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

1.1 Location Map
2.0 Considerations

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

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

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

2.2 Residential Intensification in Established Neighbourhoods Study (RIENS)

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

2.3 Urban Design Guidelines (UDG)

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

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

### 2.4 Cultural Heritage Landscape Study and Implementation

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

Introduction

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

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

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

Built Heritage Resources

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

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

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Pages from 2014 Kitchener CHL Study on Gilder Green and Gruhn Neighbourhoods, Mount Hope Cemetery, Union Boulevard, Iron Horse Trail and Canadian National Railway Line*
A Phased Approach to CHL Conservation

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Fieldwork and Analysis**

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

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

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

**Review of Land Use & Zoning**

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

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

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

Panels from April 18, 2019 Open House

Recommendations to address cultural heritage interests within the Midtown area

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recommend undertaking of Strategic Conservation Plan for Mount Hope Cemetery

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Union Boulevard should be designated under the City’s Official Plan as a heritage corridor.

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

Measures to be considered under the Ontario Heritage Act

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

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

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

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

Neighbourhood Residents, Property Owners and Interested Community Members

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

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

A Public Open House is scheduled as outlined below:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours truly,

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

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

Open House
April 18, 2019
Agenda and Format

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

6:45 p.m.  Overview Presentation
Rotating around room with individual opportunity to review the panels, write down information and ideas and discuss project review with staff

8:30 p.m.  Conclusion – Thank you for attending
Have a great night!
Background

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

8.1 Land Use Plan

Following the creation, evaluation and public review of various Alternative Scenarios, a Preferred Scenario evolved and was refined based on a series of technical considerations and feedback. The Key Directions and Strategies from the Land Use and Built Form, Mobility and Public Realm sections culminated in this final Land Use Plan. A description of the key characteristics, potential building heights and built form density for each of the different land use designations are provided on the opposite page. This Land Use Plan helps achieve the vision and objectives for the PARTS Midtown area and it provides a wide range of uses at densities that can be transit/LRT-supportive, which will help contribute to a healthy and complete community. These land uses will be implemented through the City’s Official Plan and Zoning By-law and may require some site-specific treatment related to uses or built form/density.

Map Legend

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

[Map of land use plan with various zones and features marked]
PARTS Midtown Plan – Public Realm Framework

KEY DIRECTIONS

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

The Public Realm Framework Map Legend

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

Scale (approx.) 400m
PARTS Midtown Plan– Mobility Framework

**KEY DIRECTIONS**

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

---

**The Mobility Framework Map Legend**

- **Study Area Boundary**
- **Focus Area Boundary**
- **ION Line & Stops**
- **Proposed Streets**
- **Proposed Lanes**
- **Active Transportation Network (existing)**
- **Active Transportation Network (proposed)**
- **Pedestrian Connection (proposed)**
- **Trucks/Servicing Route**
- **Bike Share Station (proposed)**
  - Indicates areas where the provision of bike share facilities over time could help to support travel between the LRT station and destinations within the station area.
- **Shared Parking (proposed)**
  - Indicates potential areas for future structured shared parking considerations.
- **Priority Crossings**
  - Indicates areas where intersection improvements such as enhanced markings and reduced curb radii should be directed to enhance the safety of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the street.

---

Scale (approx): 400m

GRH STOP
Cultural Heritage Landscape Study

Identification of 55 Cultural Heritage Landscapes across the City
Process

- In a position to commence the review of the Secondary Plans through a process called a Neighbourhood Specific Planning Review
- The implementation of various studies; i.e. PARTS, CHLS, RIENS
- Now reviewing the existing K-W Hospital Neighbourhood Secondary Plan
Secondary Plan (1994 Official Plan)
Proposed Boundary Airphoto
Proposed Changes to Map 3 – Land Use
Proposed New Secondary Plan
Land Uses Visualization

Low Rise Residential

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

**Low Rise Residential**

**DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** low density housing types, including single detached dwellings, duplex dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, and where appropriate and compatible, other low density dwelling types such as street townhouse dwellings and small-scale multiple dwellings.

**FSR:** maximum of 0.6

**MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT:** 3 storeys (4 if onto a Regional Rd or City Arterial St)

**Medium Rise Residential**

**DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** medium density housing types including townhouse dwellings in a cluster development, multiple dwellings, and special needs housing.

**FSR:** minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 2.0

**MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** 8 storeys

**High Rise Residential**

**DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** high density multiple dwellings and special needs housing to achieve a high intensity of residential use.

**FSR:** minimum of 2.0 / maximum of 4.0

**MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** none

**Institutional**

**DESCRIPTION:** These areas are intended for institutional uses that are of a neighbourhood, community, or regional nature.

**RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** secondary and post-secondary educational facilities, long-term care facilities, social, cultural, and administrative facilities, small-scale institutional uses compatible with surrounding uses such as public and private elementary schools, libraries, day care centers, and places of worship.

**Open Space**

**DESCRIPTION:** These areas provide for a comprehensive and connected open space system of parks and trails, a buffer between land uses, and increase the opportunities for recreation and general enjoyment in an active or passive manner.

**RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation, Community Facility and Cemeteries

**Mixed Use**

**DESCRIPTION:** Permits a broad range and compatible mix of commercial, retail, institutional, and residential uses, either on the same site or within the same building.

**RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** retail, office uses, day care, health office/clinic, personal services, religious institutions, commercial entertainment, restaurants, studio, artisan-related uses, and the same residential uses permitted in Medium and High Rise Residential.

**FSR:** minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 4.0

**MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** None

**Mixed Use with specific policy areas**

**MAXIMUM NON-RES. GROSS FLOOR AREA:**
- for SP. 2: 7,500 sq.m.
- for SP. 3: 10,000 sq.m.

**FSR:** for SP. 2 & 3: minimum of 0.6 / a maximum of 2.0

**MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:**
- for SP. 2: 24 m.
- for SP. 3: 32 m.
- for SP. 4: 18 m.
- for SP. 5: 18 m closer to residential areas and unlimited height fronting King St
- for SP. 7: 18 m closer to residential areas and unlimited height fronting King St

**Innovation Employment**

**DESCRIPTION:** Recognizes a growing demand for employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers’. Predominantly office and high-tech manufacturing.

**RANGE OF PERMITTED USES:** creative production industries, artisan’s establishment, studio (art and music), craftsman shop, live/work space, shared facilities, galleries, studios, office space for creative professionals, and retail sales associated with production of goods and materials.

**FSR:** minimum of 0.6 / maximum of 2.0

**MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:** 8 storeys
Proposed Zoning
# Proposed Residential Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a limited range of low density dwelling types in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="" alt="SINGLE DETACHED DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="SECOND DWELLING UNIT" /> <img src="" alt="HOSPICE" /> <img src="" alt="SMALL RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>3.4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas</td>
<td><img src="" alt="SINGLE DETACHED DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="SECOND DWELLING UNIT" /> <img src="" alt="SEMI DETACHED DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="STREET TOWNHOUSE DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="FOURPLEX" /> <img src="" alt="HOSPICE" /> <img src="" alt="SMALL RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>The site specific may limit height and FSR depending on property context and heritage attributes (TBD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td><img src="" alt="SINGLE DETACHED DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="SECOND DWELLING UNIT" /> <img src="" alt="SEMI DETACHED DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="STREET TOWNHOUSE DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="CLUSTER TOWNHOUSE DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="MULTIPLE DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="LOGGING HOUSE" /> <img src="" alt="HOSPICE" /> <img src="" alt="SMALL RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY" /> <img src="" alt="LARGE RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY" /></td>
<td>Home Occupation</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><img src="" alt="CLUSTER TOWNHOUSE DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="MULTIPLE DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="LOGGING HOUSE" /> <img src="" alt="HOSPICE" /> <img src="" alt="LARGE RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY" /></td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Office, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>8 storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rise Residential</td>
<td>RES-7</td>
<td>Accommodate high density dwelling types and a range of complementary non-residential uses in high rise residential areas</td>
<td><img src="" alt="MULTIPLE DWELLING" /> <img src="" alt="LOGGING HOUSE" /> <img src="" alt="HOSPICE" /> <img src="" alt="LARGE RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY" /></td>
<td>Artisan’s Establishment, Community Facility, Convenience Retail, Day Care Facility, Financial Establishment, Health Office, Office, Personal Services, Home Occupation, Studio</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 2.0 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

* Uses/zones subject to additional regulation and site specifics

Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
Overview of Information Provided this Evening – Your Feedback and Comments

- Sign-In and General Information
- Neighbourhood Planning Review Process
- Existing and Proposed Land Use and Zoning
- PARTS, Zoning Details and Urban Design
• Work has begun on the review of the K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan
• This is the first Open House/Engagement Session on the preliminary work
• Will collect and consider the comments and feedback from the Open House materials
• Urban Design Charrette – May 2019
• Revisions to the land use designation and zoning
• Further consultation/engagement
• Committee/Council consideration late Fall 2019?
Thank You!

