the properties to the south will be recommended to be designated Low Rise Residential. This change will maintain the existing Mixed Use land use designation and zoning of the properties at 11 and 15 Mill Street, provide an opportunity for a |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 | Melissa Bowman | I attended the open house Tuesday evening and appreciated the opportunity for input. The one question I thought of later was this: with PARTS, CHL, CRoZBy, urban guidelines, the OP, RIENS, etc., how do those all fit together? Is there a hierarchy of some sort? I picture them as all pieces to the same puzzle but I am guessing at some point there may be a conflict between some of them. In which case, does something, like the OP, 'trump' the others? | • Good question and I talked about a number of pieces of the puzzle last Tuesday evening.  
• The hierarchy of documents under the Planning Act is the Official Plan and Zoning By-law which implements the Official Plan.  
• The Official Plan serves as a roadmap for the City to follow in managing future growth, land uses, and other matters for a 20 year timeframe.  
A ‘Secondary Plan’ is a more detailed land use and policy document that forms part of the Official Plan, and is used by the City to provide more detailed direction pertaining to growth and development in specific areas of the city. The City’s Zoning By-law (currently By-law 85-1) is a tool that implements the City’s Official Plan. The Zoning By-law contains regulations to state what uses can be developed on a property, the size of a building, its location of a lot and parking requirements, among other things.  
• The City’s ten (10) Secondary Plans were deferred, as part of the review of the new 2014 Official Plan, to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS).  
• Now that these studies are done, the City is in a position to commence review of the existing Secondary Plan with a view of bringing them into the new 2014 Official Plan.  
• Since the approval of the 2014 Official Plan, the City has also commenced the review of the City’s new Zoning By-law known as the CRoZBy project (Comprehensive Review of the Zoning By-law). The CRoZBy has not applied new zone categories to the lands in the deferred Secondary Plans.  
• The City has also commenced the review of its Urban Design Manual. A draft of the City’s Urban Design Guidelines will be considered at a meeting on June 18, 2018. The City uses Urban Design |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Karen Taylor-Harrison Written: June 8, 2018</td>
<td>Thank you for your response. I think at this juncture, we may have to leave the meeting until September. Tina, can you please tell me when the plan became a public document? When will the secondary plan go back to Council?</td>
<td>Guidelines to assist in the review of development applications but it does not have authority under the Planning Act like a Zoning By-law. • The PARTS, CHL and RIENS studies/plans may have different land uses and suggest different regulations, but they have no legal status under the Planning Act until they are incorporated into an Official Plan and Zoning By-law. • As mentioned, we have commenced the review of the Secondary Plans to update them based on the studies that have been completed and apply new zoning. There could be other tools that the City applies; i.e. new urban design guidelines, tools under the Ontario Heritage Act, and these will be determined through the consultation process. • Sounds good. We can touch base later this summer, early September to set something up with the Neighbourhood Association. • To answer your question about when the plan became a public document, I am going to assume you meant the Secondary Plan. In short, we have not prepared the formal Secondary Plan for public consultation. We are not there yet. • The City’s ten (10) Secondary Plans were deferred, as part of the review of the new 2014 Official Plan, to allow for the completion of other studies that would inform the appropriate land use and policy framework in these areas. The completed studies include the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Study and Plans, Kitchener’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study (CHLS), and the Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS). • Now that these studies are done, the City is in a position to commence review of the existing Secondary Plans with a view of bringing them into the new 2014 Official Plan. • The Open House that was held on May 29th, was the initial meeting to ‘kick off’ the review of the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. We mailed letters advising of the review and this initial meeting to just over 650 properties. The Open House was the starting point to present a draft map of proposed land uses based on the PARTS Central Plan for comment, and to ask for input related to community features and character to inform the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  |  | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
Additional Comments | development of the Secondary Plan policies and other tools that may be required to assist in the implementation of the Secondary Plan. i.e. zoning, urban design guidelines, cultural heritage tools (listing, designation), site plan control.  
• Once we have a new draft Secondary Plan, implementing zoning and any appropriate tools, with input from the neighbourhoods, we will be further engaging with the neighbourhoods before anything is brought before Committee/Council.  
• We advised at the Open House that there would be no Council decisions in 2018.  
• The information presented at the May 29th Open House is posted on the City’s website and I have attached the link for easy reference.  
• Any comments and/or feedback that the Neighbourhood Association can provide in advance of staff being able to attend a meeting and facilitate is very much welcomed.  
| 6 | 81 Cedar Street South  
Written: June 10, 2018 | First, I must say that the design of ‘Cedar Hill’ is impressive. The questions I have come more from a parental perspective and I do understand if you don’t have answers at this time, but it doesn’t hurt to ask.  
