



PLANNING  
URBAN DESIGN  
& LANDSCAPE  
ARCHITECTURE

January 5, 2024

Sylvia Rafalski-Misch, Manager of Development Planning  
City of Cambridge

Dear Mrs. Rafalski-Misch:

**RE: Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment #1 – Response to Comments  
777 Laurel Street, Cambridge  
OUR FILE: 16222N**

On behalf of our client, 777 Laurel Inc., and in conjunction with ABA Architects, Crozier Engineering other members of the project team, we have reviewed the consolidated comments provided on September 19, 2023, as well as comments received during the Public Meeting and raised in a subsequent meeting with City staff and Meridian Planning Consultants. The following table includes the comments and a response.

Development Planning Comments (Michael Campos)	Response
<p>The subject lands are located within the Regeneration Area, which as outlined by the City's Official Plan, permits a maximum height of 8 storeys and an FSI of 2.0. Given the location of the site outside of the Core Area and within an area that is primarily bounded by low-rise density housing, Planning Staff, along with Council and members of the community would like to see the proposed height and density of the site lowered to better integrate with the existing community. As such, Planning Staff is requesting that the applicant strongly consider a reduction in height of Towers A through D.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideally, Planning Staff would prefer that the heights remain 8 stories in height in order to align with the Official Plan, however, given the site location just outside of the MTSA and the Preston Core Area, Planning Staff would be supportive of a reduction of the heights to between 10 and 12 stories (maximum). It is Staff's opinion that the reduction in height would integrate better with the existing community, would ease the need for a significant increase in parking (please see</li> </ul>	<p>The height of the buildings along Laurel Street are 8 storeys, consistent with the existing Official Plan policies. The balance of the site, which is further removed from Laurel Street and adjacent residential properties, contains taller buildings, reflective of changes in the Provincial and Regional planning frameworks that have occurred since the City's Official Plan was approved.</p> <p>The lands represent a rare opportunity close to the Core and transit to develop a large underutilized industrial parcel with a range of residential units in a complex that has amenity areas for residents, sufficient on-site parking and that disperses traffic onto two streets, each in proximity to King Street.</p> <p>The shadow impacts are minor – residential lands to the south and southwest are either not impacted at all or are subject to minor impacts in the morning in the spring and fall. Impacts on the adjacent properties to the northwest are also minimal – the properties have full sun all</p>

<p>Transportation comments), and would address the concerns of Council and members of the community. It is Staff’s opinion that a reduction would significantly improve the applicant’s position with Council and would continue to provide a successful proposal for these lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff have reviewed the considerations for increased height and density provided for in the Planning Justification Report, and support increased height on the site, however, the proposed height of between 12-14 stories achieves a height that is considered incompatible with the existing surrounding area and sets a precedent for the Regeneration Area that does not align with the City’s Official Plan.</li> <li>• Planning Staff would also like to see an increase in the number of proposed two and three-bedroom units offered within the development. It is requested that the applicant strongly consider this request made by Staff and Council. Given the future rental tenure of the buildings, providing additional multi-bedroom units will offer additional opportunities to a range of people and lifestyles looking to live closer to a core area.</li> </ul>	<p>afternoon. Shadows in the summer have even less impact. This is due to the building placement, the generous setbacks and the location of the sun in the sky relative to the site.</p> <p>The development includes a range of 1, 2 and 3-bedroom units. Units range in size, however the 3 bedroom units are large (up to 1700+ square feet in size) and suitable for families. The unit breakdown is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 694 one-bedroom units</li> <li>• 462 two-bedroom units</li> <li>• 59 three-bedroom units</li> </ul>
<p><b>Proposed Parking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further to the comments provided by Transportation below, Planning Staff would like to reiterate the concerns regarding the proposed parking provided for the subject development. Further to Council’s comments at the Public Meeting, the parking proposed is significantly lower than the City can support. Planning Staff will not be in a position to support the application without a considerable increase in parking for the development.</li> <li>• Planning Staff do commend the applicant on the proposed parking structure and the ability for the proposal to maintain these parking areas hidden from the street.</li> <li>• Please consider the inclusion of Electric Vehicle Chargers as part of the proposed parking structure. It would be ideal to have the ability for each parking space to be</li> </ul>	<p>The development has been revised to include more parking – there is now more than 1.1 parking spaces per residential unit. The development includes 1,364 parking spaces for 1,215 units. It is important to stress that the <b>development complies with the required resident parking</b>, which is 1 space per unit. The development does require relief from the minimum required visitor parking rate of 0.25 spaces per unit.</p> <p>With regard to the potential of some residents to require more than one parking space, (although not a By-law requirement) the spaces will be unbundled from the cost of a unit. In this regard, if some tenants do not have a vehicle and do not require a space, they do not have to pay for one. Conversely, if there are some tenants that want more than one space, and</p>


