

# Attachment D: Engagement and Response Summary for the Regional Official Plan Amendment (Implementation of the Results of the Municipal Comprehensive Review in accordance with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019)

## Introduction

### Purpose:

This document summarizes the results of the community engagement process completed for Phase 1 of the Regional Official Plan Review, with particular focus on work to develop and refine the proposed ROP amendment. It highlights the key comments received from the community along with staff's responses, organized into eight main themes:

- Land Needs Assessment
- Growth Management
- Climate Action
- Affordable and “Missing Middle” Housing
- Agriculture and Protection of Farmlands
- Mobility, Transit, and Infrastructure
- Natural Environment and Groundwater Resources
- Economic Development

## Background on the Regional Official Plan Review and the First Regional Official Plan Amendment:

The Regional Official Plan (ROP) is a powerful planning tool that shapes and defines our community for future generations. It has guided decision making for profound transformation of this region, such as the addition of the ION light rail transit system, and the protection of agricultural lands and the natural environment.

Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) forecasts (Growth Plan) Waterloo Region to grow to 923,000 people and 470,000 jobs by 2051, representing about a 50 percent increase in population and approximately 55 percent in jobs from 2021. To accommodate this growth, the Region launched the ROP Review in August 2018 (see Report PDL-CPL-18-33) to update its planning framework for where and how we will grow, while achieving its vision for an equitable, thriving, and sustainable community.

The ROP Review is structured around two related amendments. The first amendment, which is the subject of this document, involved undertaking a municipal comprehensive review of the ROP to accommodate Waterloo Region's forecasted growth to 2051 in conformity with the Growth Plan. This work included completing a Land Needs Assessment (LNA) to determine how much land is needed to accommodate future population and employment growth. It also included an update of the policies in Chapter 1 (Introduction), Chapter 2 (Where and How to Grow), and the housing policies contained in Section 3.A of Chapter 3 (Liveability in Waterloo Region).

The second phase of the ROP Review, which will commence in the fall of 2022, will update the balance of the policies in the ROP, including: mobility, goods movement, and transportation; infrastructure; the natural heritage system; the agricultural system; source water protection; and mineral aggregate resources.

This document addresses two different parts of Phase 1 of the ROP Review. The first was the process to develop the draft amendment, released June 24, 2022 for public review. The second was the process to finalize the proposed amendment, which included public consultation and feedback on the draft amendment.

## Part 1: Developing the Draft Amendment, September 2019 to June 24, 2022

Staff have been actively engaging the community since the project began in September 2019, and this engagement significantly shaped the development of the draft amendment that was released on June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2022. This included

targeted consultations with specific groups to gather focused input required to successfully update the ROP, as well as broad consultation with the general public.

A full list of meetings held with each of these groups is included in Appendix A.

### Developing the Draft Amendment: Engaging with Indigenous Peoples

The Region recognizes its responsibility to engage with local First Nations and Métis on planning matters that may affect their rights and interests, and the unique role that Indigenous peoples have had and will continue to have in the growth and development of this region. The ROP Review provided an opportunity to build stronger relationships with First Nations and Métis based on shared values of respect, trust, meaningful dialogue and cooperation. The Region is committed to improving processes for notification and ongoing engagement, and has included language in the proposed amendment to recognize the importance of reconciliation and building relationships with Indigenous peoples who have lived and are currently living in the region. Overall, 13 meetings were held with Indigenous peoples during the development of the draft amendment.

#### Six Nations of the Grand River:

Since the beginning of the ROP Review and prior to the release of the draft amendment, staff met with Six Nations of the Grand River 11 times. The meetings reviewed a variety of topics, including updates in the ROP Review process, opportunities for engagement, and relationship building. Six Nations of the Grand River emphasized the importance of the Grand River, biodiversity, sustainable development, and preserving natural and cultural heritage for future generations; and the need for a more holistic, systems level approach to managing the natural heritage system and planning in general in the region.

#### Mississaugas of the Credit:

Prior to the release of the draft amendment, staff met with the Mississaugas of the Credit three times regarding the ROP Review. Staff provided updates on the ROP Review process and received input on a variety of topics including the importance of water and groundwater, archaeological and environmental resources, and sustainable growth. The Region was also asked to plan for access for urban Indigenous peoples to support centres, places to connect with nature, and space for community and traditional uses.

## Métis

Staff reached out to the Métis Nation of Ontario through the Grand River Métis Council, and a meeting was held after the release of the draft amendment, as described in Part 2 of this appendix.

## Additional Notifications

Staff reached out to and notifications were sent to the Haudenosaunee Development Institute.

## Developing the Draft Amendment: Engaging through Dedicated Committees and Working Groups

To ensure thorough, multi-level engagement on the substance of the amendment, three dedicated groups were formed as part of the ROP Review process.

### Steering Committee:

A Steering Committee was established to provide high-level input, leadership and strategic direction. It has provided advice and direction to staff, and acted as “sounding board” throughout the process. Steering Committee members include Regional Chair Karen Redman, and Councillors Tom Galloway, Michael Harris, Helen Jowett, and Joe Nowak. The Committee also consists of Commissioners and Directors representing a wide range of regional programs and services. Prior to the release of the draft first amendment, there were 10 Steering Committee meetings.

### Technical Advisory Committee:

A Technical Advisory Committee comprised of staff from various Regional departments provided input on technical tasks. The Committee provided expertise in:

- Transportation Planning
- Water and Wastewater Servicing
- Hydrogeology and Source Water Protection
- Affordable Housing
- Public Health
- Waterloo Region International Airport
- Economic Development
- Cultural Heritage
- Sustainability and Climate Change

### Area Municipal Working Group:

The Area Municipal Working Group was created to facilitate feedback directly from planners and technical staff from the townships and cities, as well as the Grand River Conservation Authority, throughout the project. Leading up to the release of the draft amendment, there were 18 full meetings of the Area Municipal Working Group. Regional and area municipal staff also collaborated extensively beyond the working group, including meetings with Regional Staff and individual area municipalities, specific to each individual municipality's perspectives and needs.

### Stakeholder Committee:

A Stakeholder Committee was formed to engage with 29 community leaders representing a range of community interests. The members of this Committee represented the agricultural sector, the development industry, the business community, the education sector including the Waterloo Region District School Board and the local post-secondary institutions, and a range of local environmental, climate action, and active transportation groups. Prior to the release of the draft amendment, the ROP Review team met with the Stakeholder Committee 13 times.

### Provincial Staff:

Staff have held bi-weekly check-in meetings with Provincial staff throughout the process. These meetings provided an opportunity to discuss any key issues and to ensure the Region's process conformed with the Province's requirements on issues such as the Land Needs Assessment methodology.

## Developing the Draft Amendment: Engaging the General Public

In addition to the committees and technical groups noted above, staff consulted with community members on a variety of topics leading up to the release of the draft amendment. The engagement strategy sought to reach as many residents as possible using a variety of tools and approaches. The overall goal was to connect with residents early and continuously throughout the project, and provide the necessary information to ensure that the draft amendment reflected critical input from the community. Over more than two years, engagements with community members have occurred through several different forums:

- More than 465,000 website visits on EngageWR
- 13 Surveys with more than 800 responses
- 8 public events with nearly 500 attendees
- Short videos

- Virtual research symposiums
- Multiple presentations to Council
- Social media
- Newspaper ads

This extensive level of engagement was accomplished while overcoming the challenges posed by COVID-19. Despite the physical distancing requirements, new technologies such as virtual meetings helped obtain feedback from residents who do not typically attend in-person meetings. Public participation in the process increased with the use of virtual meetings.

Further, staff have engaged with stakeholders and property owners who had site-specific requests, such as urban boundary expansion requests and employment conversion requests related to specific properties.

Prior to the release of the draft amendment, we received approximately 120 written submissions from community members on a wide range of topics. These submissions generally fall into eight main themes, and are summarized below.

## Developing the Draft Amendment: Land Needs Assessment

### Why It Matters:

A Land Needs Assessment (LNA) is a key component of the ROP Review. Based on Provincial requirements and methodology, the purpose of the assessment is to determine if any additional land is needed to accommodate the region's forecasted population and employment growth to 2051, as provided in the Provincial Growth Plan, and if so, how much.

The LNA process ensures that adequate lands are available to meet the Province's targets for growth in people and jobs, while also ensuring that communities are planned efficiently and protected from high future infrastructure and environmental costs resulting from excessive urban expansion.

### What We Heard:

In November of 2021, Council directed staff to complete the LNA in accordance with Provincial requirements, and to undertake a thorough engagement process with the community and the area municipalities, prior to staff recommending a preferred growth scenario to Council. In accordance with Council's direction, staff released the draft LNA for public review and comment on April 12, 2022.

The draft LNA was based on three Growth Options for the Community Area and four for the Employment Areas, which served to illustrate different approaches to accommodating growth and the different kinds of choices that are necessary to realize the community vision. The growth options considered factors such as transportation and mobility planning, development financing, employment planning, infrastructure and servicing, protection and enhancement of agricultural lands, and a range of intensification and density targets. Community Area Option 1 reflected the minimum targets set out in the Provincial Growth Plan, which were well below what the Region is currently achieving, but provided a reference point for evaluating the other two growth options. Community Area Option 2 represented an ambitious but achievable set of targets that would require a modest urban expansion of 376 hectares of land for Community Area growth. Community Area Option 3 set out a DGA density target higher than Community Area Option 2, but which would not trigger any urban expansions for Community Area Growth.

This option addressed the spirit and intent of Council's direction-on November 9, 2021 for staff to explore an option for growth that resulted in no urban area expansion, without creating excess lands in the region. All Employment Area Options assumed an average density on employment lands of 35 jobs per hectare. This density assumption is reflective of current and planned employment areas and provided the ability to plan for a range of employment areas throughout the Region. Employment Area Option 1A and 1B are associated with community area Option 1 which allocates a greater share of the additional employment lands to Woolwich due to the amount of community area lands required in Cambridge under Community Area Option 1. Option 1A assumes an intensification rate of 15%, consistent with historical intensification rates, while 1B assumes a higher intensification rate of 25%. Employment Area Option 2 are associated with Community Area Option 2 & 3 which allocates a greater share of additional employment lands to Cambridge where the demand is greatest. Option 2A assumes an intensification rate of 15% consistent with historical intensification rates, while Option 2B assumes a higher intensification rate of 25%.

With the release of the draft LNA, staff initiated a comprehensive community engagement strategy to obtain feedback on the draft LNA. In addition to discussions through the previously outlined working groups and steering committees, a number of consultations were held specific to the Lands Needs Assessment, particularly:

- *Virtual Public Open Houses*: Staff and the project consulting team held two virtual public open houses. The first was held on April 22 (from 2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.) and the second on April 25 (from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.). Both sessions had a combined attendance of over 100 people. The virtual open houses included a staff presentation

followed by a facilitated discussion in smaller break-out groups on three potential growth options (i.e. 1) Growth Plan Minimums; 2) Modest Community Area Expansion; and 3) No Urban Expansion of Community Areas).

- *All Councils Education Session:* The Region hosted an online education session for all Regional and area municipal Councils on April 29 (from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.). The session provided Councillors the opportunity to learn and ask questions about the LNA and its associated growth options. The session also included a staff presentation on the three preliminary growth options, and an in-depth discussion of the current housing crisis led by Steve Pomeroy, a nationally recognized expert on housing. The session included a question-and-answer period and was live streamed on the Region's YouTube page.
- *Public Input Meeting:* A virtual public input meeting was held on May 18<sup>th</sup> from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. The meeting included a brief staff presentation on each of the three growth options. Following the presentation, 25 delegations provided their input on the growth options and other topics.
- *EngageWR Survey:* The ROP Engage page included a short survey asking members of the public to share their opinion on the three growth options presented in the draft LNA. Staff received over 150 submissions specifically related to the LNA. . The survey included the following four questions:
  1. What growth option do you like best? Why?
  2. What growth option don't you like? Why?
  3. What growth option aligns best with Waterloo Region's community vision? Why?
  4. Are there any other items we should be taking into consideration when evaluating where, specifically, growth should occur? Why?

At the virtual open houses, common comments included:

- We need to better protect the region's natural heritage and agricultural systems;
- We need to think bolder and seek more ambitious intensification and density targets;
- We need to take stronger actions to mitigate and adapt to climate change;
- We need to increase the supply of affordable and "missing middle" housing;
- We need to select a growth option that has the least amount of financial impact on municipalities;
- We need to ensure the LNA is completed correctly to provide a sufficient supply of land to accommodate future growth;



- We need more time to review the draft LNA with key stakeholders to provide for a more equitable distribution of growth between the cities and the townships.

At the Public Input Meeting, many of the delegates expressed their broad support for a new “Option 4” submitted by a coalition community members dedicated to protecting farmland and the environment. This fourth option, which was a variation of Growth Option 3 in the draft Regional LNA, proposed a “no urban boundary expansion” for community area growth, with a 65 percent intensification rate and a density target of 60 people and jobs per hectare for new greenfield communities.

A summary of the community’s comments in support of Option 4 were:

- It would set an intensification rate and density targets more consistent with current trends that would better support future expansion of LRT;
- It would delay consideration of expansions for community area purposes until a better forecasting methodology is developed;
- It would serve as a low/no risk placeholder until the Region can evaluate land needs in a post pandemic world; and
- It would provide the opportunity for simple course corrections, if necessary, through future ROP Review processes.

In the EngageWR survey, most respondents supported Community Area Option 3 in the draft LNA, and the proposed new Option 4 noted above. In general, supporters of Options 3 and 4 believed the two options would:

- Have the smallest overall impact on the region’s agricultural land;
- Support the more efficient use of land and infrastructure;
- Foster the development of a more compact, transit-supportive built form.

A minority of survey respondents preferred Community Area Option 1 because it would:

- Best preserve the character of existing neighbourhoods from intensification;
- Support market demand for low density housing types; and
- Provide for a more equitable distribution of residential between the Region’s urban and rural municipalities.

A small minority of survey respondents preferred Community Area Option 2 because it would strike the balance of having a limited urban expansion while also providing for a range and mix of housing options.

Concerns were expressed by members of region's development and business community, through delegations at the Public Input Meeting. Most of these delegates expressed a range of differing opinions regarding the Region's draft LNA. Some delegates asserted the Region's draft LNA contained technical errors and did not comply with the LNA methodology issued by the Province. Some of the criticisms were that the Region's draft LNA:

- Applied a capacity approach and not the housing demand supply approach required by the Provincial LNA methodology;
- Overestimates the supply of vacant land needed to support residential growth, particularly in Designated Greenfield Areas;
- Underestimated the total household forecast to 2051, resulting in a shortfall of ground-related and "missing middle" housing and in even greater shift towards apartments;
- Proposed intensification and density targets that are unlikely to be realized in some area municipalities; and
- Presented no growth options that provide for an appropriate market-based supply of land to accommodate the region's growth to 2051.

