

Ontario Land Tribunal
Tribunal ontarien de l'aménagement
du territoire



ISSUE DATE: November 21, 2024

CASE NO(S): OLT-22-002377
(Formerly PL210104)

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 17(40) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended

Applicant/Appellant:	30 Duke Street Limited
Subject:	Failure of Approval Authority to announce a decision respecting a Proposed Official Plan Amendment
Reference Number:	OPA 20/005W/JVW
Property Address:	22 Weber Street W (22 Weber Street W.)
Municipality/UT:	Kitchener/Waterloo
OLT Case No:	OLT-22-002377
Legacy Case No:	PL210104
OLT Lead Case No:	OLT-22-002377
Legacy Lead Case No:	PL210104
OLT Case Name:	30 Duke Street Limited v. Kitchener (City)

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 34(11) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended

Applicant/Appellant:	30 Duke Street Limited
Subject:	Application to amend the Zoning By-law – Refusal or neglect to make a decision
Reference Number:	20/013/W/JVW
Property Address:	22 Weber Street W (22 Weber Street W.)
Municipality/UT:	Kitchener/Waterloo
OLT Case No:	OLT-22-002378
Legacy Case No:	PL210105
OLT Lead Case No:	OLT-22-002377
Legacy Lead Case No:	PL210104

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 42(6) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18

Applicant/Appellant Subject:	30 Duke Street Limited Appeal of the Decision of Council to issue a permit with terms and conditions to (alter/erect/demolish/remove) a building or structure
Reference Number:	HPA-2022-V-015
Property Address:	22 Weber Street W
Municipality/UT:	Kitchener/Waterloo
OLT Case No:	OLT-22-004383
OLT Lead Case No:	OLT-22-002377
Legacy Lead Case No:	PL210104

Heard: October 30, 2024, by Video Hearing

APPEARANCES:

Parties

Counsel/Representative*

30 Duke Street Limited

Jennifer Meader
Anna Toumanians

City of Kitchener

Katherine Hughes

Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Andy Gazzola
Fiona McCrea (*In Absentia*)

Friends of Olde Berlin Town

Hal Jaeger*

MEMORANDUM OF ORAL DECISION DELIVERED BY YASNA FAGHANI AND GREGORY J. INGRAM ON OCTOBER 30, 2024 AND ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

[1] This was a further Case Management Conference (“CMC”) concerning an appeal by 30 Duke Street Limited (“Appellant”) of the City of Kitchener’s (“City”) failure to make a decision with respect to the Appellant’s applications for an Official Plan (“OP”) and Zoning

By-law Amendment (“ZBA”) regarding the property located at 22 Weber Street West in the City (“Subject Property”).

[2] The proposed amendments facilitate the construction of a new 19-storey multiple residential building, having 162 total units, and 24 parking spaces.

[3] At the CMC on August 27, 2024, a 15-day Hearing was scheduled to commence on April 15, 2025. The Tribunal ordered a further CMC to determine whether changes to the provincial legislation which would have any bearing on the draft Procedural Order (“PO”), to determine if any participants wished to update their statements, and to provide the opportunity for any additional Participant Status requests to be submitted.

PROCEEDINGS UPDATE

[4] The Tribunal confirmed that it did not receive any new Participant Status requests and no Participants updated their statements since the last CMC. As such, the Tribunal ruled that no further Participant Status requests would be considered moving forward.

[5] The Counsel for the Appellant advised that the parties have communicated with each other to update and reflect on the current policies and changes to the Legislation. A draft PO was filed on consent of the parties except for a few issues that were highlighted. The Counsel advised that said highlighted issues dealt with the City’s new Official Plan No. 49 (“OPA 49”) and new Zoning By-law No. 2024-065 (“new ZBL”). These issues were added to the Issued List (“IL”) by Friends of Olde Berlin Town. The Appellant did not agree to said highlighted issues and the Counsel wished to make submissions regarding the Appellant’s concerns. Both Counsels for the City and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo (“Region”) agreed in principle with the draft PO and did not take a position regarding the highlighted issues. Both the City and the Region agreed that the highlighted issues of concern were disputes between the Appellant and Friends of Olde Berlin Town.