<p>upgraded with an individual charger, should the future resident require it.</p>	<p>such spaces are available, they would be able to pay for more than one space.</p> <p>We note that the availability of parking would be known by the tenants prior to their renting a unit – if the supply of parking is not suitable to their needs (i.e. if they require more than one space and extra spaces are not available) they can choose to reside elsewhere in the community or choose to reside at this development with one vehicle.</p> <p>The owner intends to install conduit within the parking structure that will allow for the future installation of EV Chargers when required by occupants.</p>
<p><b>Amenity Area:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning Staff are pleased with the efforts made by the applicant to provide amenity areas at surface level, as well as amenity areas within the buildings, and on the proposed terrace. Planning Staff would like to note that the City’s Zoning By-law defines “amenity area” as follows:  <i>“means the area situated within the boundaries of a residential development site intended for recreational purposes, and may include landscaped areas, patios, private amenity areas (also defined in our By-law), balconies, communal lounges, swimming pools, play areas and similar uses.”</i></li> <li>As such, Planning Staff would like to ensure that the applicant has included all of the identified possible amenity areas spaces within their final calculation of amenity space per dwelling unit. This may provide additional amenity space than originally contemplated. Kindly confirm a final calculation through the future resubmission.</li> <li>Planning Staff have considered the rationale provided in the Planning Justification Report with respect to amenity area space, and are supportive of the reduction proposed, considering updated industry standards and the proximity of the site to public parks. Planning Staff confirm that the By-law’s request for 75 percent of the entire property</li> </ul>	<p>Staff comment is acknowledged. The total provided amenity area is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indoor Amenity (Common) 1,125 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Rooftop Terrace (Common) 6,140 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Landscaped Area/Open Space (including outdoor at-grade amenity areas) 9,509 m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Balconies/Terraces (Private) 9,112 m<sup>2</sup></li> </ul> <p>Total Amenity Area: 25,886 m<sup>2</sup>  Amenity Area Per Unit = 21.3 m<sup>2</sup></p> <p>The Zoning By-law Amendment proposed a rate of 15 m<sup>2</sup> per unit – although the conceptual plans show a higher rate, we agree with staff comments that the proposed rate of 15 m<sup>2</sup> is appropriate and this will allow for some flexibility as the project moves into more detailed aspects of design and related planning approvals, without potentially requiring a future minor variance.</p>

<p>to be dedicated to amenity area is not feasible and does not make sense. As such, Planning Staff are comfortable with the amenity space proposed as part of the proposed development.</p>	
<p><b>Proposed FSI Request:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning Staff would like clarification from the applicant with respect to the request for the Zoning By-law Amendment to provide a maximum FSI of 3.0, when 2.79 is requested?</li> </ul>	<p>The revised plans include a FSI of 3.30. In this regard, the OPA/ZBA proposes a maximum FSI (excluding the parking structure) of 3.30.</p>
<p><b>Affordable Housing</b></p> <p>Affordable housing is an important consideration in new development and especially of a development of this size. Policy 8.4.1.2 requires that new residential development include a minimum number of affordable housing units based on the targets established by the Region’s Community Action Plan on housing. Planning Staff would request that the applicant consider contributing to the Affordable Housing Contribution Fund should the applicant choose not to dedicate units as part of the development of Affordable Housing.</p>	<p>It is important to note that the development includes a wide range of unit sizes that will provide housing at a variety of rental rates. The owner acknowledges the request for the contribution to the City’s Affordable Housing Fund and is considering the request.</p>
<p>A Public Meeting was held on September 5, 2023. There were public delegations at the meeting and a number of questions and comments raised by members of Council and the delegates who spoke. Planning Staff request that the applicant review the recording of the Public Meeting and address any questions/concerns that were raised as part of the meeting through the following resubmission. Please provide a table/matrix with your next submission showing all comments raised and an explanation as to how they have been addressed.</p>	<p>Please see the list after this table.</p>
<p><b>Region of Waterloo, Community Planning (Melissa Mohr)</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>The Region of Waterloo has not yet submitted comments relating to the 1st submission of this application. Comments will be provided under separate cover.</p>	<p>We understand the City has asked the Region to provide comments, however those comments will not be considered as part of this resubmission. We note the Region has had the application for 6 months, well past the legislated timeframes in the Planning Act and has still not provided any comments.</p>
<p><b>City of Cambridge Environmental (Kathy Padgett)</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>A Record of Site Condition (RSC) acknowledged by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) is required prior to receiving a building</p>	<p>Noted – the applicable O.Reg would allow the Chief Building Official to require the RSC prior to issuance of a building permit.</p>