#### What We Did:

Staff assessed the public feedback, the community-building objectives of each local area municipalities, the results of the technical background work, and the strategic priorities of Regional Council. Based on this review, and a further assessment of the total supply of greenfield land to support Community Area growth, staff then refined the technical inputs into the LNA, recommended a growth approach with a significantly reduced Community Area land need to 2051, compared to illustrative Option 2. Based on a further review of Employment Area intensification opportunities, staff recommended a growth approach for employment areas which assumes a greater share of forecasted employment growth will be accommodated through intensification.

The resulting recommended approach to growth put into numerical terms the best way to meet the community's vision, address the Region's strategic priorities, respond to public and area municipal feedback, and support key principles of growth, while also adhering to the prescribed steps of the LNA methodology and the accommodating the Growth Plan's forecasts to 2051. The recommended approach to growth did not represent a compromise between other possible options

for accommodating growth, and it did not make trade-offs between being an equitable, thriving, and sustainable community. It instead reflected a holistic approach that best achieves the Region's and the Province's growth management objectives over the next 30 years and beyond.

Staff met with members of the development community on several occasions to review their concerns regarding the LNA methodology.

In response to concerns that the LNA does not comply with the Province's methodology, the Region noted that staff and the project consulting team met with Provincial staff on several occasions to discuss the LNA approach and methodology. At each step in the process, Provincial staff confirmed that the Region's LNA methodology complies with the Provincial LNA methodology, and that it is in keeping with the policies of the Growth Plan. Additionally, the Region's lead consultant for the draft LNA, Watson & Associates Economists Ltd., has been directly involved in approximately half of the municipal comprehensive reviews currently underway in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. For all of these other municipalities, Watson has employed the exact same or similar approach to the LNA methodology used by the Region. In each of these other municipal projects, Provincial staff confirmed that Watson's approach is appropriate.

Expressing concern that the LNA overestimates the development potential of the Region's existing supply of DGA lands, developers proposed excluding local roadways, parks, lands designated for schools and stormwater management ponds in unbuilt vacant subdivisions from the calculation of community area land supply. The Region noted that the Provincial methodology provides a specific list of features which are required to be excluded from the land supply calculation, and the above-mentioned features are not a part of that list. Excluding those features from the Region's vacant land supply would arbitrarily under-represent the amount of available land within the Region's DGA and would not conform with the Provincial LNA methodology.

In response to concerns regarding the alignment of housing mix in the LNA with market demand, the Region noted that forecasted housing unit mix is based on current market conditions within Waterloo Region. This housing mix closely aligns with the housing mix reflected in the region's current inventory of lots in plans of subdivision (i.e., pending, draft approved and registered unbuilt units in plans). Therefore, the LNA's forecasted housing mix aligns with the housing demand the market is providing.

In response to concerns that that the LNA underestimates the total amount of housing required, The Regions assessment of total housing need follows the specific steps set out in the LNA methodology. The Regions calculations of housing need

to 2051 are consistent with the Province's methodology. The forecasted housing need would require the Region to build 4,000 housing units per year, an increase of 1,000 units from the Regions average historical development rates.

Concerns have been raised that the proposed intensification rate is too aggressive and would not be achievable over the forecast period. The concerns raised have not been supported with any substantive evidence which suggests the Region does not have sufficient land which could develop to greater uses and support an intensification rate of 61%. The Region has a significant capacity to support additional growth within the cities and township existing built up areas. Within the Cities, there are opportunities along the existing ION line in Kitchener and Waterloo with additional opportunities as ION stage 2 is developed. Townships have also requested additional intensification growth to support the development of complete communities, increase transit opportunities and provide a greater mix of housing options for residents in their communities.

In summary, the LNA correctly follows the prescribed steps in the Provincial methodology, is based on accurate and defensible data inputs, and appropriately estimates the region's future land and housing requirements to 2051.

## Developing the Draft Amendment: Growth Management

### Why it matters:

Waterloo Region is one of the fastest growing urban areas in the province, projected to grow to 923,000 people by 2051. As the region continues to grow and change, we must plan for growth in a way that supports economic prosperity, protects the environment and supports transformational climate action, and helps us achieve an inclusive, thriving, and sustainable community.

One of the key guiding principles for achieving this vision is better integrating land use and transportation planning decisions. Communities that focus on moving people and goods primarily by trucks and automobiles generally create a dispersed, auto-oriented built form, while making them reliant on high energy use and vulnerable to high costs and supply shocks. By contrast, communities that focus on growth and development around an efficient mobility network of sidewalks, cycling paths and transit routes use less energy for transportation, and create a more compact built form and vibrant public realm.

Waterloo Region's diverse communities contain a broad range of parks, open spaces, and cultural heritage resources. These assets contribute to our sense of place, personal identity and overall quality of life.

### What we heard:

We received nearly 30 written submissions from the public on the growth management theme, which encompasses a variety of topics and comments related to where and how our community will grow in the future. Many of these submissions called on the Region to better manage growth by supporting a more compact, efficient, and transit-supportive built form. This approach to growth makes better use of land and infrastructure, protects the environment, supports transit viable, and best supports climate action, the clean energy transition, and adaptation to the effects of a changing climate.

In general, several respondents expressed their support for the following:

- Maintaining the Countryside Line to protect the region’s productive agricultural lands from urban development;
- Implementing higher intensification targets as a way to build more compact and walkable communities;
- Building complete communities, or “15-minute neighbourhoods” where residents can meet their daily needs for living within a short trip by walking, cycling, or rolling;
- Requiring transit-supportive development within Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) to increase mobility choices, support active transportation, and improve transit viability; and
- Integrating climate change considerations into planning and managing growth to reduce energy use, promote a culture of conservation, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Respondents most commonly expressed their concerns regarding:

- The feasibility of achieving 15-minute neighbourhoods in areas zoned primarily for single-detached housing;
- The potential negative impacts increased levels of intensification would have on existing neighbourhoods, including within the townships, such as increased traffic, loss of neighbourhood character, and strain on local parks and other services;
- A perceived lack of transparency in the process for delineating Major Transit Station Area boundaries;
- The high rate of higher-density residential development occurring in the cities;
- The impact of new development on cultural heritage properties within intensification corridors and strategic growth areas; and
- The lack of new parks and public open spaces to support the fast pace of development occurring in existing urban areas.

## What We Did:

To better manage growth, the draft amendment included policies to:

- Integrate land use planning with planning and investment in infrastructure and public service facilities;
- Allocate future population and employment growth to 2051 to each of the area municipalities;
- Establish a hierarchy of urban areas, and of supporting nodes and corridors within them, including Urban Growth Centres, Major Transit Station Areas, Regional Intensification Corridors, and other Local Centres and Intensification Corridors;
- Set an ambitious but achievable region-wide intensification target that requires that a minimum of 61 percent of new residential development occur annually within existing Built-Up Area;
- Set a minimum density target of 59 people and jobs per hectare in designated greenfield areas;
- Support the development of 15-minute neighbourhoods across the region with convenient access to a broad mix of amenities;
- Prioritize *walking, cycling, and rolling*, and taking transit over automobile trips;
- Foster the development of high-quality urban form through site design and urban design standards that create an attractive and vibrant public realm; and
- Support sustainable growth and financial responsibility by phasing growth, infrastructure and other community services over time.

## Developing the Draft Amendment: Climate Action

### Why It Matters:

Climate change is a global problem with local causes and local solutions. Since the adoption of the 2015 ROP, the Region has committed to transformational climate action through several key decisions, specifically:

- Setting a long-term community greenhouse gas reduction target of 80 percent by the year 2050;
- Declaring a climate emergency;
- Collaboratively creating and endorsing the TransformWR community climate action strategy, through the ClimateActionWR collaborative of the Region, the area municipalities, and local environmental non-profits; and
- Creating the Climate Change Policy Direction Paper as part of the Regional Official Plan Review, to outline the land use planning changes needed to change how we move, how we live and work, and how we build.

Energy from transportation accounts for nearly 50 percent of the community's total greenhouse gas emissions, and the energy needed for mobility is heavily influenced by community design. Given the alignment between the Region's greenhouse gas reduction target of 80 percent by 2050, and the need to plan for growth to 2051, the updated ROP provides a unique and timely opportunity to change how we grow and move, and better address climate change.

#### What We Heard:

Many residents and community groups noted the key role that land use planning plays in addressing climate change. The comments emphasized the need for the Region and its area municipalities to take more urgent action to address the climate emergency. This includes implementing green development standards, building more energy efficient buildings, and supporting a built form that prioritizes walking, cycling and rolling for day-to-day trips. Residents said these measures are necessary to transform our community to use less energy and use clean energy, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and foster a more equitable, prosperous, resilient low-carbon community.

Many members of the community also expressed concern over the local impacts of a changing climate, including flooding, extreme weather events and increased climate variability. They called on the Region to be more proactive in adapting to climate change, such as conducting vulnerability assessments to identify risks and options for enhancing resilience.

Several residents indicated their broad support for the following:

- Advancing bolder, transformational changes to better address climate change;
- Requiring climate friendly development and green infrastructure, including facilities that support electric vehicles and charging stations, and mobility networks that prioritize walking, cycling and rolling over automobile travel;
- Supporting opportunities for renewable energy systems;
- Applying a climate change lens for evaluating policy and growth options;
- Implementing the TransformWR community climate action strategy; and
- Achieving our national and local climate action goals, including Regional Council's community greenhouse gas reduction target of 50 percent by the year 2030 and 80 percent by the year 2050.

Some residents expressed their concern regarding:

- The lack of progress in reducing auto dependency in Waterloo Region;
- The inability to move beyond business-as-usual development to better address climate change;

- The risks associated with climate change in Waterloo Region, which include increased severe weather events and flooding.

#### What We Did:

The draft amendment included several new policies to integrate climate change and energy considerations into planning and managing growth. Some of the key policies include:

- Implementing the concept of 15-minute neighbourhoods;
- Promoting an intensification-first approach to development and community-building;
- Prioritizing walking, cycling and rolling over automobile travel;
- Requiring area municipalities to create High Performance Development Standards to support net-zero operational carbon buildings;
- Requiring large-scale development proposals to submit Neighbourhood Energy Plans to reduce energy use and costs, as well as greenhouse gas emissions;
- Integrating green infrastructure and low impact development (e.g., new approaches to stormwater management); and
- Planning for more resilient communities and infrastructure that are adaptive to the impacts of a changing climate.

#### Developing the Draft Amendment: Affordable and “Missing Middle” Housing

##### Why It Matters:

Housing is a broad and complex topic that impacts all members of our community. Housing is a necessity of life and is an essential element to individual health and community vitality. The provision of a full and diverse range and mix of permanent housing that is safe, affordable, of adequate size and meets the accessibility requirements of all residents is a key element of building an inclusive, thriving and sustainable community.

##### What We Heard:

There was a significant amount of public interest in housing, particularly in terms affordability and “missing middle” housing. We received over 40 submissions on a wide range of housing issues. Several residents and stakeholders expressed concern regarding the current housing crisis, and the deteriorating levels of affordability of housing (for both rental and ownership) throughout the region. Many residents also highlighted the lack of diversity in the current housing stock in terms of location, size of units, and housing types.



Many community members submitted recommendations on how to address these challenges, such as: implementing the new Inclusionary Zoning provisions under the Planning Act; supporting the construction of “missing middle” housing in areas close to existing shops, parks, schools, local services and other amenities; and facilitating the addition of new housing units in existing neighbourhoods through secondary dwellings and gentle intensification.

Several residents also emphasized the need to plan for a wider range and mix of housing options to serve all sizes, incomes and ages of households. Some residents also expressed their concern regarding gentrification and the loss of existing affordable units due to rapid intensification.

There was broad support from the community for the following:

- Supporting affordable and missing middle housing, and gentle density, throughout the region;
- Enabling Inclusionary Zoning to require new developments to provide affordable housing; and,
- Increasing the supply of a full range and mix of housing types to accommodate to all sizes, incomes, and ages of households.

Some residents and stakeholders expressed concerns regarding:

- The limited supply of vacant land to accommodate ground-related housing in greenfield communities;
- The shortage of affordable and attainable housing (for both rental and ownership) due to rapidly increasing house prices and rent;
- The diminishing supply of resale housing caused by investor speculation in the housing market;
- The potential for Inclusionary Zoning policies to increase the cost of new development, which may be passed on to market-rate buyers through increased home prices;
- The inability of the Region’s housing policies to effectively address the housing affordability crisis; and,
- The loss of existing affordable housing units and gentrification due to the rapid redevelopment of some urban areas;

#### What We Did:

The Region is committed to working with all levels of government and the private, non-profit and co-operative housing sectors to increase the supply of housing, including affordable housing, throughout the region. Planning for affordable housing requires a variety of tools and strategies, and close collaboration with several community partners. This includes

collaboration with the region's home building industry, which plays an important role in meeting the demand for a range of rental and ownership housing.

Some stakeholders expressed concerns with the loss of affordable housing, and the associated displacement of residents, in areas experiencing rapid rates of intensification, particularly along the ION light rail transit corridor. The Region recognizes this issue and has taken steps to monitor it as part of its annual Central Transit Corridor monitoring program. Research to date along the CTC corridor has analyzed affordability and the growth in different forms of development. Our overall objective for development along the CTC corridor is to create 15-minute neighbourhoods with a full range of housing options, including affordable housing.

To address these housing challenges, the draft amendment included policies to:

- Ensure the region has an adequate supply of land to accommodate its anticipated household growth to 2051;
- Provide for a diverse range and mix of housing options to accommodate people at all stages of life, and meet the needs of all household sizes and incomes;
- Set an overall target of a minimum of 30 percent of new ownership and rental housing being affordable to low- and moderate-income households;
- Implement Inclusionary Zoning in Major Transit Station Areas located along the existing Stage 1 and proposed Stage 2 ION rapid transit system routes;
- Require a review of and regular updates to the Region's 10 Year Housing and Homelessness Plan;
- Permit missing middle housing" on a residential lot within the Urban Area and Township Urban Areas;
- Encourage the construction of new private rental housing supply
- Protect existing stock of rental housing from conversion to condominiums.
- Plan for the establishment of emergency shelters and other temporary accommodations for individuals and households across the region;
- Permit and facilitate special needs housing;
- Provide direction to the area municipalities to regulate the demolition of existing residential rental buildings with six or more units; and,
- Develop a protocol to give priority review to development applications proposing affordable housing.