[6] The Counsel for the Appellant submitted that the Subject Property is explicitly exempt from OPA 49. In support for her position, she relied on an Excerpt of OPA 49

dated March 18, 2024, marked as **Exhibit 1**. She identified the Subject Property as being outside of the areas where amendments to the OP applied. She advised that the City decided to exempt the Subject Property from the amendments because it was under appeal before this Tribunal. Additionally, she relied on an Excerpt of the new ZBL dated March 11, 2024, marked as **Exhibit 2**, in support of her position that the Subject Property was exempt from the ZBL Amendments. She again identified the areas where the ZBL Amendments applied and then she identified the Subject Property was not included in said areas.

[7] Counsel for the Appellant submitted that this is not a case where the *Clergy* Principle is in question as that Policy and Regulation simply do not apply to the Subject Property. The Counsel for the Appellant further submitted that the purpose of a CMC is to ensure that a merit hearing can proceed as efficiently as possible. She submitted that including inapplicable policies, such as OPA 49 and the new ZBL, runs counter to that purpose.

[8] Mr. Jaeger, the representative of Friends of Olde Berlin Town, advised the City has updated the OP and all the lands surrounding the Subject Property and new zoning has been approved around the Subject Property. He submitted that the merits of the argument when they were first launched no longer apply because of all the changes surrounding the Subject Property and that this appeal separates the Subject Property from the municipal jurisdiction. He requested that the Tribunal reconsider its decision to re-open the appeal. In the alternative, he requested that the Tribunal place predominant weight on the new provincial and municipal guidelines to test the proposal. He recognized the fact that the City exempted the Subject Property from OPA 49 and new ZBL and did so because the Subject Property was under appeal to the Tribunal. He submitted that the Tribunal should “release the matter from [its] jurisdiction and return [it] to the jurisdiction of the City”. He finally submitted that if the matter were to proceed to a hearing, testing the proposal against the new OPA 49 and ZBL would ensure appropriate transition and fairness.

[9] Additionally, Mr. Jaeger advised that the new ZBL was under appeal under a different file and was waiting for a decision from the Tribunal. He requested an adjournment of this Hearing until the decision of that appeal of the ZBA was rendered.

[10] Counsel for the City confirmed that the Subject Property is exempt from OPA 49 and the new ZBL. The new ZBL is currently under appeal regarding two other properties and not related to the Subject Property. The Region confirmed that the OPA 49 is in full force and effect and does exclude the Subject Property.

[11] In response to Mr. Jaeger, the Counsel for the Appellant advised that while the new provincial legislation has been implemented, it is not significantly different from the old version and the main purpose was to consolidate the old provincial legislation with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. While she agrees that the regional plan has been revised, the issues related to the amendments will be framed in terms of the *Clergy Principle* and arguments in that regard will follow at the merit Hearing.

[12] After hearing submissions from all Parties and standing down to confer, the Tribunal determined that the OPA 49 is in full force and effect and not under appeal. It specifically exempts the Subject Property from any amendments and as such has no relevance to this matter. Further, the Subject Property is also exempt from amendments to the new ZBL. While there is an appeal before this Tribunal concerning an appeal of the new ZBL, it is unrelated to the Subject Property. As such, the highlighted issues on the draft IL concerning OPA 49 and ZBA are to be stuck out.

[13] The Tribunal received a finalized IL and PO on Thursday, October 31, 2024, reviewed it, approved same and deemed it in force and effect to guide the proceedings of the merit hearing.

MEDIATION/SETTLEMENT

[14] The Counsel for the Appellant advised that settlement discussions have occurred with the City and the Region with the view of narrowing the issues. All counsel agreed that

it was appropriate to proceed this way. The Parties were aware of Tribunal-led mediation and indicated that they are not opposed to mediation, but that it is premature to determine whether that will be required. The preferred route is to continue settlement discussions at this time.

[15] Of note, Mr. Jaeger advised that mediation may assist in this matter, although he agreed it was premature at this time and was not opposed to the matter. He advised that Friends of Olde Berlin Town have asked to be part of settlement discussions but have yet been included in same.