FOR ONGOING AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION on this project or to provide written comments at any time, please view the City’s website at: https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR

Email comments to secondaryplans@kitchener.ca

or contact the Project Manager
Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Project Manager/Senior Planner
519-741-2200 x7765 (TTY:1-866-969-9994)
tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca
**DESCRIPTION**: Same as low rise residential land use, however specific policy area may limit some of the dwelling types that will be permitted and will limit the number of units in a dwelling to 2 units. Consideration will also be given to further regulating garages, building height and density. Analysis to be completed to confirm the properties to which the specific policy area will apply.

**Low Rise Residential with specific policy area**

**High Rise Residential**

**DESCRIPTION / RANGE OF PERMITTED USES**: High density multiple dwellings and special needs housing to achieve a high intensity of residential use.

**FSR**: Minimum of 2.0 / Maximum of 4.0

**MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT**: None

**Mixed Use with specific policy areas**

**Max. Number of Dwelling Types**: 2

**MAXIMUM NON-RES. GROSS FLOOR AREA**:
- for SP. 2: 7,500 sq.m.
- for SP. 3: 10,000 sq.m.

**FSR**: for SP. 2 & 3: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0

**MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT**:
- for SP. 2: 24 metres
- for SP. 3: 32 metres
- for SP. 4: 16 metres
- for SP. 5: 24 metres closer to res areas and unlimited height fronting King St
- for SP. 7: 18 metres closer to res areas and unlimited height fronting King St

**Innovation Employment**

**DESCRIPTION**: Recognizes a growing demand for employment lands for ‘start-ups’ and ‘makers’. Predominantly office and high-tech manufacturing.

**RANGE OF PERMITTED USES**: Creative Production Industries, Artisan’s Establishment, Studio (art and music), Craftsman Shop, Live/Work Space, Shared Facilities, Galleries, Studios, Office Space for Creative Professionals, and retail sales associated with production of goods and materials.

**FSR**: Minimum of 0.6 / Maximum of 2.0

**MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT**: 6 storeys
### Proposed Residential (RES) Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed RES ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Residential Uses*</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Non-Residential Uses</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>RES-3</td>
<td>Accommodate a limited range of low density dwelling types in low rise areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a range of low density dwelling types that allow up to four dwelling units on a range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>3, 4 if fronting onto Regional Rd or City Arterial St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RES-5</td>
<td>Accommodate the widest range of low density dwelling types on the widest range of lot sizes in low rise areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td>Max – 0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>RES-6</td>
<td>Accommodate medium density dwelling types and some complementary non-residential uses in medium rise residential areas.</td>
<td>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><strong>High Rise Residential</strong></td>
<td>RES-7</td>
<td>Accommodate high density dwelling types and a range of complementary non-residential uses in high rise residential areas.</td>
<td>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 additional regulation and site specifics.

- Additional site specific provisions will be drafted and applied to relevant properties to implement urban design and neighbourhood character elements and cultural heritage objectives and other site contextual considerations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Land Use</th>
<th>Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Purpose of Proposed ZONE</th>
<th>Proposed Permitted Uses*</th>
<th>Max. # of Storeys</th>
<th>Min. and Max. Floor Space Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>MIX-4</td>
<td>Accommodate a variety of uses within mixed use buildings at a high density within the City’s Major Transit Station Areas.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Brewpub, Commercial Entertainment, Commercial School, Community Facility, Computer/Electronic/Data Processing/Server Establishment, Craftsperson Shop, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Dwelling Unit, Financial Establishment, Fitness Centre, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hotel, Large Residential Care Facility, Light Repair Operation, Lodging House, Multiple Dwelling, Office, Payday Loan Establishment, Personal Services, Pet Services Establishment, Place of Worship, Post-Secondary School, Print Shop, Research and Development Establishment, Restaurant, Retail, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment, Veterinary Services</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (SP.2)</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>8 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (SP.3)</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>10 Storeys</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (SP.4)</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>Max. height – 18 metres</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIX-4 (SP.5 &amp; 7)</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Same as allowed in MIX-4</td>
<td>Unlimited height fronting King St. and limited height to 18 or 24 metres closer to residential areas</td>
<td>Min – 0.6 Max – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>INS-1</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses intended to serve surrounding residential communities.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Cemetery, Community Facility, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Elementary School, Funeral Home, Health Office, Hospice, Large Residential Care Facility, Place of Worship, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment</td>
<td>4 Storeys Max. height – 14 metres</td>
<td>Max – 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INS-1 (SP. 8)</td>
<td>Uses allowed in INS-1 plus Commercial School, Multiple dwelling, Office, Personal Services, Research and Development Establishment, and Restaurant (permitted only as accessory to a Community Facility or a Cultural Facility). Shared/reduced parking rates to be studied through a future site specific study. Uses permitted in existing buildings and/or any approved additions/modifications only.</td>
<td>A base shall be required for buildings greater than 14 metres in height</td>
<td>6 Storeys</td>
<td>Max – 0.6 Max – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation Employment</strong></td>
<td>INS-2</td>
<td>Accommodate institutional uses that are intended to serve a region and/or city-wide population.</td>
<td>Adult Education School, Artisan’s Establishment, Cemetery, Community Facility, Continuing Care Community, Cultural Facility, Day Care Facility, Elementary School, Funeral home, Health Clinic, Hospice, Hospital, Large Residential Care Facility, Place of Worship, Post-Secondary School, Secondary School, Small Residential Care Facility, Social Service Establishment</td>
<td>A base shall be required for buildings greater than 14 metres in height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td>OSR-2</td>
<td>Accommodate comprehensive and connected parkland and open space system.</td>
<td>Outdoor Active Recreation, Outdoor Passive Recreation and Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

• Well-maintained residential structures representing a significant range of architectural styles dating from the early 1900s (i.e. Edwardian, Tudor Revival)

• Attractive and consistent public realm linked by the streetscapes, mature trees and the urban cross section with grass boulevards

• Early 20th century street pattern characterized by a simple grid with some slightly radiating streets, including Wood, Gildner and Glasgow Streets

• Public street trees and private front yard trees (images 1 and 2)

• Two-lane paved secondary roads (image 2)

• Common housing design characteristics (front porches, front gable and centre gable roofs, detached rear yard garages, brick and stucco cladding) (images 3-5)

• Houses set on an angle to one another on the streets that radiate from the grid pattern (image 4)

• Gildner Green Park (image 6)

• Views (images 4, 7-9)

• Gently rolling topography

• Primarily two to two-and-a-half storey residential structures

• Consistent street edge with shallow front yard and exterior side yard setbacks

• Consistent lot sizes and coverage of residential properties
Heritage Attributes
Gruhn Neighbourhood

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

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

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

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

#### Iron Horse Trail
- Alignment along former right-of-way of the original Preston and Berlin Railway
- Connection of Victoria Park and Waterloo Park
- Vegetation
- Preservation of views of original rail corridor
- Trail signage
- Remnant commemorative railway infrastructure
kw-hospital midtown secondary plan

fact sheet

Official Plan: A long-term planning document, which contains policies and plans related to land use for a 20-year time horizon for the city as a whole. The Official Plan gets direction from and must conform to Provincial and Regional policies. A new Official Plan for the City was approved on November 19, 2014.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Background studies supporting KW-Hospital Secondary Plan:

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

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

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

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

**Next Steps:**

- Preparing land use and zoning maps based on the recommendations from the background studies and reports
- Presenting proposed Land Use and Zoning for public feedback (April 8th, 2019)  
  - We are here
- KW-Hospital Secondary Plan Urban Design Charrette (May, 2019) will provide:
  - An opportunity for public to visualize the proposed build form due to upcoming changes; and,
  - A direction for zoning by-law and built form.
- Consider public feedback, technical reports and make changes accordingly
- Finalize land use, zoning and related polices and present it to the council
- More information can be found on the City’s website [https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR](https://www.kitchener.ca/NPR)
- Feedback and comments can be emailed here secondaryplans@kitchener.ca
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74 Gruhn Ave Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Herbert St.</td>
<td>N2G 3R6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 Gillmor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84 York St</td>
<td>N2G 1T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>533 Killearn</td>
<td>N4A 2R9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>850 S1 Cherry Hill Pl. Ferguson</td>
<td>N1M 3T9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 BRAUN St</td>
<td>N2E 2LZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298 Park St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>Phone Number*</td>
<td>E-mail Address*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>540 Bingemans Centre Drive, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 2H2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Gildner St, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 1N1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>330 Park St, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 1N1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133 Elm Ridge Drive</td>
<td>N2M 1J 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 Glasgow St.</td>
<td>N2G 2G8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Highview Pl., Kit</td>
<td>N2N 1W8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Avery St, Kit</td>
<td>N2N 3R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139 Union St. E, Waterloo</td>
<td>N2J 1C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
# SIGN-IN SHEET

