

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

From: Jayne Emms [REDACTED]
Sent on: Wednesday, November 6, 2024 10:00:35 PM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
CC: Greg [REDACTED]
Subject: 0 Grand Ridge Drive Application for re-zoning

Ms. Goodbrand,

My name is Jayne Emms and I live at [REDACTED]. My husband Greg and I are in receipt of the Notice of Complete Application – OR12/24 delivered via the postal service.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed housing development in our neighbourhood. While I understand the need for affordable housing in our city, I believe that this project would have a detrimental impact on our community and that a housing development of any description on this particular parcel of land creates more problems than it solves. Some of these issues are outlined below.

The Grand Ridge community consists of a blend of 1 and 2 storey homes. The introduction of 3 or 4 storey apartments would dramatically change the community since it does not fit in both aesthetically and in terms of density.

There is already a problem with on street parking. An apartment building with reduced parking will create further pressure on parking on the street and this will inevitably be concentrated near the very busy intersection of Grand Ridge and Cedar Creek (Hwy 97).

The proposal shows access off of Cedar Creek and also Grand Ridge. The houses nearest to Cedar Creek already experience difficulty exiting out of their driveways. Additional traffic from an apartment building with 50 units would simply exaggerate this existing problem. The intersection of Grand Ridge and Cedar Creek is already a dangerous nightmare to navigate for both cars and pedestrians especially with there being no sidewalk on the South side.

In terms of environmental damage, it is to be seen what the impact will be to the wildlife that roams this property and the migrating birds that are often found in the area. The small pond on the east side of Grand Ridge (zoned as OS1) has already seen negative impacts since the changes to Cedar Creek Road. Part of this parcel in question is zoned Environmentally Sensitive and I see no reason to change that zoning that has existed before we moved here in 1997. If it was deemed environmentally sensitive then, what has changed? This is a very special neighbourhood with marshes, ponds and abundant wildlife.

In conclusion, I strongly urge you to reconsider this proposed housing development. I believe that this project is simply not the right fit for our neighbourhood and specifically, for this parcel of land.

I am part of the neighbourhood group that will be making a presentation during the public meeting on Tuesday, November 12th. I trust as an elected member representing this ward that you can support our concerns and ensure that they are brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Greg and Jayne Emms

Sent from my iPad

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

From: carol crane [REDACTED]
Sent on: Saturday, November 9, 2024 6:45:13 PM
To: Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>
CC: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
Subject: 0 Grand Ridge Drive Cambridge

Follow up: Follow up

Start date: Monday, November 11, 2024 12:00:00 AM

Due date: Monday, November 11, 2024 12:00:00 AM

Good Afternoon I writing to you with my concerns on an apartment building being built at 0 Grand Ridge drive. I am building [REDACTED] I have lived here for 15 years and over the years have noticed that we have a very high volume of traffic, as we are a main artery for all the side streets. On many occasions I have been almost hit coming into my driveway, as well as a few of my neighbours. Your plan would see at least 70 to 80 parking spots, which would not only create an even larger traffic issue, but the parking on the street would increase as well. My concerns for both the parking and traffic are a major issue. We all our aware that we need housing and support it. But we are also concerned about the environment as we are losing protected land. Please take the time to really look at this, it is a major safety concern . Thank you
Carol Crane



From: Jen S [REDACTED]
Sent on: Sunday, November 10, 2024 2:08:09 AM
To: Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>
CC: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>; Jan Liggett <liggettj@cambridge.ca>
Subject: 0 Grand Ridge Drive Development

Follow up: Follow up

Start date: Monday, November 11, 2024 12:00:00 AM

Due date: Monday, November 11, 2024 12:00:00 AM

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Good Evening Sherri,

My name is Jen and I am writing this letter on behalf of myself, my husband and two teenage sons. We have lived on [REDACTED] in Cambridge for the past 18 years and I, myself, have grown up on this same street for the past 40 years. Where my parents reside.

While we understand the need for affordable housing in our city, we want to express our extreme opposition to the proposed housing development in our neighborhood. I believe that this project would have a detrimental impact in our neighbourhood and would have extreme effects on parking, traffic and our environment.

Traffic and parking is absolutely my number one concern. We are already experiencing a high volume of traffic, speeding and street parking. Adding a new development with minimal parking availability will only create an increased demand for parking on Grand Ridge Drive and create increased congestion and safety concerns. Transport trucks and cars continue to drive past Grand Ridge Dr. on Hwy 97 at 80km/hr despite the speed change to 50 km/hr. This is causing, at times, back up of cars and buses that are turning out of Grand Ridge Dr. especially during the weekday mornings or after work hours. This backup at times can go far past the proposed development. I in turn, have had to choose to take an alternate longer route to reach Cedar street in these cases. You can only imagine what this would be like with additional cars having to turn out from this development onto Grand Ridge and then wait to exit in this same area. In addition, the winter months turning onto Grand Ridge Dr. can also be quite slippery with a slight uphill. With additional demand for street parking in front of the development entrance, especially with city buses stopping just after the turn, would definitely create increased safety concerns. This in turn, would also create a backup of traffic on Hwy 97 for those cars waiting to turn onto Grand Ridge Dr..