permit due to the proposed change in use from a non-sensitive industrial use to a sensitive residential use. Staff note that the applicant is in the process of preparing the RSC.	
<b>City of Cambridge Development Engineering (Alex Nichols)</b>	<b>Note – Responses to Engineering comments were prepared by Crozier Engineering</b>
<b>General</b>	<b>Response</b>
The Functional Servicing and Preliminary Stormwater Report and drawings should be sealed by an engineering licensed to practice in the Province of Ontario.	Functional Servicing and Preliminary Stormwater Report and drawings are sealed by an engineer licensed to practice in the Province of Ontario
Show all existing services within all right-of-ways and show all existing service connections.	Existing services within rights-of-way are identified on plan with callouts noting “to be confirmed by contractor”
<b>Stormwater Management</b>	<b>Response</b>
The City’s SWM design criterion is to control the post development peak flows to the existing conditions peak flows for the range of design storms. It is noted that proposed flows being directed to the Laurel Street outlet exceed the allowable flow rates for all storms. Allowable flow rates from Laurel Street and Dolph Street cannot be combined as they represent separate outlets/receiving sewers.	Rational Method calculations have been revised with newly delineated pre-and post-development catchments. Post-development flows going to Laurel Street are no longer exceeding that of existing conditions. Flows going to Laurel Street and Dolph Street are assessed as separate outlets and allowable flow rates are no longer combined
It is noted that the existing building roof is peaked and does not appear to pipe roof drainage directly to the existing storm sewer easement. Also, it appears that half of the roof may drain into Area 102 and the other half may drain into Area 103. Please review and revise pre-development conditions and allowable peak flow rates.	The existing industrial building has been split into two catchments (101A & 101B respectively) discharging to both Laurel Street and Dolph Street separately. Existing conditions and allowable peak flow rates were adjusted accordingly
Drainage Area 104 appears to drain to more than one outlet. While part of the area drains overland to Laurel Street, a significant part of the area also drains overland into the properties immediately to the east (which themselves drain to Dolph Street). Additionally, the overland flow area placed adjacent to the Area 104 label is pointing in the wrong direction.	Catchment 104 has been revised to split in the south and allowable peak flow rates were adjusted accordingly
<b>External Drainage Areas:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area to north of the site appears to drain into the site under existing conditions. This area includes rail corridor and possibly additional land north of the rail corridor.</li> <li>• Area to the west of the site appears to drain into the site under existing conditions.</li> <li>• Confirm where building in the property to the west currently drains.</li> </ul>	The external area to the north of the Site was reviewed and it was identified during a Site Visit completed by Crozier that the rail corridor drainage would be contained by an existing berm adjacent to the site. The external area to the west of the Site was captured as an external catchment and reflected in both the pre-and post-development drainage figures. All site

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed on site storm sewer system will be required to accommodate all external flows. External flows do not count towards the site's allowable peak discharge rates. Please review and revise.</li> </ul>	storm sewers will be sized to accommodate the external catchments
Confirm that the overland flow route as denoted by the grey arrows is representative of how overflow flow will function throughout the site. Additionally, please refer to comment below (under Grading) regarding maximum ponding depth.	Overland flow arrows have been revised to identify overland flow route in pre-and post-development scenario
Stormwater Quality controls are required on all storm service connections to municipal infrastructure.	Three OGS units have been sized for each respective outlet and connection to the municipal storm sewers
<b>Water Servicing</b>	<b>Response</b>
Provide fire flow testing results or modelling obtained from the Region and provide an analysis confirming that adequate capacity is available for the proposed development.	Proposed water demands have been provided to the Region and Region capacity analysis is forthcoming
Note that any redundant water services are to be capped at the watermain at 100% Owner's expense (works completed by City's Public Works Division).	Noted. This will be identified through the Site Plan detailed design.
<b>Sanitary Servicing</b>	<b>Response</b>
Confirm diameter of existing sanitary sewer in easement. In report it is referred to as 550mm dia and on the drawings it is referred to as 500mm dia. City records indicate that it is 500mm dia.	It has been confirmed and revised to an existing 525 mm nominal pipe size in the FRSWMS report and drawings
I/I shall be based on 0.25 L/s/ha. Please revise.	Calculations have been revised to align with DGSSMS (2022) standards
City records indicate that there is an existing sanitary service connection into the easement that appears to service 639 Laurel Street. If this services crosses land not covered by the existing easement, a new easement in 777 Laurel Street will be required for the adjacent property for this service. This can be dealt with at site plan	Acknowledged. Further investigation will be completed during the site plan stage.
<b>Storm Servicing</b>	<b>Response</b>
Service connection at STMMH1 is in conflict with the existing municipal sanitary sewer. Please revise.	Noted. The connection to STM MH 1 has been revised. Refer to Servicing drawing
The existing municipal sanitary sewer and storm sewer within the easement appear to be both horizontally and vertically in very close proximity to one another, confirm that STMMH1 and STMMH2 and the proposed services connections, along with the required drop structures, can be constructed as proposed. Additionally, please note that the City does not permit internal drop structures.	Noted. The storm servicing connections have been revised to ensure constructability.