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

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2186 Lonsdale Rd</td>
<td>NOB 1M0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>411 Braun</td>
<td>N2H 3R3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89 Wood St</td>
<td>N2G 2H7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 Mary St</td>
<td>N2H 3K1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86 Glasgow St</td>
<td>N2G 2K7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>385 Duke St W</td>
<td>N2H 3Y4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*optional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ed@pavelson.com">ed@pavelson.com</a></td>
<td>N2H 3M 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:aliwardrop@gmail.com">aliwardrop@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>N2H 529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Pink St</td>
<td>N2H 527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>455550-2</td>
<td>N2H 164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 Agnes Street, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2H 209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Amherst St, Ku.</td>
<td>N2H 512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93 Walter St</td>
<td>N2H 153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Mary St.</td>
<td>N2H 3PP</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>269 Union Blvd Kitch</td>
<td>N2M 2S9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 Pine St Kitch</td>
<td>N0H 2C7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 Mt. Hope St.</td>
<td>N2G 2J5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Eden Ave Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 1V1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Louisa St, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2H 5L8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Glasgow, Kitchener</td>
<td>N2G 2G6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298 Park St, Kitchener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>217 Waterloo St, Kitcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SIGN-IN SHEET

**KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**

**April 18, 2019**

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 Braun St</td>
<td>N2H 3R8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66 Braun St.</td>
<td>N2H 3R4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89 Skinner St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137 Walter St</td>
<td>N2G-1S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199 Strange St</td>
<td>N2G-1R7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>296 Strange St.</td>
<td>N2G 1R6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132 Strange st.</td>
<td>N2G 1R6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53 Shanley St.</td>
<td>N2H 5N7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SIGN-IN SHEET

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

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 Mary St. Kitchener</td>
<td>N2H 3R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110 Strange St. Kitcher</td>
<td>N2G 1R3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 Albert St</td>
<td>N2G 2H2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>524 King St W</td>
<td>N2G 1G1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 Louis St</td>
<td>N2H 3R8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Herbert St, Kitcher</td>
<td>N2H 3R6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77 Wellington St</td>
<td>N2G 2E6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Optional
### SIGN-IN SHEET

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

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 Gildner Street, Kitchener</td>
<td>N9C 4H4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129 Walter St</td>
<td>N2H 1S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>507 Park St</td>
<td>N2G 1N8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MHBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MHBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>304 Park St.</td>
<td>N2G 1N1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>209 Carnegie Way</td>
<td>N2G 1H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C/O Grand River Hospital</td>
<td>N2G 1H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
# SIGN-IN SHEET

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

Please sign in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Phone Number*</th>
<th>E-mail Address*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84 GRUHN ST, KITCHENER N2G 1S6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298 PARK ST, KITCHENER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 DOMINION ST</td>
<td>N2G 2G2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 MARY ST.</td>
<td>N2H 3R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 GRIFFIN ST</td>
<td>N2G 2H3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 VICTORIA ST S, SUITE 201</td>
<td>N2H 4Y9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 SHAWLEY</td>
<td>N2H 5W7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 YORK ST.</td>
<td>N2G 1T7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* optional
## SIGN-IN SHEET

**KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review - Public Open House #1**

**April 18, 2019**

Please sign in below:

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

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

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

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

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

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

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

Write your additional comments here:

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

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

Name: [redacted]
Mailing Address: 41 1/2 Barry St.
Email: [redacted]
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

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

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

SOUNDS GOOD

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

I'M FINE WITH IT.

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

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

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

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

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 60 HERBERT ST. KITCHENER N2H 3R6
Email: [Redacted]

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

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

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

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

KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Write your additional comments here:

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

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

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

Name: 

Mailing Address: 55 Pine St. Kitchener, ON N2H 5Z7

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

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

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

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

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

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

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

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

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

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

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

The proposed uses seem to be in keeping w. the current neighborhoods.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

Keeping the actual rezoning to the major streets - Parc-Glasgow, Green. King is good but there seems to be a need to have some depth down the side streets - Wood, Gilder, Mt. Hope, Grahm.

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

Not an expert .... some thinking required to answer more intellectually.
Write your additional comments here:

How do we change our zoning from R3 to institutional adjacent to labuts institutional zoning?

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

Name:

Mailing Address: 3 Gildner St.

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

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

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

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

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

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

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

- Strictly regulate parking lot density for surface parking
  ie Sun Life, Catalyst
- Have a public consult on Heritage guidelines
- Have a public consult on streetscape to establish neighbourhood master plans & incorporate neighbourhood associations
- Ensure architecturally significant structures such as St. Paul's hospitals, Sacred Heart & Electra are maintained & not fallen to ruin through disrepair or vagrancy/graffiti abandonment

KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Looking for clarification on proposed use of Glasgow as "Connecting" road & impact on traffic density and amenity.

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

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

Name: [Redacted]
Mailing Address: 16 Glasgow Street
Email: [Redacted]
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

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

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

   *Park space for neighbourhood use on Pine St. is excellent!*

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   *Keep higher buildings along King St and green space within the residential zone.*

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

   *If park space is not an option then keep it low residential housing.*
Write your additional comments here:

I really like the additional green space that is planned for Pine St (between Mary and Herbert) that is the current location of a parking lot.

Keeping the multi-use/multi-storey buildings at the King St frontage is a good plan as well as it keeps the Mary/Pine/Herbert St residential community relatively unaffected by large buildings, respecting the admittance heritage area.

Our neighborhood is very close-knit and a wonderful community in an inner-city environment. I very much value the addition of park space for us to use as could people at the hospital.

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

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

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

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

   I think they look good.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

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

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

   Not sure.
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

Write your additional comments here:

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

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

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

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

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   
   I LIKE THE PROPOSAL OF GREEN SPACE ON PINE ST

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards,

Preet

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

1. Land Use Designations

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

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

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

2. Zoning - Low Rise Residential

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Additional Comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for providing us with this opportunity to share our ideas and concerns.

83
I look forward to attending more Public Open Houses in the near future to discuss the many opportunities our community has to offer.

Sincerely,

Brenda Shantz
Good morning,

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

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

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

Regards,
Preet

From: Preet Kohli on behalf of Secondary Plans
To: Secondary Plans
Subject: RE: Public Open House information material for K-W Hospital / Midtown Neighbourhood Secondary Plan
Date: Friday, May 17, 2019 9:01:48 AM

Hello

Please find attached my feedback form on the secondary plan.

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

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

23 Dominion Street

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

Good morning Neighbourhood Residents and Community Members,


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

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

Sincerely,
Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
May 13, 2019

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP Senior Planner – Policy
Planning Division, 6th Floor
City of Kitchener
200 King Street West
Kitchener, Ontario N2G 4G7

Dear Ms. Malone-Wright:

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

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

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

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

Background

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

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

Pre-consultation and Proposed Development

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

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

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

Next Steps

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

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

Yours truly,

MHBC

Pierre J Chauvin MA, MCIP, RPP
Partner

Stephanie Mirtitsch, BES, MCIP, RPP
Planner
Good morning

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

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

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

Regards,
Preet

Hello

Please find attached my feedback form on the secondary plan.

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

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

---

23 Dominion Street

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

Good morning Neighbourhood Residents and Community Members,


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

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

Sincerely,
Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
Land use seems to be generally appropriate - mixed use or innovation seem like reasonable uses adjacent to residential. High rise residential or mixed use with no height limit and no defined transition do not seem appropriate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards,

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

See attached comment document.

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

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

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

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

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

Write your additional comments here:

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


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

Name: __________________________________________

Mailing Address: 217 Waterloo Street

Email: __________________________________________
Good afternoon

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

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

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

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

Regards,

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

Tina,  

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards,

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

---

Good day,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.
Good afternoon,

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

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

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

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

Regards,

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

I recently examined the proposed secondary plan for my neighbourhood (I live on Agnes St). It has been challenging to determine which plan applied to our neighbourhood in light of the many development initiatives emerging in the midtown and hospital area.

From the most recent proposed secondary plan, it makes sense to expand the neighbourhood’s boundary to include the lands of 607 King Street, Ontario Seed and the KW Badminton Club. This is also helpful for us when trying to understand the full impact of intensification on the neighbourhood, which will be significant.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you

42 Agnes St Kitchener
Good afternoon

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

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

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

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

Regards,

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

---

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

84 Moore Ave
Good Afternoon

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

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

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

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

Regards,

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

From: <tina.malonewright@kitchener.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, May 07, 2019 11:55 AM
To: Secondary Plans <SecondaryPlans@kitchener.ca>
Subject: KW Hospital Feedback Form

Hello,
I hope you are well.