Finally, our neighbourhood has continued to welcome the migration of many geese, ducks and blue herons year after year. The numbers over the years have unfortunately decreased due to previous street construction on Hwy 97 not that long ago. We have been fortunate to watch many geese nest and raise their little goslings alongside the pond and up towards the grassy areas on either side of Grand Ridge, including the proposed development site. With this development, this natural habitat would be taken away.

I trust as an elected member representing this ward that you will take my concerns along with all other concerns brought to your attention and help support them. I am well aware you are very supportive of affordable housing and again this is not my concern. I want to make it clear that there are greater concerns that need to be considered before further approval. This ward should have been given the opportunity to discuss and address these concerns prior to this next step. The notice in the mail approximately three weeks ago and the sign that just so happened to be posted on the property in the past week, is extremely unacceptable and unfair to the public. I would also like to address your choice of public correspondence to post on the public board. I am aware of many emails that were sent to you regarding this matter, yet you chose to only ask one of many for consent, which just happened to include a very strong viewpoint against affordable housing. Why have other correspondence with other viewpoints not been requested to be added ?

I will be joining the meeting with my family on Tuesday, November 12th as members of the neighbourhood group that will be making a presentation.

Regards,

Jen Sousa & Family

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

From: Mary Lou Figueiredo [REDACTED]
Sent on: Friday, November 8, 2024 1:27:48 AM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
Subject: 0 Grand Ridge Drive

Follow up: Follow up

Start date: Monday, November 11, 2024 12:00:00 AM

Due date: Monday, November 11, 2024 12:00:00 AM

I am writing as a resident of Ward 5 for the past 29 years, to express my concerns about the city's decision to choose this location for rezoning and constructing a 4 storey apartment complex [REDACTED] where no development has previously existed.

The proposed apartment complex brings several significant concerns:

- 1. Increased Traffic:** The roads in this area are not designed to handle the influx of traffic that will come with such a high-density development. There are safety related issues of having an entrance off the highway on a downslope or even on the corner of Grand Ridge where it is already unsafe and incredibly busy to turn left onto Cedar Creek Road on a daily basis. This does not include the times whereby something happens on the 401 and the traffic is redirected down Cedar Creek road into and out of town. This scenario has been occurring quite often. We have also seen a dramatic increase in the volume of aggregate trucks now driving into and out of the city down Cedar Street.
- 2. Zoning Changes:** The shift from low-density to high-density is a dramatic change, one that will severely impact the character of our neighbourhood. This decision was made without proper communication with homeowners like myself and my neighbours, who have made significant investments in our properties.
- 3. Home Values:** Our homes will likely see a reduction in value due to this development. The increased noise, lack of privacy (5 of the homes impacted all have pools) and disruption to the peaceful environment we have come to cherish will certainly affect the desirability of our properties.
- 4. Environmental Issues:** Currently the area is zoned as a green space. Changing this to high density will affect the wildlife that live and breed in the area.
- 5. Gravel Pit:** Our community has already been under a lot of stress having to deal with another expansion of the gravel pit. The dust, noise, and increased truck traffic and damage to vehicles because of rocks escaping these trucks has been an ongoing and exhaustive battle. This proposed development is just another disregard for Ward 5 residents.

I'm hoping going forward, that the city will involve residents more fully in decisions that will significantly impact our neighbourhood and that we can count on your support to stop this development.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Mary Lou and George Figueiredo
[REDACTED]

   |  ...

From: Irene DeJong [REDACTED]
Sent on: Friday, November 8, 2024 5:07:18 AM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
Subject: Concern Re: zoning change at 0 Grand Ridge

Follow up: Follow up
Follow up status: Completed
Completed on: Monday, November 11, 2024 4:48:00 PM

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Greetings Nicole Goodbrand,

We are writing to you as residents of [REDACTED] for almost 30 years. We are not in support of the application to change the zoning at the corner of Cedar Creek Road and Grand Ridge Drive. We have seen the concept drawings that are part of the application. These potential zoning changes cause a great deal of concern.

Traffic at this intersection is already overburdened. Cars coming down Cedar Street are going at 80 km an hour and have barely begun to slow by the time they pass Grand Ridge Dr. The volume of traffic has increased tremendously as have the number of trucks. Visibility at this intersection has always been a problem. There are hills on either side of this intersection which make it almost impossible for vehicles to slow down. We can hear trucks attempting to break all throughout the day and night. Grand Ridge Drive is always slippery (due to the 2 ponds) especially by the stop sign and in winter the snow piles are so high that they provide a real visibility problem. The high volume and speed of traffic makes this very unsafe for pedestrians. There isn't even a sidewalk on the one side of Cedar Street. Drivers on Grand Ridge attempting to turn left onto Cedar Street can be expected to wait over 5 minutes to make the turn.

Police officers can often be seen monitoring this intersection and still the problems are there.

