

### **Attachment-3 Summary of Reasons for Refusal and Planning Analysis**

This report reviews and recommends refusal of the application to amend the Official Plan. The subject site is not appropriate for the density and height of the development as proposed. The applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed development can achieve appropriate transition to the surrounding low density residential lands, has not demonstrated compliance with urban design policies and guidelines, and has not demonstrated no negative impact to the adjacent Torrance Creek Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW). Taken together, these issues demonstrate an over-development of the subject site. It is recommended that the application be refused for reasons outlined below.

The proposal has been reviewed against the policies of the PPS, A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020) (Growth Plan), and the City of Guelph Official Plan.

In summary, the subject application:

- Is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS);
- Does not conform to the Official Plan;
- Does not meet Official Plan Amendment criteria; and,
- Does not represent good land use planning.

#### **Provincial Policy Statement, 2020**

The Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, came into effect on May 1, 2020. The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) provides direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. The PPS supports a comprehensive, integrated and long-term approach to planning, and recognizes linkages among policy areas. The PPS is issued under Section 3 of the Planning Act and all decisions of Council in respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter shall be consistent with the PPS.

The Provincial Policy Statement (2020) (PPS) provides policy direction provincewide on land use planning and development to promote strong communities, a strong economy, and a clean and healthy environment. It includes policies on key issues that affect communities, such as:

- the efficient use and management of land and infrastructure;
- ensuring the sufficient provision of housing to meet changing needs including affordable housing;
- ensuring opportunities for job creation;
- ensuring the appropriate transportation, water, sewer and other infrastructure is available to accommodate current and future needs;
- protecting people, property and community resources by directing development away from natural or human-made hazards; and,
- conservation of biodiversity, protection of natural heritage, water, agricultural, mineral and cultural heritage resources.

Policy 1.1.3.3 of the PPS directs that Planning authorities shall identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where it can be accommodated. This is underscored by Policy 4.6 of the PPS which states that the Official Plan is the most important vehicle for implementation of the PPS. The City of Guelph has established a vision and policy framework through the City's Official Plan. The analysis of the proposed built form, increased density and height in the context of Official Plan policies are outlined in greater detail below. The analysis concludes that this proposal represents over-development of this site. The proposal does not meet urban design policies and does not meet multi-unit residential building criteria outlined in the Official Plan.

Policy 2.1.1 directs that natural heritage features and areas shall be protected for the long term and policy 2.1.8 states that development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural heritage features or their ecological functions. As discussed later in this analysis, the supporting documents do not demonstrate conformity with the approved Environmental Implementation Report, therefore, it is unknown whether the proposed development has a negative impact on Torrance Creek or to the adjacent Torrance Creek Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW).

The proposed Official Plan Amendment is not consistent with the PPS.

### **Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (A Place to Grow)**

Amendment 1 to A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe came into effect on August 28, 2020. This is an amendment to the Growth Plan that came into effect on May 16, 2019.

The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, is issued under the Places to Grow Act and works to support the achievement of complete communities, manage forecasted population and employment growth, protect the natural environment, and support economic development. While the PPS as outlined above provides broader policy direction on matters of provincial interest, the Growth Plan provides more focused direction for development within the Greater Golden Horseshoe area. The Growth Plan builds on other provincial initiatives and policies and provides a framework to manage and guide decisions on growth through building compact, vibrant, and complete communities.

The policies of the Growth Plan focus on the key themes of building more compact and vibrant communities; directing a significant share of new growth to existing built-up areas of the City; promoting the development of transit-supportive densities and the use of active transportation methods; and creating complete communities through ensuring a healthy mix of residential, employment and recreational land uses.

Through the on-going Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR), City Council has received the Shaping Guelph Growth Management Strategy Land Needs Assessment and the recommendations from this assessment are to be incorporated into a draft Official Plan Amendment (OPA 80) to be brought forward to Council later this year. Although, draft OPA 80 has not yet been adopted by Council, it is based on an assessment that was received by Council. One of the key changes proposed through OPA 80 is the decrease in maximum building height in the Low Density Residential designation for the greenfield area from 6 to 4 storeys. This change clearly demonstrates that the subject site has not been identified for additional height and density.

Policy 2.2.7 of the Growth Plan applies to designated greenfield areas. This policy directs that new development taking place in designated greenfield areas will be planned, designated, zoned and designed in a manner that:

- a) supports the achievement of complete communities;
- b) supports active transportation; and
- c) encourages the integration and sustained viability of transit services.

The proposed increase in density and height at this location is not appropriate as there are limited commercial uses and services and public transit options are limited.