## Developing the Draft Amendment: Agriculture and Protection of Farmland

### Why It Matters:

Waterloo Region has a long-standing tradition of protecting farmland and supporting its local agricultural sector, which is thriving and built on some of the best farmland in the province. Waterloo Region has some of Ontario's most important and productive farmland, which is a finite, non-renewable resource. Agriculture and the agri-food industry also forms an important part of the region's economy and provides many positive benefits. Each job in the agricultural sector supports several additional jobs in the wider regional economy. As providers of fresh, locally grown food, area farmers play an important role in the health and food security of the community. Local agriculture also supports sustainability by reducing reliance on foods transported long distances using considerable energy and fossil fuels.

### What We Heard:

Many residents called on the Region to be bolder and implement stronger measures to protect farmland.

There was broad support from the community for the following:

- Maintaining the Countryside Line;
- Protecting farmland from urban development to ensure a vibrant agricultural economy and to secure a local food supply for future generations;
- Supporting a more compact, transit supportive built form to minimize growth pressures on farmland; and
- Maintaining farmlands to support the region's resilience and ability to adapt to climate change.

Some residents expressed concerns regarding:

- Permitting mineral aggregate operations on prime agricultural lands; and
- The encroachment of urban uses in the countryside, increasing the potential for land use conflicts with agricultural operations.

Additionally, as part of the ROP review process, residents, stakeholders, and area municipalities were given the opportunity to submit urban boundary expansion requests. Before the draft amendment was released, we received approximately 100 urban expansion requests covering an area of roughly 2,500 hectares. What We Did:

Waterloo Region's long-standing tradition of protecting farmland and supporting its local agricultural sector is evident in the Region's innovative growth management policies, which were all maintained and carried forward into the draft

amendment. These include the Countryside Line, the Protected Countryside, and Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes. These policies are also supported by the strengthening of policies to support the development of vibrant, compact, and energy efficient built form throughout the first amendment, such as policies to support the development of 15-minute neighbourhoods, where people can meet their daily needs through a short trip by walking, cycling, or rolling.

Requests for urban expansion were considered based on the staff recommended growth approach described in Report PDL-CPL-22-20. Appendix B contains a list of all requests received and indicates whether or not the request was recommended.

As part of phase two of the ROP Review, the Region will be advancing several new planning policies to support agriculture and better protect farmland, including:

- Implementing a new Agricultural System comprised of a productive agricultural land base and a new agri-food network;
- Updating the mapping in the ROP in keeping with the new agricultural land base mapping issued by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs;
- Encouraging the retention of existing lots of record in the countryside for agricultural uses; and
- Implementing agri-food strategies and other approaches to sustain and enhance the Agricultural System, including supporting access to healthy, local, and affordable food.

## Developing the Draft Amendment: Mobility, Transit, and Infrastructure

### Why It Matters:

Efficient and high-quality infrastructure for transportation and water and wastewater is a critical part of a well-connected, vibrant and functional community. The mobility system, in particular, significantly influences quality of life in the community, and is a significant part of efforts to build a more equitable, thriving, sustainable community.

### What We Heard:

We received a number of comments and questions from the community related to transportation and other infrastructure. With regard to transportation infrastructure, several residents called on the Region to enhance its mobility network and transit system to increase travel choices and reduce auto-dependency.

With respect to other infrastructure, such as stormwater management facilities, and water and wastewater services, several submissions expressed the need for more green infrastructure and low impact design standards, including permeable pavers and rainwater cisterns to help minimize flooding and stormwater runoff. Other submissions emphasized the need to consider the financial feasibility of constructing new infrastructure through various costing models, and the need for municipalities to ensure that any new infrastructure to support growth is financially viable over its full life cycle.

Residents and stakeholders expressed broad support for the following:

- Implementing rainwater cisterns, permeable pavers, and other low impact design features in all new developments;
- Ensuring new infrastructure is cost-effective and financially viable through life-cycle costing models;
- Improving GO and intercity transit in Waterloo Region, including a future Breslau GO station and increased intercity transit to nearby communities such as Guelph and cities in the GTHA;
- Enhancing transit services to the townships and rural areas;
- Expanding the rapid transit network, including Stage 2 ION in Cambridge, and Stage 3 ION to the Region of Waterloo International Airport;
- Widening and/or building certain Regional roads; and
- Constructing new infrastructure to provide access to safe and comfortable active transportation, such as protected cycling lanes.

#### What We Did:

The draft amendment included a requirement for Regional infrastructure to be planned and managed in a manner that is financially viable over the life cycle of the asset. This requirement would be implemented in part through future infrastructure master plans, which would be updated in coordination with the ROP to ensure an integrated approach to managing urban development.

There are a number of initiatives that staff are working on to make mobility in the region more convenient, affordable, efficient, and sustainable. This includes policies in the draft amendment to support the transition to most trips being made by walking, cycling, and rolling, in alignment with the TransformWR community climate action strategy, as well as the identification of a new east/west Regional Intensification Corridor extending along Ottawa Street in the City of Kitchener to Fountain Street in the Township of Woolwich. In the future, this corridor has the potential to accommodate significant

growth that supports higher order transit (see Map 1 and 2 in the proposed ROP amendment). The second phase of the ROP Review will further address integrated mobility planning and infrastructure.

Staff also continue to work on Stage 2 ION and the continued expansion of transit service, while working with Metrolinx to provide increased GO Transit service frequencies and station locations to enhance intercity transportation to and from Waterloo Region.

## Developing the Draft Amendment: Natural Environment and Groundwater Resources

### Why It Matters:

One of the goals of the ROP is to protect the countryside from urbanization and inappropriate rural activities, while sustainably managing its natural resources for the needs of current and future generations. This includes protection of our natural heritage features and our groundwater recharge areas that are essential to our drinking water supply. As a growing region, we must plan for the availability of mineral aggregate resources needed to build our community, while also preventing or minimizing potential impacts on surface water and groundwater resources, and environmental features and ecological functions.

### What We Heard:

Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation and Mississaugas of the Credit River First Nation provided substantial guidance on the importance of the Grand River, biodiversity, water and natural resources. In addition, numerous residents and stakeholders submitted comments and presented to Council regarding the need to protect the region's valuable natural environment and valuable water resources. Many submissions emphasized the importance of these areas and resources in maintaining the long-term quality of life, economic prosperity, and environmental integrity of the region. These areas also provide essential ecosystem services, including and related to water storage and filtration, cleaner air and habitats, carbon storage, and adaptation and resilience to climate change. Residents commented that unmanaged growth could degrade these natural assets, and that we must do more to protect them for future generations.

We also received comments suggesting that we use more native plant species in new developments, and that we give more consideration to addressing air pollution. There was also significant public support for implementing stronger source water protection policies, including reducing the use of winter road salt, and prohibiting new mineral aggregate operations in sensitive groundwater recharge areas.

First Nations and residents expressed broad support for the following:

- Prioritizing the protection of water resources and local biodiversity;
- Creating new urban greenspaces, natural areas, and hiking/recreational trails;
- Planting more native plant species in new developments;
- Acknowledging the cultural value and importance of humans' connection to the land; and
- Better protecting the region's natural heritage features, including the Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes.

First Nations, in particular, identified that:

- Humans are part of nature: We need to provide space and resources to maintain and enhance healthy, connected, and accessible natural areas. This is important for everyone's health and wellbeing, but is particularly critical for local Indigenous people.
- Water is essential for life. The Grand River should be cared for, protected, and restored/naturalized. The water system, including groundwater, needs to be able to support the health of the Grand River watershed as well as the level of planned growth over the long-term.
- Biodiversity should be protected and nurtured. We have a local responsibility to steward the lands and waters that sustain us, and to contribute to national and international biodiversity commitments. Wetlands are especially important.

Some residents raised concerns regarding the following:

- The impacts of urban development and mineral aggregate operations on ground water recharge areas;
- The types of development occurring adjacent to forested areas;
- The lack of composting and recycling in some multi-residential buildings; and
- Noise and air pollution from roadways.

#### What We Did:

The draft amendment recognized the Grand River, local landscapes, water and natural features that have and continue to sustain past, current and future populations; the importance and vulnerability of groundwater; and maintain the Region's existing strong policies for the protection of our environmental features and groundwater recharge areas. Some examples of these policies include the Countryside Line, the Protected Countryside, and the Regional Recharge Area. These policies work to protect our groundwater supply and natural heritage from urban development. The chapters in the ROP

specifically related to the Region's Greenlands network, countryside, source water protection, and mineral aggregates will be updated in second phase of the ROP Review, commencing in the fall of 2022.

Greenspace policies will be updated as part of a future amendment, and will be reviewed with respect to how they can improve humans' relationship with nature, including: opportunities to connect with nature; facilitating Indigenous traditional uses; and creating more naturalized spaces.

The updates to natural heritage policies undertaken in a future amendment will consider opportunities to positively impact biodiversity, including: total coverage of protected area; connectivity of natural areas; protection of areas of a significant physical scale; and protection of significant species and habitats.

While the draft amendment acknowledged and prioritized the value and importance of protecting water, and specifically the Grand River, future amendments will consider: options to further identify rivers, lakes and other surface features as significant environmental features; developing a systems-approach to natural heritage conservation; and support for re-naturalization of the river shoreline.

## Developing the Draft Amendment: Economic Development

### Why It Matters:

The Province of Ontario's Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe forecasts Waterloo Region's employment growth for the next 30 years. One of the goals of the ROP is to support the strategic development of this forecasted employment growth.

### What We Heard:

We received a number of comments related to the Region's draft employment policies, as well as other general comments related to employment and economic development in the Region.

Residents expressed broad support for the following:

- Creating more compact, higher density, and transit supportive employment areas;
- Making better use of existing employment areas by intensifying underutilized spaces; and
- Locating employment areas close to where people live to support shorter commuting distances.

Some residents raised concerns regarding the following:



- Accessing natural amenities and greenspace within and near employment areas;
- The lack of public transit service to existing employment areas; and
- The availability of industrial land for companies to locate or expand within the Region.

#### What We Did:

To support the strategic development of forecasted employment growth, the draft amendment included the following objectives:

- Providing a diverse mix and range of accessible employment opportunities throughout Waterloo Region to build economic resilience, to be flexible in responding to changing employment needs, and to maintain a competitive advantage in attracting and retaining people, jobs and investment.
- Promoting intensification and increased densities in both new and existing employment areas to facilitate compact urban form and to support complete communities.
- Provide Regional employment areas near existing or planned major goods movement facilities and corridors to promote the efficient movement of goods and to reduce energy needs and associated greenhouse gas emissions.

Additionally, in response to public feedback, the recommended approach to growth used an ambitious intensification target for employment areas of 25%, which would allow for more development on already developed, but underutilized employment sites such as parking lots.

Overall, considerable community feedback was incorporated in the draft amendment released in June, as outlined above.

## Part 2: Finalizing the Proposed Amendment, June 25- August 4, 2022

### Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Engaging the General Public, Stakeholder Committees, and Working Groups

Since the release of the draft amendment on June 24, 2022, extensive engagement has occurred with the general public, and dedicated committees and working groups.

Specifically, engagement of the general public was conducted:

- Open Houses
  - July 6, 2022, 6:00-7:30 pm – Virtual Open House
  - July 13, 2022, 2:00-4:00 pm and 6:00-8:00 pm – In-Person Open House, Wilmot Recreation Complex
  - July 14, 2022, 6:00-7:30 pm – Virtual Open House
  - July 19, 2022, 2:00-4:00 pm and 6:00-8:00 pm – In-Person Open House, 150 Frederick Street, Kitchener
- Virtual Statutory Public Meeting, July 27, 2022, 3:00 pm
- Comments by email (50 received)

The following meetings were held following the release of the draft amendment:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Group or Individual</b>	<b>Date</b>
Working Groups and Stakeholder Committees	Stakeholder Committee	June 27, 2022 July 20, 2022
	Area Municipal Working Group	July 5, 2022
	Technical Team	July 14, 2022
	LNA Meeting with Métis Council of Ontario	June 27, 2022
	Six Nations of the Grand River	June 28, 2022
	Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation	July 5, 2022
Other Area Municipal Meetings	Planning Heads and CAOs	June 28, 2022 July 14, 2022
	Planning Heads	July 15, 2022
	City of Cambridge	July 20, 2022 July 22, 2022 July 26, 2022
	City of Kitchener	July 15, 2022 July 18, 2022 (Council) August 3, 2022
	City of Waterloo	August 3, 2022
	Township of North Dumfries	July 20, 2022
	Township of Wellesley	July 20, 2022 July 21, 2022

		July 22, 2022 August 3, 2022
	Township of Wilmot	August 2, 2022
	Township of Woolwich	August 2, 2022
Meetings with Developers and Expansion Proponents	Caroline Baker	July 12, 2022
	Schlegel Urban Developments	July 15, 2022
	Dryden Smith and Head	July 19, 2022
	MHBC	July 21, 2022
	Stovel and Associates (Green Horizons)	July 21, 2022
	Intermarket	July 21, 2022
	Polocorp (with Woolwich staff)	July 25, 2022
	Branthaven	July 26, 2022
Other	Media Briefing	June 28, 2022
	Meeting with Mike Doherty	July 6, 2022
	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	July 21, 2022
	Jess Dixon, MPP for Kitchener South Hespeler	July 25, 2022
	Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation	August 2, 2022

### Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: What We Heard and High-Level Response

The following tables outline the feedback received following the release of the draft amendment, as well as a response from staff.