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

Thanks for your efforts in community engagement.

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

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

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

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

   I am in support of mixed use development. However, I am concerned about the zoning of the parking lot at Dominion Park and Agnes as mixed use 4. There is no transition or setback and 18' metres in my opinion is too dramatic bordering a residential street.

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

   I support the mixed 4 zoning of the badminton club and Ontario Seed.

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

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

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

Write your additional comments here:


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

Name: __________________________

Mailing Address: 21 Dominion St, Kitchener

Email: __________________________
Hello Yasmine,

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

Hello Preet,

Here are my comments.

Thank you,

Yasmine Shamsie
Associate Professor and Graduate Coordinator
Department of Political Science
Wilfrid Laurier University
75 University Avenue West
Waterloo, ON
Canada
N2L 3C5
MAP your future in Political Science at Laurier!
Learn more at: http://wlu.ca/programs/arts/graduate/applied-politics-map
Good morning Neighbourhood Residents and Community Members,


Here is the link to the information presented in the open house:

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

Sincerely,
Preet

Preet Kohli, B. Arch., MES., PMP
Technical Assistant (Policy) | Planning Division | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 ext. 7041 | TTY 1-866-969-9994
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

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

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

I see that some space has been designated as green space. My concern is that the cemetery not be viewed as the only ‘green space’. It is lovely but the neighbourhood lacks parks. With medium density housing planned at the end of Braun St., I feel we need more green space to accommodate an increased population. The redevelopment of the KCI field is rather vague. What would that entail exactly? Is that owned by the city? If the school board owns it, would it not want to sell that piece of land to developers to maximize profit?

2. What are your comments about the zoning?

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

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

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

Write your additional comments here:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

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

Name: _______________________________________________

Mailing Address: _______________________________________________

Email: _______________________________________________

KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Good afternoon Gwen,

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

We very much appreciate receiving your comments/feedback on the information that was presented at the Open House and these comments will be considered moving forward through the review process.
We have ensured that your contact information is included on our notification list to keep you informed of the project and upcoming meetings.

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

Regards,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Illustration

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

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

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

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

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

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

Gwen Wheeler
Good afternoon.

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

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

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

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

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

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
KW Hospital Secondary Plan Review
Public Open House #1 Comment Form

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

1. What are your comments about the land use designations?
   The new structures down homes along behind Central Ave will overpower lower elevations small homes on Braun.

2. What are your comments about the zoning?
   Concerned about zoning of Braun St. reduced to R3! Street needs to retain all R5 or increase to R6 as Braun will be surrounded by R6. At end of street & behind on Central Medc Side, Andrew St. is a good functional element from R3.

3. What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?
   Because Braun St. is a bit of an anomaly amongst the rest of R3, Braun home owners should have option to redevelop without actual developer sweeping in to help benefits.

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

   Neighbours in those homes would use a facilitator to be able to discuss viable options for their properties along Braun St.
Feasibility of a laneway at the back of properties on Brunswick that currently sit up to 3 storey town homes, to create separation and enable Braun owners to develop housing at the end of their deep lots, so that access can be via a laneway/mausoleum and parking for infill is off main street.
Good afternoon

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regards,

Tina Malone-Wright, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner - Policy | Planning | City of Kitchener
519-741-2200 Ext. 7765 | TTY 1-866-969-9994 | tina.malonewright@kitchener
It is our desire to have the zoning changed to that of Institutional to join the existing properties that front Park Street at 399, 403 and 407 Park Street respectively.

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

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

Yours sincerely,
Hi Gwen,

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

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

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

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

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

Regards,

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

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

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

Thanks again,
Preet

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

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

Hello KW-Hospital Secondary Plan Urban Design Charrette Kitchener

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

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

Thanx and have a great day!

56 Louisa St.
Kitchener

PS In the future it would be nice if their was a contact name included in the proposal.
Good afternoon

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

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

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

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

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

Regards,

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

Good afternoon

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

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

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

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

Thanks again for engaging with the neighborhood.

217 Waterloo Street Kitchener
Good afternoon,

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

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

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

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

Regards,

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

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

Hi this is [Redacted] from 65 Shanley street.