The Growth Plan sets out minimum density targets for municipalities to achieve a minimum number of residents and jobs combined per hectare. The minimum density

target is to be measured over the entire designated greenfield area, not on a site-specific basis. The existing land use designation that applies to this site assists the City in achieving this minimum density target.

### **Official Plan Conformity**

The subject site is identified as being within the Greenfield Area on Schedule 1: Growth Plan Elements of the Official Plan. As per Official Plan policy 3.12, the greenfield area will be planned and designed in a manner which will contribute to the City's overall vision of a diverse and complete community. Development within the greenfield area must be compact and occur at densities that support walkable communities, cycling and transit and promote live/work opportunities. The greenfield area will be planned and designed to:

- Achieve an overall minimum density target that is not less than 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare in accordance with the Growth Plan policies. The density target will be measured in accordance with the provisions of subsection 2.2.7 of the Growth Plan over the entire designated greenfield area to be developed;
- Provide a diverse mix of land uses including residential and employment uses to support vibrant neighbourhoods; and,
- Create high quality public open spaces with site design and urban design standards that support opportunities for transit, walking and cycling.

The subject property is designated as "Low Density Greenfield Residential" in the Official Plan. Permissible uses within this land use designation include detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings, as well as multiple unit buildings such as townhouses and apartments. The maximum net density is 60 units per hectare and the maximum height is six storeys in this land use designation. The proposal contemplates the intensification of the present site from six storeys and 60 units per hectare to 208 units per hectare with a 10-storey building. While it is recognized that this designation provides for the proposed uses (townhouses and apartments), the development in its current form fails to appropriately address the development criteria of the Official Plan and associated built form policies as outlined later in this analysis.

The proposed Official Plan Amendment does not conform to the above Official Plan policies.

### **Official Plan Amendment Criteria**

In accordance with Policy 1.3.14 of the Official Plan, the following criteria must be considered when evaluating an Official Plan Amendment. Staff have evaluated each of the criteria below.

- i. The conformity of the proposal to the strategic directions of this Plan and whether the proposal is deemed to be in the overall interests of the city.

The proposed Official Plan Amendment does **not** conform to the strategic goals of the Official Plan in Section 2.2, specifically the following:

- Ensure that development is planned to meet the goals, objectives and policies of this Plan (2.2.1.d);
- Protect, maintain, enhance and restore natural heritage features and functions and biodiversity of the City's Natural Heritage System to the greatest extent possible and support linkages between and among such systems and features within the city and beyond (2.2.2.b);
- Plan and design an attractive urban landscape that reinforces and enhances Guelph's sense of place (2.2.6.c); and,

- Encourage intensification and redevelopment of existing urban areas that is compatible with existing built form (2.2.6.d).

ii. Consistency with applicable provincial legislation, plans and policy statements;

The proposed Official Plan Amendment is not consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).

iii. Suitability of the site or area for the proposed use, particularly in relation to other sites or areas of the city.

The proposed townhouses and apartments are permitted uses in the "Low Density Greenfield Residential" land use designation, however, the density and height proposed are not suitable for this site. The site is not located in close proximity to commercial, recreational and institutional uses that could support the increased density.

iv. Compatibility of the proposed use with adjacent land use designations;

The proposed uses are compatible with adjacent land uses, however, the proposed height and density are not. The applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed density and height can be accommodated without adverse impacts on adjacent land uses.

v. The need for the proposed use, in light of projected population and employment targets.

This site is part of a larger subdivision that was draft plan approved in 2013. 168 dwelling units or a density of approximately 71 units per hectare were identified on this block through the original draft plan approval. This number of units was thought to be a number that could be accommodated on this block given its proximity to an environmentally sensitive area. The City's population projections do not identify a need to increase density on this block.

vi. The market feasibility of the proposed use, where appropriate.

The applicant has determined that the proposal is marketable.

vii. The extent to which the existing areas of the city designated for the proposed use are developed or are available for development.

The proposed height and density are not suitable at this location. High density residential proposals are generally encouraged to locate in areas that are in close proximity to commercial, services and in areas with good transit service.

viii. The impact of the proposed use on sewage, water and solid waste management systems, the transportation system, community facilities and the Natural Heritage System.

The applicant has failed to demonstrate no negative impacts to the Natural Heritage System.

ix. The financial implications of the proposed development.

There are no financial implications as staff are recommending refusal of the application.

x. Other matters as deemed relevant in accordance with the policies of this Plan.

Consideration of other relevant matters are discussed in this planning analysis.

The proposed Official Plan Amendment does not meet the criteria for an Official Plan Amendment.