Comments that were made by more than 5 times are shaded in yellow and accompanied by a star(\*)

### Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Feedback on the Land Needs Assessment

Theme	Feedback	High-Level Response
Recommended approach to growth	General support for the recommended approach to growth	The recommended approach to growth, along with the proposed

	Support for proposed housing mix	housing mix, has been maintained in the proposed amendment. The required expansion also remains the same as outlined in Report PDL-CPL-22-20 in June.
	Support for community expansion amount and/or for the extent to which the amendment limits greenfield expansion [multiple comments]	
farmland loss	Request for less or zero farmland loss [multiple comments]	The Region is required to follow Provincial methodology for its land budget and to plan to accommodate the population identified by the Province. The proposed amendment takes an intensification first approach, focusing growth within the Regions existing built up area, specifically around transit. A small amount of additional land need was identified in order to accommodate the forecasted population to 2051.
Housing undersupply due to inadequate land	Concern that Canada has the lowest number of homes per capita in the G7, and that this is not compensated for by its larger average households because household formation depends on the availability of housing	The Region is required to follow the steps set out in the LNA methodology which does not account for housing comparisons among G7 Nations. The assessment of homes per capita does not adjust any demographic factors which influence housing needs such as the age structure of a population. Waterloo Region is significantly younger on average than every G7 nation. Younger families with children occupy a single home with 3-4 individuals. Older populations

		have a higher prevalence of seniors who occupy housing with 1-2 people per household. This results in a higher number of homes needed.
Housing undersupply due to inadequate land	Concern that the minimum Provincial growth targets were used for the LNA, rather than a higher number, and that the Province's numbers are outdated or incorrect and this will make housing unaffordable	Under the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the Region is required to plan to accommodate the forecast people and jobs identified by the Province. These planning targets help to ensure that any expansion is needed and expansion occurs efficiently, and avoids significant costs for municipalities associated with inefficient infrastructure. The forecasts provided by the Province require the Region to plan for an annual population growth which is 25% higher than historical growth rates.
	Concern that increasing the provincial population projection would not be in line with Provincial guidelines for land needs assessment, and that there is already the required flexibility to ensure adequate lands are available for housing	
housing mix	Concern about availability of custom homes, and want larger building lots to accommodate single family homes	The recommended approach to growth builds into the inventory a greater range and mix of housing forms, in order to accommodate people at all life stages and at a broader range of price points.
	Concern that the proposed housing mix will not meet future market demand	

methodology	Concern that the Region's approach does not conform to the Provincial methodology and 944 hectares of expansion is needed for community uses	<p>The Regional LNA follows the prescribed steps in the Provincial methodology, and forecasts total housing need to 2051 consistent with the Provincial methodology, using housing propensity data to inform the total housing need over the forecast period. This includes using the Province's requirements for what to include within the Community Area, which includes not only residential lands, but those that can accommodate schools, including post-secondary institutions such as Conestoga College, some office uses, and retail/commercial areas. Excluding land uses which are not a part of the Province's list of takes out from our analysis would result in our LNA not conforming with the Provincial methodology.</p> <p>While different ministries of the Province use different population forecasts for different purposes, the LNA uses the Provincial forecast identified by the Province for this purpose. The Growth Plan technical report provides conceptual figures which could be used but notes that individual municipalities can complete their own assessment utilizing specific</p>
	Concern that the Land Needs Assessment underestimates land need to 2051 and doesn't conform to Provincial methodology [multiple comments]	
	Concern regarding the numbers used by the Province compared to what the Region is presenting	

		data that reflects their municipalities, which is what every municipality within the GGH has done.
global context	Concern regarding global overpopulation	While the required methodology from the Province focuses on people and jobs to be accommodated within Waterloo Region, the Provincial approach does include consideration of migration to Ontario.

#### Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Feedback on Growth Management

Theme	Feedback	High-Level Response
overall approach	General Support for the draft amendment [multiple comments]*	The approach outlined in the draft amendment has been maintained in the proposed amendment. Key policy changes to the to the amendment are summarized in Attachment F to Report PDL-CPL-22-24
	Support for draft amendment because of bold vision [multiple comments]	
	General support for the approach	
	No comments or concerns at this time	
Countryside Line and Protected Countryside	Support for maintaining the Countryside Line [multiple comments]	The proposed amendment maintains the Countryside Line, as well as the Protected Countryside. The proposed amendment includes an adjustment to the location of the Countryside Line in the Town of Wellesley, which will result in more lands being protected
	Support for the Protected Countryside designation	
15-minute neighbourhoods	Support for 15-minute neighbourhoods [multiple comments]*	Policies related to 15-minute neighbourhoods have been

	Support for 15-minute neighbourhoods because they lower the cost of living	maintained through the process to finalize the proposed amendment.
	Support for inclusion of rural communities in 15-minute neighbourhoods	
intensification	Support for "Intensification First" [multiple comments]*	This approach from the draft amendment has been retained in the proposed amendment.
	Concern that adequate green space will not be provided in neighbourhoods growing through intensification	Policy 2.C.2.2 (j) provides direction to ensure the development of a high quality urban form through site design and urban design standards that create and attractive and vibrant public realm, including parks, open spaces and other green spaces. We will reviewing ways to improve and increase the amount of green spaces in the region's urban areas as part of phase two of the ROP review.
public understanding	Need more public awareness and communications, even for municipal councillors and staff	The Region has undertaken quite lengthy and extensive engagement virtually and online, and has been working with a range of community organizations and stakeholders to build support and understanding around the proposed approach to growth and the benefits of more inclusive and complete communities.  Community members have seen growth and development in the
	Need for a public education strategy as ambitious as the plan, to help people understand why their cities will change	



		<p>Region evolve over the past several years, and while there is a perpetual challenge with encouraging public engagement, we have had great conversations with participants in recent meetings and engagement sessions. These conversations will continue, and we will work with local communities to support broader awareness and understanding of the proposed policies and what they mean in terms of meeting our goals, now and into the future.</p> <p>Amendment of the Regional Official Plan is only one step in building an equitable, thriving, and sustainable Waterloo Region. This work will proceed through the second phase of the ROP Review, as well as through other projects and initiatives related to issues such as transportation and climate change.</p>
housing mix	Concern that higher-density, family-sized units are unaffordable, and more low-density, ground-oriented homes are needed	The proposed amendment provides for a mix of housing forms to accommodate growth to the year 2051, along with high-level policies that can help facilitate achievement of this mix.
housing mix	Concern that the plan is not ready and not balanced to meet the needs of future residents	

missing middle location	Concern that missing middle housing is more achievable in designated greenfield areas than through intensification	The proposed amendment includes policies a series of policies to provide for full range and mix of housing across the region. One of the challenges relating to missing middle housing relates to existing zoning regulations that prohibit a wider range of housing forms in existing neighbourhoods. The proposed amendment seeks to alleviate this problem by permitting missing middle housing in all residential areas.
density targets in the built-up area	Interest in whether there are targets for density in existing low density neighbourhoods, or whether this is limited to major transit station areas and new subdivisions	Density targets have only been calculated for the Regions Urban Growth Centers, Major Transit Station Areas and Designated Greenfield Lands.
housing turnover	Interest in creatively using single detached homes when existing owners move out, for co-housing/home share/retrofit apartments	The ROP provides direction on the range and mix of housing throughout the region. Specifics regarding how to creatively use single detached homes is typically addressed at the area municipal level. It is assumed that over the forecast, a number of homes occupied by seniors will turn over and be occupied by new occupants either.
specific amenities	Concern for how the approach to growth addresses a proposed health centre campus and replacement for the Kitchener Auditorium	The Regional Official Plan outlines high-level land uses. Within the proposed amendment, a health centre would be a use that would be included within community area. The Region continues to work with

		community partners on the siting of major community amenities, to support integration into region-wide and Region-owned infrastructure, such as the mobility system.
timing and implementation of the amendment	Request to continue with the amendment and not defer due to recent discussions at an area municipal council	The proposed amendment will be presented to Council for its consideration in mid-August of 2022.
	Interest in how and when new policy requirements will be transitioned to apply to development applications that have already been submitted	Once an amendment is approved by the Minister, each area municipality will need to update their respective official plans and zoning by-laws to conform to the updated ROP. Some of this policy work will likely take at least a year to implement, and some of it may take a few years to fully implement. As a general rule, any development applications in progress will be reviewed in the context of the policies in effect at the time.
Major Transit Station Areas	Request to refine the Central MTSA boundary	A full list of individual responses to site-specific requests is included in Appendix B.
	Request to have properties located at 97 Kent Avenue and 60 Ottawa St. S. included within the Borden Major Transit Station Area	
Specific area: North Dumfries	Concern regarding North Dumfries employment areas creating demand to further convert prime agricultural lands	Based on the results of the Regional Land Needs Assessment, the Township of North Dumfries requires additional employment land to support its forecasted job growth to 2051. The

		proposed amendment will address this land through a series of strategically located expansion areas along the Northumberland Corridor and the Highway 401/Regional Road 97 Employment Area. The recommended expansions areas represent logical connecting to the existing employment uses in these two areas. Any future development in these expansion areas must prevent or mitigate any potential agricultural impacts.
Specific Area: Southwest Kitchener	Request to see more clear and deep protection for the Countryside Line and Regional Recharge Area in Southwest Kitchener.	The Land Needs Assessment did not identify a need for further expansion in Kitchener as part of the amendment.
	Request for expansion lands to be located in Kitchener	54% of vacant designated greenfield area located within Waterloo Region is located within the City of Kitchener.
	Concern that Southwest Kitchener would be the best location for 15-minute neighbourhoods, and additional lands have not been allocated there	The Cities are in a strong position to create energy efficient 15-minute neighbourhoods by building on their existing population, employment, amenities, and larger land bases that are already able to accommodate a significant amount of forecasted growth.
	Request for expansion in Southwest Kitchener	
	Support for keeping the Southwest Kitchener Policy Area rural/prime agricultural	
	Request for 165 and 208 Bloomingdale Rd to be included in	

Inclusion request and concerns about inclusion requests	the Urban Area or Settlement Area for Community Area.	<p>A full list of individual responses to site-specific requests is included in Appendix B.</p> <p>The expansion areas identified in the proposed amendment were identified based on the priorities listed in Report PDL-CPL-22-20, to ensure alignment with the community's priorities in building an equitable, thriving, and sustainable community.</p>
	Request to reconsider 2117 Lonsdale Road, included as employment lands	
	Request to reconfigure urban boundary at 51-55 Hawkesville Road	
	Concerns related to recommended employment area expansions in Cambridge and Woolwich	
	Questions regarding the timing of servicing to lands that are located on Middle Block Rd. and designated Prestige Industrial in the City of Cambridge Official Plan	
	Request to include Lion's Mane Ministry at 1700 Kramp Road within the urban area	
	Request for a conversion of employment lands at 388 Phillip Street and 413 Albert Street within the MTSA to allow a mix of urban uses	
	Request to include the rest of Stremma lands in Baden within the urban area	
	Request to include BSF 2 lands in expansion	

	Request to include the owner's property at 55 Spring Street in St. Jacobs within the urban area	
	Support for including Infrastructure Ontario Lands in North Cambridge in the urban area for employment	
	Further justification to include request S-9, lands located at 271 Reidel Drive in the Urban Area, and a request that the Grambian lands remain under the "Rural" designation through the second phase of the ROP Review	
	Additional justification for request S-6 for lands located at 2118 New Dundee Road to be included in the urban area.	
	Additional justification for request S-33 located at 2450 Victoria Street North.	
	Further justification for request S-14	
	Support for recommended Employment Area (EA 15) with regard to request S-52.	
	Support for recommended Employment Area (EA 15) with regard to request S-53.	
	Further justification for S-7 and S-9. Additional input on LNA.	
	Further justification for S-7.	

	Additional justification for request S-45.	
	Additional justification for request S-55.	
	Question regarding Maryhill Rural Settlement Area Boundary, specifically with regard to lands located at 44 St Charles Street.	
	Concern that developer requests are similar to requests made in 2009 regarding the existing ROP	
	Concern that calls for further greenfield expansions are based on specific business interests	
	Support for focusing on community needs rather than financial profits	
	Support for the amendment and request that community interests not be sacrificed to developer interests [multiple comments]	

Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Feedback on Climate Action

Theme	Feedback	High-Level Response
support for integration of climate change	Support for the draft amendment in order to address climate change and/or implement the TransformWR community climate action strategy [multiple comments]*	The integration of climate change in the draft amendment has been maintained in the proposed amendment.
	Support for focus on climate change [multiple comments]	

climate growth approach	Support for the draft amendment because of better alignment with Option 4 for climate change reasons [multiple comments]	This approach has been maintained in the proposed amendment.
climate growth approach	Support for draft amendment because of limited urban expansion, to enable carbon sequestration and resiliency to the effects of a changing climate	This approach has been maintained in the proposed amendment.
community partnerships	Request for developers to join in a partnership with community members to address climate change	The Region collaborates with community partners, including businesses and developers
equity and climate justice	Supportive of responding to climate change in a safe, healthy, inclusive way and/or through a social justice lens [multiple comments]	In alignment with the TransformWR community climate action strategy, the proposed amendment focuses on building an equitable, prosperous, resilient low-carbon community. The proposed amendment recognizes does not make trade-offs between being an equitable, thriving, and sustainable community, and that these objectives must be achieved together.  On affordability, in particular, planning for the energy transition will be an important part of securing affordability in the community, as prices for energy and particular fossil fuels continue to rise.
	Concern that sustainability is expensive and may conflict with affordability	



Green Development Standards	Support for tiered approach to implement climate change mitigation technologies	Policies requiring area municipalities to apply tiered High Performance Building Standards (formerly described as Green Development Standards in the draft amendment) are retained, with minor refinements, in the proposed amendment.
issues for further policy development	Request for policy changes to minimize embodied carbon through stronger measures to adaptively reuse heritage structures	While the proposed amendment covers growth-related components of the Regional Official Plan Review, additional policy areas, including those relating to cultural heritage resources, will be considered in the second phase of the review. These comments will be considered during the second phase. They can also inform other policies and work outside of the Regional Official Plan, which is only one of the tools available to support achieving the community's vision.
	Request for more focus on Green Development Standards, aggregates, and/or transit in future work [multiple comments]	

Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Feedback on Affordable and “Missing Middle” Housing

Theme	Feedback	High-Level Response
support for draft policies	General support for the draft housing policies [multiple comments]	The draft housing policies have been retained in the proposed amendment, with refinements to support the achievement of <i>net-zero operational carbon</i> performance for all newly built housing, including affordable housing.

tools	General concern for housing affordability and interest in tools to ensure it is built	<p>A significant part of our housing inventory is not affordable to about 70% of our population. Though the Region has limited planning tools to require the provision of affordable housing, we are trying to create a wider mix and range of housing that is more intrinsically affordable. Policies in the proposed amendment to support housing affordability include policies related to missing-middle housing, inclusionary zoning, and the conversion of rental units to condos.</p> <p>The current proposed Amendment has a number of policies that speak to emergency shelter and housing for people experiencing homelessness, but we recognize that this is a complex issue requiring multiple ways to tackle housing insecurity and take an equity-focused approach to address disparity in housing access. The Region is continuing the conversation with community members and organizations on the ground, and will be bringing forward additional policies through forthcoming amendments that will follow later in 2022 and early 2023.</p>
	Concern that policies won't be implemented due to structural or political barriers	
	Concern for families unable to find affordable housing, and requests for more policies to promote larger family units in higher density housing forms, requirements for a certain percentage of affordable housing, etc.	

inclusionary zoning	Support for implementing inclusionary zoning everywhere	Inclusionary zoning is a new tool in the Planning Act. The proposed amendment would designate each Major Transit Station Area as a Protected Major Transit Station Areas, so they could become eligible for the inclusionary zoning provisions under the Planning Act. The implementation of inclusionary zoning would be carried out by the area municipalities.
	Concern that building 30% affordable housing will make projects less profitable and discourage more housing	The ROP provides general direction on range and mix of housing, and addresses the Province's direction on the provision of affordable housing.
	Concern that there will be neighbourhood resistance to inclusionary zoning	The full implementation of inclusionary zoning will occur at the area municipal level, so cities and townships will lead engagement of their communities on potential implementation.
missing middle	Support for missing middle and housing affordability policies [multiple comments]	Given the current state of the housing market, we think there is a lot of incentive to build new missing middle housing in this marketplace. Missing middle policies in the proposed amendment aim to make it easier to build gentle density across the
	Interest in allowing four storeys with four units on properties accommodating one unit	

