

# Appendix F Neighbourhood Meeting Questions and Answers



**229, 235, 239 & 247 Royal Oak Road**

**Neighbourhood Meeting Notes**

**June 12, 2023**

**City Hall, Bowman Room, 6:00 – 7:40 pm.**

## **In Attendance:**

**Staff:** Rachel Greene, Senior Planner, Claudia Beeso, ASR, Sian Younan, Transportation Engineering Technologist, Shannon Noonan, Manager of Transportation Engineering, Councillors Devine and Reid

**Developer Representatives:** Evan Wittmann, GSP Group, Phil Schiedel, Schiedel Construction Inc., Erica Bayley, Paradigm Transportation, and Andrew Orr

## **Regrets:**

## **ITEMS**

### **1. Introductions**

Rachel Greene completed introductions including Councillors Devine and Reid who were in attendance, as well as the applicant representatives, Evan Wittmann, Erica Bayley and Andrew Orr. After a recap of the application process, Provincial, Regional and City Planning Policy for this application, Evan explained the intent to revise the site plan based on the discussion and feedback from this meeting along with other comments received to date. Evan further explained the permitted uses for M1 zone and highlighted the uses they are looking to exclude on the site due to potential compatibility concerns, the distance to the intersection, future tenants, heritage designation, Traffic Impact Study, current land use, buffering, lighting, groundwater, and further revisions to the application.

We proceeded directly into a roundtable discussion where residents were able to provide feedback and ask questions to staff and applicant representatives.

## 2. Round Table Discussion

### Questions and Answers

Who protects the enjoyment and property values of adjacent residents, who would be responsible to compensate homeowners?

Provincial, Regional and Local planning policy includes policies intended to protect land use compatibility between industrial and sensitive land uses. Through the pre-consultation process studies were identified to be completed by the applicant including (but not limited to) a noise study, traffic study, environmental impact study as well as analysis of the provincial D-6 guidelines with respect to land use compatibility. The applicant submitted these studies as part of their application, and they can be reviewed online here: <https://www.cambridge.ca/en/build-invest-grow/current-development-applications.aspx#>

Could the applicant request an expansion to the uses being proposed in the future?

If the application is approved as currently proposed, and they want to request additional uses to be permitted on the site, they would need to submit a new application. The planning process, including public meetings and a decision by Council would start from the beginning.

Who will be the end users/ future tenants? Residents concerned with incompatible industrial uses for example sandblasting.

Applicant does not yet know who the end users of the industrial buildings will be as these spaces will be leased out. The proposed site-specific provisions intend to prohibit uses that may be incompatible with the adjacent residential uses. The City of Cambridge Zoning By-law also prohibits noxious uses.

Applicant noted Trade Union Hall removed as a possible use. Councillor Devine asked applicant to reconsider.

Applicant took note.

What is the distance from the building to the intersection at Royal Oak and Speedsville?

Building B is located a 50 metre distance from intersection.

How far away is the access driveway from the residential property at 255 Royal Oak Rd?

The driveway access for Building A is located 250 metres 255 Royal Oak Rd on Speedsville Road.

Where is Building B access?

The Building B access is also located off Royal Oak Road as the grading is too steep to have the access driveway from Speedsville Road.

What will happen to the residential heritage house?

The house is not listed or designated on the City's Heritage Register. The owner intends to retain the existing house and will collaborate with staff on how this would be implemented.

When will the roundabout on Speedsville Road be constructed?

The background traffic study warrants further investigation into the roundabout at Speedsville Road and Royal Oak Road. Estimated year is 2029 but the Region would need to undertake further studies.

Was a traffic light considered?

Through the traffic study a traffic signal was considered and was determined not to be warranted. The development does warrant an additional left turn lane which would be the responsibility of the applicant to implement.

Safety traffic concerns were expressed. Volume of traffic on residential two lane road with no sidewalks, no turn lanes, no safety measures. Traffic at approximately 25,000 vehicular trips per day within 1 kilometre of the neighbourhood. Where is the traffic infrastructure to support this development?

The applicant has provided a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) that is under review by City Transportation staff. This development and all other development applications in the area (for example River Mill) are also required to submit Transportation Impact Studies which make recommendations for transportation improvements as a result of their developments.

Will a traffic study be a part of this development?

Yes, The City of Cambridge is currently reviewing the TIS provided by the applicant prepared by Paradigm Transportation.