1. How soon do these projects intend to be started?  
2. Will all of these new developments happen or are they just ideas at this point?  
3. Will residents be made aware of future meetings on development progress?  
4. Where do the men’s shelters intend to be moved to?  
5. Are there plans for new schools as a result of the increased population?  
6. Are there ‘green space’ provisions being considered for this mass number of new residents?  
If you have answers or any direction for me regarding these questions, it would be greatly appreciated. And again, I only ask since my main concern is whether this new vision of the downtown has a ‘family friendly’ perspective, or if I should start looking on MLS to potentially relocate. | 1. I am not quite sure what you mean by ‘projects’? The City-initiated new Secondary Plan or proponent-driven development applications?  
The Open House that was held on May 29th, was the initial meeting to ‘kick off’ the review of the new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. We mailed letters advising of the review and this initial meeting to just over 650 properties. The Open House was the starting point to present a draft map of proposed land uses based on the Planning Around Rapid Transit Stations (PARTS) Central Plan for comment, and to ask for input related to community features and character to inform the development of the Secondary Plan policies and other tools that may be required to assist in the implementation of the Secondary Plan. i.e. zoning, urban design guidelines, cultural heritage tools (listing, designation), site plan control.  
Once we have a new draft Secondary Plan, implementing zoning and any appropriate tools, with input from the neighbourhoods, we will be further engaging with the neighbourhoods before anything is brought before Committee/Council. We advised at the Open House that there would be no Council decisions in 2018.  
If your question is with respect to proponent- |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initiated developments, these are not within the City’s control and the City cannot predict when a particular property will develop/redevelop, if at all. 2. The new Secondary Plan and Zoning will assign land uses and provide zoning regulations to indicate what the maximum permitted development of lands with the secondary plan can be. Any 3D modelling that was presented at the Open House is a representation of “what could be” under the proposed land use designation that were shown at the Open House. Again, proponent-initiated developments cannot be anticipated/predicted. However based on the proposed land use and zoning one can have an idea of what the development potential of a property is. 3. With respect to the new Secondary Plan, there will be additional meetings and community consultation. Proponent-initiated developments would only be made aware to residents if the proponent was seeking an Official Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Minor Variance application to facilitate the development (looking to develop something that is not permitted by the land use designation and/or zoning by-law). Site Plan applications to develop a property within the existing provisions of the zoning by-law are not circulated to the public. 4. The new Secondary Plan will indicate proposed land use and what uses would be permitted in a particular land use designation. If the men’s shelter is not permitted in the new land use designation in the Secondary Plan then this use would become legal non-conforming and be permitted to continue until such time as they relocate to another property. Their decision to stay or relocate based on the proposed land use is theirs and I am not aware of their future plans. 5. The new Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan proposes to retain the existing Institutionally designated lands and is not proposing any new lands be designated Institutional. The need for a new school would be determined by the appropriate school boards. 6. The provision of ‘Green space’ is a consideration in the development of the new Secondary Plan. Parkland dedication is a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?</td>
<td>requirement of the redevelopment of properties and it can be given in the form of land or monies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15 Mill Street</td>
<td>My household and many of our neighbours are not in favour of the zoning change for the west side of Mill street. We would not like to see apartment buildings here.</td>
<td>The properties at 11 and 15 Mill Street are currently designated 'Low Density Commercial Residential' and zoned 'CR-1'. The proposed land use and zoning that was shown at the Open House was 'Medium Rise Residential' to implement the recommendation for land use in the PARTS Central Plan. Given these parcel's size and proximity/adjacency to the Mixed Use properties on Queen Street, it is proposed that these two properties be designated 'Mixed Use' and zone 'MU-1'. This is consistent with the recommendation for the lots on Queen Street in the new Victoria Park Secondary Plan. The properties at 19-41 Mill Street will continue to be recommended for Medium Rise Residential, while the listed property at 45 Mill Street and the properties to the south will be recommended to be designated Low Rise Residential. This change will maintain the existing Mixed Use land use designation and zoning of the properties at 11 and 15 Mill Street, provide an opportunity for a medium rise form of housing to accommodate additional families in the neighbourhood while also providing the listed property and low rise residential built form to be maintained on the southwesterly side of Mill Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: June 16, 2018</td>
<td>There are many families here...it's already a nice neighbourhood. There are many historic buildings here...many century homes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>49 Courtland Avenue East</td>
<td>My name is ___ and we met at the public open house secondary review plan for the new Cedar Hill/Schneider Creek area. I am emailing you to see if you could provide me a digital package of some or all the information that was presented during the open house. I own the house at 49 Courtland Ave East, so ideally information that applies to the houses on Courtland/Benton would be beneficial. In addition to the new proposed zoning, if you could send a few of artistic drawings you presented at the</td>