Parking will be a huge problem. I realize that there is a parking lot attached to the potential complex but it will not provide for more than 1.25 cars per unit. Where are two car households supposed to park? Where are guests supposed to park? We already have many cars parking along Grand Ridge and Sullivan Court. These cars have sustained damage. We do not want more cars parking on our streets!

The land for the proposed zoning change has always been a safe habitat for wildlife and plant life. What is going to happen to the environment at and around this site? This area is directly in the migration pattern of Canadian geese. They land and have their babies in the ponds. We also have turtles, which used to be in abundance but are now depleting because they are getting killed on the highway. We have herons, muskrats, hawks, and all kinds of bird life. What will happen to their habitat when their biome has changed?

We thank you for taking the time to consider are concerns.

Clare and Irene DeJong
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

From: Julie Kinder [REDACTED]
Sent on: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 11:17:35 PM
To: Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>; Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
CC: David Kinder [REDACTED]
Subject: Grand ridge zoning change

We are unable to attend the meeting tonight. We are very concerned about the increased traffic on this already busy street. We are opposed to both the high and low density concepts. We live at [REDACTED] Please provide us with an update from tonight's council meeting. Julie and Dave Kinder [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Douglas Saunders [REDACTED]
Sent on: Thursday, November 7, 2024 9:30:05 PM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
CC: Scott Hamilton <hamiltons@cambridge.ca>; Ross Earnshaw <earnshawr@cambridge.ca>; Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>
Subject: Proposed Housing Development - 0 Grand Ridge & Hwy #97 - Comments
Attachments: 20241107-Hsg Development-Grand Ridge & Hwy#97.docx (13.63 KB)

Please see attached correspondence:



Given the lack of affordable housing in Cambridge, and in Waterloo region in general, I'm not sure why we should oppose this development? Yes, there will be an increase in the numbers of cars in the neighbourhood but there are ways of calming the traffic. I would hope that the city would including the following considerations: (1) that the development ensure that 10% of the units are rented Below Average Market Rents so that middle income and low-income households have the opportunity to live there. A development of high end/high cost units will not help with the housing issues we face in this community; (2) that the street entrance/exit be from Grand Ridge and that there be no direct access to Hwy #97; (3) that traffic signals be installed at Grand Ridge and Hwy #97 to ensure even smooth and timed flow of traffic from Grand Ridge to Hwy #97 ... this intersection is already becoming dangerous with traffic not obeying the 60 km limit on #97 and the inability to exit Grand Ridge to #97 resulting in long wait times. The housing is needed. Let's not stop the development but ensure the city takes the precautions necessary to control the flow of traffic.



From: Tracy Bruce [REDACTED]
Sent on: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 11:53:06 AM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
Subject: Proposed High Density Build - Cedar Creek Road and Grand Ridge Drive

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Good morning, Ms. Goodbrand.

This letter will highlight my concerns around the proposed "high density" housing project to be placed at the corner of Cedar Creek Road and Grand Ridge Drive.

This proposed parcel of land is very small for a building the size of the drawings in the flyer. I know it is "to scale" and that is what is most alarming.

- There does not seem to be enough parking for a building(s) this large.
- Since there does not appear to be enough proposed parking for this build, people will be parking on Grand Ridge Drive which will add to the already busy street and the people that currently park on this road.
- Adding this building to this corner will make it impossible to exit Grand Ridge Drive onto Cedar Creek Road.
- This build could make it more difficult to see oncoming traffic while trying to turn onto Cedar Creek Road. This is an issue at the moment.
- There are issues with traffic at this corner now. I have waited at this corner to turn for as long as 5-6 minutes because it is so busy.
- If there is an issue on the 401, people will take Cedar Creek Road as an alternate and it is almost impossible to travel on this road let alone turn onto it at this corner.
- The trucks from the gravel pit come flying down Cedar Creek Road towards Grand Ridge Drive with no concern for anyone but themselves. I was almost rear-ended by a gravel truck because he was going way too fast in the 50 kph zone. They go through red lights and stop signs like they do not exist.
- This will diminish the property values of the people that live closest to this proposed build. Everyone in this neighbourhood is already dealing with diminished property values because of the proposed gravel pit expansion. Adding this high density building to the neighbourhood will make it nearly impossible to sell our homes.
- If this building gets approved and built, the City of Cambridge will need to install traffic lights at this corner and at the corner of St. Andrews Street and Grand Ridge Drive. People will start exiting Grand Ridge Drive at St. Andrews Street therefore increasing the traffic at that corner.
- Let's talk about the wildlife - that small parcel of land is where a lot of the geese, rabbits, turtles and deer can be found. You will be displacing them.
- There are a lot of children in this neighbourhood and very close to this proposed building. The increased traffic and congestion that this new build will bring will be dangerous for these children.

It is bad enough that the neighbourhood is already fighting the gravel pit expansion and now they have the City of Cambridge wanting to add a high density building to the mix. Is this about tax dollars that this building will bring in?

Surely there must be a better parcel of land that would be more suited to this proposed project. Why does every piece of greenspace need to be built on?

Please be smart about this and do the proper studies. This corner is already a nightmare at times. Adding this building to this corner will make it impossible to get through it. Also please consider the families that live in close proximity to this proposed build.