Pipe between STMCBMH4 and STMCBMH5 is larger than immediate downstream pipe.	Noted. The pipe running from STM CBMH4 to STM CBMH 5 has been upsized accordingly. Please refer to Servicing drawing
STMMH2 - Obvert of N should match obvert of existing 1050mm dia pipe or be higher	Pipes crossing existing 1050 storm sewer have been revised to provide sufficient clearance between existing and proposed sewers
For all CB, note that maximum depth of cover is 1.2m	Proposed catchbasins have been revised and are to be constructed in accordance with relevant OPSD
<b>Grading</b>	<b>Response</b>
Maximum permitted ponding is 0.30m. Ponding depth is exceeded at CBMH1, CBMH2, CBMH4, CBMH14, DCBMH3, CB3 and CBMH8	Preliminary grading design has been revised to ensure maximum ponding depths of 0.3m. These criteria will be further confirmed through the detailed site plan design
Note that minimum grade on landscaped/soft surfaces is 2.0%.	Noted. Landscape grading has been revised accordingly. These criteria will be further confirmed through the detailed site plan design
The above comments will need to be addressed prior to providing a recommendation for approval of the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendment. If you have any questions, or require further details, please do not hesitate to contact us.	Noted- Responses to the engineering comments have been prepared by Crozier Engineering. Also included with the Resubmission is a revised Report and related Plans.
<b>City of Cambridge Transportation Engineering</b>	
<b>Transportation Engineering Action Items</b>	<b>Response</b>
As previously mentioned in the pre-consultation, driveway accesses must comply with the City's commercial access requirements. Contact Transportation Engineering to obtain a copy of the latest commercial access standards.	Though the final design of the driveway is subject to Site Plan approval (to the City's satisfaction) the Conceptual Site Plan shows a widened driveway at Laurel Street (7.6 m per commercial standard)
Dimensioning is required at all accesses.	The dimension can be shown on the Site Plan at the time of site plan application submission
Show all street lights, utility poles and any other above-ground utility infrastructure adjacent to an access. All above ground utility infrastructure must be at least 1.5m from the nearest point of any access.	Noted - these details are matters related to Site Plan approval.
Fire route signs (FR A) are to be placed on both sides of each access on a 45 degree angle facing incoming traffic. Fire route signs (FR B) are to be placed along the fire route at a 45 degree angle facing approaching traffic. Show and label fire route signs on the Site Plan and Fire Route Diagram.	This is a site plan related detail – though the Conceptual Site Plan does illustrate the location of fire route signs.

 <p style="text-align: center;">FR A                  FR B</p>	
<p>Provide a Fire Route and Accessible Parking diagram in PDF format. The diagram needs to include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North arrow</li> <li>• Property line</li> <li>• Adjacent municipal roads and sidewalks</li> <li>• Building outline</li> <li>• Parking and internal road layout</li> <li>• Fire Route (bolded or hatched for clarity)</li> <li>• Fire Route sign locations</li> <li>• Accessible parking space (noted with wheelchair symbol)</li> <li>• Accessible parking sign locations</li> <li>• Municipal address</li> <li>• No dimensioning is required on this diagram</li> </ul>	<p>The Fire Route is shown on the Conceptual Site Plan. The Fire Route and Accessible Parking diagram can be provided through a future Site Plan application submission.</p>
<p>Provide a truck turning drawing showing how the internal road network will accommodate truck movements throughout the site including but not limited to: shipping and receiving (per appropriate design vehicle), waste collection and fire route access. The truck turning drawing shall be at a scale of 1:250 or 1:500.</p>	<p>A truck turning diagram will be provided through the future Site Plan application submission and will be subject to City approval.</p>
<p>Provide a lighting plan showing photometrics. Lighting levels must be shown up to the property line. No more than 0.5 foot candles from on-site lighting are permitted at the property line adjacent to the road allowance.</p>	<p>Lighting Plan will be provided at the time of Site Plan application and will be subject to City approval.</p>
<p><b>Traffic Impact Study</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>Please conduct left-turn lane warrants at the site accesses.</p>	<p>Left turn lane warrants were conducted and no left turn lanes were required. Please see the updated Transportation Study</p>
<p><b>Parking Justification Study</b></p>	<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>The City has processed this application through its Parking Reduction Worksheet. The results indicate an acceptable parking reduction of 6% for this application.</p>	<p>The By-law requires 1.25 spaces per unit – or 1 space per unit and 0.25 spaces per unit for visitors. A 6% reduction results in 1.175 spaces per unit or:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0.94 spaces per unit for residents</li> <li>• 0.235 spaces per unit for visitors</li> </ul> <p>We note that the development does not seek a reduction in the supply of parking per residential</p>