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

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

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

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

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

thanks,
## 5.0 Public Comments and Staff Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** 563 Killbeau Court  
Written: April 18, 2019 | 1. The new street and townhomes behind Central Meat will overpower lower elevation homes on Braun.  
2. Concerned about zoning of Braun St reduced to R3! Street needs to retain R-5 or increase to R-6 as Braun Street will be surrounded by R6 & Mix at end of street and behind on Central Meat side. Andrew St. is a good junctional division from R3.  
3. Because Braun St. is a bit of an anomaly amongst the rest of R3, Braun homeowners should have option to redevelop without actual developers swooping in to reap benefits. The coverage of lot at 55% needs to be higher to encourage infill along Braun St. Neighbours in these homes should use a facilitator to be able to discuss viable options for their properties along Braun St.  
4. Feasibility of laneway at the back of properties on Braun, that currently butt, up to 3 storey townhomes, to create separation at the end of their deep lots, so that access can be via a laneway/muse and parking for infill is off main street.  | There are no plans to extend Linwood Avenue at this time.  
The RES-3 zone will allow similar uses to the R-5 zone.  
Homeowners are not excluded from developing their own properties. The 55% lot coverage allows for an appropriate amount of building envelope, landscaping, parking, and amenity area.  
Property owners are welcome to obtain assistance from a professional planner in consultation with the property owners along Braun Street.  
The PARTS Plan recommended a connection at through the Central Fresh property. This could be explored at the time development applications are received. |
| **2** 6 Herbert Street  
Written: April 18, 2019 | 1. Sounds Good  
2. I'm Fine with it.  
3. I can't think of anything at the moment. I like the way it is.  
4. Parkland where the parking lot on Pine St. is located would be nice. I like that idea. I don’t want any mid-high rises in this area.  
I’m ok with mid-rise mixed use on King by LRT. Cafes and boutique shops would be nice.  | Thank you for your comments. |
| **3** 55 Pine Street  
Written: April 18, 2019 | 1. Reasonable and well thought out. Love green space on Pine st.  
2. Well done!  
3. Preserve neighbourhoods and communities by incorporating green spaces.  
4. Love the plan for Pine St. and expansion of soccer field to create park space. Given the development of King St. and lack of park space in the neighbourhood. This green space is a welcome addition. Shoppers, student, hospital visitors, and patients would use the space. Love, Love, Love!  
I was concerned that the intensification would disregard the need for green space. That was not case!  
Bravo!  | Thank you for your comments. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>800 King Street West Written: April 18, 2019</td>
<td>I am property owner/manager at 800 King St. W. I noticed that the plan reduces our current FSR from 4 to 2. This reduces amount of buildable space by half, and therefore makes it far less likely that the space would be developed. The FSR should stay at 4, especially since the plan proposes a midrise buildings/zoning in the back of our parking lot. The Midtown lofts at 640 King St. W. are 6 floors and very Close to 2 floor houses (beside and across the street). Also, a tall structure at 800 would not have shadow impact on houses around it. Restrictions should be by height, not by reducing FSR.</td>
<td>There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high rise residential, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. The property is proposed to be split designated and zoned but will maintain a 4.0 FSR along the King Street portion of the lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 Gildner Street Written: April 18, 2019</td>
<td>1. The proposed uses seem to be in keeping with the current neighbourhoods 2. Keeping the actual re-zoning to major streets – Park, Glasgow, Green, King is good but there seems to be a need to have some depth down the side streets – Wood, Gildner, Mt. Hope, Gruhn 3. How do we change our zoning from R3 to institutional – adjacent /abuts institutional zoning.</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. This property addressed as 3 Gildner Street is currently designated and zoned for low rise residential uses. The CHL Study recommended that the properties across the street addressed as 4, 6, and 10 Gildner Street be redesignated as Low Rise Residential from Institutional. This will maintain the established character of the streetscape. It is not recommended that this property be redesignated and zoned to Institutional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>86 Glasgow Street Written: April 18, 2019</td>
<td>Agree with the proposed land use designations and preservation of RES-3 Low density areas. Zoning seems reasonable to preserve existing architecture from intensification. CHL designation also helps with this plan as it was what drew us to the neighbourhood. Strictly regulate parking lot density for surface parking i.e. Sunlife, Catalyst • Have public consult on Heritage Guidelines • Have public consult on streetscape to establish neighbourhood master plans and incorporate neighbourhood associations. • Ensure architecturally significant structures as such Air Boss, Dominion Offices, Sacred Heart &amp; Electrohome are maintained and not fallen to ruin through despair or vacancy/graffiti abandonment. Looking for clarification on proposed use of Glasgow as ‘connecting’ road and impact on traffic intensity and amenity. Also looking for classification on Glasgow Streetscape plan and effect on traffic calming, boulevard, street road speed limit (should) be 40! Due to pedestrian crossing for Sunlife and Ironhorse, limiting truck access etc.</td>
<td>The City's property standards by-law regulates vacant designated heritage properties to ensure they are maintained. The neighbourhood specific urban design guidelines are being developed through neighbourhood consultation and will include recommendations to address heritage significance. The City of Kitchener is consulting with the public on lowering speed limits in residential areas and recommendations are projected to go to Council in the fall. Glasgow Street is classified as a City Arterial Street in Map 11 of the City of Kitchener's Official Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? Additional Comments</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7 | Written: Apr 18, 2019 | 1. Park space for neighbourhood uses on Pine St. is excellent!  
2. Keep higher buildings along King St and Green Space with the residential zone.  
3. If park space is not an option, then keep it low residential housing.  
4. I really like the additional green space that is planned for Pine St (between Mary and Herbert) that is the current location of a parking lot. Keeping the multi-use/multi-storey buildings at the King St. frontage is a good plan. As well as it keeps the Mary/Pine/Herbert St. residential community in an inner city environment. I very much value the addition of park space for us to use, as could people at the hospital. | Thank you for your comments. |
| 8 | Written: Apr 18, 2019 | 1. I think they look good  
2. I am satisfied with the zoning. I like the idea of mixed-use around the LRT, so there can be more little shops, cafes, re-purposing old buildings with residences and offices.  
4. I like the green space plans for the parking lot and football field on Pine St. I think removal of all the fencing would be nice so we could all use it. | Thank you for your comments. |
| 9 | Written: Apr 18, 2019 | 1. I like the proposal of green space on Pine St.  
3. Mixed Com-Res buildings would get more people using the area on foot.  
4. I like the Mary St. extension plan with the Pine St. parking lot conversion to green space. With the development of sports field to a multi-use park. I see these as a huge benefit to the community. | Thank you for your comments. |
| 10 | Written: Apr 18, 2019 | Where the medium rise buildings at the end if Braun St. are put a park. **Green spaces needed!** | Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process. |
| 11 | 65 Shanley Street  Written: April 19, 2019 | Thanks for the open house. It’s good to see that the proposed new plans largely overlap with the PARTs plan. I just have a few areas of concern/comments:  
1) The triangle of land including Braun, Andrew/Shanely to Moore, King, and Breithaupt that is designated as R3 on the new maps is NOT designated as part of a cultural heritage landscape, and it should be. Our neighbourhood was recognized as a cultural heritage landscape in your study. It contains the Sacred Heart Parish campus, and the built environment has the same recognized characteristics (historic homes, regular built form, local vernaculars well preserved, mature street trees)  
The triangle of land is recognized in the CHL Study as a CHL. This CHL will be evaluated as part of the broader area and will be considered at a later date. The neighbourhood is similar to the other neighbourhood CHLs identified. The new RES-3 zoning as is proposed to be modified is consistent with similar neighbourhoods in this secondary plan area. At the time the RES zones were applied for the Open House we did not have a RES zone that permitted three units so Staff determined that applying the lesser zone would be more appropriate to reflect the |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as the rest of the area, as described in your report. The areas of these historic neighbourhoods closest to the major arterials are most in need of protection. It seems it was an administrative issue (that our fragment was contained in the Central heritage assessment) that kept us from having that recognition in the Midtown plan. I trust this issue can be remedied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) I wonder if we need something like “Residential 3.25”. I understand the city’s motivation in maintain highly restrictive zoning in stable neighbourhoods, but this prevents healthy densification efforts that can preserve our built form, such as allowing triplexing or companion/laneway/coach house units. R4 would probably attract developers wanting to demo and rebuild, but perhaps owners could be allowed to opt-in for the level of up-zoning that I describe above. Our property values are growing, and if the future zoning restrictions are clear, in my view there is potential for more high-quality subdivision of existing homes (such as recently done on Wellington, Shanley near Waterloo, Agnes, and the SE corner of Shanley and Moore). This maintains the affordability of the neighbourhood and allows us to accommodate more residents without less desirable developments such as Midtown Lofts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Many people had questions not addressed directly by your boards: what version of R zoning they were rezoned to, exactly what zoning was changing (you can do a GIS overlay for this), and exactly where your proposal deviated from PARTS (again a GIS overlay). Hopefully you can make this information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) The sycamore tree on Agnes just West of King, which is at least 200 years old, need heritage designation, as those lands are going to be re-zoned as mixed use. Please head off any surprise tree demolition by taking a look at this tree now. It is the largest and one of few remaining healthy deciduous trees in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>217 Waterloo Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written: April 22, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanks for the open house last week. I appreciate the time you have spent. The Plan seems to be getting down to the fine strokes. One little detail I would like to mention: The triangle of land including Braun Street, Shanely, Moore, King, and Breithaupt I think should be shown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>56 Louisa Street</td>
<td>I am sending you this email because the city wants to change the zoning criteria in my area. I am at 56 Louisa St. I have a 25 x 24 foot garage that I would like to be able to build a single 600 sq. foot apartment on top of. My lot has parking for 4 cars and it is on, the garage is detached and located on the alley. This would be a good fit for increasing the density without compromising the integrity and be unobtrusive to the neighbourhood. My proposal would not go past the already determined height of 18 feet but it would be nice to go to 20 feet if at all possible. My property would have 4 separate parking spots, 2 inside the garage, 1 beside the garage off the alley and one in front off of Louisa St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Written: April 23, 2019</td>
<td>Can you tell me the zoning regulations for Innovation Employment High Density 3. I believe this is the proposed zone which is currently a parking lot on the property bordered by Park, Dominion, Strange and railway tracks. I would like to know for example the set backs and maximum building height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Written: May 2, 2019</td>
<td>I attended the April 18th open house. Here are my comments. I was glad to see that the boundary for the Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? Additional Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter Details</td>
<td>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</td>
<td>Staff Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | low rise residential land use is not in the interest of healthy neighbourhoods. It reduces the housing stock that meets the needs of families and threatens the viability of the schools. I would like to see low rise residential zoning on the west side of Wellington and both sides of Walter near Wellington.  
The Ontario Seed property is designated MIX4. My understanding is that currently there are no zoning regulations for MIX4 similar to the ones proposed for MIX 1-3. My assumption is that MIX4 allows for greater intensification than other MIX designations. Because the Ontario Seed property is adjacent to properties zoned low density residential it should be MIX 1.  
Ontario Seed is just one example of areas where M4 zoning is adjacent to low rise residential in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan. According to the Planning Around Rapid Transit Station report, different intensities of mixed use are intended to aid in facilitating the transition between high and low intensity use (page 22). The KW-Hospital Secondary plan fails to implement appropriate transitions through the use of different intensities of Mixed Use zoning. All properties that designated Mixed Use and are adjacent to low rise residential should be MIX 1.  
The Ontario seed property should be zoned for low rise residential on the property that fronts Walter street and on the land that is adjacent to the rear yards of the homes on Agnes. This is not counter to the policy of intensification. It maintains a balance of housing stock in the neighbourhood and attracts families to the neighbourhood, giving them an opportunity to live in the downtown core. It provides suitable homes for children.  
The parking lot on Dominion Street on the west side of Park is proposed as Innovative Employment. My concern is that this zoning is defined using stories rather than height. From the BB3 development residents learned not to assume that a story is the same for residential zoning as it is for other land use designations. This is also an issue for the MIX 4 SP.3 zoning. All zoning designations should have maximum height restrictions.  
The Station Park project, the developments along Victoria between King and Park and the Bram yard properties, provide plenty of space for |
<table>
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<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16 | 21 Dominion Street  
Written: May 7, 2019 | I am in support of mixed use+ intensification. However, I am quite concerned about the zoning of the parking lot at Dominion, Park and Agnes as Mixed use 4. There is not transitions or setback and 18 metres in my opinion is too dramatic boarding a residential street. (Low rise residential). I support the mixed-4 zoning of the Badminton Club and Ontario Seed. The lot at Dominion Park + Agnes is too small and close to single detached homes to be an effective, design for human centered scale. Thanks for your hard work and willingness to engage residents. | The triangular piece of land at the corner of Agnes Street and Park is in the same ownership as 69 Agnes and is intended to be designated the same as the property at 69 Agnes Street to support a consolidated development. The MIX-4 zoning is proposed to have a site specific policy to limit the allowable height of development to ensure compatibility with adjacent low rise development. |
| 17 | Braun Street  
Written: May 7, 2019 | I see that some space has been designated as green space. My concern is that the cemetery not be viewed as the only “green space”. It is lovely but the neighbourhood lacks parks. With medium density housing planned at the end of Braun St., I feel we need more green space to accommodate an increased population. The redevelopment of the KCI field is rather vague. What would that entail exactly? Is that owned by the city? If the school board owns it, would it not want to sell that piece of land to developers to maximize profit? The zoning seems fine. I am not opposed to intensification as long as green space is created to match the intensified population. I am a resident of Braun St. At the moment, commuters use the street to get to a parking lot at the end of the street. They drive too fast, racing to their lot, treating the street as a a city street rather than a residential one. If an apartment building is indeed built at the end of the street, as proposed, there will be even more traffic as these new residents aim to access their parking. Moreover, if Braun is extended to connect with the street that goes up to the Central Market street light, we will also have the traffic from people bypassing King. My suggestion would be to place 3 large speed humps on Braun to discourage speeding and its use as a King street bypass. | Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process. At the time of site plan approval the appropriate location for vehicular access is determined to ensure the least impacts to residential streets. It is agreed that additional traffic can result from intensification however, it is hoped that eventually there is a modal shift and the residents will utilize alternative means of transportation. |