Thank you for noting my concerns for this build. I would be attending the meeting tonight, [REDACTED]

Tracy Bartlett
[REDACTED]



From: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
Sent on: Monday, January 27, 2025 7:50:34 PM
To: G & D Figueiredo [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Application OR12/24 579 Grandridge
Attachments: Mail out NOTICE OF NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING - OR12_24_corr.pdf (0 Bytes)

Good Afternoon, Dalila and George,

Thank you for your comments. Would you like these added to the formal record as formal written comments? I can also relay your concerns about traffic to the appropriate transit department.

I have added you to the mailing list and I have also attached the Notice of Neighbourhood Meeting for your reference.

Please let me know your preferences and if you have any questions,

From: G & D Figueiredo [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 26, 2025 3:39 PM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
Subject: Application OR12/24 579 Grandridge

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Hello Nicole, we are Dalila & George Figueiredo and we live at [REDACTED]. I am writing this email as we are unable to attend the Neighbourhood meeting schedule for February 6th regarding a proposed high density units (apartment building). We do not believe this development is appropriate for that section of land for the following reasons:

1. This development runs along side Hiway 97, with higher speed vehicles including numerous gravel trucks through
2. We expect the entrance to the apartment building would be off Grand ridge. It will be a short distance from the inte
3. It seems likely that the overflow parking from this unit would likely extend to Grandridge and neighbouring streets. T

There are numerous high- density units near Cedar street around the St Johns on the Hill church. However, these ha

I appreciate the need for more housing, but the city needs to be consider everyone's safety and proper infrastructure

I would appreciate being included in updates.

Thanks
Dalila & George Figueiredo



From: D Watson [REDACTED]
Sent on: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 4:18:58 AM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>; Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>
Subject: Re: OR1224, Public Meeting for 0 Grand Ridge Drive

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing this to express my concern about the above application that is put forth to amend the current designation of Low/medium density residential and redesignate it to High density residential.

I have been heading to work out at [REDACTED] for the past 20 years at about 630 to 7 am every work day. There is always a steady flow of traffic coming out of this subdivision at that time, and throughout the day during the week, and as well during the weekend. Turning either way at this intersection has a very high risk attached to it, Looking to the right the vehicles are accelerating up to 80 km as they are heading out of town, and looking to the left the vehicles, and many are heavy truck traffic, are coming over the crest in the road at a high rate of speed and are typically not down to the 50 km limit by the time they get to the intersection. Grand Ridge is only a single lane, but the volume of traffic forces it into 2 lanes to try and turn left and right. Then there is the pedestrian walk just west of the intersection. This all makes for a higher risk situation for all vehicles turning at this intersection, having to always look 2 or 3 times each way to be sure it is safe to do with the speed of the traffic on Cedar creek from both directions, and very minimal site lines.

Now this development would add a new driveway access to Grand Ridge within 150' of this intersection. The Low/Medium density designation will add more unsafe situations, and a High density designation would multiply the risks even further. Cedar Creek is becoming a busier main road for all the Gravel Trucks in this area, and will only become more difficult and riskier at this intersection over the years ahead, even without this development.

Please refrain from making this any more dangerous than it is now.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

From: John De Freitas [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2024 10:13 AM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
Cc: Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>
Subject: zoning change for lot at end of grandridge and hwy 97

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Hello,

My name is John De Freitas and I live on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] from the lot that is being considered for development.

One of the things on my mind is what in the world are you people thinking. Is this city determine to fill in every piece of land and turn it into a city of Toronto. it is bad enough already traffic wise in this city where the development is happening but not taking into account the traffic congestions that are presently taking place without any changes to the current roads.

Has anyone noticed the traffic that comes down hwy 97 into Cambridge. What was the reason that houses were never build on this land when the original homes were built. I can only assume that the city at that time did not allow it as i am sure the builders at the time would have built homes in this lot.

I thought it had been left empty purposely due to the hwy and natural habitat with the pond across the st.

I am dead set against this property being developed this way and i can't imagine how those people that their properties back on to this lot feel having that intrusion jammed down their privacy. I would rather see single family homes build to stay with the look of the neighbourhood.

It is bad enough already that the gravel pit is creating more issues for the neighbourhood.

These are my concerns. Thank you

John De Freitas



From: Alan Smiley [REDACTED]
Sent on: Monday, November 11, 2024 4:32:14 PM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>; Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>
Subject: Zoning Change at 0 Grand Ridge Drive

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

To: Nicole Goodbrand, Sheri Roberts

My Wife and I have owned our home [REDACTED] 1997

We have recently been made aware that Cambridge City Council has completed an application to change the zoning of the vacant parcel of land at the corner of Grand Ridge Drive and Cedar Creek Rd (Hwy#97) to allow for higher density affordable housing to be built on this site

We believe that any development that would place 16 three storey Townhouses (low density option) or a 50 unit four-storey Apartment building (high density option) in the middle of our residential neighbourhood of single-family homes is irresponsible and inappropriate and we oppose any zoning change that would allow multi-unit housing on this site

Having lived in this neighbourhood for 27 years we are well aware of the impact that either of these proposed higher density housing options will have on the traffic at the intersection of Grand Ridge and Cedar Creek

Traffic volume on Cedar Creek Rd has increased a lot over the years since we have lived on [REDACTED]. We used to be able to get to the 401 at Homer Watson in under 10 minutes from our house. We now routinely have to wait at least 5 minutes at the [REDACTED] intersection to make a left turn to get to the 401. We will have to compete with cars exiting the proposed Apartment building parking lot and crossing over Grand Ridge to get to this intersection. It will make a bad situation even worse let alone dangerous.