<td>Good to hear from you. All the info, including 3D renderings are posted here: <a href="https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/cedar-hill-and-schneider-creek.aspx">https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/cedar-hill-and-schneider-creek.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: June 28, 2018</td>
<td>Good to hear from you. All the info, including 3D renderings are posted here: <a href="https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/cedar-hill-and-schneider-creek.aspx">https://www.kitchener.ca/en/city-services/cedar-hill-and-schneider-creek.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9 | John MacDonald  
Written: June 26, 2018 | Is there a place online where we can go to experience and use the modelling that was shown at the May 29th meeting, showing potential massing, heights, and possibilities within and around the area of the planning boundary? | Thank you for your question. The 3D renderings that were prepared for the May 29th Open House have been placed on the City’s website, along with the other information presented at the meeting, and can be found at the link below. https://www.kitchener.ca/en/planning-and-development-consultations.aspx# The renderings and modelling that were prepared for the meeting on the 29th were based on the extensive modelling work that was completed for the PARTS Central Plan. The proposed land uses in the new Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan that were shown at the meeting are based on this work and the approved PARTS Central Plan. I have copied Adam Clark, who was involved in the PARTS Central Plan, attended the May 29th Open House, and created the 3D model and renderings for both projects. For any specific questions, I would suggest contacting Adam. He will be able to assist you in your analysis of potential massing and heights in the proposed secondary plan boundary. |
| 10 | Amanda Stellings, Polocorp Inc.  
19-41 Mill Street  
Written: June 29, 2018 | Please see attached our comments for the proposed Cedar Hill Schneider Creek Secondary Plan.  
19-41 Mill Street, Kitchener  
5.0 Moving Forward  
Polocorp Inc. formally requests that the land designation for the subject lands be changed to ‘High Density Mixed Use’ to accommodate the changes in planning policies on the provincial, regional, and local levels. This is in alignment with the proposed development for the subject lands, as submitted for a Pre-Submission Consultation Meeting. Development in this area is ongoing, and the land uses within the Secondary Plan should be consistent to reflect the changes that will occur within, and adjacent to Queen Street South, identified as a Transit Corridor and Primary Intensification Area. | The properties at 19-41 Mill Street are currently designated ‘Low Density Commercial Residential’ and zoned ‘CR-1’. The proposed land use and zoning that was shown at the Open House was 'Medium Rise Residential' to implement the recommendation for land use in the PARTS Central Plan. The request for land use is for 'High Rise Residential' given the location of the lands in the PARTS Central Plan. The purpose of the Secondary Plan Review is not for the consideration of site-specific proposals which require detailed review and public consultation not contemplated through the PARTS Central Plan. Owner initiated site-specific OPA and ZBA applications would be required to implement a High Rise Residential land use designation on the subject lands wherein the specifics of the proposal and appropriateness of such a land use designation would be reviewed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10 Whitney Place</td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</td>
<td>I look forward to receiving the comments and feedback on the consultation materials that were presented at the Open House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John MacDonald</td>
<td>I’ve conferred with other building ownership at 141 Whitney Place, based on the City’s potential review of the property at 141 Whitney Place as somehow being worthy of a form of heritage designation. This idea was floated in the recent public meeting for the new Secondary Plan for Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek, which I attended. We object strongly to the potential for such designation, and see no grounds for it. We ask that the property be removed from any such consideration. My understanding from conversation is that the criterium for such a designation is that it may end a vista (although not much, as a single storey building at the bottom of a slope). By this criterium there would be an enormous number of properties with heritage designation, at every abrupt turn in street or T-intersection. We do not believe this is at all grounds for contemplating a designation. Please do not hesitate to call if you require further clarity regarding our position in this matter. I’m cc-ing Greg Hayton, who liaises with Globe Studios, for information. Thank you for your consideration. On behalf of the property ownership (Globe Studios (K-W) and CityWorks Development and Management Inc.</td>
<td>Staff have identified important terminating vistas that contribute to the cultural heritage landscape within the proposed Cedar Hill Schneider Creek secondary plan area. These terminating vistas were initially identified based on the Kitchener Cultural Heritage Landscape Study, the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood: Making our Neighbourhood Great! document (identified as a community asset and view), and various site visits and discussions among the staff working team. At the May 29, 2018 public open house, the majority of residents responded that terminating vistas within the neighbourhood were either somewhat important, or very important. One of three examples of a terminating vista provided to residents was that of 141 Whitney Place. Staff are not proposing to designate 141 Whitney Place. Staff are proposing that terminating vistas be listed on the Municipal Heritage Register. Some of the terminating vistas are already listed while other are not. Currently, 141 Whitney Place is not listed. It is important to understand the impact of listing on the Municipal Heritage Register. Listing does not provide protection under the Ontario Heritage Act, does not impose restrictions or obligations with respect to obtaining heritage approvals under the Ontario Heritage Act (e.g. a Heritage Permit is not required, review by the City’s Heritage Kitchener committee is not required, etc.), and does not require Council approval to make alterations. Listing has two implications. First, listing does increase the amount of time municipalities have to process demolition applications made under the Ontario Building Code to provide time to evaluate whether a property merits some form of protection, such as designation, under the Ontario Heritage Act, which is subject to a separate legal process with appeal mechanisms. Second, listing does allow the City to ask for a Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan, if necessary, as part of a complete Ontario...