ORDER

[16] THE TRIBUNAL ORDERS THAT:

1. The Procedural Order is in full force and effect as it appears in **Schedule 1** below and this matter will proceed to the 15-day Hearing scheduled to commence on April 15, 2024.

“Yasna Faghani”

YASNA FAGHANI
MEMBER

“Gregory J. Ingram”

GREGORY J. INGRAM
MEMBER

Ontario Land Tribunal

Website: www.olt.gov.on.ca Telephone: 416-212-6349 Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248

The Conservation Review Board, the Environmental Review Tribunal, the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal and the Mining and Lands Tribunal are amalgamated and continued as the Ontario Land Tribunal (“Tribunal”). Any reference to the preceding tribunals or the former Ontario Municipal Board is deemed to be a reference to the Tribunal.

Schedule 1



Ontario Land Tribunal

655 Bay Street, Suite 1500, Toronto, ON M5G 1E5

Tel: 416-212-6349 | 1-866-448-2248

Web Site: olt.gov.on.ca

CASE NO(S). : OLT-22-002377
(Formerly PL210104)

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 17(40) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended

Applicant/Appellant: 30 Duke Street Limited
Subject: Failure of Approval Authority to announce a decision respecting a Proposed Official Plan Amendment
Reference Number: OPA 20/005W/JVW
Property Address: 22 Weber Street W (22 Weber Street W.)
Municipality/UT: Kitchener/Waterloo
OLT Case No: OLT-22-002377
Legacy Case No: PL210104
OLT Lead Case No: OLT-22-002377
Legacy Lead Case No: PL210104
OLT Case Name: 30 Duke Street Limited v. Kitchener (City)

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 34(11) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended

Applicant/Appellant: 30 Duke Street Limited
Subject: Application to amend the Zoning By-law – Refusal or neglect to make a decision
Reference Number: 20/013/W/JVW
Property Address: 22 Weber Street W (22 Weber Street W.)
Municipality/UT: Kitchener/Waterloo
OLT Case No: OLT-22-002378
Legacy Case No: PL210105
OLT Lead Case No: OLT-22-002377
Legacy Lead Case No: PL210104

PROCEEDING COMMENCED UNDER subsection 42(6) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18

Applicant/Appellant	30 Duke Street Limited
Subject:	Appeal of the Decision of Council to issue a permit with terms and conditions to (alter/erect/demolish/remove) a building or structure
Reference Number:	HPA-2022-V-015
Property Address:	22 Weber Street W
Municipality/UT:	Kitchener/Waterloo
OLT Case No:	OLT-22-004383
OLT Lead Case No:	OLT-22-002377
Legacy Lead Case No:	PL210104

1. The Tribunal may vary or add to the directions in this procedural order at any time by an oral ruling or by another written order, either on the parties' request or its own motion.

Organization of the Hearing

2. The hearing will proceed in two phases:
 - a. Phase 1 – The Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment; and
 - b. Phase 2 – The Ontario Heritage Act Permit, to be scheduled upon issuance of the Tribunal's written Decision in respect of Phase 1.
3. The Phase 1 video hearing will begin on **April 14, 2025 at 10:00 a.m.** through video link <https://meet.goto.com/348282861>. When prompted, enter the code **348-282-861**.

GoTo Meeting: <https://meet.goto.com/348282861>

Access code: 348-282-861

Audio-only line: +1 (647) 497-9373 or (Toll-Free) 1-888-299-1889

Audio-only access code: 348-282-861

4. The parties' initial estimation for the length of the Phase 1 hearing is **15** days. The parties are expected to cooperate to reduce the length of the hearing by eliminating redundant evidence and attempting to reach settlements on issues where possible.

5. The parties and participants identified at the case management conference are set out in **Attachment 1**.
6. The issues are set out in the Issues List attached as **Attachment 2**. There will be no changes to this list unless the Tribunal permits, and a party who asks for changes may have costs awarded against it.
7. The order of evidence shall be as set out in **Attachment 3** to this Order. The Tribunal may limit the amount of time allocated for opening statements, evidence in chief (including the qualification of witnesses), cross-examination, evidence in reply and final argument. The length of written argument, if any, may be limited either on the parties' consent, subject to the Tribunal's approval, or by Order of the Tribunal.
8. Any person intending to participate in the hearing should provide a mailing address, email address and a telephone number to the Tribunal as soon as possible – ideally before the case management conference. Any person who will be retaining a representative should advise the other parties and the Tribunal of the representative's name, address, email address and the phone number as soon as possible.
9. Any person who intends to participate in the hearing, including parties, counsel and witnesses, is expected to review the Tribunal's [Video Hearing Guide](#), available on the Tribunal's website.