	<p>Concern that low-rise residential zoning in low-rise residential areas is exclusionary and limits the provision of housing</p>	<p>Region, particularly where we have the opportunity to add housing in areas that are already well-supported by transit and with strong access to amenities. The amendment provides direction to the area municipalities to update their official plans and zoning by-laws permit missing middle housing on a residential lot. The ability to accommodate more density at a smaller scale, in a way that contributes to the existing neighbourhood, is critical for increasing the supply and affordability of housing.</p>
	<p>Concern that public opposition decreases the amount of housing being built in specific proposals</p>	
	<p>Concern about pushback from developers and single family homeowners who don't want duplexes etc. built in existing single family home neighbourhoods.</p>	
	<p>Interest in ways to incentivize higher density in lower density areas</p>	
condominiums	<p>Interest in breakdown of rental units vs. condos</p>	<p>While the Regional Official Plan does not dictate the ownership model of new housing, the Region does monitor and play an approval role in the creation of new condominiums.</p>
relationship between land supply and housing affordability	<p>Concern that Ontario will need to build 2.6 million homes by 2030 to make housing affordable</p>	<p>There has been considerable discussion on the relationship between land supply and housing affordability. The Regions approach to growth follows the specific steps set out in the LNA methodology to ensure adequate land has been allocated to accommodate the forecasted</p>
	<p>Concern that opening significant new lands for urban development will not increase housing supply or affordability</p>	

	<p>Concern that land developers and investors have an economic incentive to limit the amount of housing they supply to maintain high prices</p>	<p>population to 2051. The Region already has 2,750 ha of available land for residential development. The ROP is a guiding land use planning document, which ensures a range and mix of housing options can be provided to meet the needs of the community.</p>
	<p>Concern about renoviction, where property upgrades are used to get rid of tenants and increase rents</p>	<p>The proposed ROP amendment contains policies to help protect the supply of rental housing from conversions to condominiums, which may help alleviate some of the factors leading to “renovictions”. Part of the solution to this issue involves strengthening the Province’s existing legislation regarding rental housing.</p>

affordable housing definition	Interest in the definition of "affordable" housing [multiple comments]	There is a full continuum of housing needs, and affordability means different things to different people. We use the Provincial definition of affordable housing. In the case of ownership housing, it is the least expensive of housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30% of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households or housing for which the purchase price is at least 10% below the average price of a resale unit in the Regional market area. We calculate what that threshold is for each development based on income levels and market rates at that time.
	Support for definition of affordable housing that includes income, not just market average	We recognize and agree that determining affordability levels on the basis of average market rates is a challenge. This challenge stems in part from the policy direction outlined in the Provincial Policy Statement.
implementation and enforcement	Concern regarding implementation and that proposed policies and design standards will not be enforced or implemented	The proposed amendment seeks to strengthen the Region's planning framework and provide clearer direction to build 15-minute neighbourhoods. Providing clearer policy direction will help alleviate

		issues related to enforcement and implementation.
--	--	---

Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Feedback on Agriculture and Protection of Farmlands

Theme	Feedback	High-Level Response
farmland loss	Support for minimizing farmland loss	Recognizing the importance of farmland, the proposed amendment reflects the lowest feasible expansion for community area under Provincial requirements, and also uses an ambitious intensification target for employment areas, to minimize expansion and the loss of farmland.
	Support for recommended option and/or amendment due to less expansion over farmland [multiple comments]	
	Support for amendment because of non-renewable farmland resources	
food security	Support for the protection of agricultural land for its contribution to global food security	Policies to maintain farmland and support the agricultural industry and local food security are maintained in the proposed amendment. New policies in Chapter 2 requiring the development of 15-minute neighbourhoods also help to strengthen the region's food system by supporting greater access to local, healthy and affordable food, and by providing good access to local grocery stores and community gardens.
	Support for the protection of agricultural land and long-term local food supply resiliency [multiple comments]*	

prioritization of farmland	Concern that farmland in the townships is more important than in Southwest Kitchener where there are no viable family farms, and should be preserved	The recommended expansion areas have been identified in alignment with Provincial policy guiding expansions.
agricultural practices	Suggestions for farming approaches that improve productivity, biodiversity, carbon storage, and flood management	While the Regional Official Plan only provides high-level policy guidance on land use planning within the region, the Region continues to engage with community partners on environmental opportunities and priorities, including with the agricultural industry.

Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Feedback on Mobility, Transit, and Infrastructure

Theme	Feedback	High-Level Response
wastewater	Interest in details of sanitary sewer infrastructure and capacity in Breslau, and the schedule of future road widenings and expansions	Wastewater and transportation infrastructure provided by the Region is guided by its master plans. The Regional Transportation Master Plan will be updated soon, and public engagement will occur as part of that process. More information on sanitary sewer capacity in Breslau can be found by contacting the Township of Woolwich.
cost	Interest in whether property taxes from new development will fully cover the lifecycle of infrastructure required to support them	A Growth Options Infrastructure Review and Class D Cost Estimates brief as well as a Fiscal Considerations memo has been prepared and were attached to PDL-CPL-22-21. PDL-CPL-22-24 provides



		a summary of the financial implications.
Transit Oriented Development	Support for Transit Oriented Development	Transit Oriented Development policies in the draft amendment have been maintained in the proposed amendment.
overcoming car dependency	Support for neighbourhood amenities to allow living without a car	<p>The proposed Amendment lays the groundwork for how existing residential communities can be 'retrofitted' to support easier access to services and retail stores to meet residents' daily needs, which will need to be further detailed through planning at the local level in each of the Townships and Cities in the Region. This would be a gradual process, and could be achieved through Secondary Plans and other local planning processes to create the right conditions to encourage and support a range of uses in existing residential neighbourhoods.</p> <p>As outlined in the TransformWR community climate action strategy, to meet the community's goals for climate change and energy perspective as well as in terms of equity and liveability, we need to get</p>
	Concerns that inadequate frequency of transit will continue car dependence	
	Concern that 15-minute neighbourhoods definition is not clear that it is intended to reduce car dependency, and that these neighbourhoods will continue to be scaled to the car	
	Interest in tools to reduce traffic and encourage active transportation and transit, including separated cycling infrastructure and tools to discourage theft, and consideration of car-free downtown streets	
	Support for diverse mobility solutions that meet the needs of all residents	

	<p>Concern about implementation of 15-minute neighbourhoods and tools available to ensure communities are walkable [multiple comments]</p>	<p>to a place where most of our trips are taken using active transportation (walking, cycling, and rolling). There is a lot more work coming to transportation infrastructure as the Region gears up to revise the Transportation Master Plan, which will consider these issues in greater detail including specific routes and transportation corridors. We are thinking about how to make it as easy and appealing as possible for people of all ages and abilities to walk, cycle, or roll as a key part of their mobility, and to live robust lives without needing multiple vehicles per household.</p> <p>The Region as well as all local governments in the region have been working on improving active transportation networks and connections, and will continue to prioritize a reduction in car dependency and provide support to increase transit ridership but also consider all the different ways people could and want to move in our local communities.</p>
--	--	---

parking	Concern that the amendment does not adequately address the need to reduce parking and convert existing parking into more efficient land uses	While there are some policies related to parking reduction in the proposed amendment, parking will be one element that area municipalities will address through their Official Plans, in order to meet the objectives highlighted in the Regional Official Plan.
infrastructure for walking, cycling, and rolling (active transportation)	General support for protected bike lanes, more comprehensive connections to ION stations, and more transit with dedicated rights of way	While there are many policies pertaining to these areas in the proposed amendment, more complete consideration of these areas will be covered in the mobility and infrastructure policies that are being reviewed as part of the second phase of the Regional Official Plan Review, as well as the upcoming review of the Regional Transportation Master Plan.
transit service	Support for Stage 2 and Stage 3 ION [multiple comments, some with routing suggestions]	Transit supportive policies, including policies related to future ION stages, are included in the proposed amendment. Transit service will be an important policy area for the upcoming review of the Regional Transportation Master Plan, as well.
	Interest in a park and ride at the North end of the ION line	
	Request to create an integrated regional transit system that connects with Guelph and Brantford	

Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Feedback on Natural Environment and Groundwater Resources

Theme	Feedback	High-Level Response
Indigenous	Concern for attention to Indigenous concerns, such as funding for education, permanent structures, and monuments	The amendment includes a land acknowledgement, and speaks to the Region's commitment to relationship building, engagement and reconciliation. Language has also been included that acknowledges Aboriginal and treaty rights, Indigenous peoples unique relationship with the land, the value of indigenous perspective, and unique role in growth and development of the region.
groundwater	General concern for improved groundwater stewardship	Policies protecting groundwater are continued in the proposed amendment. More detailed consideration of water provision is expected to be included in the second phase of the ROP Review.
Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes	Support for Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes	Policies protecting Environmentally Sensitive Landscapes have not been altered as part of the proposed amendment.
remediation	Interest in mitigation plans and policies for when lands with trees, ecosystems, and habitat have been disturbed	Current ROP policies require the conservation of natural heritage resources through avoidance and mitigation measures. The updates to

	Concern for how the impact of new development be managed, in terms of net gain vs. net loss of trees and natural spaces	natural heritage policies undertaken in a future amendment will consider opportunities to conserve natural heritage resources at a system-wide level.
advocacy priorities	Concern for whether the Region will take a holistic approach to environmental stewardship and consider which types of projects it advocates for, such as highways vs. transit or more environmental protection	The amendment's intensification first approach prioritizes compact and efficient development, which also minimizes potential impacts from urban expansion.
general policy interest	Interest in the kinds of environmental policies included in the draft amendment	A variety of environmental policies are addressed in the proposed amendment, as outlined in Part 1 of this document.
areas for further policy development	Concern that there is not enough attention to the conservation of forests, wetlands, and ecological services in the amendment	The Regional Official Plan provides high-level direction on land use across the region, and guides the development of area municipal plans. Opportunities for additional high-level direction on environmental policy areas will arise as part of the second phase of the ROP Review. Beyond the ROP, the Region continues to work with diverse community partners to advance the health of ecosystems and our natural environment.
	Request to use an ecosystem approach	
	Request for policies to protect birch and/or pollinators	
	Support for landscaping using pollinator gardens, less cement, etc.	

	Request for moratorium on new golf courses to keep existing natural areas for people and wildlife [multiple comments]	
--	---	--

#### Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Feedback on Economic Development

Theme	Feedback	High-Level Response
employment lands in 15-minute neighbourhoods	Interest in how employment land fits into 15-minute neighbourhoods, given heavier industrial use	There are different types of employment. While there is industry and factory-related employment, there is also a variety of community-related employment which can include shops, schools, and other jobs that serve the local community, as well as office-located jobs. We think there are opportunities for a better balance of people living and working in one area.
planning for employment lands	Support for densification of existing employment lands	The proposed amendment promotes intensification of employment areas.
	Request to be bolder with employment lands	
rural employment lands	Request for more clear policies restricting servicing in rural employment area and ensuring they support rural settlement areas	The Region will be reviewing its policies related to rural employment areas as part of phase two of the ROP review. This work will be done in conjunction with the review of the Region's agricultural policies contained in Chapter of the ROP. A key objective will be to continue supporting the vitality of rural

		settlement areas in each of the Region's four townships.
site-specific employment lands	Desire to confirm that that the residential enclave NW of Fountain and Allendale will not be Urban Employment Area and PSEZ	A full list of individual responses to site-specific requests and questions is included in Appendix B.
	Request for information on the status of the request for Employment Area conversion of 200 Holiday Inn Drive	

### Conclusion

The Region sincerely appreciates all of the sustained engagement from the community, as well as stakeholders, throughout the process to arrive at the proposed amendment. Further engagement will occur throughout the process of the second ROP amendment throughout the fall of 2022 and winter of 2023.

### List of Appendices

**Appendix A: List of meetings**

**Appendix B: Responses to Site Specific Comments**

**Appendix A – List of Meetings**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Group/Event/Agency/Area Municipality</b>
31-Oct-2018	City of Cambridge Staff
14-Jan-2019	PDLS Management Forum Workshop
15-Jan-2019	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
21-Feb-2019	Meeting with Housing Staff
26-Feb-2019	ROPR and Subwatershed Planning
15-May-2019	ROPR with SMT
22-May-2019	Meeting with Branthaven Homes
04-Jun-2019	Meeting with Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing re: Rural Settlements
12-Jun-2019	Area Municipal Working Group
27-Jun-2019	City of Kitchener Staff - MTSA's and Neighbourhood Planning Review
18-Jul-2019	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
25-Jul-2019	City of Waterloo Staff - MTSA's
18-Sep-2019	Special Council meeting to initiate the ROP Review
09-Oct-2019	Meeting with Councillor Harris re: ROPR
10-Oct-2019	Meeting with Prica Global Enterprises
24-Oct-2019	City of Kitchener Staff - MTSA Workshop
15-Nov-2019	ROPR Presentation to IBI Group
29-Oct-2019	Joint Area Municipal Working Group/Technical Committee
18-Nov-2019	Kitchener Public Open House
26-Nov-2019	Meeting with Six Nations of the Grand River
27-Nov-2019	Cambridge Public Open House
28-Nov-2019	Wilmot Public Open House
03-Dec-2019	City of Cambridge Staff - MTSA Workshop
04-Dec-2019	Woolwich Public Open House
16-Dec-2019	Six Nations of the Grand River and Regional Official Plan Review
05-Jan-2020	North Dumfries Mayor's Levee
08-Jan-2020	City of Waterloo Staff
14-Jan-2020	City of Kitchener Staff
23-Jan-2020	Stakeholder Committee
08-Feb-2020	Housing Workshop with the Area Municipalities
13-Feb-2020	HPAC meeting - presentation
18-Feb-2020	ATAC meeting - presentation
24-Feb-2020	MTSA meeting with Kitchener, Cambridge and Waterloo
25-Feb-2020	Neighbourhood Planning Association Presentation
05-Mar-2020	Meeting with Lion's Mane Development
06-Mar-2020	Meet with Jean Haalboom re: heritage
12-Mar-2020	ROPR Presentation to MHBC
28-Apr-2020	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting



30-Apr-2020	ROPR with SGL Consulting, and IBI Group
12-May-2020	Meeting with the Citizens for Safe Groundwater
28-May-2020	Technical Team Meeting
09-Jun-2020	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
15-Jun-2020	Steering Committee Meeting
24-Jun-2020	Meeting re: 1700 Kramp Road with Robert Walters
25-Jun-2020	Ask-a-Planner Webinar
13-Jul-2020	KW Real Estate Board
16-Jul-2020	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting re: Climate Change
06-Aug-2020	Meeting with PVDG
18-Aug-2020	University of Waterloo Virtual Research Symposium
25-Aug-2020	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting re: Climate Change
01-Sep-2020	Meeting with Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation
11-Sep-2020	Meeting with the Waterloo Region District School Board
16-Sep-2020	Meeting and Presentation with Six Nations of the Grand River
17-Sep-2020	ROP Review Update Meeting with Six Nations of the Grand River
01-Dec-2020	Steering Committee Meeting
02-Dec-2020	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
03-Dec-2020	Technical Team Meeting
08-Jan-2021	Employment Conversion Cambridge Meeting
11-Jan-2021	Employment Conversion Waterloo Meeting
13-Jan-2021	Employment Conversion North Dumfries Meeting
13-Jan-2021	Employment Conversion Wellesley Meeting
14-Jan-2021	Employment Conversion Woolwich Meeting
15-Jan-2021	Employment Conversion Kitchener Meeting
15-Jan-2021	Employment Conversion Wilmot Meeting
20-Jan-2021	City of Kitchener Staff - MTSAs
21-Jan-2021	Meeting with Wellesley Staff
21-Jan-2021	Meeting with Paul Britton (MHBC)
23-Jan-2021	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
01-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Cam-15)
01-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Wat-3)
01-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Cam-9)
02-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Kit-1)
02-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Cam-5)
03-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Wat-6)
03-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Cam-13)
03-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (NDu-1)
04-Feb-2021	Meeting With MHBC (Activa) - SKPA
04-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Cambridge Meeting
05-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Wil-3)
05-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Waterloo Meeting
07-Feb-2021	Area Municipal Working Group Housing Workshop

09-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Wat-13)
10-Feb-2021	Samantha Lernout
10-Feb-2021	Meeting with Six Nations of the Grand River
11-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Wat-12)
11-Feb-2021	Area Municipal Working Group and Technical Team Meeting
12-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Wat-11)
12-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Wat-9)
16-Feb-2021	Meeting with University of Waterloo - Employment Area
18-Feb-2021	Active Transportation Advisory Committee meeting
18-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Wat-4)
19-Feb-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Cam-8)
22-Feb-2021	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
23-Feb-2021	Steering Committee Meeting
26-Feb-2021	Meeting with Woolwich Staff - Employment Area
03-Mar-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent Meeting (Cam-8)
16-Mar-2021	Active Transportation Advisory Committee - Climate Change Presentation
30-Mar-2021	Meeting with Kitchener Staff - Employment Area
06-Apr-2021	Cambridge Council Employment Workshop
06-Apr-2021	Technical Team Meeting
08-Apr-2021	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting
13-Apr-2021	Cambridge Council ROP Education Session
15-Apr-2021	Meeting with IBI Group - Employment Area
19-Apr-2021	Meeting With MHBC - MTSA Request
20-Apr-2021	Committee of the Whole - Draft MTSA and Regional Employment Area
27-Apr-2021	Steering Committee Meeting
28-Apr-2021	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
29-Apr-2021	Meeting with City of Kitchener Staff - MTSA
12-May-2021	Employment Conversion Meeting City of Waterloo Staff
17-May-2021	Meeting with Grambian - SKPA
31-May-2021	Meeting with Stantec - STROH
04-Jun-2021	Meeting with Kitchener Wilmot Hydro, Waterloo North Hydro, and Kitchener Utilities
10-Jun-2021	Committee of the Whole - Growth Scenarios Evaluation Criteria
16-Jun-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent
24-Jun-2021	Ask-a-Planner Webinar
24-Jun-2021	Regional Official Plan Review Update with Six Nations of the Grand River
24-Jun-2021	City of Kitchener Staff - Urban Boundary Expansion Requests
28-Jun-2021	Township of North Dumfries Staff Regional OP Update / Land Budget
30-Jun-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent
09-Aug-2021	Regional Official Plan Review Update with Regional Chair

12-Aug-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent
17-Aug-2021	Meeting with YIMBY - Growth Scenarios
18-Aug-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent
31-Aug-2021	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting
09-Sep-2021	Meeting with Wilmot Staff - Settlement Expansion Request
14-Sep-2021	Meeting with Kitchener Staff
14-Sep-2021	Meeting with Kitchener Staff and Activa - SKPA
20-Sep-2021	Meeting with Children's Planning Table - Planning for Children in the ROP
21-Sep-2021	Meeting with Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
22-Sep-2021	Meeting with Kitchener Economic Development Advisory Committee
24-Sep-2021	Meeting with Woolwich Staff - Employment Area
27-Sep-2021	Meeting with Waterloo Staff
30-Sep-2021	Meeting with Waterloo Region District School Board
05-Oct-2021	Regional Official Plan Review Update Meeting with Six Nations of the Grand River
12-Oct-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent - MHBC
14-Oct-2021	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting
15-Oct-2021	Technical Team Meeting
18-Oct-2021	Steering Committee Meeting
18-Oct-2021	Regional Official Plan Review Update Meeting with Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation
19-Oct-2021	Meeting with Cachet Developments
19-Oct-2021	Employment Conversion Proponent
20-Oct-2021	Meeting with Grand River Conservation Authority
21-Oct-2021	Meeting with Woolwich Staff and Polocorp
22-Oct-2021	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
25-Oct-2021	ROPR Growth Scenarios Follow-up - Wilmot Staff
26-Oct-2021	ROPR Growth Scenarios Follow-up - Woolwich Staff
27-Oct-2021	Meeting with Kitchener, Cambridge and Waterloo Staff - MTSA and REA
28-Oct-2021	ROPR Growth Scenarios Follow-up - Wellesley
28-Oct-2021	ROPR Growth Scenarios Follow-up - Kitchener
01-Nov-2021	ROPR Growth Scenarios Follow-up - North Dumfries
03-Nov-2021	ROPR Growth Scenarios Follow-up - Cambridge
04-Nov-2021	ROPR Growth Scenarios Follow-up - Waterloo
08-Nov-2021	Regional Official Plan Review Update Meeting with Six Nations of the Grand River
09-Nov-2021	Committee of the Whole - Preferred Growth Scenario
15-Nov-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Wilmot
16-Nov-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Woolwich
16-Nov-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Wellesley
17-Nov-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Kitchener
18-Nov-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Cambridge

18-Nov-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Waterloo
24-Nov-2021	Meeting with MHBC - Paul Britton
29-Nov-2021	Steering Committee Meeting
29-Nov-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Wilmot
30-Nov-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Woolwich
30-Nov-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Wellesley
01-Dec-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Kitchener
02-Dec-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Cambridge
02-Dec-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Waterloo
14-Dec-2021	ROPR Biweekly - Woolwich
15-Dec-2021	Committee of the Whole - Revised Growth Scenario
12-Jan-2022	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting
25-Jan-2022	Meeting with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
25-Jan-2022	Meeting with the Kitchener Waterloo Association of Realtors
01-Feb-2022	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting
10-Feb-2022	Meeting with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
14-Feb-2022	North Dumfries Staff - Vision and Opportunities in the ROP
14-Feb-2022	Meeting with City of Kitchener Staff - ROP Review and Zoning By-law
14-Feb-2022	Technical Team Meeting
15-Feb-2022	Steering Committee Meeting
15-Feb-2022	Active Transportation Advisory Committee meeting
17-Feb-2022	Meeting with Area Municipal Economic Development Offices
22-Feb-2022	Meeting with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
23-Feb-2022	Meeting with MHBC - Paul Britton
28-Feb-2022	Meeting with Woolwich Staff - Vision and Opportunities in the ROP
01-Mar-2022	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting
07-Mar-2022	Meeting with Wellesley Staff - Vision and Opportunities in the ROP
08-Mar-2022	Meeting with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
10-Mar-2022	Meeting with MHBC - Paul Britton
10-Mar-2022	Meeting with Waterloo Staff - vision and opportunities in the ROP
11-Mar-2022	Meeting with Wilmot Staff - Vision and Opportunities in the ROP
11-Mar-2022	Steering Committee Meeting
21-Mar-2022	Meeting with Cambridge Staff - vision and opportunities in the ROP
22-Mar-2022	Meeting with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
28-Mar-2022	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
29-Mar-2022	North Dumfries Staff - Vision and Opportunities in the ROP
29-Mar-2022	LNA Results Presentation - Woolwich
30-Mar-2022	LNA Results Presentation - Kitchener
31-Mar-2022	LNA Results Presentation - Wilmont
31-Mar-2022	Steering Committee Meeting
01-Apr-2022	LNA Results Presentation - Wilmont
04-Apr-2022	LNA Results Presentation - Cambridge

05-Apr-2022	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting
05-Apr-2022	Meeting with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
06-Apr-2022	LNA Results Presentation - North Dumfries
06-Apr-2022	LNA Results Presentation - Waterloo
06-Apr-2022	LNA Results Presentation - Wellesley
12-Apr-2022	Committee of the Whole - Draft Growth Options
20-Apr-2022	Meeting with the Waterloo Region Homebuilders Association
20-Apr-2022	LNA Follow Up - North Dumfries
21-Apr-2022	LNA Follow Up - Wilmot
22-Apr-2022	LNA Follow Up - Wilmot
22-Apr-2022	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
22-Apr-2022	LNA Virtual Public Engagement Session 1
25-Apr-2022	LNA Virtual Public Engagement Session 2
26-Apr-2022	Steering Committee Meeting
26-Apr-2022	LNA Follow Up - Kitchener
27-Apr-2022	LNA Follow Up - Waterloo
27-Apr-2022	LNA Follow Up - Woolwich
29-Apr-2022	LNA All Council Meeting
03-May-2022	Meeting with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
03-May-2022	LNA Follow Up - Cambridge
05-May-2022	LNA Follow Up - Woolwich
05-May-2022	LNA Follow Up - Wellesley
05-May-2022	Meeting with the Kitchener Waterloo Real Estate Association
05-May-2022	Meeting with the Grand River Conservation Authority - LNA Growth Options
10-May-2022	LNA Follow Up - Woolwich
10-May-2022	LNA Follow Up - Cambridge
12-May-2022	LNA Follow Up - Kitchener
16-May-2022	LNA Follow Up - North Dumfries
17-May-2022	Meeting with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
17-May-2022	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting
17-May-2022	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
17-May-2022	Meeting with MHBC - Paul Britton
24-May-2022	Wellesley Council Meeting on the Growth Options
24-May-2022	Cambridge Council Information Session on the Growth Options
27-May-2022	Meeting with WRYIMBY - LNA Growth Options
30-May-2022	Meeting with the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation
30-May-2022	Kitchener Council Meeting on the Growth Options
30-May-2022	Wilmot Council Meeting on the Growth Options
31-May-2022	Steering Committee Meeting
31-May-2022	Meeting with Community Members that Submitted Option 4
01-Jun-2022	LNA Meeting with MHBC, Altus, and Activa
01-Jun-2022	Draft ROP policies with Township Planners

02-Jun-2022	Planning Heads and CAO's Meeting - LNA
03-Jun-2022	LNA Meeting with Schlegel, MGP, IBI
03-Jun-2022	Meeting with Kitchener Residents and Councillor Marsh – MTSA's
06-Jun-2022	ROP Update with Six Nations of the Grand River
06-Jun-2022	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
06-Jun-2022	Woolwich Council Meeting on the Growth Options
07-Jun-2022	Wellesley Council Meeting on the Growth Options
10-Jun-2022	LNA Meeting with Schlegel, MGP, IBI
13-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Kitchener
13-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - North Dumfries
13-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Woolwich
13-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Wellesley
13-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Wilmot
13-Jun-2022	Waterloo Council Meeting on the Growth Options
14-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Cambridge
14-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Woolwich
14-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up – North Dumfries
17-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Wellesley
17-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Wilmot
21-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up – North Dumfries
21-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Wellesley
22-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Wellesley
23-Jun-2022	LNA Follow Up - Wellesley
27-Jun-2022	LNA Meeting with Metis Council of Ontario
27-Jun-2022	ROPR Stakeholder Committee Meeting
28-Jun-2022	Planning Heads and CAO's meeting
28-Jun-2022	ROP Media Briefing
28-Jun-2022	Meeting with Six Nations of the Grand River
29-Jun-2022	Planning and Works Public Input - Regional Official Plan and Special Council
05-Jul-2022	Meeting with the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation
05-Jul-2022	Area Municipal Working Group Meeting
06-Jul-2022	Meeting with Mike Doherty
06-Jul-2022	ROP Virtual Public Open House
12-Jul-2022	Urban Expansion Meeting - Caroline Baker
13-Jul-2022	ROP Open House - Wilmot Recreation Centre
13-Jul-2022	ROP Open House - Wilmot Recreation Centre
14-Jul-2022	Meeting with Schlegel Urban Developments
14-Jul-2022	ROP Virtual Public Open House
14-Jul-2022	Planning Heads and CAO's meeting
14-Jul-2022	Technical Team Meeting
15-Jul-2022	City of Kitchener Staff
15-Jul-2022	Planning Heads Meeting

18-Jul-2022	City of Kitchener Council Meeting - Recommended Approach to Growth
19-Jul-2022	Public Open House (in-person) - 150 Frederick
19-Jul-2022	Meeting with Dryden Smith and Head (urban expansion proponent)
20-Jul-2022	Stakeholder Committee Meeting
20-Jul-2022	Meeting with North Dumfries
20-Jul-2022	Meeting with Wellesley
20-Jul-2022	Meeting with Cambridge
21-Jul-2022	Meeting with MHBC
21-Jul-2022	Meeting with Stovel and Associates (Green Horizons)
21-Jul-2022	Meeting with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
21-Jul-2022	Meeting with Intermarket
21-Jul-2022	Meeting with Wellesley
22-Jul-2022	Meeting with Wellesley
22-Jul-2022	Meeting with Cambridge
25-Jul-2022	Meeting with Jess Dixon - MPP - Kitchener South Hespeler
25-Jul-2022	Meeting with Polocorp and Woolwich Staff
26-Jul-2022	Meeting with Cambridge
26-Jul-2022	Meeting with Branthaven - Urban Expansion
27-Jul-2022	ROP Amendment Statutory Public Meeting
02-Aug-2022	Meeting with Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)
02-Aug-2022	Meeting with Woolwich
02-Aug-2022	Meeting with Wilmot
03-Aug-2022	Meeting with Kitchener
03-Aug-2022	Meeting with Cambridge
03-Aug-2022	Meeting with Waterloo
03-Aug-2022	Meeting with Wellesley

## Appendix B: Responses to Site Specific Comments

### Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Requests

Ref #	Date	Name and Organization	Municipality	Comment Summary	Staff Response
S-1	2019-11-29	Joseph Puopolo Resident/Owner	Cambridge	Request for 850 Riverbank Dr. to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-2	2021-08-26	Trevor Hawkins MHBC	Cambridge	Request for 250 Allendale Rd to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area. These lands remain subject to the ROPA 2 appeal.
S-3	2021-08-26	Trevor Hawkins MHBC	Cambridge	Request for 245 Riverbank Dr. to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area. These lands remain subject to the ROPA 2 appeal.
S-4	2021-08-27	Brandon Flewwelling GSP	Cambridge	Request for 3.2 ha at the Northwest corner of Hespeler Rd and Maple Grove Rd to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-5		Roger Roedding	Cambridge	Request for 0 Old Mill Rd to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.