We are very concerned that the proposed Apartment building will not have enough parking spaces for the residents and visitors at the Apartment building. This will cause people to have to park on the streets in our neighbourhood.

We understand that the proposed 50 unit four-storey Apartment building (high density option) is what your planning staff is recommending to Council as the best opportunity for this site.

We disagree, it is the worst option. The 50 unit four-storey Apartment building will make our neighbourhood less desirable for anyone seeking to buy a single family home in the area. This option will significantly lower the property values of all the single family homes in the area.

Sincerely

Alan and Bonnie Smiley



From: Octavio Melo [REDACTED]
Sent on: Sunday, November 10, 2024 4:39:56 PM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
CC: Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>
Subject: Zoning Change at the Corner of Grand Ridge Drive and Cedar Street

Follow up: Follow up

Start date: Monday, November 11, 2024 12:00:00 AM

Due date: Monday, November 11, 2024 12:00:00 AM

This Message Is From an External Sender

This message came from outside your organization.

Hello,

As requested here are my comments on the proposed zoning bylaw:

1. I am extremely concerned about the volume, speed and type (lots of trucks using Cedar St on their easterly or westerly trips, not related to deliveries within the City of Cambridge. Cedar St and the intersection with Grand Ridge Drive in particular are extremely dangerous, especially at rush hour.
2. The City of Cambridge and many other municipalities in Ontario are suffering from a shortage of affordable housing and I applaud the City's efforts to facilitate the building of affordable housing. City planners and Council are in the best position to evaluate where the opportunities to build this type of housing exist within City limits and rank-order the sites on the basis of factors like: safety, proximity to schools, parks, playgrounds, walking trails, public transit, etc. But, all of this needs to proceed in an expedited way to solve the shortage of affordable housing.
3. As Council knows, residents in this neighbourhood are concerned about the health and environmental impacts of aggregate mining, processing and transportation so close to our neighbourhood. Dust and noise are a problem and seniors like me and other sensitive individuals are particularly vulnerable. This industrial activity so close to our neighbourhood is another reason why additional housing development should not be allowed at the subject site, if other more suitable sites are available. The planned expansion of the gravel operations to within 60-m of our fence line, as well as the fence-line of the subject property will only make things worse.
4. I urge Council to continue to oppose the expansion of gravel mining toward Cambridge as strongly as it can and leave the selection of suitable and safe affordable housing in the hands of City planners and Council

Octavio Melo
[REDACTED]

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

From: John Westenberg [REDACTED]
Sent on: Friday, November 8, 2024 9:45:06 PM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
CC: Sheri Roberts <robertss@cambridge.ca>
Subject: Zoning Change Cedar Creek and Grand Ridge

Follow up: Follow up
Follow up status: Completed
Completed on: Monday, November 11, 2024 4:48:00 PM

Dear Nicole and Sheri, I'm having a hard time believing that the city of Cambridge would even consider this location as a place to add more housing. I have lived [REDACTED] for just over six years and have often been frustrated by the traffic situation at the corner in question. Adding either low or high density housing to that corner will only exacerbate things. At peak times 7-9 am and 5-7 pm) it is almost impossible to make a left turn off of Grand Ridge. There have been many times that I was in the process of making a left turn onto Grand Ridge from Cedar Creek and felt that the gravel truck barrelling down the road behind me just barely cleared my vehicle. I honestly believe that adding more traffic to that intersection is an accident (and most likely a death) waiting to happen! As such, I am strongly opposed to the idea of rezoning the piece of property in question!!!! Sincerely, John Westenberg [REDACTED] Sent from my iPhone

**This Message Is From an External Sender**

This message came from outside your organization.

From: Brian Duggan [REDACTED]
Sent on: Tuesday, November 12, 2024 10:43:29 PM
To: Nicole Goodbrand <goodbrandn@cambridge.ca>
Subject: Zoning Change Request

Good afternoon, Ms. Goodbrand:

We are unable to attend this evening's council meeting so we are hoping our concerns about the City's application for rezoning the Grand Ridge Drive, Cedar Creek Road intersection can be considered.