| 18 | 84 Moore Avenue  
Written: May 8, 2019 | I’m happy to see Mt. Hope Cemetery included as a cultural heritage landscape. I would like to see this designation extended to include the Moore Ave streetscape from Peltz to Wellington. This unique street has historically significant buildings including Sacred Heart Church, convent and school, as well as a wealth of mature trees on both sides of the street. Moore Avenue is part of the Mt. Hope Breithaupt CHL as identified through the 2014 CHL Study. This CHL will be evaluated as part of the broader area and will be considered at a later date. The neighbourhood is similar to the other neighbourhood CHLs identified within the KW Hospital/Midtown Secondary. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
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</table>
| | | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | that create a canopy overhead. This is complimented by century homes built in the same era as the Sacred Heart buildings.  
As a resident of Moore Ave, I was originally drawn to the neighborhood because of the heritage look of the area and the pedestrian friendly location. Moore Ave gets heavy pedestrian traffic in part because it is a beautiful street to walk on.  
in conclusion, I would like to see a cultural heritage designation for this beautiful and historic street linked to the Mt. Hope Cemetery. |
| 19 | 93 Walter Street  
Written: May 10, 2019 | 1. The property at 93 Walter Street is currently zoned R6 (with restriction) and we would like to keep it that way. The property is in a unique position on the edge of the Downfield Park (open space) and across from King Edward school; and would be well-suited for some sort of community facility, artist establishment, or studio space as described in the proposed RES-6 designation. Although it is currently used as a single-family dwelling, we purchased this property with full knowledge of this unique zoning in a rapidly developing area and would like to keep such options open for the future.  
2. The proposed Open Space at the corner of Park and Glasgow is a welcome idea. It is currently a dangerous corner with low visibility for drivers, and treacherous for pedestrian crossings of which there are many. I know more than one family on the south / west side of Park who do not allow their children to walk to school because of that intersection. A "scramble style" traffic light system has also been discussed at community gatherings and would be well supported by the residents.  
3. Perhaps a design issue, but the sidewalks going south / west along Glasgow need to be widened and/or installed. Anyone traveling from the east side of this planning area must cross the road three times to access the businesses at Catalyst137. If one is traveling with a stroller or mobility device this issue is compounded by the utility poles and narrowness of the one sidewalk on the west side of Glasgow.  
4. Connecting the neighbourhoods on either side of King Street needs to be prioritized as the LRT begins operation. One of the main pedestrian routes goes through the Downfield Park, crossing Walter at the (recently installed) crosswalk, through the King Edward schoolyard, and across King at Andrew Street (where there is currently no crossing). Despite there being traffic lights only a block away, many people still j-walk for ease of access to everything from the cemetery / medical building area to the Central Fresh Plan boundary. The new RES-3 zoning as is proposed to be modified is consistent with similar neighbourhoods in this secondary plan area.  
The property is currently zoned R-5 129U which restricts the use of the property to two dwelling units. The new proposed zoning will be similar to the existing zoning.  
In order to address concerns related to sidewalk infill, the City of Kitchener sidewalk infill policy identifies processes and establishes a priority ranking system. The primary goal of this policy is to improve the sidewalk infill process as a whole, while creating a sustainable and accessible transportation network within the City of Kitchener.  
King Street is a Regional road and City Staff support safe pedestrian crossings where an opportunity exists.  
The proposed mixed zoning along King Street will provide many opportunities for retail and commercial uses.  
Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process.  
The Ontario Seed property is currently designated and zoned general industrial. This is privately owned property. At such time as development applications are received for this parcel Staff can review the ability of this parcel to provide a parkland dedication in the form of land.  
Staff have reviewed the properties along Walter Street south of Agnes and recommend 66 and 70 Walter Street be designated Low Rise Residential and zoned RES-3 to assist in maintaining the existing character of the Walter Street streetscape at the corner of Agnes Street. The properties at 44 to 60 |
| #  | Commenter Details | Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet  
Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | Staff Response |
|---|---|---|
| 20 | 42 Agnes Street  
Written: May 10, 2019 | I recently examined the proposed secondary plan for my neighbourhood (I live on Agnes St). It has been challenging to determine which plan applied to our neighbourhood in light of the many development initiatives emerging in the midtown and hospital area. From the most recent proposed secondary plan, it makes sense to expand the neighbourhood’s boundary to include the lands of 607 King Street, Ontario Seed and the KW Badminton Club. This is also helpful for us when trying to understand the full impact of intensification on the neighbourhood, which will be significant.  
While it is good to see that the elementary school green space off of Walter Street, referred to locally as downfield, has been designated green space in the proposed land use plan, the current plan indicates that the neighbourhood will lose a de facto green space that is on the property of Ontario Seed. This is currently a large open space used by many in the community for dog walking and summer relaxation. In the proposed plan this property is zoned as mixed use with zone of MIX4. I understand that with each development the city receives funds that are allocated to green space/parkland which may or may not be used with in the neighbourhood under development. The city needs to increase future/new green space in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan, specifically within the lands now included in the neighbourhood boundaries. In this case it makes sense for the city to review this zoning and consider buying the Ontario Seed space to convert it to permanent green space. This will be necessary to provide amenities to the increased population in this neighbourhood and the surrounding downtown area.  
The Ontario Seed property was identified in the PARTS Central Plan as a significant opportunity to achieve and contribute to the density goals of the Growth Plan in the station area while maintaining the established neighbourhood’s existing character. It would not be appropriate to split designate the Ontario Seed property and create an additional transition condition along Walter Street and frustrate the ability of this property to redevelop with an appropriate mixed use built form that would be sympathetic to the existing low rise development on Agnes Street. Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process.  
The Ontario Seed property is currently designated and zoned general industrial. This is privately owned property. At such time as development applications are received for this parcel Staff can review the ability of this parcel to provide a parkland dedication in the form of land.  
There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. | Walter Street should maintain the Mixed Use land use designation to support the recommendation from the PARTS Central Plan as these properties would be most impacted by adjacent mixed use developments and should also be redeveloped as such. |
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am concerned about the development intensification the current proposed plan would allow on the Ontario seed lands. I do not know what the zoning regulations for MIX4 are, but I assume that it allows for greater intensification than other MIX designations. Great care should be taken to plan the transition between residential homes on Agnes street and the planned intensification that is encroaching into the neighbourhood from the downtown intensification. MIX 4 does not permit such transitional zoning and this needs to be revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario Seed is just one example of areas where M4 zoning is adjacent to low rise residential in the KW Hospital Secondary Plan. According to the Planning Around Rapid Transit Station report, different intensities of mixed use are intended to aid in facilitating the transition between high and low intensity use. The KW-Hospital Secondary plan fails to implement appropriate transitions through the use of different intensities of Mixed Use zoning. All properties that designated Mixed Use and are adjacent to low rise residential should be carefully reviewed to maintain the integrity of neighbourhoods, which includes appropriate set backs and green space. If the Ontario seed property is zoned for development, it should be zoned for low rise residential on the property that fronts Walter street and on the land that is adjacent to the rear yards of the homes on Agnes. This is not counter to the policy of intensification. It maintains a balance of housing stock in the neighbourhood and attracts families to the neighbourhood, giving them an opportunity to live in the downtown core. It provides suitable homes and neighbourhoods for children and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The city has committed to the protection of established neighbourhoods. But this plan indicates that homes on Walter between Agnes and Wellington will be zoned for intense redevelopment. Reducing low rise residential land use is not in the interest of healthy neighbourhoods. It reduces the housing stock that meets the needs of families and threatens the viability of the schools. Low rise residential zoning on the west side of Wellington and both sides of Walter near Wellington would protect the neighbourhood and provide an important transition between the intensification planned for downtown, the transit hub and the former Six-O lands.</td>
</tr>
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| 21 | 217 Waterloo Street | **Question 1:** What are your comments about the land use designations?  
**Question 2:** What are your comments about the zoning?  
**Question 3:** What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
**Additional Comments**  
The Station Park project, the developments along Victoria between King and Park and the Bram yard properties, provide plenty of space for intensification. Intensification in the KW Midtown area should be less ambitious because of the impact on existing residential streets. Also, limiting the focus to one neighbourhood plan also does not reflect the overall intensification that will occur across the downtown region, the increased traffic and the increased population that will need some kind of green space for recreational activities, dog walking and to promote general wellbeing. The current plan does not provide for adequate green space for an increasing population, and worse it actually takes out informal green space already being used by the community. Moreover, the secondary plan for the Hospital area gives a false impression of available green space, since it suggests the playing field for the KCI high School and the cemetery are green spaces akin to parks.  
While these areas are used for people to walk through, they are not recreational spaces or parks, and suggesting they are is misleading. There is already a shortage of green space in this community, which will become more acute as the population increases with planned intensification. Rather than removing green spaces, we need to create more. This lack of green space and the lack of transitions between residential homes and the surrounding areas where intensification is planned are a concern, and I request more careful and considerate planning is needed to address these concerns. I look forward to further opportunities to provide feedback and discuss the proposed plans for my neighbourhood.  
**Parcel at the end of Braun Street would be better suited as low rise residential**  
-love the addition of park space at the end of Mary & Herbert  
-consider appropriate transition between mixed use areas where it meets low rise residential  
-ensure that parcels of Mount Hope neighbourhood already included in Cultural Heritage Landscape are recognized as such on all maps, as is the Mount Hope Cemetery, including Moore Ave street scape as it does fall within the boundary --> triangle of land including Braun, Andrew/Shanely to Moore, King, and Breithaupt that is designated as R3 and should also indicate its Cultural Heritage Landscape recognition.  
The parcel at the end of Braun Street was identified in the PARTS Central Plan as a significant opportunity to achieve and contribute to the density goals of the Growth Plan in the station area while maintaining the established neighbourhood’s existing character.  
There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high rise residential, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. The triangle of land is recognized in the CHL Study as a CHL. This CHL will be evaluated as part of the broader area and will be considered at a later date. The | 21  
Written: May 11, 2019 |
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|    |                   | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
|    |                   | Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
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|    |                   | Additional Comments |
|    |                   | Staff Response |
| 22 | 67 Agnes Street    | -it would be helpful to know if/where the proposed zoning differs/agree with the zoning approved in the PARTS Midtown plan and RIENS. It would be helpful for people to know how their previous engagements have been included into the existing plans.  
|    | Written: May 11, 2019 | My family and I live at 67 Agnes Street, and so our back and side yards are adjacent to the land that is being proposed for mixed use development. Our primary concern is that any new development include an adequate transition between the current two-story residential houses in the neighbourhood and new buildings. For example, could the plan could include height restrictions along the low-rise residential boundary so that the current character (as described in the plan) would not be diminished?  
|    |                   | Secondly, I am surprised that the plan does not include a vision (or expectation) for more green spaces. In fact, we would be losing significant shared green space currently enjoyed by many on the Ontario Seed Company property, while adding a significant number of new residents to the neighbourhood.  
|    |                   | There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas.  
|    |                   | Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process. |
| 23 | 23 Dominion Street | I find the use of MIX-4 bordering on low rise residential without clear setback/massing/transition requirements inappropriate. It seems more reasonable to apply lower height restrictions on locations like the badminton club, along Walter and Wellington streets and behind properties on Agnes Street. According to the Planning Around Rapid Transit Station report, different intensities of mixed use are intended to aid in facilitating the transition between high and low intensity use. The KW-Hospital Secondary plan fails to implement appropriate transitions through the use of different intensities of Mixed Use zoning. All properties that designated Mixed Use and are adjacent to low rise residential should be MIX 1.  
|    | Written: May 16, 2019 | There also seems to be very little green space designated to accommodate the increased population density. A green way along the train tracks, increased setbacks to maintain the treed streetscape and clearer guidance on how proposed developments could incorporate green space would all be welcome additions. I think a trail connection from the Iron Horse to the transit hub was discussed - this seems like the best time to try and implement  
|    |                   | Staff have reviewed the properties along Walter Street south of Agnes and recommend 66 and 70 Walter Street be designated Low Rise Residential and zoned RES-3 to assist in maintaining the existing character of the Walter Street streetscape at the corner of Agnes Street. The properties at 44 to 60 Walter Street should maintain the Mixed Use land use designation to support the recommendation from the PARTS Central Plan as these properties would be most impacted by adjacent mixed use developments and should also be redeveloped as such.  
|    |                   | There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas.  
<p>|    |                   | Opportunities for urban greenspace are extremely limited under existing constraints. The PARTS Plan recommended areas for greenspace and park and these have been shown on the plans. There is also an option to require parkland dedication through the site plan process. |</p>
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| 24 | 66 Braun Street  Written: May 17, 2019 | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? |