S-6	2019-09-13	Colin Chung Glen Schnarr and Associates (Branthaven Homes)	Kitchener	Request for 2118 New Dundee Rd to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-7	2021-07-19	Paul Britton MHBC (Activa)	Kitchener	Request for Activa’s Holdings in Southwest Kitchener to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-8	2019-09-18	Vaughn Bender Schlegel Urban Developments	Kitchener	Request for Schlegel Urban Developments Holdings on New Dundee Rd in Southwest Kitchener to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-9	2021-07-29	Jonathan Rodger Zelinka Priamo LTD (Grambian Investments)	Kitchener	Request for 82.5 ha located at 271 Reidel Dr. in Southwest Kitchener to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-10	2020-09-09	Paul Lowes SGL (Mattamy Homes)	Kitchener	Request for Mattamy Homes lands south of Bleams Road and west of Fischer-Hallman Road just south of the urban boundary to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-11	2019-09-18	Vaughn Bender Schlegel Urban Developments	Kitchener	Request for Schlegel Urban Developments Holdings at 236 Gehl PI to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-12	2021-05-12	Paul Puopolo Polocorp (Silvestri)	Township of North Dumfries	Request for Silvestri Investments Limited Holdings located at Branchton Rd. and north of the	These lands are subject to policy 2.B.3 k and policy 2.D.32 of the ROP and Special Policy

		Investments Limited)		South Boundary Road to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	Area 2.1.4.1 of the Township of North Dumfries Official Plan and are recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.
S-13	2021-06-07	Brandon Flewwelling, GSP (Activa)	Township of North Dumfries	Request for Activa's Holdings located at 1470 Dundas St to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area	These lands are subject to policy 2.B.3 k and policy 2.D.32 of the ROP and Special Policy Area 2.1.4.1 of the Township of North Dumfries Official Plan and are recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.
S-14	2020-11-17	Douglas W. Stewart IBI (Ballantyne)	Township of North Dumfries	Request for land located at the Northwest corner of Swan St and Brant Waterloo Rd to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	A portion of the lands (19 hectares) located on the easterly side of the property, adjacent to the existing urban area are recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.
S-15	2020-11-17	Douglas W. Stewart IBI (Rick Elliot)	Township of North Dumfries	Request for land located at the Northeast corner of Nith Rd and Brant Waterloo Rd to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-16	2019-11-26	Paul Puopolo Polocorp (Breslau Properties)	Township of Woolwich	Request to add two parcels, one is located on the east side of Fountain Street, south of the CN rail tracks, the other is on the western side of	The lands on the east side of Fountain Street, south of the CN rail tracks are recommended to be included in

				Fountain Street, south of the future Ottawa Street extension and east of a Provincially Significant Wetland. These lands have been requested for Community Area by Polocorp (Breslau Properties). The same lands have been requested by the Township of Woolwich.	the Urban Area for Community Area. The lands on the west side of Fountain Street, south of the future Ottawa Street extension are recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-17	2020-10-23	Hardy Bromberg	Township of North Dumfries	Request for land located at 2772 Greenfield Rd to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-18	2021-06-22	Paul Puopolo (Polocorp)	Township of North Dumfries	Request for land located at 1678 and 1688 Morrison Rd to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-19	2021-08-26	Brandon Flewwelling (GSP)	Township of North Dumfries	Request for land located at Lot 2, Concession 9, EGR, (HWY 24) to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-20	2019-07-19	Township of Wellesley	Township of Wellesley	Resolution from Wellesley Council (OPA - 01-17 – Rationalization - Resolution No. 109) regarding the rationalization of the lands from Rural Settlement areas as part of the MCR.	The request is recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.
S-21	2021-06-01	Greg Romanick Stantec	Township of Wellesley	Request for 5.86 Ha of land located on the North Side of Gerber Rd to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.

S-22	2021-01-20	Steve Wever GSP	Township of Wellesley	Request for lands located at 1309 Greenwood Hill Rd to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.
S-23	2021/05/16	Matthew Warzecha (Polocorp)	Township of Woolwich	Request for lands located at 51 Hawkesville Rd. St. Jacobs to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-24	2019-07-19	Township of Wellesley	Township of Wellesley	Request for lands located at the northeast corner of Gerber Rd and Greenwood Hill Rd to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	A portion (6.1 ha) of the requested lands are recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.
S-25	2021-03-29	Paul Britton MHBC	Township of Wilmot	Request for lands located at 1056, 1149 Snyder's Rd and 1455 Nafziger Rd. Wilmot to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	A portion of the requested lands located at 1149 Snyder's Rd W south of Sir Adam Beck Public School and west of the Baden Township Urban Area are recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.
S-26	2021-08-28	Paul Britton MHBC	Township of Wilmot	Further justification for the request (S-25) for lands located at 1149 Snyder's Rd and 1455 Nafziger Rd. Wilmot to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	See response to S-25
S-27	2021-08-06	Sheila Wiebe	Township of Wilmot	Request for lands located at 1056 Snyder's Rd Wilmot to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.

S-28	2021-03-10	David Falleta Bousfields (Cachet Development Partners Inc.)	Township of Wilmot	Request for lands located at 1265 and 1299 Waterloo St Wilmot to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.  Request for the portion of the lands located south of the Ivan Gingerich drain to be included in the Township Urban Area for Employment Area.	A portion of the requested lands for Community Area north of the Ivan Gingerich drain is recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.  The lands located south of the Ivan Gingerich drain are recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-29	2020-10-20	Carol Wiebe MHBC (Carey Homes)	Township of Wilmot	Request for lands located at 1145 Christner Rd Wilmot to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-30	2021-06-21	John Lowater	Township of Wilmot	Request for lands located at 1291 Christner Rd Wilmot to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-31	2020-09-02	Hugh Handy GSP	Township of Woolwich	Request for lands located on the East side of St. Jacobs north of Hawkesville Rd. to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-32	2020-01-27	Don Kenesky	Township of Woolwich	Request for 5.9 hectares located at 55 Spring Street to be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	5.9 hectares of these lands have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-33	2021-06-08	Megan Gereghty	Township of Woolwich	Request for 17.06 hectare parcel of land north of Highway 7/Victoria Street North, west of Greenhouse	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.

		GSP (Thomasfield Homes)		Road to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	
S-34	2021-06-08	Robert Walters Weston Consulting (Lions Mane Ministry)	Township of Woolwich	Request for 13.7 Ha located at 1700 Kramp Rd to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-35	2021-04-16	Paul Grespan McCarter Grespan Lawyers	Township of Woolwich	Request for the lands that are bounded by the future Ottawa Street to the north, the Grand river to the west and the Built-Up Area to the east to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-36	2021-07-12	Liviu Cananau BLG	Township of Woolwich	Request for the lands located at 1085 Wurster Place to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-37	2021-07-09	Megan Geregthy GSP (Thomasfield Homes and Fieldgate Developments)	Township of Woolwich	Request for two parcels of land totaling 12.1 hectares North of the intersection of Highway 7/Victoria Street North and Fountain Street North to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	These lands have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Community Area.
S-38	2022-02-02	Rick and Nancy Pereira	Township of Woolwich	Request for 12 Ha of land located on Kramp Rd (Tract German Company PT LOT 105) to be included in the Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-39	2021-08-09	Sam Head Dryden Smith and Head	Township of Woolwich	Request that lands located at 13 and 14 Kraft Dr be redesigned to a use other than Prime Agricultural.	This request will be considered through the second amendment of the ROP review process.

S-40	2018-10-09	Sam Head Dryden Smith and Head	Township of Woolwich	Request for 165 and 208 Bloomingdale Rd to be included in the Urban Area or Settlement Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-41			Township of Woolwich	Request for 55 acres located at 1020 old Scout place, St. Jacobs be included in the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-42	2021-06-08	Brandon Flewwelling GSP	Cambridge	Request for land located at 4650 Fountain Street North be included in the Urban Area for Employment Area.  The lands south of Fairway road have been requested for Community Area.	The lands on the north side of Fairway Road have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.  The lands on the south side of Fairway road remain subject to the ROPA 2 appeal.
S-43	2021-06-22	Dan Currie MHBC	Cambridge	Request for land located at the southeast corner of Kossuth Road and Fountain Street North be included in the Urban Area for Employment Area .	These lands have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-44	2022-01-19	Peter Smith Bousfields	Cambridge	Request for land located at 0-355 Chilligo Road and 0 Fisher Mills Road to be included in the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-45	2021-08-25	Brandon Flewwelling GSP	Township of North Dumfries	Request to add 41.6 ha of land located along Northumberland Street / Cedar Creek Road west of the existing Highway 401/97 Employment Area to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.

S-46	2020-12-28	Township of North Dumfries	Township of North Dumfries	Request to include land located at 2407 Cedar Creek Rd in the HWY 401 and Regional Rd 97 Employment Area.	These lands have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-47	2020-12-28	Township of North Dumfries	Township of North Dumfries	Request to include 20.8 Ha of land located at 1128 Rife Rd in the HWY 401 and Regional Rd 97 Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-48	2021-08-27	Steven Jefferson K. Smart Associates Limited	Township of North Dumfries	Request to include land located at 1580 Edworthy Sideroad, in the Urban Area for Employment Area.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-49		Township of North Dumfries	Township of North Dumfries	Request to include 38.4 Ha of land located South of HWY 401 and East of Reidsville Rd in the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-50		Township of North Dumfries	Township of North Dumfries	Request to include 29.6 Ha of land located Cedar Creek Road – East of CP Rail Corridor in the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-51		Township of North Dumfries	Township of North Dumfries	Request to include land located along the Northumberland Corridor North of Ayr, in the Urban Area for Employment Area. The township has also requested to add the Greenfield Mill property to the Greenfield Settlement area.	A portion of the lands along the Northumberland Corridor have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.  The Greenfield Mill property will be considered through the second phase of the ROP Review process.



S-52	2020-10-30	Douglas W. Stewart IBI (Ballantyne)	Township of North Dumfries	Request to include 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the Ayr Turf & Trac Ltd. Dealership, and Alps Rd South of HWY 401 in the Urban Area for Employment Area.	These lands have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area
S-53	2020-10-30	Douglas W. Stewart IBI (Rick Elliot)	Township of North Dumfries	Request to include 9 Ha of land located at 1203 Northumberland St, in the Urban Area for Employment Area.	These lands have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area
S-54	2021-06-22	Paul Puopolo Polocorp	Township of North Dumfries	Request to add the southern portion of the lands located at 1678 and 1688 Morrison Rd to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-55	2021-08-27	Brandon Flewwelling GSP (Freure Homes / Tampa Hall Limited)	Township of North Dumfries	Request to add the land located at the southwest corner of Greenfield Rd and Northumberland St to the Township Urban Area for Community Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-56	2020-05-20	Township of Wellesley	Township of Wellesley	Request to include land in Linwood to the Rural Settlement Area for Employment use.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-57	2019-04-04	Andrew Head Dryden Smith and Head	Township of Wellesley	Request to add lands located in Hawkesville to the Rural Settlement Area for Employment use.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-58	2020-05-20	Township of Wellesley	Township of Wellesley	Request to add lands on the West side of the Village of Wellesley to the Township Urban Area for Employment Area.	These lands are not recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Employment Area. These lands will be will

					be reviewed for rural employment uses in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-59	2020-12-27	Township of Wilmot	Township of Wilmot	Request to consider the lands located between New Hamburg and Baden south of the rail line for long term employment reserve.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-60	2021-04-13	Township of Woolwich	Township of Woolwich	<p>Request to add various parcels for Community Area and Employment Area located near Elmira and Breslau to the Urban Area.</p> <p>Breslau:</p> <p>Request to add the lands located south of the CN rail line, east of Fountain St.</p> <p>Request to add lands on the west side of Fountain St, south of the future Ottawa St extension for Employment Area.</p> <p>Elmira:</p> <p>Request to add lands on the east side of Elmira, south of Church St. E for Employment Area</p> <p>Request to add the lands on the west side of Elmira between the existing Township Urban Area and the Countryside Line for Community Area.</p>	<p>The lands located on the west side of Fountain Street are recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.</p> <p>A portion of the lands located on the east side of Fountain Street, south of the CN rail line are recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Community Area.</p> <p>A portion of the lands on the east side of Elmira are recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.</p> <p>A portion of the lands on the south west side of Elmira are recommended to be included in the Urban Area as Community Area.</p>

S-61	2021-08-30	Rob Stovel Green Horizons	Township of Woolwich	Request to add lands located at 1292 Shantz Station Rd to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-62	2021-12-22	Rob Stovel Green Horizons	Township of Woolwich	Request to add several properties located near the Waterloo Region International Airport to be included in the Urban Area for Employment Area. (1502 Kramp Rd, 1770-1772 Shantz Station Rd, TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 103 RP58R 2532 PT 3, TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 87 RP58R1556 PT 2, 1625 Kossuth Rd, TRACT GERMAN COMPANY PT LOT 88 RP58R13391 PTS 1 TO 4 TOG WITH SUBJ TO ROW, 1229 Shantz Station Rd, and 3515 Speedsville Rd Cambridge.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-63	2018-10-09	Sam Head Dryden Smith and Head	Township of Woolwich	Request to include land located at 285 Woolwich St to be included in the Urban Area for Employment Area.	These lands have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-64	2019-07-02	Sam Head Dryden Smith and Head	Township of Woolwich	Further justification for request S-63 to include land located at 285 Woolwich St in the Urban Area for Employment Area.	See response to S-63.
S-65	2019-08-12	Sam Head Dryden Smith and Head	Township of Woolwich	Request to include land located at 5185 Fountain St to be in the Urban Area for Employment Area.	These lands have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.

S-66	2019-10-16	Sam Head Dryden Smith and Head (House of Walker)	Township of Woolwich	Request to add 2177 Lonsdale Rd to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-67	2021-05-26	Greg McNally	Township of Woolwich	Request to add 1976/2000 Shantz Station Rd to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-68	2021-06-22	Dan Currie MHBC (Amjen Financial)	Township of Woolwich	Request to add land located at 4827-4835 Fountain Street North to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	These lands have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-69	2021-06-22	Dan Currie MHBC	Township of Woolwich	Request to add lands located at 4795-4815 Fountain Street North to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	These lands have been recommended to be added to the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-70	2021-08-25	Rob Stovel (Green Horizons)	Township of Woolwich	Request to add lands located at 1625 Kossuth Rd to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-71	2021-08-25	Rob Stovel (Green Horizons)	Township of Woolwich	Request to add lands located at Tract German Company PT Lot 87 RP58R1556 PT 2 on Shantz Station Rd to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-72	2020-11-10	Peter Smith Bousfields (Cook Lands Group)	Township of Woolwich	Request to add properties located at 985-999 Bridge Street West and 730 King Street North to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.