- 1) **Traffic:** As we live off of [REDACTED] we deal with traffic congestion at this intersection daily. During peak times it is challenging to make a left hand turn on to Cedar Creek Rd. heading out of the City as there is constant traffic from both directions. Adding additional housing at this corner will only increase the pressure at this corner.
- 2) **Safety:** At the current rate of traffic and with the number of gravel trucks heading east on Cedar Creek towards the core area it is already a safety concern for us. Traffic heading east is often moving at a high rate of speed well after the speed limit turns to 50km/hr. Add additional traffic as a result of a new development will increase the safety concern.
- 3) **Dance Pit expansion:** IF the Dance pit is allowed to expand a new housing development will be up against the pit boundaries. The dust, noise, additional trucks will impact anyone living in a new development.
- 4) **Natural inhabitants:** The two ponds on the north and south side of the Cedar Creek Road are homes for a large number of natural inhabitants. Red tail hawks, great blue heron, ducks, geese, trumpeter swans, beaver, fox, etc. use these ponds as their home. What impact will this development have on these animals?

Cedar Creek Road is often an alternative route for drivers who must exist the 401 if there is a closure. Traffic heading east to bypass the problem can be horrendous. People living in a new development at that location would struggle to enter or exist their homes.

Thank you for your consideration

Brian & Margaret Duggan
[REDACTED]

February 4, 2025

City of Cambridge
Planning Services, Community Development
50 Dickson Street
P.O. Box 669
Cambridge, ON N1R 5W8

Attn: Nicole Goodbrand, Senior Planner

Sent by email

**Re: Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Application OR 12/24
579 Grand Ridge Drive**

CBM Aggregates owns the property at 1107 Cedar Creek Road, located immediately west of this proposed residential development. CBM operates an active sand and gravel pit operation on this property (Dance Pit). There are applications in process under the Aggregate Resources Act and the Planning Act which would allow for an expansion of the existing pit operations.

We acknowledge the need for affordable housing, however, given the existing pit operations and the proposed pit expansion, we are concerned that there may be a conflict with the timing of the development relative to the life span of the pit operations. In particular, the added density in the subdivision and the proposed height of the buildings relative to the proposed berm on the east side of the pit expansion lands may create land use compatibility concerns. As you know, Policy 3.5 of the Provincial Planning Statement 2024 (PPS 2024) requires the City to protect the long-term viability of major facilities such as the Dance Pit (and proposed expansion) by ensuring that the impacts of development of sensitive uses are mitigated in accordance with provincial standards.

Close to market supply of high-quality aggregates is an essential component in addressing the housing crisis. Policy 4.5.2.1 of the PPS 2024 makes it clear that ensuring close to market supply of aggregate is a key component of provincial policy. In addition, Policy 4.5.2.4 provides that mineral aggregate operations – such as the Dance Pit – shall be protected from development and activities that would hinder their expansion or continued use.

The design of the Dance Pit expansion application has required a significant amount of time, effort and community consultation since in 2018. The applications were subject to extensive peer reviews, with municipal and provincial agencies providing comments. The Site Plans include numerous measures reviewed and incorporated to mitigate or eliminate impacts from noise, dust, groundwater and natural heritage resources. CBM has worked diligently to minimize the impacts of their operations on nearby residents. An OLT hearing has been scheduled for this summer to consider the merits of the

applications. It would be premature for the City to approve this proposed development before the applications have been determined by the OLT.

If this proposed affordable housing development is approved, we suggest that the City include a mechanism to ensure future residents are informed of the adjacent pit operations and the expansion.

Please ensure that this letter is provided to Council before it makes its decision on this application. Please also provide us with notice of any decision of Council or a Committee of Council in relation to this application.

Sincerely



Melanie Horton, MCIP, RPP

c.c. David Hanratty, Votorantim Cimentos
Stephen May, Votorantim Cimentos



Kim Mullin | B.A., LL.B.

T. 416.203.5633
E. kmullin@woodbull.ca

File No. 1890

February 10, 2025

Mayor and Members of Council
City of Cambridge
Council Chambers
50 Dickson Street
Cambridge, ON N1R 5W8

Dear Mayor Liggett and Members of Council:

**Re: Proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment
579 Grand Ridge Drive (previously 0 Grand Ridge Drive)
City of Cambridge File No. OR12/24**

We represent CBM Aggregates, A Division of St. Marys Cement (Canada) Inc. (“**CBM**”) in connection with the property municipally known as 1107 Cedar Creek Road (the “**CBM Site**”). CBM currently operates a licensed sand and gravel pit on the western portion of the CBM Site, known as the Dance Pit, and has applied to extend operations to the eastern portion of the CBM Site.

It has come to our attention that the City of Cambridge has initiated an Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment for the lands municipally known as 579 Grand Ridge Drive (previously 0 Grand Ridge Drive) (the “**Subject Lands**”). The Subject Lands are adjacent to the CBM Site.

The Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment (the “**OPA and ZBA**”) are intended to permit a residential building with a maximum of four (4) storeys and 50 units. We understand that the Statutory Public Meeting was held on November 12, 2024, and a Council Meeting is scheduled for March 25, 2025.

We respectfully submit that the proposed OPA and ZBA should not be approved for the following reasons:

The proposed development would hinder the expansion of CBM’s existing mineral aggregate operation.

Section 4.5 of the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 (“**PPS**”) addresses Mineral Aggregate Resources. PPS Policy 4.5.2.4 states:

Mineral aggregate operations shall be protected from development and activities that would preclude or hinder their expansion or continued use or

which would be incompatible for reasons of public health, public safety or environmental impact.