	<p>unit – the Bylaw requires 1 space per unit and 1 space per unit is being provided.</p> <p>The Bylaw does require a high percentage of visitor parking spaces. The City of Waterloo requires 0.1 spaces per unit, while the City of Kitchener requires a range, including none in some cases, and 0.1 in others. Both of those municipal By-law are newer than the City of Cambridge’s By-law.</p> <p>The supply of parking has been increased for the units, but remains more than 0.1 spaces per unit for visitors, or 10% of the parking. The updated Parking Study prepared by Crozier Engineering concludes the supply of parking is appropriate for the development in its context.</p>
<p>Please include the municipal address for the Saginaw Gardens proxy site within the report.</p>	<p>Crozier Engineering provides the following response: The municipal address for Saginaw Gardens is included in the updated Parking Justification Study</p>
<p>The surrogate site data provided for the two proxy sites in Grimsby are not acceptable as they do not reflect the size, scale and area characteristics of the proposed development. The proxy sites used for justification are preferred to be within the City of Cambridge. Proxy sites within the Region of Waterloo, in similar settings and scale are also acceptable.</p>	<p>Crozier Engineering provides the following response:</p> <p>The surrogate sites used are both smaller in scale and further away from transit than the development. These sites are deemed as conservative estimates for the parking rates due to these factors</p>
<p>The Saginaw Gardens development does not support the proposed parking rate.</p>	<p>Crozier Engineering provides the following response:</p> <p>Saginaw Gardens demonstrates that lower parking rates than the current by-laws are used in the City. As well, as noted in the report, the underground parking was not made accessible to the survey and the worst-case scenario was used which results in this being a conservative rate</p>
<p>The referenced zoning-by-law rates within the neighboring municipalities is incorrect. The zoning by-law requirements reference within the report were for “MIX Zones” within the City of Kitchener and “RMU” within the City of Waterloo. This development would fall under “All Other Zones” and</p>	<p>Crozier Engineering provides the following response:</p> <p>The City of Kitchener’s “All other zones” rate is included in the updated Parking Justification Study and supports the proposed parking rate</p>

the RM9 "All other zones" categories within each zoning by-law, respectively. The neighbouring municipality zoning by-laws do not support the proposed parking rate.	
<b>Transportation Engineering Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
None.	Acknowledged
<b>City of Cambridge Fire Department (John Percy)</b>	
<b>Comments (for applicant's consideration)</b>	<b>Response</b>
for any demolition of the existing site, it must be performed in accordance with the Ontario Fire Code (OFC).	Noted
new fire route (i.e., fire access) for the entire complex to be designed in accordance with the Ontario Building Code (OBC) and City of Cambridge by-law. Additionally, if a new route is to be designed which travels over an underground parking garage it must be able to withstand the weight design of the heaviest fire apparatus vehicle currently with the Cambridge Fire Department.	Noted- the Fire Route will be provided and ultimately approved by the City through the Site Plan approval process.
Fire hydrants are to be provided in accordance with the Ontario Building Code (OBC).	Noted.
All fire and life safety systems to be installed in accordance with the OBC.	Noted.
Draft fire safety plans are required for each of the residential buildings in accordance with the OFC. Draft copies of the plans are required to be submitted to the Cambridge Fire Department before occupancy	Noted.
If partial occupancy of any of the buildings is required, it must be done in consultation with the City Building Department.	Noted.
<b>Grandbridge Energy (Helen Robinson)</b>	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Response</b>
GBE has no objection to the proposal by the Applicant/Owner for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment to redevelop the subject lands with multiple mid-rise apartment buildings, with structured parking, and outdoor amenity areas. All GBE and ESA minimum clearances to existing hydro plant must be met. The Applicant/Owner will be required to enter into a Service Agreement with GBE, to establish the terms and conditions to service the development at 100% cost. If relocation or upgrade of hydro plant is required as a result of this Application, the Applicant/Owner will be responsible for 100% cost.	Noted – discussions with Grandbridge will continue through the future Site Plan approval process.