S-73	2021-08-27	Ronald Martin Marhome Farms	Township of Woolwich	Request to add a portion of 790 King St North that extends from King St North to Martins Creek to the Urban Area for Employment Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.
S-74	2020-05-12	Sam Head	Cambridge	Request to add lands located at 2450 Kossuth Rd to the Urban Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-75	2021-08-17	Michelle Adams	Cambridge	Request to add 233 acres of land located at 3185 Speedsville Rd to the Urban Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area for Employment Area.
S-76	2021-08-24	Ronald Martin Martins Historical Place	Woolwich	Request to add 1057 Bridge St to the Urban Area.	The request is not recommended to be included in the Urban Area.

**Rural Settlement Expansion Requests**

Ref #	Date	Name and Organization	Municipality	Comment Summary	Staff Response
S-145	2019-11-04	Andy Macdonald	Township of North Dumfries	Request for land located at 1410 Wrigley Rd to be included in the Wrigley Rural Settlement Area.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-146	2019-09-20	Todd Cressman	Township of Wellesley	Request for lands located at 4200 Manser Rd to be included in the Linwood Rural Settlement Area.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the

					second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-147	2019-07-19	Township of Wellesley	Township of Wellesley	Request for lands located south of Wallenstein on Herrgott Rd to be included in the Wallenstein Rural Settlement Area.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-148	2021-08-24	Andrew Head Dryden Smith and Head	Township of Wilmot	Request for lands located at 1862 Erbs Rd Wilmot to be included in the St. Agatha Rural Settlement Area.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-149	2020-01-02	Sam Head Dryden Smith and Head (Westgate Farms)	Township of Woolwich	Request for lands located at 6430 Line 86, West Montrose, to be included in the Rural Settlement Area for residential purposes.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-150	2019-11-12	Sam Head Dryden Smith and Head	Township of Woolwich	Request for lands located at 5009 Crowsfoot Rd, to be included in the Crowsfoot Corner Rural Settlement Area.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-151	2019-09-12	Sasa Fillipovic Sunset Hills Estates	Township of Woolwich	Request for lands located on the West side of Maryhill, to be included in the Maryhill Rural Settlement Area for residential purposes.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-152	2020-08-16	Megan Gereghy GSP	Township of Woolwich	Request for 7.8 Ha of land located North of Saint Charles Street in the town of Maryhill to be included in the Maryhill Rural Settlement Area for residential purposes.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.

S-153	2021-06-14	Dave Arjune	Township of Woolwich	Request for 8.0 Ha of land located at 1236 Sawmill Road to be included in the Crowsfoot Rural Settlement Area for residential purposes.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-154	2022-02-11	Dieter and Rosalind Kays	Township of Wellesley	Request to add 1.9 ha of land to the Bamberg settlement area for residential purposes.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.
S-155	2021-11-29	Township of Wellesley	Township of Wellesley	Request for minor rounding out of rural settlement areas within the Township of Wellesley.	Rural settlement expansion requests will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process.

**Employment Area Conversion Requests:**

Ref #	Date	Name and Organization	Municipality	Comment Summary	Staff Response
S-168		Richard Domes Gagnon Walker Domes (Sunbridge GP Ltd.)	Cambridge	Employment conversion request for lands located at 200 Holiday Inn Drive.	Regional staff and City of Cambridge staff support the proposed conversion. See Figure 1 of report PDL-CPL-22-24 for more detail on the location request.

**Other Requests and Additional Justification**

Ref #	Date	Name and Organization	Municipality	Comment Summary	Staff Response
S-130	2021-03-23	Prem Deep	Cambridge	Question related to servicing a specific parcel within the City of Cambridge.	Seek comments from City of Cambridge Staff on site specific servicing information.
S-131	2021-03-18	Nancy Wheeler	North Dumfries	Request for updates/timelines and feedback on any changes in Rural lands outside of the town of Ayr.	Requests related to Rural matters will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process in 2023.
S-132	2021-03-06	Tom	Woolwich	Request to sever a lot outside of the Countryside line in Woolwich, adjacent to the Bridgeport area of Kitchener.	Requests related to Rural matters will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process in 2023.
S-133	2020-12-15	Nicolette van Oyen MHBC (Vive Developments)	Kitchener	Request to include lands on King Street East, Kitchener within the proposed Intensification Corridor.	The Regional Intensification Corridor follows the route of the established ION LRT route as well as an additional corridor along Ottawa Street. Area municipalities will be delineating local intensification corridors in their Official Plans.
S-134	2022-05-16	Douglas Stewart IBI (Elliot)		Additional correspondence for submission S-15.	Refer to S-15 for staff response.
S-135	2022-05-16	Douglas Stewart IBI		Additional correspondence for submission S-53.	Refer to S-53 for staff response.



		(Dan Ayr Driving Range)			
S-136	2022-05-16	Douglas Stewart IBI Group (Ballantyne)		Additional correspondence for submission S-14.	Refer to S-14 for staff response.
S-137	2022-05-16	Douglas Stewart IBI Group (1054455 ONTARIO LTD. AND TERRY BALLANTYNE)		Additional correspondence for submission S-52.	Refer to S-52 for staff response.
S-138	2022-05-16	Matthew Warzecha Polocorp		Additional correspondence for submission S-23.	Refer to S-23 for staff response.
S-139	2022-05-16	Matthew Warzecha Polocorp (Breslau Properties)		Additional correspondence for submission S-73.	Refer to S-73 for staff response.
S-140	2022-05-16	Matthew Warzecha Polocorp (Madison Group)		Additional correspondence for submission S-73.	Refer to S-73 for staff response.
S-141	2022-05-16	Matthew Warzecha		Additional correspondence for submission S-12.	Refer to S-12 for staff response.

		Polocorp (Silvestri)			
S-142	2022-05-27	Pierre Chauvin MHBC (Stremma)		Additional correspondence for submission S-26.	Refer to S-26 for staff response.
S-143	2022-05-27	Dan Currie MHBC		Additional correspondence for submission S-77.	Refer to S-77 for staff response.
S-144	2022-05-27	Dan Currie MHBC		Additional correspondence for submission S-76 and S-50.	Refer to S-76 and S-50 for staff response.
S-165	2022-07-10	Mike Puopolo (Polo Corp)	Woolwich	Request to reconfigure the St. Jacobs Urban Area located at 51-55 Hawkesville Rd, St. Jacobs. The request does not add any additions lands to the urban area and represents a reconfiguration of the existing boundary.	The request is not supported by Region staff and Township of Woolwich staff as the proposed reconfiguration could impact the long term configuration of the remaining lands within the Countryside Line in St. Jacobs.
S-166	2022-06-06	David Aston MHBC (Flag Raiders)	Cambridge	Request to re-designate lands located at 1500 Kossuth Road from Prime Agricultural Area to Rural Area.	Requests related to the Agricultural system will be reviewed in the second phase of the ROP Review process in 2023.
S-167	2022-07-10	Rob Stovel Stovel and Associates	Cambridge and Woolwich	Concerns related to the timing servicing of recommended employment area expansions in Cambridge and Woolwich.	Seek comments from City of Cambridge and Township of Woolwich Staff on site specific servicing information.
S-169	2022-07-26	Rob Stovel Stovel and Associates	Cambridge	Question regarding the timing of servicing to lands that are located on Middle Block Rd. and designated	Seek comments from City of Cambridge Staff on site specific servicing information.

		(Maple Grove Properties Inc.)		Prestige Industrial in the City of Cambridge Official Plan.	
S-170	2022-07-26	Jonathan Rodger Zelinka Priamo (Grambian)	Kitchener	Further justification to include request S-9, lands located at 271 Reidel Drive in the Urban Area. Additional request that the Grambian lands remain under the "Rural" designation through the second phase of the ROP Review.	Refer to S-9 for staff response to urban expansion request. Matters related to rural lands will be considered through the next phase of the ROP Review.
S-171	2022-07-26	Colin Chung Glen Schnarr & Associates	Kitchener	Additional justification for request S-6 for lands located at 2118 New Dundee Road to be included in the urban area.	Refer to S-6 for staff response.
S-172	2022-07-26	Hugh Handy GSP (Thomasfield)	Woolwich	Additional justification for request S-33 located at 2450 Victoria Street North.	Refer to S-33 for staff response.
S-173	2022-07-27	Douglas W. Stewart IBI Group (Ballantyne)	North Dumfries	Additional correspondence for request S-14. Request that the remaining portion of the Ballantyne lands that are located outside of the Township Urban Area be considered as a priority in the next ROP Review.	Refer to S-14 for staff response. Refer to policy 2.E.2.4 of the ROP regarding priority lands in Ayr.
S-174	2022-07-27	Douglas W. Stewart IBI Group (Ballantyne)	North Dumfries	Support for recommended Employment Area (EA 15) with regard to request S-52.	Refer to S-52 for staff response.

S-175	2022-07-27	Douglas W. Stewart IBI Group (Dan Ayr Driving Range)	North Dumfries	Support for recommended Employment Area (EA 15) with regard to request S-53.	Refer to S-53 for staff response.
S-176	2022-07-27	Steve Wever (GSP)	Woolwich	Question regarding Maryhill Rural Settlement Area Boundary, specifically with regard to lands located at 44 St Charles Street.	Maps 1 and 2 of the draft ROP amendment each contain a footnote regarding the Agricultural System, which includes Rural Settlement Areas. As stated in the footnote, the Region will be updating the Agricultural System (and Rural Settlement Areas) as part of the second phase of the ROP Review. Consequently, the boundary changes noted in Maryhill will not be considered or implemented as part of the current draft ROP amendment.
S-177	2022-07-27	Rob Howe Goodmans (Activa and Grambian)	Kitchener	Further justification for S-7 and S-9. Additional input on LNA.	Refer to the table titled "Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Feedback on the Land Needs Assessment" in Appendix D of report PDL-CPL-22-24 for responses related to the LNA.  Refer to S-7 and S-9 for staff response.

S-178	2022-07-27	Paul Britton MHBC (Activa)	Kitchener	Further justification for S-7. Additional input on LNA.	Refer to the table titled “Finalizing the Proposed Amendment: Feedback on the Land Needs Assessment” in Appendix D of report PDL-CPL-22-24 for responses related to the LNA. Refer to S-7 for staff response.
S-179	2022-07-29	Brandon Flewelling GSP	North Dumfries	Additional justification for request S-45.	Refer to S-45 for staff response.
S-180	2022-07-29	Brandon Flewelling GSP	North Dumfries	Additional justification for request S-55.	Refer to S-55 for staff response.
S-182	2022-07-13	Rob Russell Robert Russell Planning Consultants Inc	Cambridge	Request for clarification on the status of employment designation on lands located at 470 Allendale Rd.	The lands are located within the Employment Area designation.

**MTSA Boundary Refinements**

Ref #	Date	Name and Organization	Municipality	Comment Summary	Staff Response
S-156	2021-09-17	Scott Patterson (Patterson Planning Consulting)	Cambridge	Request to include 231 Queenston Road in the Preston Station MTSA boundary.	This request was received prior to June 29, 2022 and was reflected in the mapping in the Draft ROP Amendment published on June 29, 2022.

					Minor revisions to the MTSAs were made based on the methodology outlined in Appendix B of Report PDL-CPL-21-17. Specifically, refinements were made to avoid dissecting a city block.
S-157	2020-08-14	Peter Benninger	Kitchener	Request to include 808 and 836 Courtland Avenue within the Blockline MTSA boundary.	This request was received prior to June 29, 2022 and was reflected in the mapping in the Draft ROP Amendment published on June 29, 2022. Minor revisions to the MTSAs were made based on the methodology outlined in Appendix B of Report PDL-CPL-21-17. The lands are within walking distance to Blockline Station and represent an opportunity for high density land uses.
S-158	2020-09-22	Dave Aston (MHBC)	Kitchener	Request to include 844 Courtland Avenue within the Blockline MTSA boundary.	This request was received prior to June 29, 2022 and was reflected in the mapping in the Draft ROP Amendment published on June 29, 2022. Minor revisions to the MTSAs were made based on the methodology outlined in Appendix B of Report PDL-

					CPL-21-17. The lands are within walking distance to Blockline Station and represent a potential opportunity for high density land uses.
S-159	2020-11-30	Scott Patterson (Patterson Planning Consulting)	Kitchener	Request to include 130 Weber Street West within the Central Station MTSA boundary.	This request was received prior to June 29, 2022 and was reflected in the mapping in the Draft ROP Amendment published on June 29, 2022. Minor revisions to the MTSA's were made based on the methodology outlined in Appendix B of Report PDL-CPL-21-17. Specifically, refinements were made to avoid dissecting a city block.
S-160		Pearl Valley Development	Kitchener	Request to include a portion of Hidden Valley Drive within the Fairway MTSA.	Staff do not support including this request within the Fairway MTSA boundary. The request does not conform to the methodology outlined in Appendix B of Report PDL-CPL-21-17. The requested lands are located across a rail corridor and are not well connected for pedestrians.
S-161		Dawn Parker and Catherine Owens	Kitchener	Request that stable neighbourhoods located between 500m and 800m	Regional, Consulting, and City of Kitchener staff did not apply the same interpretation to the

				<p>from a transit stop be removed from MTSA.</p> <p>Additionally, a request was made to specifically remove the area of Moore Avenue and Shanley Street from the Central MTSA.</p>	<p>MTSA boundary criteria as was presented in the refinement request and therefore do not support the requested refinement to remove stable neighbourhoods that are located between 500m and 800m from a station.</p> <p>However, draft policy 2.D.2.8 may address the concern regarding the protection of stable residential neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Regional staff and City of Kitchener staff do not support the request to remove the area of Moore Avenue and Shanley Street from the Central MTSA, as this area falls within 500m-800m radius of a station.</p>
S-181	2022-07-29	Brandon Flewwelling GSP (Stanley Black & Decker)	Kitchener	<p>Request to have properties located at t 97 Kent Avenue and 60 Ottawa St. S., be including within the Borden Station Area.</p>	<p>Minor revisions to the MTSA were made based on the methodology outlined in Appendix B of Report PDL-CPL-21-17. The lands are within walking distance to Borden Station and represent a potential opportunity for high density land uses. See Figure 2 of report PDL-CPL-22-24 for a</p>



					detailed map of the lands that were added to the Borden MTSA.
--	--	--	--	--	---