**Staff Response**

Thank you for your comments. Multiple dwellings are required to go through the site plan process where building elevations, landscape plans and urban design considerations including shadow impacts are reviewed. Staff advised that the zone categories and uses are still under review. At the time the RES zones were applied for the Open House we did not have a RES zone that permitted three units so Staff determined that applying the lesser zone would be more appropriate to reflect the existing built form of the neighbourhood. Staff are reviewing the RES-3 zone for inclusion of a three unit residential use in accordance with Bill 108. There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and

1. Land use seems to be generally appropriate - mixed use or innovation seem like reasonable uses adjacent to residential. High rise residential or mixed use with no height limit and no defined transition do not seem appropriate.  
2. With the absence of defined transition requirements, it appears that the zoning could be staggered to provide more clearly defined transitions, ie MIX-4 or high rise residential should not be adjacent to low rise residential with no defined transition requirements, especially in confined areas where transition and unlimited height will be at odds (ie Mt Hope/York/Union, between Walter and King, OSC property).  
4. Provide continuous strip of open space along train tracks from Belmont to King to facilitate a trail connection from the Iron Horse trail to the transit hub instead of routing commuters through side streets and Cherry Park.

1. Medium Rise Residential land use would affect us the most, since it is located directly across from our driveway on Linwood and adjacent to Mt Hope Cemetery.  
Mixed Use (with specific policy areas) is just meters away, directly across Central Fresh Market's parking lot from our front door. We currently see KCI from our front windows.  
I would appreciate more discussion regarding what new business and residential spaces would tend to look like.  
2. Zoning - Low Rise Residential, I feel that a provision needs to be maintained to allow us to build a triplex on our residential property, if we choose to in the future.  
When we looked into purchasing our home in 1999, we consulted and received confirmation of this from the City of Kitchener.  
I would also like to discuss a second proposal to build plan process. It is agreed that additional traffic can result from intensification however, it is hoped that eventually there is a modal shift and the residents will utilize alternative means of transportation. Staff is investigating the opportunities for an active connection from Belmont to the multimodal hub.

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

1. Land use seems to be generally appropriate - mixed use or innovation seem like reasonable uses adjacent to residential. High rise residential or mixed use with no height limit and no defined transition do not seem appropriate.  
2. With the absence of defined transition requirements, it appears that the zoning could be staggered to provide more clearly defined transitions, ie MIX-4 or high rise residential should not be adjacent to low rise residential with no defined transition requirements, especially in confined areas where transition and unlimited height will be at odds (ie Mt Hope/York/Union, between Walter and King, OSC property).  
4. Provide continuous strip of open space along train tracks from Belmont to King to facilitate a trail connection from the Iron Horse trail to the transit hub instead of routing commuters through side streets and Cherry Park.