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    |                  | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
|    |                  | Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
|    |                  | Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
|    |                  | Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
|    |                  | Additional Comments | Planning Act application in order to address conservation policies outlined in the Ontario Planning Act and the Provincial Policy Statement. Staff will consider your comments along with those of other residents and members of the public as we continue to draft the secondary plan for this area. |
|    |                  | Concerned about traffic on Peter St, Church st and St. George St. They are also concerned about old trees at the back of the properties on Courtland during the development. | We require Tree Management Plans as part of the Site Plan Approval Process. Planning Staff forwarded the traffic concerns to the Director of Transportation. |
|    | Cedar Hill Neighbourhood Association | Boundary of Secondary Plan: Why was the corner of Courtland Ave and Benton (148 Benton St) now included in the boundary of the secondary plan? This land is currently vacant and treed and forms a natural boundary of the neighbourhood. This property should be included in the boundary of the secondary plan and appropriate land use designations and zoning applied. Consideration of extending the secondary plan to the limits of property ownership (25 Courtland Ave) would make sense. Existing site specific policies - former Schneider Factor and Courtland Ave public school: Current secondary plan has site specific policies for these lands. Are these policies intended to be eliminated with the new secondary plan or will they be carried forward? Site specific policies should be provided for these lands since they represent likely redevelopment opportunities in the neighbourhood. Access prohibitions from any local roads (Benton, Martin, Peter, Cedar) should be incorporated into the policy and zoning as well as site specific standards for building setbacks (stepbacks and terracing), landscaping and buffering of parking areas. City should consider a proactive neighbourhood design charrette for these sites in advance of completion of the secondary plan to guide the long term redevelopment of these lands. Benton St and Martin St- land use designations: In order to maintain the low rise residential character of Benton St, 145, 147, 149 Benton St should be designated low rise residential conservation as is. |
| 13 | Written: October 31, 2018 | Thank you for the attached compiled comments on behalf of some of the residents within the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood. We will definitely review the comments but given the timing of the comments and the meeting on Tuesday, November 20, 2018, they may or may not be reflected in the visuals and other materials that are proposed to be presented at the meeting. Moving forward, these comments and any comments that we receive with respect to the visuals/materials presented on Tuesday evening will be considered in the final draft of the new Secondary Plan and Zoning when it goes to Committee in the Fall of 2019. If I have any questions or need further clarification on your neighbourhood’s comments, I will definitely be in touch. Hopefully you and the residents of the Schneider Creek Neighbourhood will be able to attend on Nov. 20th. See you then. |  |
| 14 | Bryan Cooper | Written: November 13, 2018 |  |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proposed on the opposite side of Benton St. Similarly 26 Martin St and the Martin St frontage of 63 Courtland Ave should be designated low rise residential conservation and zoned accordingly to ensure that any new development completes what is currently a disrupted low rise residential streetscape. Building height and regulations along Courtland Ave: Agree with including height restrictions along Courtland Ave; however, careful consideration of the interface between existing homes along Martin St and Cedar St. is required including accounting for the grade changes between Courtland Ave and Martin St. This difference in topography should be considered in determining the overall building height. For example, the maximum building height of a development fronting on Courtland Ave. in this area should be determined from the lowest point of the shared rear lot line of the properties on Martin St that back onto properties fronting on Courtland Ave. This will assist in mitigating the impact of taller buildings and provide for the continued enjoyment of the private backyard space of the Martin Street residences which is important since the proximity of our homes to the street, or public spaces, means that our private spaces are limited to our rear yards. These much needed and valued spaces add great benefit to our residents in terms of liveability. There are concerns that with Bonusing permissions a developer may be able to exceed any height restriction applied in the secondary plan. This is of particular concern due to the above mentioned grade changes between Courtland Ave. and Martin St. The maximum height regulations for Courtland Ave should be a metric measurement rather than measured in &quot;storeys&quot; since the ceiling height of each storey can have a significant impact on the overall height of the