Question regarding Page 3 number 11 of the traffic study, relating to the assumptions that there are no people in the area with any disabilities or horse and buggies.

Paradigm Transportation explained this is a measure used in the Region's roundabout screening tool, and these questions are part of it to determine if a roundabout may be suitable in this location.

What will be the size of the left turning lane on Royal Oak Road?

Forecasted volume is how they determine the size and is being reviewed through the TIS.

Will the left turning lane be for large trucks only or also cars?

This lane will be for any vehicles making left turns.

Will the roundabout be large enough for big trucks to maneuver?

There is a process for determining roundabout size and is recommended to be evaluated by the Region.

Is Speedsville Road a Regional Road?

No, it is a City road; however, Manager of Transportation, Shannon Noonan, advised it will be transferred to the Region with the expectation that the Region will undertake an environmental assessment for potential improvements such as widening for future traffic. Expected roadway improvement prior to 2031.

Is the Region aware of this plan and can Council accept this application before roundabout established? Will the City vote this in when Region owns it?

The Region and City both review the TIS submitted by the applicant. As per Shannon Noonan, background traffic is considered as part of these studies. The TIS suggests further investigation for roundabout.

Is the creek not protected environmentally?

The creek is current zoned and designated as Open Space and no development can occur within this buffer. The applicant has submitted an Environmental Impact Assessment that is currently under review by City and Regional environmental staff as well as the Grand River Conservation Authority. All development is currently proposed outside of the Open Space designation.

Safety concerns were expressed. Safety of children, drivers, and the elderly with the expected traffic volume.

Councillor Devine noted that residents want to be ensured that their wells not be compromised during construction and who would be responsible?

The proposed development will be on municipal water and wastewater and as such will not draw on the water sources used by neighbours on private wells.

What are the plans for truck traffic control? Were there traffic studies at peak times?

It would be up to the business operator to provide truck routes. Trucks are permitted on most Regional Roads and restriction in their Traffic and Parking By-law 16-023. The traffic study was done during AM and PM peak times.

How can it be ensured that ambulance and fire trucks can enter and exit safely?

Transportation and the Fire departments have been circulated and will provide their comments.

What is the buffering for this site?

There is a plan for a 2.5-metre-high wood privacy fence along the property line. Large shade and coniferous trees will line the property as well.

What is the elevation of the proposed buildings? Up or downhill?

The developer will come out and visit adjacent properties to evaluate.

What is the diameter of trees to plant?

Not yet determined.

How do you propose limited lighting?

A photometrics plan has been requested by staff to demonstrate the proposed lighting plan. Lights will be directed downwards to mitigate light pollution. The City of Cambridge has a zero light-spill policy so light cannot be directed to adjacent properties.

What will happen to the current wells on the proposed property?

They will be decommissioned.

Evan noted that further revisions will be made to the concept plan based on staff and agency comments including an increase to the proposed parking supply, additional landscape details, tree management, photometric plan, servicing review, site grading and revisions to technical studies.

Sharon Venturin who resides at 225 Royal Oak Road approached the podium with the following concerns: safety for residents, proper infrastructure to support this development, keeping this area residential, decrease of property values, truck traffic, noise, lighting, elevation results in loss of privacy, construction clean up and construction activity damaging residential wells. Sharon submitted a Neighbourhood Meeting package which contains detailed questions and concerns from neighbouring residents and requested another follow up Neighbourhood meeting.

### **3. Next Steps**

Rachel Greene explained the next steps in the application process. A question-and-answer document will be created and posted on our website along with an application resubmission. Another meeting prior to Council will be arranged if the developer is open to it. If anyone is interested, they can delegate at the next Council meeting. Rachel provided her phone number and email address for any questions.



**229, 235, 239 & 247 Royal Oak Road**

**Neighbourhood Meeting Notes**

**July 17, 2023**

**City Hall, Bowman Room, 6:00 – 7:30 pm.**

**In Attendance:**

**Staff:** Rachel Greene, Senior Planner, Claudia Beeso, ASR, Councillor Devine and Councillor Reid

**Developer Representatives** Evan Wittmann, GSP Group and Phil Schiedel, Schiedel Construction Inc.

**ITEMS**

**1. Introductions**

Rachel Greene advised that presentations and notes from the June 12<sup>th</sup> and July 17<sup>th</sup> neighbourhood meetings will be posted on the City's website. Rachel introduced the applicant's consultants Evan Wittmann and Phil Schiedel as well as Councillors Devine and Reid. Evan, joined by Phil, provided a presentation including renderings demonstrating the buffer between Building A and the adjacent residential property at 225 Royal Oak Road explaining the proposed plans for grading and tree screening.