The introduction of new sensitive uses directly adjacent to the Dance Pit and proposed extension will create a situation whereby a new receptor has been introduced that has not been taken into account by CBM in their assessments and thereby hinder the continued operation and expansion of the Dance Pit. We note that it does not appear that a land use compatibility assessment has been undertaken. In our opinion, it would be contrary to this Policy and not good planning to approve a residential development in close proximity to the Dance Pit without such an assessment.

The proposed high-density residential development has not been properly assessed for its compatibility with the ongoing operations at the CBM Site.

The PPS defines "Major Facilities" as facilities that may require separation from sensitive land uses, including resource extraction activities. Aggregate operations are categorized as Major Facilities.

Section 3.5 of the PPS concerns Land Use Compatibility and provides policies that require major facilities and sensitive land uses to be planned to avoid, or where avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate any adverse effects. Policies 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 state:

Major facilities and sensitive land uses shall be planned and developed to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate any potential adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety, and to ensure the long-term operational and economic viability of major facilities in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards and procedures.

Where avoidance is not possible in accordance with policy 3.5.1, planning authorities shall protect the long-term viability of existing or planned industrial, manufacturing or other major facilities that are vulnerable to encroachment by ensuring that the planning and development of proposed adjacent sensitive land uses is only permitted if potential adverse effects to the proposed sensitive land use are minimized and mitigated, and potential impacts to industrial, manufacturing or other major facilities are minimized and mitigated in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards and procedures.

Contrary to this Policy, the proposed OPA and ZBA, which would allow a high-density residential development on the Subject Lands, does not avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential adverse effects. Furthermore, the proposal fails to ensure the long-term operational and economic viability of the Dance Pit and proposed expansion.

Moreover, the PPS stipulates that such development should only be permitted if the potential impacts on both the proposed sensitive land uses and the existing aggregate pit are minimized and mitigated. As there has been no land use compatibility assessment, this requirement has not been adequately addressed.

Lack of Consultation

Finally, it is important to note that CBM has not been consulted regarding this proposal. In fact, CBM only became aware of this proposal when a Notice for a Neighborhood Meeting was sent out by the City, after the statutory public meeting has been held.

As a result, we cannot ascertain whether the City has taken sufficient steps to ensure that the potential impacts to both the proposed residential development and CBM's existing operations are adequately minimized and mitigated.

In conclusion, we respectfully request that the City of Cambridge reconsider the proposed OPA and ZBA, as they are not in alignment with the policies of the PPS and may adversely affect CBM's ongoing and future operations.

Please provide us with notice of any decision of Council or any Committee of Council in relation to this matter.

Yours very truly,

WOOD BULL LLP

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kim Mullin", with a stylized, cursive script.

Kim Mullin
KM/aa

0/579 GRAND RIDGE DRIVE Public Feedback

Council is considering a zoning by-law and official plan amendment to facilitate a redevelopment of the lands. The redevelopment could include:

- 4 storey residential building
- Surface parking

We are looking for constructive feedback. Please ensure you are clear and concise.

1. Are there design features and/or amenities that the site development should include?

- Right turn lane onto Grand ridge
- Sidewalk on south side of road between Grand ridge + Southwood high school
- Stop light at Grand ridge + Kent St
- pedestrian crosswalks at Grand ridge + Kent St.
- ~~road~~ - wildlife underpass at Grand ridge + Kent St.

2. Are there special setbacks, separations or conflicts that should be considered?

Traffic Speed
Lack of sidewalks, stop lights & pedestrian crosswalks
bank of wildlife crossing

3. If you have a concern, please explain it below.

Traffic, speed + difficulty turning onto 97 from Grand ridge + Kent

4. Final Comments or Suggestions

Improve traffic safety for motorists, pedestrians with improved speed monitoring/calm, stop lights & crosswalks before adding more traffic to the area



Survey Responses

21 January 2025 - 19 February 2025

Neighbourhood Meeting Questionnaire

EngageWR

Project: Cambridge HAF Project: 0 Grand Ridge Drive



VISITORS					
8					
CONTRIBUTORS			RESPONSES		
2			2		
0	0	2	0	0	2
Registered	Unverified	Anonymous	Registered	Unverified	Anonymous



Respondent No: 1

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Feb 06, 2025 21:18:33 pm

Last Seen: Feb 06, 2025 21:18:33 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Are there design features and/or amenities that the site development should include?

Residence want some sort of privacy. Trees and wood fences are not going to be adequate. Can we please look into concrete barriers for noise as the wall is high can help with privacy.

Q2. Are there special setbacks, separations or conflicts that should be considered?

I know it's been said to me and me again. But driving, pedestrian safety need to put up front.

Q3. If you have a concern, please explain it below.

The concern I have. Is the deterioration of the soil. Can my house walls and the vibration of the building. The change in the water table. The arrogation of the soil has changed the soil. I've had 5 trees die and fall from erosion, same as my neighbors. Environmentally. We have Canada geese that return year after year to produce offspring and use the parcels of land to grow and develop. We have owls nesting in the trees, as well as Eagles and Falcons. Wildlife is loose. What studies are being done to protect them.