24 66 Braun Street  Written: May 17, 2019 | Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet |

Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? |

**Staff Response**

Thank you for your comments. Multiple dwellings are required to go through the site plan process where building elevations, landscape plans and urban design considerations including shadow impacts are reviewed. Staff advised that the zone categories and uses are still under review. At the time the RES zones were applied for the Open House we did not have a RES zone that permitted three units so Staff determined that applying the lesser zone would be more appropriate to reflect the existing built form of the neighbourhood. Staff are reviewing the RES-3 zone for inclusion of a three unit residential use in accordance with Bill 108. There was extensive 3D modelling completed as part of the PARTS Plan. Further work will be done to review transitions and

1. Land use seems to be generally appropriate - mixed use or innovation seem like reasonable uses adjacent to residential. High rise residential or mixed use with no height limit and no defined transition do not seem appropriate.  
2. With the absence of defined transition requirements, it appears that the zoning could be staggered to provide more clearly defined transitions, ie MIX-4 or high rise residential should not be adjacent to low rise residential with no defined transition requirements, especially in confined areas where transition and unlimited height will be at odds (ie Mt Hope/York/Union, between Walter and King, OSC property).  
4. Provide continuous strip of open space along train tracks from Belmont to King to facilitate a trail connection from the Iron Horse trail to the transit hub instead of routing commuters through side streets and Cherry Park.

1. Medium Rise Residential land use would affect us the most, since it is located directly across from our driveway on Linwood and adjacent to Mt Hope Cemetery.  
Mixed Use (with specific policy areas) is just meters away, directly across Central Fresh Market's parking lot from our front door. We currently see KCI from our front windows.  
I would appreciate more discussion regarding what new business and residential spaces would tend to look like.  
2. Zoning - Low Rise Residential, I feel that a provision needs to be maintained to allow us to build a triplex on our residential property, if we choose to in the future.  
When we looked into purchasing our home in 1999, we consulted and received confirmation of this from the City of Kitchener.  
I would also like to discuss a second proposal to build plan process. It is agreed that additional traffic can result from intensification however, it is hoped that eventually there is a modal shift and the residents will utilize alternative means of transportation. Staff is investigating the opportunities for an active connection from Belmont to the multimodal hub.

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

1. Land use seems to be generally appropriate - mixed use or innovation seem like reasonable uses adjacent to residential. High rise residential or mixed use with no height limit and no defined transition do not seem appropriate.  
2. With the absence of defined transition requirements, it appears that the zoning could be staggered to provide more clearly defined transitions, ie MIX-4 or high rise residential should not be adjacent to low rise residential with no defined transition requirements, especially in confined areas where transition and unlimited height will be at odds (ie Mt Hope/York/Union, between Walter and King, OSC property).  
4. Provide continuous strip of open space along train tracks from Belmont to King to facilitate a trail connection from the Iron Horse trail to the transit hub instead of routing commuters through side streets and Cherry Park.
<table>
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</table>
|   |                  | Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | compatibility between high, mixed use, and low rise residential areas. |
|   |                  | 3 townhouse units within our deep lot, with access to doors / windows facing Mt Hope Cemetery and Linwood Ave. Windows with a southern exposure towards Braun and King would also allow more light. If Medium Rise Residential buildings are being zoned directly across from our driveway on Linwood, I would appreciate if consideration would be given to construct buildings facing north and south. This would allow for some open space for parking etc, without obstructing our view of the wonderful sunsets that we have been accustomed to for 20+ years.  
I would appreciate more discussion re what building styles, height and setbacks would look like.  
3. Development to be Compatible with Existing Neighbourhood Character  
This is a well-established neighbourhood near the heart of our city. I have always enjoyed its proximity to downtown Kitchener and Uptown Waterloo. There are always people walking their dogs, riding their bikes, taking their kids to the parks, etc. I would love to see an outside space created where people can gather, relax with friends and enjoy some outdoor activities.  
4. When new Zoning and Land Use proposal(s) for our Neighbourhood were initiated between 2012 to 2015, my husband was going through aggressive cancer treatment. I did not attend any meetings at that time, since my family was my #1 priority. Shortly after we purchased our home in 1999, we visited the Land & Title office to determine how long ago the house was built. Records went back as far as the 1860’s. However, we were also advised that our double brick house could possibly be even older than that.  
Considering that our house is almost 160 years old, I am once again concerned about any future construction in our Neighbourhood causing structural issues due to vibration.  
When construction began in 2011 to upgrade Braun St infrastructure and the LRT construction on King St in front of KCI followed soon after, we began to notice our parging foundation was compromised both inside and outside. We now have several cracks in the corners of every room in our house. Concrete steps from our basement walkout to the back yard and driveway area have also cracked and shifted. Also since this construction time frame, we have experienced squirrels, mice and most recently over the winter a new family of rats inhabit our home. This was never an issue prior to the construction. |
| #  | Commenter Details | Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet  
Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations?  
Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning?  
Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character?  
Additional Comments | Staff Response |
|---|---|---|
| 25 | 49, S1 and S3 Pine Street  
Contacted: June 6, 2019 | I am hopeful that care will be taken to minimize any future setbacks in our homes during this new phase of progress. | Staff advised that the zone categories and uses are still under review. At the time the RES zones were applied for the Open House we did not have a RES zone that permitted three units so Staff determined that applying the lesser zone would be more appropriate to reflect the existing built form of the neighbourhood. Staff are reviewing the RES-3 zone for inclusion of a three unit residential use in accordance with Bill 108. |
| 26 | 399, 403 and 407 Park Street  
Written: April 29, 2019 | Phone call conversation on June 6, 2019 to advise that the property owner objects to the proposed RES-3 Zone. The property is currently zoned R-5 and at a minimum the existing zoning should be retained, particularly in close proximity to the LRT stop. | Thank you for your comments. Staff have reviewed the properties and determined that an institutional zoning would not be appropriate for these properties given their size and locations, despite their adjacency to an institutional property. Low rise residential land use and zoning will be maintained. |
| 27 | Dawn  
Written: July 16, 2019 | Thank you again for the valuable information and guidance obtained from the open house held on April 18 at the Victoria Park pavilion. I was advised at the time to follow up with the design team and to formally request a zoning change to our property (currently zoned Low Rise Residential RES-3). It is our desire to have the zoning changed to that of institutional to join the existing properties that front Park Street at 399, 403 and 407 Park Street respectively. Thank you for your always insightful comments. So that you are aware, with Bill 108, we are no longer able to use the bonusing approach to try and achieve some of the community benefits (such as the climate change ones you indicated). We are re-evaluating. Our intent remains to deliver the secondary plan updates, new zoning, design guidelines, etc to Council by the end of this year. | Thanks Dawn for your always insightful comments. So that you are aware, with Bill 108, we are no longer able to use the bonusing approach to try and achieve some of the community benefits (such as the climate change ones you indicated). We are re-evaluating. Our intent remains to deliver the secondary plan updates, new zoning, design guidelines, etc to Council by the end of this year. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? | **Staff Response**

Fue to the current zoning bylaws, the market does not allow bids for alternative uses that would also intensify the neighbourhood - purchase and restoration/updating of the existing homes, with building of a rear-yard or other secondary residential units - which do not need to be attached to the existing unit. Laneway units would be options on many properties. This option could be much more economical, as it does not require new construction for at least one unit (the original house, which could also be duplexed). It is also much better from a climate-change perspective, because new construction is very, very costly from an environmental perspective, and the existing large trees have a strong climate mitigation impact.

2) The current Midtown re-zoning plan is not likely to lead to a pleasant built environment that contributes to climate emergency goals.

What is happening: Here, I'm confused. Floor space ratios were presented at the neighbourhood open house. I submitted comments on those. But later, I read that density bonusing was being developed. Some of the bonusing strategies seem very promising to contribute to intensification and climate change goals - trees and green infrastructure, family-sized units, affordable housing, etc. But, to work right, you need to set the initial target lower than the FSR the market wants to build, and is acceptable from a design perspective. It's identical from an economic perspective to a carbon market. The "cap" has to be low enough to make developers take up the policy incentives. What IS happening is that current construction along the corridor is failing to meet many important goals that density bonusing could address.

Solution: Midtown re-zoning should be done at an initial lower height with density bonusing required to achieve the heights presented to the public at the open house.

3) Generally, we need to act now - or the re-development will be done, and it will be too late. ION is in place. Investors are responding now. KW is one of the few "hot" housing markets in the country. The city has developed some great visions, but is we wait until the policies are implemented to put them in place, it will be too late. Can you imagine if Council had said, yes we believe there is a climate crisis, but we need to wait 11 years to take action? We need to act now on these issues - even if it means putting current applications on hold until policies have
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter Details</th>
<th>Individual Comment Submission or Comment Sheet</th>
<th>Staff Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1: What are your comments about the land use designations? Question 2: What are your comments about the zoning? Question 3: What else should be considered to ensure that future development in this area is compatible with the existing neighbourhood character? Additional Comments</td>
<td>caught up. Now, we all have another shared reason to act now. We need to ensure that our intensification goals are aligned with our climate emergency goals. I fully understand that many aspects of the problem (the concrete oven between Victoria and Union on King that makes taking transit a trying experience, even for the true believers) are in the hands of the Region. But the secondary plan is still in the hands of the City - please act now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Justification and Summary

General Justification:

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

Site Specific Justification:

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