building (e.g Breithaupt Block 3). This also gives greater certainty to the public in how tall a building may be. Zoning standards such as stepbacks should be applied to any new multi-storey building so that the building heights are at the lowest height at the interface of existing low rise buildings and property. Building massing and height should be oriented towards Courtland Ave rather than existing single detached dwellings and local streets. Parking Areas and Structures need to be carefully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>managed particularly at the interface of existing low rise residential areas. The overall building height should include any parking structure. Parking structures should not project above grade to avoid blank walls backing onto homes or streets. Building setbacks to Courtland Avenue - front yard setbacks should be measured from the existing limits if this Regional road rather than from any future road widening taken by the Region. This will avoid pushing a building closer to the rear yard area of homes on Martin St. Severance/minor infilling criteria: Criteria should be developed to consider any new severance applications within the neighbourhood. Criteria should include whether the lot has sufficient frontage to properly accommodate a new building, parking and landscaping. Properties in the neighbourhood have very narrow frontages and the lack of boulevard means that any landscaping needs to be provide within the front yard of private property. Wide driveways and attached garages within the front yard should not be permitted. Some form of architectural control or site plan approval should be required for new infilling of severance lots (or rebuilding of an existing lot) to ensure building style is compatible with surrounding building stock (materials, roof pitch, etc). Garages should be limited to being detached and in the rear yard. Policies should be developed that require new developments to be respectful of the character of the streetscape of this unique neighbourhood- with the open porches, the front doors facing the street, the narrow lots, tightly squeezed houses, tiny front yards, the rooflines, etc. Front yard landscaping in new developments: A suggestion was made by staff at the neighbourhood meeting about the possibility of publicly owned trees within private front yard space for new developments. This should be implemented since there is no opportunity for trees to be installed within the City owned road. Financial securities should be taken should be taken for the publicly owned trees with an extended hold period post construction to ensure that they are established and thrive. Zoning Standards: Minimum front yard landscaped open space standard should be incorporated in the zoning of the area to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?</td>
<td>maintain limited front yard landscaping. Maximum driveway width standards that account for the very narrow lot frontages of the area should also be applied. A minimum landscaping strip along the side lot lines within the front yard to eliminate driveways being installed across the frontage of a property or connecting with adjoining lots should also be applied. This is particularly important for any home that is duplexed to ensure that already small front yards of the neighbourhood are not paved over. Transportation: Courtland Ave currently functions as a barrier between the Schneider Creek and Cedar Hill neighbourhoods. The PARTS plan indicates some streetscaping enhancements are intended for this Regional road - how will this implemented and coordinated with the Region and new development in the area and what opportunity for public involvement will there be. Parking - zoning standards require too much parking for new multi-unit developments and as a result too much of a site is often dedicated to parking when it could be better utilized as amenity space and landscaping. Consider reducing parking standards. General Comments on the neighbourhood and new development: Diversity: The community would like to see new developments provide spaces for families as well as single people and couples - in doing this we will continue to support this community allowing it to remain vibrant and diverse. Families will also ensure that existing infrastructure, such as schools, remain useful. Consider standards that would require a developer to incorporate some family sized dwelling units. Streets: Concerns have been raised regarding the often very narrow, yet charming, streets in this area with regard to their ability to handle increased traffic - it would be inappropriate or undesirable to have any new developments use these streets as a back door access - part of the charm of our community are these often one way, narrow streets which greatly enhance and encourage our social engagement. This close proximity of homes and street provides a unique opportunity to gather, chat and play on the street itself. This makes the community feel safe because we have eyes on the street and know our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

neighbours.

Walkability:
It is a great community asset to be able to walk or bike the iron horse trail or amble around to our parks and downtown. Not always needing a car is something we hope to see supported through the new growth - the experience at street level will be key to encouraging foot traffic, so scale of buildings, materials used and a mix of uses including shops and retail needs to be planned. Potential destinations are needed.

Residents understand the need to move traffic along but suggest lowering the speed limit on regional roads and streets in the core to improve walkability since it contributes to the enjoyment of living in the core.

Sidewalks:
The current sidewalks on some side streets are quite narrow and result in many pedestrians choosing to walk on the street. In addition, steeply angled driveways create slants that make it difficult to maintain your balance and can lead to overturned strollers, childrens' tricycles and wagons, as well as slips and falls, particularly in poor weather conditions. This can be especially problematic for anyone with a mobility challenge or the elderly. In addition the narrow sidewalks leave very little space to put snow or garbage/green bin/blue bins which results in an additional mobility barrier.