Q4. Final Comments or Suggestions

Be more transparent in dealing with the public. Most of the resistance is because we don't know and no one is willing to ask questions. Be upfront we don't know the process. By saying things like we followed the guidelines doesn't instill confidence from anyone on the project. Provide us with options and try and get the buy-in. Be better than the minimum requirements by the province.



Respondent No: 2

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Feb 07, 2025 11:29:10 am

Last Seen: Feb 07, 2025 11:29:10 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Are there design features and/or amenities that the site development should include?

You are asking me to comment on the design of a development I don't think belongs here. As I expressed at the meeting, this is a site bounded by a graveyard, a highway and a busy street. The best we can do for people who need affordable housing? Is it realistic to find suitable for a home? But, in terms of the actual questions asked, the neighbours whose backs are to the proposed site would need large, mature trees planted along the edge of his boundary to protect privacy. A four-storey building with balconies that face and overlook the backyards is less than desirable. There are also grave arrangements concerns already due to the graveyard which is being expanded to within 200 feet of the proposed site. This quality will also be impacted by 1.25 cars/unit (minimum) and the emissions as they walk to the parking lot, as they surely will have to do, due to traffic. This is especially true for the home located on Grand Ridge and next to the proposed driveway entrance. Also, you say in the header a four-storey residential building but what guarantee do we have that will be only four storeys? Every day in the paper we see stories of developments in Waterloo Region that started as one height but for various reasons the final plan shows more. I have to even comment on design because suggests there would be a way if I hadn't put in the design that I would come to see this as a viable plan and I do not.

Q2. Are there special setbacks, separations or conflicts that should be considered?

I would have to know what the setback, separation and conflicts guidelines are for developments in Cambridge to answer this. I do wonder what has changed that now is proposed to allow development on a lot that has previously not been allowed. The environmental concerns haven't changed. The proximity of two overtopping ponds hasn't changed. Why are we even considering building here? What impacts will it have on the pond and its wildlife? By the time the site is demolished and a building has gone in, will we be able to see the negative impacts on the environment. Ask anyone who has tried to get the ponds cleaned up of the garbage left behind when highway 97 was redeveloped how much a promise to protect the environment means. Years later, here sits construction garbage in the ponds.

Q3. If you have a concern, please explain it below.

My concern is that we went to a meeting to discuss our concerns about any development that would arise from a zoning change being approved and the feedback requested about design! Aren't we or rather, aren't you, getting ahead of yourselves here? We keep being told no decision has been made but you want our input on design? Seems like you are full steam ahead. Why would you waste time bringing together housing partners and developers before you know if approval will be given? I feel as if you (the City) think if you show us nice building designs we won't continue to oppose the zoning change.

Q4. Final Comments or Suggestions

Lastly, the meeting the gentleman who took on the role of moderator the afternoon of the meeting but whose name and role I didn't hear, commented to me after I gave my concerns about the office as a viable location for housing. He said he couldn't be that bad because you all live here". I think his attempt at a joke on his very serious issue was inappropriate and doesn't account for the fact that many of us have lived in the area long before the garage and the increase in traffic on both 97 and Grand Ridge and that of course we would prefer for neither to be issues but these are our homes and our neighbourhood. We bought into a beautiful neighbourhood of 2000-3500 sq foot single family homes on the edge of town where we were once assured nothing could be built behind or beside. And yet we were unable to stop the encroaching garage port or do anything about the traffic concerns that developed around the intersection of 97 and Grand Ridge Drive. We are hopeful that some of our concerns will be settled so as we try to stop another negative impact on our neighbourhood. And still just us that have concerns. Within the residents of the 50 units surrounding the City about the dust and noise from the garage port, the noise and the danger of driving on a highway and the difficulty getting out of the complex and exiting the neighbourhood at peak times. You have the opportunity to look elsewhere for a more suitable location for an affordable housing development. Surely this is the best you can do.

Describe in a few words what matters most to you about the proposed development.

TRAFFIC!

SIGNIFICANT
INCREASE IN
DENSITY IN
THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

Speed on 97
- Quit Cruise
- 50-60 MPH
- Going in front of
- truck
- how well safer
- with tail
- 2 more cars?

Agnes, OK
Trucks.
-with proposal
for more cars
leaving DND this
afternoon and
returning in
mid-evening
in place of
normal
availability.

Will there be
a bypass?

Traffic
+ turning
only
Lb

TRAFFIC
PARKING

- INFRASTRUCTURE
- LOAD
- WATER
- ELECTRICITY
- WATERNET

No right turn
here and no
left turn
- then south on
- 1 mile and
to second side -

IS THIS THE BEST
LOT IN THE WHOLE
CITY FOR THIS
DOWD RANCH?
(Katherine and I had
nothing but a best friend)

Left turn
off Kent St.
-officially a turn
dangerous at
baked up. Two
wish half. How
will you improve?
Sutton @ this.com?

The feedback form and EngagementHQ website provide an opportunity to explain your concerns further.