We proceeded directly into a roundtable discussion where residents were able to provide feedback and ask questions to staff and applicant representatives.

**2. Round Table Discussion**

Questions and Answers

Will the trees planted be mature and will the trees on 225 Royal Oak Road be touched?

The trees will not be mature but intermediate and will be planted along the buffer area and the trees on 225 Royal Oak will not be touched. The City has a private tree by-law that requires compensation or replacement trees when trees are proposed to be removed.

Will the property at 225 Royal Oak Road be higher elevation than the proposed building?

Yes, 225 Royal Oak is at a higher elevation with an approximate 4 metre difference.

The following concerns were brought up by residents: excess noise, traffic safety, light spill from illuminated signs, lack of traffic control, traffic study flawed, cyclist safety, no fence barrier, well water quality, area is not light industrial but mainly residential, debris and house repair during construction, lack of response from By-law enforcement related to Trademark properties – not zoned for heavy equipment on Royal Oak Road, decrease of property value, lack of Councillor representation, and emergency vehicle access.

Residents of the opinion the Traffic Study is flawed and proposed development cannot be accommodated by existing infrastructure.

City Transportation staff have reviewed the Transportation Impact Study prepared by the applicant's consultants at Paradigm and provided comments back to the applicant that must be addressed to their satisfaction. Planning staff rely on their technical expertise to inform a recommendation to Council. Recommended transportation improvements identified in the TIS will be the responsibility of the applicant at the detailed design stage if approved.

What kind of tenant will occupy buildings?

The applicant anticipates that warehousing, light manufacturing, and office uses are expected similar to 105 Boxwood.

What is the proposed setback between residential property and proposed development?

The minimum building setback from adjacent residential is 14 metres.

What kind of sound barrier will be provided for manufacturing tenants?

The applicant explained the 12-inch-thick wall is designed as sound barrier.

Who ensures the well water quantity and quality will not be affected?

City Engineering staff have reviewed the Stormwater Management Report prepared by the applicant's consultants K.Smart Associated Limited and provided comments back to the applicant that must be addressed to their satisfaction. The Stormwater Management Report includes proposed quality and quantity control measures and water balance calculations to demonstrate infiltration rates will be maintained post-construction. City staff are also looking into mechanisms to implement well monitoring by applicant similar to what Toyota may have done with willing participating landowners in the past.

Who will pay if City decides to bring water services past homes?

The City does not currently have plans to extend servicing along Royal Oak Road. It is the applicant's responsibility to demonstrate they can adequately service the

proposed development to the satisfaction of City Engineering staff.

What is the parking space numbers for buildings A and B? Residents expressed concerns for traffic volumes and pedestrian safety given the previous accidents in the area.

Building A is 150 and Building B is 54 spaces. This was increased due to a request from City Transportation staff.

Who will pay for development fees?

The applicant is required to pay Development Charges at the issuance of a building permit.

### **3. Next Steps**

Evan explained the next steps to this development resubmission. The consulting team is continuing to work on their technical reports (Traffic, Environmental Impact, Noise Assessment, Functional Servicing, Geotechnical, Hydrogeology) to respond to comments from City and agencies. When revisions are complete, a resubmission package will be provided to the City for further review. Revised submissions will be posted on the City's website: <https://www.cambridge.ca/en/build-invest-grow/current-development-applications.aspx#>. The City may have additional comments on the resubmission but once all outstanding issues has been addressed to their satisfaction, a recommendation report will be brought forward to a Council meeting where Council will make a decision on the application. All those that have attended the public meetings or registered with the City will be notified of when this Council meeting will be taking place. After the Council meeting, if approved, the next step in the redevelopment process is Site Plan Approval. A severance application will also be submitted to separate the two buildings onto their own parcels. A recommendation could possibly be made by the end of September or early October if there are no outstanding issues.

Oral and written comments received at the statutory public meeting and neighbourhood meetings will be incorporated into a future recommendation report to Council. Residents will also have the opportunity to delegate at the Council meeting when a recommendation is brought forward and also have an opportunity to appeal the decision made by Council.