Requirements Before the Hearing

10. A party who intends to call witnesses, whether by summons or not, shall provide to the Tribunal and the other parties a list of the witnesses and the order in which they will be called. This list must be delivered on or before **December 16, 2024** and in accordance with paragraph 21 below. A party who intends to call an expert witness must include a copy of the witness' Curriculum Vitae and the area of expertise in which the witness is prepared to be qualified.
11. Expert witnesses in the same field shall have a meeting on or before **January 17, 2025** and use best efforts to try to resolve or reduce the issues for the hearing. Following the experts' meeting the parties must prepare and file a Statement of Agreed Facts and Issues with the Tribunal case co-ordinator on or before **January 31, 2025**.

12. An expert witness shall prepare an expert witness statement, which shall list any reports prepared by the expert, or any other reports or documents to be relied on at the hearing. Copies of this must be provided as in paragraph 14 below. Instead of a witness statement, the expert may file his or her entire report if it contains the required information. If this is not done, the Tribunal may refuse to hear the expert's testimony.
13. Expert witnesses who are under summons but not paid to produce a report do not have to file an expert witness statement; but the party calling them must file a brief outline of the expert's evidence as in paragraph 14 below. A party who intends to call a witness who is not an expert must file a brief outline of the witness' evidence, as in paragraph 14 below.
14. On or before **February 21, 2025**, the parties shall provide copies of their witness and expert witness statements to the other parties and to the Tribunal case co-ordinator and in accordance with paragraph 23 below.
15. On or before **February 21, 2025**, a participant shall provide copies of their written participant statement to the other parties in accordance with paragraph 23 below. A participant cannot present oral submissions at the hearing on the content of their written statement, unless ordered by the Tribunal.
16. On or before **March 10, 2025** the parties shall confirm with the Tribunal if all the reserved hearing dates are still required.
17. On or before **March 28, 2025**, the parties shall provide copies of their visual evidence to all of the other parties in accordance with paragraph 23 below. If a model will be used, all parties must have a reasonable opportunity to view it before the hearing. All models shall be shared electronically.
18. On or before **March 14, 2025**, the parties shall provide copies of their reply witness statements and expert's reply witness statements to the other parties and to the Tribunal case co-ordinator and in accordance with paragraph 23 below.
19. The parties shall cooperate to prepare a joint document book which shall be shared with the Tribunal case co-ordinator on or before **April 4, 2025**.
20. A person wishing to change written evidence, including witness statements, must make a written motion to the Tribunal. *See Rule 10 of the Tribunal's Rules with respect to Motions, which requires that the moving party provide copies of the motion to all other parties 15 days before the Tribunal hears the motion.*

21. A party who provides written evidence of a witness to the other parties must have the witness attend the hearing to give oral evidence, unless the party notifies the Tribunal at least 7 days before the hearing that the written evidence is not part of their record.
22. The parties shall prepare and file a preliminary [hearing plan](#) with the Tribunal on or before **April 4, 2025** with a proposed schedule for the hearing that identifies, as a minimum, the parties participating in the hearing, the preliminary matters (if any to be addressed), the anticipated order of evidence, the date each witness is expected to attend, the anticipated length of time for evidence to be presented by each witness in chief, cross-examination and re-examination (if any) and the expected length of time for final submissions. The parties are expected to ensure that the hearing proceeds in an efficient manner and in accordance with the hearing plan. The Tribunal may, at its discretion, change or alter the hearing plan at any time in the course of the hearing.
23. All filings shall be submitted electronically. Electronic copies may be filed by email, an electronic file sharing service for documents that exceed 10MB in size, or as otherwise directed by the Tribunal. The delivery of documents by email shall be governed by the *Rule 7*.
24. No adjournments or delays will be granted before or during the hearing except for serious hardship or illness. The Tribunal's Rule 17 applies to such requests.

