Public Statutory Meeting
Re: 0 Grand Ridge Dr.
Proposed Zoning By-Law and Official Plan Amendments
November 12, 2024 – 6:30pm
Council Chambers

Good evening and thank you for allowing me to speak tonight.

My name is Jennifer Gibb. My husband Doug Gibb and myself liv[redacted]t in Cambridge and recently moved to Cambridge as part of our long-term retirement plan.

I represent a group of concerned neighbours in attendance tonight that hold a significantly longer tenure in the neighbourhood of Grand Ridge Dr. and Sullivan Crt, including some original home owners from the builder. We call those folks "the originals".

Doug and myself came to Galt and our neighbours stay in Galt because it is not an urban core but rather it has been able to maintain (so far) a smaller city charm with strong parks, programs, entertainment and shopping options.

We held a neighbourhood meeting last week and shared our mutual concerns. This presentation summarizes our core issues. To substantiate the growing concern, you'll find that our neighbours have chosen to attend this public meeting (some also on line) and participated in the crafting of the message that I am delivering tonight; showing their support by signing this oral presentation as their agreement to concerns herein.

We have also distributed a flyer to a broader neighbourhood representing an additional 300+ homes in the area. We want to make sure that everyone potentially affected by this proposed amendment and potential future building can add their voice to concerns list. This represents houses beyond the required 120m notice requirements. We've had a good response from that flyer campaign, with people requesting more additional information, which we have been happy to share.

We also want to be transparent in sharing that a number of us have written Sheri Roberts and Nicole Goodbrand in opposition of the zoning and official plan amendments.

As the application outlines, the subject land at 0 Grand Ridge Drive is currently zoned at a R5 and OS1 and are proposed to be combined under a RM2 zoning. The concept drawings offer two RM2 options that will bring 16 townhouses or a 4-storey apartment building. We have also noted that the City of Cambridge staffing recommendation during your workshop on July 4th was the high density 4 storey option, realizing that their role is to confirm optimal use, not necessarily use that blends with the homes of the current home owners and tax payers.

Three core issues carry heavy weight on our concerns list. They are primarily issues related to parking, vehicle and pedestrian traffic & the environment. In this presentation, Cedar Creek Rd. is referenced, but it should be noted that it is also called Highway 97, and often is treated as a highway corridor.

The corner of Grand Ridge Dr. and Cedar Creek Rd., with only a stop sign is already a challenging traffic reality.

It is a dangerous entrance into and exit out of our community. This proposed corner development at the bottom of an east-west highway, where hills exist on both sides within 500m are far above the target site. In addition, Grand Ridge Dr. drops down into this depression where it terminates on Cedar Creek Rd. Here are our traffic issues:

- In the morning, the east bound traffic is blinded by direct sun exposure and poor visibility. The same holds true for the evening west bound traffic.
- Large volume of traffic is making its way into Galt coming from an 80-speed rate to a 50-speed rate. Although there is a warning sign for this change, the actual change occurs only 250-300 feet from the corner of Grand Ridge/Cedar Creek.
- At the bottom this depression on Cedar Creek is the south turn onto Grand Ridge Dr. with no right-hand turning lane.
- Eastbound traffic is coming in "hot", despite the posted 50 speed rate.
- Despite signaling early, most times coming east bound, turning right into our community has become a white-knuckle experience as vehicles behind us are still traveling fast and needing to break hard.
- Coming out of our community with eastbound and westbound turns onto Cedar Creek is another challenge. There is often a long queue at this corner because:
    - Stop sign only
    - Street at bottom of depression with hills on both sides
    - 80km/hr traffic coming into the city, despite signage
    - Drivers leaving the city anticipating needing to get up to an 80 km/hr speed
    - The need for quick acceleration going up or hard breaking coming down through changing speed zones at a major community turn

In the winter the concerns are heightened as the stop on Cedar Creek Rd. and Grand Ridge Dr. both would be at the bottom of a hill that is already known to be slippery and dangerous. That intersection ices prematurely due to being surrounded by large ponds on the South East and Northwest Corners.

One of our neighbours conduct an unofficial truck count over a 6-hour period on one day as the individual has a particular vantage point from his deck. It was observed that about 120 aggregate style large trucks were traveling east bound on Cedar Creek Rd into the core of downtown Galt. The resident has requested traffic flow data from the region to correlate and compare findings. The proposed expansion of the Dufferin Aggregate gravel pit which will be adjacent to the 0 Grand Ridge Dr. property gravel pit will certainly increase this number. With no right-hand turning lane onto Grand Ridge Dr, that volume of truck traffic behind you when you are trying to turn right is daunting.

Prior to the any rezoning approval, our community is requesting a traffic study to determine if a traffic engineer would sign off on additional entrances and traffic volume at this very unsuitable and dangerous location. Our neighbour's group would also like to have the same study peer reviewed by an independent company at our cost.

Some type of traffic calming is needed along the Cedar Creek Rd. corridor in the Grand Ridge Dr. area. A traffic stoplight, on first thought is the easy answer, but consider the truck breaking noise coming down the hill towards a light at Grand Ridge and the start up noise heavy trucks will create making their way up Cedar Creek Rd. going east into the Galt core. Occasionally there are police officer monitoring the speed along Cedar Creek Rd. and is ongoing for a number of years now, but it is not enough to calm traffic moving into this area. It is not working.

And now, the city is considering more traffic coming from these units at this particular corner. The driveway going in and coming out of the subject property is exactly where the traffic congestion is, and the various dangers exist.

Related to pedestrian traffic; there are no sidewalks present on the south side of Cedar Creek Rd from Grand Ridge Dr. so pedestrians will have no safe mode of travel from the potential site to Southwood High School or the Westgate Plaza. We acknowledge a sidewalk on the north side of Cedar Creek Rd, but requires crossing over where there is no stoplight on a busy street. In addition, the vacuum of wind that is created by aggregate trucks moving along Cedar Creek Rd. can be significant and makes the walking up Cedar Creek Dr. to the current community infrastructure difficult.