Residents acknowledge that the streets in the area were relatively recently reconstructed and therefore there may not be an immediate solution to this issue but wanted to light the problem to the City and would like some direction on what process to engage the City in when the time comes for reconstruction of the streets. When the time comes for reconstruction it will be important to consider alternative designs to address this issue but that is still respectful of the character of the neighbourhood.

Trees and green spaces:
The community would like to see an increase in the minimum allotment of green space around new buildings - more lawns, gardens, trees make for a pleasing streetscape and add to community enjoyment. We know this helps promote overall goals that the city has already indicated wanting to achieve.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46, 49, 53 Courtland Avenue East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: December 17, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46, 49, 53 Courtland Avenue East</td>
<td>Thank-you for hosting the 2nd public open house neighborhood meeting for the New Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek Secondary Plan. My partners and I own the 46, 49 and 53 Courtland Ave East properties. As owners of these properties that will be see a change in zoning, we have been in contact with several developers regarding the properties and wanted to share with you some of the feedback we have received. Currently the three properties are zoned CR-1 and the proposed change would see the zoning changed to MIX-2 (MU-2). A CR-1 zoning today, allows for a maximum building height of 18 meters or approximately 4 floors, while MU-2 zoning allows for up to 8 floors. With your proposed change in zoning, the properties along Courtland Ave would change to a MIX-2 zoning with a cap at 5 floors (as we have been told). This limit of 5 floors effectively makes this a minor change as the difference between the current allowed height and the proposed height of 5 floors would be the addition of 1 floor to the current CR-1 zoning. This limit of 5 floors is something that all the developers we have spoken to have commented on as a deterrent to them looking to purchase and assemble the properties along Courtland Ave. My partners and I are also in agreement that such a limit will deter developers from trying to assemble properties along the street as there is not enough building space allowed to entice developers to assemble the properties and ultimately make a profit. We are afraid that the effects of this, will unfortunately lead to some single houses sandwiched in-between newer buildings. If this were to occur, the City of Kitchener and the residents of that neighborhood would miss the opportunity to fulfill the vision that the City of Kitchener has worked hard in developing and that were demonstrated via the 3-D renderings at the open house. While it is important to take the local residents concerns into</td>
</tr>
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<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
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<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 |                  | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
Additional Comments | consideration when making this plan, we feel that it is also vital that your decisions take into considerations the developers to whom you will be relying on to fulfill the vision for this area. Limiting the height of buildings (according to developers), will lead to an incomplete vision of the area. Please reconsider removing the limit of 5 floors and allowing the maximum height of the MIX-2 zoning to 8 floors as currently allowed for MU-2 zoning. |
| 2 | 54 and 58 Madison Avenue |
Written: November 20, 2018 | 1. Please look at the consistent use of the mid-rise plan at Madison and Church. The original plan was for mid-rise on the church corner of Charles but now is low rise. |
2. Can you please change these properties to medium density like the one across the street?  
3. The neighbours on Church and Madison do not like the fact that it goes from high density 58 Madison 62 Madison and up the street but they should have medium density for their lots. |
We have reviewed the lot fabric in the area. It does not appear conducive to support medium rise built form and could not accommodate this density and appropriate transition from low rise. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81 Cedar Street South&lt;br&gt;Contacted: January 16, 2019 and January 21, 2019</td>
<td>Concerns with adjacent property 87 Cedar Street South - amount of development on site and ensuring that only existing zoning permissions are maintained. This site currently has R-6 zoning. Proposing Medium Rise and new R-6 zoning. Should only have Low Rise Residential and new R-5. I am following up on our phone conversations from January 16th and this past Monday, January the 21st. As discussed the zoning of your property with respect to uses is not intended to change. Between the existing Zoning by-law 85-1 and the new CRoZBy Zoning By-law there are some differences in the names of the respective zones. I believe you are zoned R5 now under Zoning By-law 85-1 and the proposed zoned category in CRoZBy is R4 which is essentially the same zone category with respect to use. We are still reviewing the setback regulations that will be contained in the new