If easements are required as a result of this application, the Applicant/Owner will be responsible for 100% cost.	
<b>Grand River Conservation Authority (John Brum)</b>	<b>Response</b>
The Grand River Conservation Authority has no comments with respect to this application.	Acknowledged
<b>Waterloo District School Board</b>	
<b>Student Accommodation</b>	<b>Response</b>
At this time, the subject lands are within the boundaries of the following WRDSB schools: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preston Public School (Junior Kindergarten to Grade 6);</li> <li>• William G. Davis Public School (Grade 7 to Grade 8); and</li> <li>• Preston High School (Grade 9 to Grade 12).</li> </ul>	Acknowledged
The WRDSB's 2020-2030 Long-Term Accommodation Plan provides detailed enrolment projections for all schools in review area E03 - Cambridge Northwest (Preston) as well as the rest of the Region. None of these schools is currently experiencing extreme accommodation pressures but Preston Public School is being closely monitored as it is currently holding students from the North Cambridge Hunt Club DA. William G. Davis and Preston High School may also experience pressure beyond what is forecast in the LTAP as additional redevelopment proposals are submitted within their boundaries. Interim student accommodation measures including portable classrooms may be required until an alternative accommodation solution is in place. Alternatively, the WRDSB may conduct a boundary study or designate this property as a "Development Area" and assign it to Holding Schools before occupancy or sales.	Acknowledged
<b>Student Transportation</b>	<b>Response</b>
The WRDSB supports active transportation, and we ask that pedestrians be considered in the review of all development applications to ensure the enhancement of safety and connectivity. WRDSB staff are interested in engaging in a conversation with the City and applicant to review the optimization of pedestrian access to public transit, and municipal sidewalks so students may access school bus pick-up points.	Pedestrian connections are proposed from the development to both municipal streets.
Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR)'s school buses will not travel privately owned or maintained rights-of-way to pick-up/drop-	Noted – the lands front on two municipal streets allowing for multiple locations where students may be collected by buses.

<p>off students. Transported students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point. STSWR may have additional comments about student pick-up point(s) placement on municipal rights-of-way.</p>	
<b>WRDSB Draft Conditions</b>	
<p>Concerning any future declaration or agreement, the WRDSB requests the following inclusions in the conditions of Draft Approval.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the Owner/Developer shall include the following wording in the condominium declaration to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. "Despite the best efforts of the Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB), accommodation in nearby facilities may not be available for all anticipated students. You are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside the area, and further, that students may, in future, be transferred to another school."</li> <li>b. "For information on which schools are currently serving this area, contact the WRDSB Planning Department at 519-570-0003 ext. 4419, or email <a href="mailto:planning@wrdsb.ca">planning@wrdsb.ca</a>. Information provided by any other source cannot be guaranteed to reflect current school assignment information."</li> <li>c. In order to limit risks, public school buses contracted by Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up and drop off students, and so bussed students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point"</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>These matters related to the condominium approval process, which has not been advanced, and not to the OPA or ZBA.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. That the Owner/Developer enters into an agreement with the City of Cambridge to be registered on the title to the Property that provides: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. "All agreements of purchase and sale or leases for the sale or lease of a completed home or a home to be completed on the Property must contain the wording set out below to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same."</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>These matters related to the condominium approval process, which has not been advanced, and not to the OPA or ZBA.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. "Despite the best efforts of the Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB), accommodation in nearby facilities may not be available for all anticipated students. You are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside the area, and further, that students may, in future, be transferred to another school."</li> <li>i. "For information on which schools are currently serving this area, contact the WRDSB Planning Department at 519-570-0003 ext. 4419, or email <a href="mailto:planning@wrdsb.ca">planning@wrdsb.ca</a>. Information provided by any other source cannot be guaranteed to reflect current school assignment information."</li> <li>i. "In order to limit risks, public school buses contracted by Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up and drop off students, and so bussed students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point"</li> </ul>	
<p>3. That in cases where Agreements of Purchase and Sale have already been executed, the Owner/Developer sends a letter to all purchasers which include the above statements (conditions 2 a. i., ii., and iii.)</p>	<p>These matters related to the condominium approval process, which has not been advanced, and not to the OPA or ZBA.</p>
<p>4. That the Owner/Developer supply, erect and maintain a sign (at the Owner/Developer's expense and according to the WRDSB's specifications), near or affixed to the development sign, advising prospective residents about schools in the area and that prior to final approval, the Owner/Developer shall submit a photo of the sign for review and approval of the WRDSB.</p>	<p>These matters related to the condominium approval process, which has not been advanced, and not to the OPA or ZBA.</p>
<p>5. Prior to final approval, the WRDSB advises in writing to the Approval Authority how the above condition(s) has/have been satisfied.</p>	<p>These matters related to the condominium approval process, which has not been advanced, and not to the OPA or ZBA.</p>
<p>Please be advised that any development on the subject lands is subject to the provisions of the WRDSB's Education Development Charges By-law,</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