ATTACHMENT 1
PARTIES & PARTICIPANTS

Parties

1. 30 Duke Street Limited

TMA Law
25 Main Street West, Suite 2010
Hamilton, ON L8P 1H1
Jennifer Meader
Tel: 905.529.3476
Email: jmeader@tmalaw.ca

Anna Toumanians
Tel: 905.529.3476
Email: atoumanians@tmalaw.ca

2. City of Kitchener

200 King Street West, 4th Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4G7

Katherine Hughes
Tel: 519.741.2200ext.7266
Email: katherine.hughes@kitchener.ca

3. Region of Waterloo

150 Frederick Street, 3rd Floor
Kitchener, ON N2G 4J3

Fiona McCrea and Andy Gazzola
Tel: 519.575.4518 / 226-750-5016
Email: fmccrea@regionofwaterloo.ca / agazzola@regionofwaterloo.ca

4. Friends of Olde Berlin Town

55 Margaret Avenue
Kitchener, ON N2H 4H3
Hal Jaeger
Tel: 519.341.6007
Email: obtfriends@gmail.com

Participants

1.	Daniel Ariza	dariza347@gmail.com
2.	Neil Baarda	neil.baarda@gmail.com
3.	Ilona Bodendorfer	synergistic_solutions@sympatico.ca
4.	Richard Buck	richard@crbucklaw.com
5.	Taijwant (Tony) Greer	taijwant@gmail.com
6.	Cathryn Harris	drcathrynharris@gmail.com
7.	Bob Janzen	bob.janzen46@gmail.com
8.	Adam Joncas	adamjoncas@hotmail.com
9.	Gail Pool	gail.richard.pool@gmail.com
10.	North Waterloo Region Branch of Architectural Conservancy Ontario	rowell01@sympatico.ca
11.	Donna Kuehl	adeline@sympatico.ca
12.	Peter Eglin	peglin@wlu.ca
13.	Trudy Wagner	twagner29@live.ca
14.	Simon Euteneier	stonehouserent@gmail.com
15.	Sally Gunz	sgunz@uwaterloo.ca
16.	Roy Cameron	cameron@uwaterloo.ca
17.	Monica Weber	monicaweber10@gmail.com
18.	Social Development Centre of Waterloo Region	sdcwr@waterlooregion.org
19.	John Ryrie	jryrie_04@sympatico.ca
20.	Kathryn Forler	kathrynforler@gmail.com
21.	Maaïke Asselberg	masselbergs@sentex.ca
22.	Micah Sadler	mica@sadlerrealty.ca
23.	Ron Brohman	r.f.brohman@gmail.com

ATTACHMENT 2

ISSUES LIST

Note: The identification of an issue does not mean that all parties agree that such issue, or the manner in which the issue is expressed, is appropriate or relevant to the determination of the Tribunal at the hearing. The extent to which the issues are appropriate, within the jurisdiction of the OLT, or relevant to the determination at the hearing will be a matter of evidence and argument at the hearing.

	Matters of Provincial Interest (Section 2 of Planning Act)	Party
1	Do the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment applications (the “proposed applications”) have sufficient regard to the matters of provincial interest listed in section 2(d), (n), (p) and (r)?	FOBT
	Provincial Policy Statement 2020 and Provincial Planning Statement 2024	
2	a) Are the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications (the proposed applications) consistent with the PPS 2020, including but not limited to, policies 1.1.3.2, 1.1.3.3, 1.1.3.4, 2.6 and 4.6? <i>(Issue may no longer apply in light of PPS 2024)</i>	City FOBT
	b) Are the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications (the proposed applications) consistent with the PPS 2024, including but not limited to, sections 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.6 a), 2.2.1, 2.3.1, 2.4.1, 2.4.2.3, 4.6.1, 4.6.3, 6.1.1, 6.1.5, 6.1.6, 6.1.7, 6.1.11, and 6.1.12?	City FOBT
	Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe	
3	Do the proposed applications conform to the Growth Plan, including but not limited to, Guiding Principle 1.2.1, and policies in sections 2.2.2, 2.2.4, 2.2.6, 4.1, and 4.2.7? <i>(Issue may no longer apply in light of PPS 2024)</i>	City FOBT
	Region of Waterloo Official Plan	
4	Do the proposed applications conform to the Region of Waterloo Official Objective 3.8?	FOBT