CRoZBy Residential zones. The proposed regulations relate to some of the questions that we asked at the Open House on May 29th, 2018, with respect to the location of garages, front porches and some of the views in the neighbourhood. Dayna Edwards is holding an Urban Design Charrette on Monday, February 11th, which results from this Charrette may also impact the regulations proposed to be contained in the Zone Categories. With respect to the adjacent property at 87 Cedar Street South, the land use designation and zone category to be applied, are not intended to give more development rights to this property. We will review this further and make the necessary revisions. As promised, I did ask the Urban Designer that worked on the file, to visit the property at 87 Cedar Street South to ensure that it was developed in accordance with the approved Site Plan, File SP13/028/C/AP. He visited the site yesterday, January 23rd, and sent me the following: “As per our conversation I went out to inspect the above noted site and I can confirm that the building and site has been built in general conformity to the approved plans. I can also confirm that no balconies or air conditioning units are affixed to the exterior of the buildings on the rear/side facades facing the adjacent properties. Let me know if you require any further information.” Once we have the Final Draft Land Use Designation and Zone Categories determined and applied to the Secondary Plans, there will be</td>
</tr>
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<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</td>
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<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>81 Cedar Street South</td>
<td>Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to address my concerns. In regards to our last conversation, I wanted to clarify my concerns with future developments and the adjacent property built by the Madison group. My concern with the new proposed set back regulations; is they will be misused by developers. The guidelines discussed in the planning departments proposal allows developers a legal loop whole to tear down existing structures and put new structures at the same side and front set back distance as old structures. The builders will use the closest point of old structure to the neighbouring property. While making the new structure larger in length and width; of coarse to maximize profits their roofs will not slope and be more box like to increase living space. The windows of any adjacent properties that face...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  |                  | Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses?  
Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning?  
Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines?  
Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?  
Additional Comments | new build are not all negatively affected. For example: my home for instance does not get any direct sunlight after mid morning on the main floor. Three of my large windows currently look at solid brick wall and 15 gas meters. I know you can’t tear down what has been built, but you shouldn’t allow this to happen to anyone else either.  
My concern with the proposed zone changes are adjacent property now can build up higher with new categories. It may not be your intention with current developments, but if the city amends their policies as outlined. Any developer will use them to their advantage to maximize their profits. They don’t care about history and that my home was built in the late 1800's.  
As I stated on the phone. I don’t fault the current planning committee for previous decisions, but when you indicated that you sent an individual to check that the build generally complies with the approved building papers and he said that it does; that's very difficult to understand. My main concern is for the safety of my family. Here are the issues I stated over the phone. I’d like to mention a lot of these issues can be fixed without tearing down the existing structure.  
1) 15 gas meters placed under 7 feet from my driveway without any real safe guards put in place. (there are no metal posts in ground protecting these meters from any possible impact)  
2) The roof that is slanted towards my property on the building closest to Cedar Street builds up with snow whenever there is a large snowfall. That snow comes crashing down all at once due to slope of roof. It falls directly into my driveway due to close proximity. My main concern there is for the safety of my children.  
3) The landscaping of the property has also been sloped towards my property, so all rain and snow; melt or pour into my driveway. Even the downspouts are placed to go onto there grass where it is sloped towards my property and the water comes directly into my driveway.  
4) poor visibility for getting out of my driveway as well; minimum 14-foot visibility triangle not given (especially being on top of hill. visibility is already hindered.)  
5) Where the fence begins to go on angle in back end of my property; it begins to encroach on my land. | As I mentioned in my last email I would encourage you to attend Dayna’s Urban Design Charrette session on February 11th, 2019. It will be a great opportunity to discuss several of the items of concern in your email and how they can be potentially addressed either through a guideline, a zoning regulation or both.  
Thank you again.  