2021 or any successor thereof and may require the payment of Education Development Charges for these developments prior to issuance of a building permit.	
<b>Waterloo Catholic District School Board</b>	
<b>WCDSB Action Items</b>	<b>Response</b>
That any Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s).	Noted
That the developer and the Waterloo Catholic District School Board reach an agreement regarding the supply and erection of a sign (at the developer's expense and according to the Board's specifications) affixed to the development sign advising prospective residents about schools in the area.	The owner has no objection to the placement of a sign.
That the developer shall include the following wording in the site plan agreement to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same: "In order to limit risks, public school buses contracted by Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up and drop off students, and so bussed students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point."	The owner does not object to the inclusion of the noted wording within a site plan agreement.
<b>Canadian National Railway</b>	
No comments have been received from the Canadian National Railway. Comments may be provided under separate cover.	Noted.
<b>Canadian Pacific Railway</b>	
No comments have been received from the Canadian Pacific Railway. Comments may be provided under separate cover.	Noted. We understand the City has reached out in this regard.
<b>Comments from Meridian Planning</b>	
Confirmation regarding permitted uses that could be developed on the adjacent M3 lands under the Zoning Bylaw and their potential impact on the 'worst case' scenario	The M3 zone is referred to as the 'General Industrial Zone'. The By-law has another zone referred to as the 'Heavy Industrial Zone (M4)'. The M3 zone does not permit 'heavy industrial uses', which are a specific permitted use in the Zoning Bylaw. More specifically, it permits (subject to other applicable regulations): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General industrial uses</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A public storage unit</li> <li>• A factory sales outlet</li> <li>• Offices</li> <li>• A day nursery or day care centre</li> </ul> <p>It is also important to note that the industrial lands to the north are generally surrounded by existing residential uses and lands both planned for and zoned for residential uses. As such, any land use compatibility considerations for a future use of other lands zoned M3 would need to consider the other surrounding residential lands and would not be more negatively impacted by the proposed residential use of the subject lands.</p>
Comparison of required vs proposed Official Plan policy and zoning by-law regulations	See below for a summary of the OPA and ZBA
Addendum to Noise Study regarding information confirming any applicable safety berming and/or crash wall requirement with CP Rail / FCM-RAC Guidelines	A letter from HGC is included. We understand that discussions with CP will occur with regard to any berms and/or crash walls that may or may not be required. The need for a crash wall or berm is not related to Noise or Vibration, but rather safety and could be implemented through the site plan approval process, as required.

### Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw Amendment

The following summarized the Official Plan Amendment (further details are contained in the Planning Justification Report submitted with the application):

1. Amend Map 2 *General Land Use* to re-designate the subject lands from 'Business Industrial' to 'High Density Residential'
2. Amend Map 2A *Site Specific Policies* to apply a new Site Specific Policy (SS XX) to the subject lands that permits a maximum building height of 19 storeys and maximum density of 3.3 Floor Space Index (FSI). (The 2012 Official Plan permits an FSI of 2.0 within Regeneration Areas).

The following summarizes the Zoning By-law Amendment (further details are contained in the Planning Justification Report submitted with the application), which includes rezoning the lands from General Industrial (M3) to Residential Use Class (RM1) – where a site specific amendment is required, it is **bolded**:

Regulation	Required – RM1	Provided
Lot Frontage (minimum)	30 metres	Dolph Street: 110 metres Laurel Street: 150 metres

Regulation	Required – RM1	Provided
Maximum Density	250 units per hectare	<b>3.3 FSI</b>
Front Yard Setback (minimum)	4.5 metres	12.6 metres (Dolph Street) (10 m min proposed through ZBA)
Exterior Yard Setback (minimum)	4.5 metres	12 metres (Laurel Street) (10 m min proposed through ZBA)
Interior Side Yard Setback (minimum based on the height of the buildings)	Towers E and F: 10.5 metres Towers/Podium (south): 12 metres Towers/Podium (north): 12 metres	Towers E and F: 10.5 metres Tower D/Podium (south): 12 metres Tower A/Podium (north): 15 metres
Rear Yard Setback (minimum based on the height of the buildings)	Tower E: 10.5 metres Tower A/Podium: 12 metres	Tower E: 12.2 metres Tower A/Podium: 18 metres
Gross Floor Area per Dwelling Unit (minimum)	One-bedroom unit: 50 m <sup>2</sup> Two-bedroom (or more) unit: 60 m <sup>2</sup>	One bedroom unit (min): 57 m <sup>2</sup> Two bedroom unit: 69.5 m <sup>2</sup>
Amenity Area (minimum)	20 m <sup>2</sup> per one-bedroom unit: 13,880 m <sup>2</sup>  30 m <sup>2</sup> per two or more bedroom unit: 15,630 m <sup>2</sup> (29,510 m <sup>2</sup> required) – the equivalent of almost 3 hectares	Indoor Amenity: 1,125 m <sup>2</sup> Rooftop Terrace Amenity: 6,140 m <sup>2</sup> At-Grade Outdoor Landscape and/or Amenity: 9,509 m <sup>2</sup> Private Balconies/Terraces: 9,112 m <sup>2</sup> 25,886 m <sup>2</sup> overall <b>21 m<sup>2</sup> per unit (on average and including both soft and hard landscaping at grade)</b>
Landscaped Open Space (minimum)	30%	30%
Planting Strips and Fencing	3 metres along rear and interior side lot lines	3 metres