Explaining that there is already bus services route available on Grand Ridge Dr, including a bus stop at the site is acknowledged, theoretically making this a favoured site. The current route is linear and limited to potential residents in this area as it winds its way throughout the community to a further transfer site downtown Galt or up near the Cambridge Mall area. It is more likely that residents in

the proposed units will demand 2 car spaces, not one, as they need to travel to job sites that would require multiple bus transfers. In other words, just because there is a bus stop near by does not mean the routes are favourable or convenient for potential residents. We believe saying otherwise is not realistic.

With limited parking 1.25 in the current application amendment, and the reality of more than one car belonging to these units, there is no alternative city parking lot nearby, leaving the parking to move onto Grand Ridge Dr, Sullivan Court, Wadsworth etc. Our current circumstance on street parking is already limited, especially on Sullivan Crt, as visitors often cannot find a spot. It is already a problem.

You can imagine when the city comes along and suggests that 0 Grand Ridge Drive is a good site to add more vehicle and pedestrian traffic, the strong opposition is created in our collective voice.

The increased pollution at the site will be quite heavy due to idling cars that must wait upwards of 5-10 minutes to exit safely onto Cedar Creek Rd. This in combination of the current and pending gravel pit pollution is added to our list of environment concerns. Various neighbours are already reporting environment damage to the pond land on the southeast corner of Grand Ridge Dr and Cedar Creek Rd., in that there are no longer fish living in that pond.

Related to the planning aspects of the nature and character of the development v. surrounding neighbourhood. We have walked this site ourselves...it is a small building site. It represents a site that will offer limited space and parking and setbacks of multi-storey buildings onto residential neighbourhoods with backyards and pools, etc.

And now the city is proposing more pedestrian traffic, more parking on our streets and environment issues.

We understand that there is no evidence that undetached and/or high-density building will change are property values, but values are about more than the economic value. We all hold a high level of peace, pride of ownership, and appreciation for our beautiful views in our neighbourhood. We all engage in capital upkeep to our homes as a shared value. Introducing attached homes or high-density apartment units will impact non-economic value.

Further, we understand that this amendment application is tied to affordable housing applications. As a community of neighbours, we support and encourage the city staff and council in this important effort. We all know that developers will push the envelope in adding as many units possible to a parcel of land. In addition to limiting parking availability, this may lead the final building design towards one- or two-bedroom units. If this is the case, it only supports single or couple housing, which represents a smaller subset of needed affordable housing. How does this type of design support families? In addition, can the city offer our neighbourhood group some studies that demonstrate housing that starts as "affordable housing" will stay as affordable housing throughout the years. I believe this question was asked in the July 4th Council Workshop. Staff provided an answer suggesting that contract language could be used to enable this. We are requesting studies that support the staff's response.

Should this file make its way to a RM2 zone, what controls are in place that keep developers in check related to a final product that looks similar to the concept drawings. Developers win battles at the Ontario Land Tribunal.

This community is exhausted with ongoing efforts in opposition to the proposed expansion of the Dufferin Aggregates gravel pit to the west of Grand Ridge Drive. The gravel pit expansion file is supported and helped along with the strong support of Brian Riddell our provincial representative. We also acknowledge the partnership with the City of Cambridge on this file. Our neighbours bordering the west side of city property (Sullivan, Wadsworth, Harwood etc.) are already reporting deterioration of their backyard landscapes as a result of gravel pit activity. Should the expanded gravel pits become a reality, it will result in more pollution, more environment deterioration and more aggregate truck traffic.

Our homes exist at the borderlands of Cambridge, where people enter and leave our city. We want to maintain the beauty and landscaping at our welcoming areas. Why can't we together naturalize this property and return it to true OS1 or OS2 state, perhaps add a park to our community with a welcoming sign to City of Cambridge.

This is the end of our presentation and we welcome any questions you might have.

Carol Crane	[redacted]	Carol Crane
Danny Freitus	[redacted]	
Jen Sousa	[redacted]	
Philip Wilson	[redacted]	
Chris Krawchyk	[redacted]	
Karen Krawchyk	[redacted]	
Greg Emms	[redacted]	
Jayne Emms	[redacted]	
hConnie Pacheco-Wilson	[redacted]	
Tanya Dodsworth	[redacted]	
Anna Brito	[redacted]	
Doug Gibb	[redacted]	
Jennifer Gibb	[redacted]	
Mary Lou Figueiredo	[redacted]	
George Figueiredo	[redacted]	
Bev Baker	[redacted]	
Kirk Baker	[redacted]	
Doug Taylor	[redacted]	
Angela Taylor	[redacted]	
Rose Tjepkema	[redacted]	
Matt Hunter	[redacted]	
Christina Hunter	[redacted]	
Adam Goodyear	[redacted]	
Tracy Joyce	[redacted]	
Clare Dejong	[redacted]	
Irene Dejong	[redacted]	
John Toste	[redacted]	
Bonnie Toste	[redacted]	
George Martynuik	[redacted]	
Vicky Martynuik	[redacted]	
WILLIAM TUCK	[redacted]	
[illegible]	[redacted]	
Eva Bodemer	[redacted]	
Dean Bodemer	[redacted]	
Jose Sousa	[redacted]	
Maria Sousa	[redacted]	
Pat Giarrizzo	[redacted]	
Doug + Sue Watson	[redacted]	
Christina Einboden	[redacted]	
~~Emma Hunter~~	[redacted]	
Ron Sisto	[redacted]	Ron Sisto
Gilbert Talatta	[redacted]	