We look forward to discussing further with you as we progress in the Official Plan and Zoning By-law review for the Cedar Hill and Schneider Creek neighbourhood. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review? Additional Comments</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Written: November 20, 2018</td>
<td>Importance of this is that the second structure is built closer than first structure. It has overhanging built out lofts. (Overhang is less than two feet from my property line) I’d further like to clarify, when I spoke about the 8 air conditioners and the over hanging balconies; I was stating how these things should not be ever allowed to happen again. 1) 8 air conditioners were placed on the fence line beside what at that point was the master bedroom to my property. These air conditioners were removed three years after installation for reasons I’m not fully aware of. 2) When I mentioned the balconies, I said luckily; I’m not the poor old man on Madison Street where the Madison group also built another building with balconies that are directly above his fence line, his massive back yard is worthless now. In our conversation I also mentioned that the cities interactive mapping system is inaccurate in many areas with regards to my property and adjacent new build (81 Cedar St. S. and 87 Cedar ST S) The Interactive Mapping System displays the building that was built; as being set in more than my property. 87 Cedar St. S is set back less than 3 feet from the sidewalk; my home is 14 feet and 1 inch set back from the sidewalk. If there are any decisions or discussions, the individuals involved need to see the sites in person. I am more willing to forward pictures and bring in a copy of my official survey or any information requested.</td>
<td>An urban design charrette was held February 11, 2019. Transitional issues will be reviewed through the application of the zone category and also addressed through the Urban Design Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your opinions/comments with the proposed land uses? Question 2: What are your opinions/concerns with the proposed zoning? Question 3: What comments do you have regarding the proposed Urban Design Guidelines? Question 4: What other key aspects about this neighbourhood should be considered while undergoing this review?</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Intensively used property and then scaling up beyond. If a sloped building is deemed unacceptable, the “treads” of the steps can be widened. As to shadowing, Mississauga’s rules may offer some ideas. Please see <a href="http://www6.mississauga.ca/onlinemaps/planbldg/UrbanDesign/FinalStandards_ShadowStudies_July2014.pdf">http://www6.mississauga.ca/onlinemaps/planbldg/UrbanDesign/FinalStandards_ShadowStudies_July2014.pdf</a>.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>John Macdonald Architects Sally Gunz</td>
<td>Please find the attached a Visioning Report prepared by the Cedar Hills Community as input for the drafting of the urban design guidelines that support the proposed new zoning. This project began with the work of City staff who encouraged us to prepare our own vision document. We were assisted as we began this project by John Macdonald and Elyn Lin of John Macdonald Architects. John and Elyn led the community in the initial visioning exercise and have shown continued interest throughout spring 2019. The community has been involved throughout. We will be preparing a print version of this document in due course but in truth we want to let this ‘sit’ for a couple of weeks or so in order that we may back for a final proof-read with fresh eyes. But since we believe the substance is all there, we wanted to get you this almost final version now in e-form so that you can consider its content as you conduct your work. Of course we will ensure you have a final hard copy version as soon as it is available. I believe I speak on behalf of all the community when I say that we are all most grateful for the City Staff support and the support of you, Debbie. Throughout the recent zoning meetings we have been struck by the openness of everyone we have met to considering the community perspective, even when we are mixed up at times and not always clear. For all of this we thank you. Of course we hope that this document is a beginning for further discussion. We would be thrilled if suggestions might be incorporated into your proposals. No doubt you will have further suggestions for improvement. Thanks. And please pass this on to any relevant City staff whom I have inadvertently omitted in this email.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Justification and Summary

General Justification:

- RES-3 zone applied generally across established low rise residential streets to maintain the existing character, with limited permissions for additional uses.
- Properties fronting Courtland Avenue given increased permissions with Medium Rise Mixed Use designation and zone (MIX-2) but limited to a 5-storey height limit to maintain character and require new development to have appropriate transition to low rise residential.
- Individual low rise residential properties were identified to be zoned as RES-5 dependent on the existing use as well as lot size and lot width.
- Properties on the north side of Church Street identified as Medium Rise Residential in the PARTS Central Preferred Plan were designated as Low Rise Residential and zoned RES-3 through this review based on the existing use of the properties and lot fabric.
- Lands south of Whitney Place previously zoned for General Industrial uses have been designated Innovation Employment and zoned EMP-6 to permit more compatible uses adjacent to the established neighbourhood and floodplain, and reflects the recommendations of the PARTS Plan.
- PARTS Central Plan recommended that bonusing for additional height and density could be used to encourage the provision of affordable housing. This will be examined and reviewed further through the secondary plan review as well as through additional work that the City is doing with respect to an Affordable Housing Strategy.
- Special policies were created and added to this neighbourhood that speak to maintaining the existing character through new development that considers front porch design and garage location.

Site Specific Justification:

- 11 and 15 Mill Street: Proposed to be Medium Rise Residential on the first draft of this secondary plan. Changed designation to Mixed Use to reflect existing uses of the properties and justified through their proximity to a major corridor (Queen Street South).
- 19-41 Mill Street: Proposed to be Medium Rise Residential on the first draft of this secondary plan to implement the recommendation from the PARTS Central Plan. High Rise Residential was requested for this property but Staff do not support the change from Low Density Commercial Residential to this land use. Staff have determined that this change would require an owner-initiated site specific Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications on these lands and falls outside the scope of this review.
- 87 Cedar Street South: Proposed to maintain Medium Rise Residential land use designation. Concerns were expressed regarding increased permissions for this property. Staff have reviewed and maintained the existing permissions.
- 91 Madison Ave S: Proposed to be Institutional on the draft of this secondary plan. PARTS designated the property as Medium Rise Residential and the property is currently zoned as R-6. Staff determined that an Institutional designation and INS-1 zone are more appropriate for this property.