In this regard, the following site-specific provisions are requested:

1. A parking rate for residents and visitors combined of 1.1 spaces per unit;
2. A minimum requirement for 15 square metres of amenity area per unit;
3. A maximum Floor Space Index of 3.30 and that density be regulated by Floor Space Index;
4. Maximum permitted height as follows:
  - a. Tower E and Tower F – 8 storeys
  - b. Tower B and D – 15 storeys



- c. Towers A and C – 19 storeys
- d. Podium – 4 storeys
- 5. That the minimum setback from Laurel Street shall be 10 metres;
- 6. That the minimum setback from Dolph Street shall be 10 metres;

**Comments from Public Meeting:**

The following summarizes the key areas of comment raised at the Public Meeting:

*Parking*

As noted above, the development has increased the supply of parking, such that there is no reduction in resident parking and only a reduction in visitor parking. The project is providing 1.12 spaces per unit, which is an appropriate supply of vehicular parking within an urban context, particularly for a development located close to the Preston Core, transit, and numerous community amenities (shopping, employment, parks and schools).

As discussed earlier, parking will be unbundled from the cost of a rental unit. In this regard, tenants can choose whether or not they require a space. If they require more than one parking space and additional spaces are not available, they can choose other locations that better suit their individual needs.

*Amenity Area on Site*

The project is providing a substantial amount of amenity area, both inside the building, on the roof of the podium and outdoors at grade. The details of the programming of the amenity areas will be explored in greater detail through the site plan process. However given the size of many of the units, which will appeal to families, programming for children will be included.

*Traffic on Laurel Street*

The Traffic Study has been updated to reflect the revised design. The Study recommends a four-way stop at Duke/Laurel and has assessed the warrants for left turn lanes into the site from either Laurel or Dolph Streets – a left turn lane is not warranted for either access. Please see the updated Study for further details.

*Mix of Units – Family sized units*

There is a significant supply of larger units in the project, including large three-bedroom units that will appeal to multi-person households, including families.

The original plans had 73% one-bedroom units, 22% two-bedroom units and 4% three-bedroom units.

The revised plans have 57% one-bedroom units, 38% two-bedroom units and 5% three-bedroom units.

In this regard, there has been a significant reduction in the supply of one-bedroom units and a corresponding increase in the supply of two and three-bedroom units.

### *Bicycle Parking*

The development includes 420 long-term secure bicycle parking spaces within the parking structure. Additional bicycle parking will be provided outside of the buildings for visitors.

### *Compatibility*

The lands are located in an area planned for redevelopment and intensification. Specifically, the lands are within a Regeneration Area which is one of the key areas within the City's Official Plan where development is to be accommodated.

The concept of compatibility does not require that a new development be the same as the existing development in the area. In this case, matters of compatibility have been considered both with regard to the surrounding residential properties and the industrial properties. Physical separation and building placement were utilized to provide appropriate transitions to adjacent lands – in particular positioning the 8-storey buildings along Laurel Street and the tallest buildings at the rear of the site further from residential uses.

Compatibility with industrial uses was considered through the Noise and Vibration Study prepared by HGC Engineering. It is also important to note that the industrial lands to the north are generally already surrounded by sensitive uses and in this regard, the redevelopment of the subject lands with residential uses does not introduce a sensitive use that does not already exist in the area.

### *Shadows*

As discussed above, the project does not have significant impacts on surrounding residential properties – the properties all have access to the sun in the spring, summer and fall in accordance with best practices.

Yours truly,

**MHBC**



Trevor Hawkins, M.PL, MCIP, RPP  
Partner

cc. *777 Laurel Inc.*  
*ABA Architects*  
*Crozier Engineering*