5	Do the proposed applications conform to the Urban Area Development policies in chapter 2.D (2.D.1, 2.D.2, 2.D.6, 2.D.10)?	City FOBT
6	Do the proposed applications conform to the Liveability in Waterloo Region policies in chapter 3 (3.A, 3.B, 3.C, 3.G.1, 3.G.6)?	City FOBT
7	Do the proposed Official Plan Amendment and proposed Zoning By-law Amendment implement all requirements to address noise from stationary and transportation sources in conformity with the Regional Official Plan, including Sections 2.G.10, 2.G.13, 2.G.14, 2.G.15 and 2.G.16, including but not limited to an appropriate holding provision?	Region
Region of Waterloo Official Plan Amendment 6		
8	What consideration, if any, should be given to the following policies of OPA 6:	Applicant
	a) Do the proposed applications conform to Policy 2.C.2.2.(f) and general objective bullet #8 (Chapter 2, page 3) regarding cultural heritage conservation?	FOBT
	b) Do the proposed applications conform to Policy 2.D.2.8, regarding the appropriate location of major intensification?	FOBT
	c) Do the proposed applications conform to Policy 2.F.3, regarding intensification on properties designated under the OHA?	FOBT
	d) Do the proposed applications conform to Policy 2.I.5.1, regarding exceeding intensification and density targets?	FOBT
	e) Do the proposed applications have sufficient regard to Objective 3.A., bullet 1, regarding supporting a range of housing?	FOBT
City of Kitchener Official Plan		
9	Do the proposed applications conform to the Urban Structure policies in Part C (3.C.2.9, 3.C.2.10, 3.C.2.17, 3.C.2.20, and 3.C.2.22)?	City FOBT
10	Do the proposed applications conform to the Housing policies in Section 4 (4.C.1.7, 4.C.1.8, 4.C.1.9, 4.C.1.13, and 4.C.1.19)?	City FOBT
11	Do the proposed applications conform to the Private Greenspace and Facilities policies in Section 8 (8.C.1.21 and 8.C.1.23)?	City FOBT

12	Do the proposed applications conform to the Urban Design objectives in Section 11 (11.1.1 through 11.1.8)?	City FOBT
13	Do the proposed applications conform to the Urban Design policies in Section 11 (11.C.1.4, 11.C.1.11, 11.C.1.12, 11.C.1.21, 11.C.1.29, 11.C.1.30, 11.C.1.31, 11.C.1.32, and 11.C.1.33).	City FOBT
14	Do the proposed applications conform to the Cultural Heritage Resources objectives in Section 12 (12.1.2)?	City FOBT
15	Do the proposed applications conform to the Cultural Heritage Resources policies in Section 12 (12.C.1.1, 12.C.1.10, 12.C.1.14, 12.C.1.19, 12.C.1.21, 12.C.1.23, 12.C.1.26, 12.C.1.27, and 12.C.1.29??	City FOBT
16	Do the proposed applications conform to the Active Transportation objectives in Section 13 (13.1.1, 13.1.3, and 13.1.7)?	City
17	Do the proposed applications conform to the Transportation policies in Section 13 (13.C.1.4.d, 13.C.1.6, 13.C.1.13, 13.C.3.12, 13.C.7.3, 13.C.7.4, 13.C.8.2, and 13.C.8.4)?	City
18	Do the proposed applications conform to the City of Kitchener Official Plan objective 3.2.5?	FOBT
City of Kitchener Civic Centre Secondary Plan		
19	Do the proposed applications conform to the General Policies in Section 13.1.1 (13.1.1.1, and 13.1.1.7)?	City FOBT
20	Do the proposed applications conform to the Land Use Designation policies in Section 13.1.2 (13.1.2.8)?	City FOBT
Kitchener Zoning By-law		
21	Are the proposed on-site secured and visitor bicycle parking rates appropriate for the scale, proposed use, and number of dwelling units proposed with the development?	FOBT
22	Do the requested site specific zoning regulations address compatibility between the proposed development, the existing community, and the planned function of the immediate area, including: adequate setbacks from existing low density uses, maximum building heights and step backs regulations to regulate	City FOBT Region

	<p>built form, setbacks for surface parking facilities from the public realm, as well as setbacks and step backs from other properties?</p> <p>Do the requested site specific zoning regulations address adequate setbacks and driveway visibility triangles?</p> <p>Does the driveway width comply with zoning regulations and Regional Requirements for Access By-law and policy?</p>	
	Kitchener Urban Design Manual	
23	What weight should be given to the Kitchener Urban Design Manual?	Applicant
24	Does the proposed development complement adjacent built form through compatible height, scale, massing, and materials?	City FOBT
25	Does the base of the proposed development meet the built form guidelines for a Tall Building?	City FOBT
26	Does the proposed development achieve sufficient transition to the adjacent existing and planned built form of the adjacent properties? Is there a suitable transition in scale, massing, building height, building length and intensity through setbacks, step backs, landscaping, and compatible architectural design/material selection?	City FOBT
27	Does the proposed development meet the tower separation guidelines for a Tall Building?	City FOBT
28	Does the proposed development exceed the target overlook guidelines for a Tall Building?	City
29	Does the proposed development provide a sufficient step back from the base to mitigate the potential wind impact on the public realm?	City
30	Does the proposed development include a sufficient shared outdoor amenity area?	City FOBT
31	Is the proposed building height compatible and aligned with adjacent neighbouring properties?	City FOBT

32	Does the proposed development appropriately mitigate the unwanted microclimate impact on surrounding properties, such as wind and shadow impacts?	City FOBT
33	Do the proposed applications respect the Major Transit Station Area guidelines, including but not limited to the following guidelines? a) Compatibility (section 02.2.6, p. 5, items 2 and 4) b) Cultural and Natural Heritage (section 02.2.7, p. 5, item 1) c) Built Form (section 02.3.1, p. 6, items 2 and 4) d) PARTS Central (section 02.4.2, p. 12, item 7)	FOBT
34	Do the proposed applications respect the Tall Buildings guidelines, including but not limited to the following guidelines? a) Relative Height, For towers adjacent to low-rise surrounding areas (p. 6) b) Compatibility (p. 15) c) Heritage, When a tall building is adjacent to a built heritage resource (p. 16, items 1, 3 and 4)	FOBT
35	Do the proposed applications respect the City-Wide guidelines, including but not limited to the following guidelines? a) Focal Points & Gateways (section 01.2.5, p. 15, item 4), b) Cultural & Natural Heritage (section 01.2.8, p. 18, item 7) c) Built Form (section 01.3.1, p. 19, item 9) d) Site Function (section 01.3.3, p. 23, items 8 and 9)	FOBT
Civic Centre Neighbourhood, Heritage Conservation District Plan (HCD Plan)		
36	Are the proposed applications consistent with the Heritage District Objective, Principles, and Policies in the HCD Plan (Section 3.1, 3.2, 3.3.3, and 3.3.5.2, Recommendation 4.2.1 on “High Density Commercial Residential Designation” and Bullets 2 and 7 of Guideline 6.9.4)?	City FOBT
37	Are the proposed applications consistent with the Architectural Design Guidelines in the HCD Plan (Section 6.6 and 6.9.4)?	City FOBT
38	Does the proposed development provide a 45 degree angular plane measured from the rear property line to provide transition in scale from proposed development down to adjacent lands?	City FOBT
Other		

39	What consideration, if any, should be given to The PARTS Central Plan?	Applicant
40	Do the proposed applications represent good planning and are they in the public interest?	FOBT
Phase 2: Ontario Heritage Act Permit		
41	Is there sufficient information before the Tribunal to issue a Heritage Permit pursuant to section 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act?	City
42	Do the proposed applications have sufficient regard to the Ontario Heritage Act, including but not limited to, sections 41.2.2, 42(1) and 68(3)?	FOBT