### **Urban Design**

The proposed Official Plan Amendment has been reviewed against applicable urban design policies of the Official Plan and the Built Form Standards for Mid-Rise Buildings and Townhouses.

Zoning By-law information including conformity with the existing Zoning By-law has not been provided. Zoning regulations assist in understanding if the density in combination with the height are appropriate on this site. Based on the concept plan provided, there appears to be very little common amenity area, deficient private amenity area, very little landscaping and staff can not determine if parking regulations are being met.

### **Sun and Shadow Study**

The submitted sun and shadow study has not been prepared in accordance with the City of Guelph terms of reference (TOR).

For example, the following information has not been submitted:

- The dates and times have not been provided as per the City's Terms of Reference (e.g. hourly times not provided, April 21 date not provided etc.);
- The criteria as outlined in the terms of reference have not been evaluated. The massing model is not detailed enough to review against the criteria (e.g. sidewalk locations, adjacent development not shown etc.);
- Unknown if Daylight Saving Time been accounted for; and,
- As per the City's TOR, scale bars should be included on each sheet to allow for interpretation.

Based on the above, the applicant has not provided enough information to evaluate the impact of the shadows proposed.

The Official Plan states that the greenfield area will be planned and designed to create high quality site design and urban design standards (3.12.2.v). The Official Plan also promotes planning a design an attractive urban landscape (2.2.6).

From an urban design perspective, the proposed combination of density and height represented are not supportable and do not meet the intent of the Official Plan to create high quality site design. This is evident in the submitted concept plan which does not conform to the Built Form Standards for Mid-rise and Townhouses a number of ways including:

- Rear yards for townhouses are to be 7.5m where around 4m is shown in some locations (8.1.7).

- Balconies should be required to be recessed or partially recessed whereas the concept generally does not show this (7.13.7.7).
- Soft landscaping and trees cannot generally be accommodated on the internal streets given the lack of setbacks to the 10 storey buildings or to the 4 storey townhouses whereas wide landscaping and street trees are to be provided (7.0, 8.0).
- For front yard tree plantings, 1 medium or large stature tree should be planted for every two townhouse units facing a street (6.5.12). As proposed, there are many situations where inadequate space is provided. As well, the proximity of proposed trees to townhouse blocks and apartment blocks, utilities and infrastructure, should consider tree size at maturity to avoid future conflicts that could be damaged by tree branches and root systems.
- The separation between the two stacked townhouses should be a minimum of 15 metres where 13.52m is provided (8.1.10).
- Where a rear yard of one townhouse is adjacent to a side yard of another 9 metres is to be provided whereas 7.5m is shown (8.1.9).
- Townhouses should have a minimum exterior side yard setback of 4.5 metres to allow for the planting of trees along the sidewalk of the building to frame street whereas approximately 3.5m is provided (8.1.6).
- The setback along the public street is to be 6 metres whereas in one location 4.55m is provided.
- The midblock connections are 3.6m wide whereas a minimum of 5 metres is to be provided (6.6).
- Pedestrian walkways/sidewalks in midblock connections are to generally 2 metres in width whereas 1.5m is proposed (6.6.2).
- The midblock connection between the tall building and mid-rise should be 11 metres whereas 7.93m is provided (6.6).
- For the tall building a stepback of 1.5m between the 4th and 5th storeys whereas no stepback is proposed (7.1.6).
- The proposed building does not have a distinctive building top as required for tall buildings (Official Plan policy 8.9.1i).

### **General Comments on the Concept Plan**

- It appears there is a lack of tree planting opportunities if the balconies of townhouse blocks are factored into the elevations/plans, both front and back yards. This seems especially true for those units that back onto the natural feature/open space block.
- The Official Plan states the new development shall be integrated with the existing topography where possible (8.1.3). Proposed retaining walls of approximately 4/4.5m high prohibit desirable opportunities from either the townhouse block side and especially the future trail side, which will be situated at the base of the proposed wall (8.1.14, 8.1.15). Where built form will abut natural areas, an appropriate transition that provides visual and physical connection and contributes to the creation of a high-quality public realm will need to be provided.
- Based on the Grading Plan, the location of the proposed retaining walls along the natural feature/open space block are set back from the property line, which may further eliminate opportunities for trees along this edge, as proposed on the Landscape Plan Concept.
- Based on the Grading Plan placement of infiltration galleries conflict with proposed trees along Keegan and Poole Street, as shown on the Landscape Plans, as well as those trees proposed within the Apartment Block Common Amenity space, as shown on the Underground Parking Plan.

Given the information submitted, the proposed combination of density and height does not create high quality site design. The concept plan is not in keeping with urban design policies of the Official Plan and is not consistent with the City's urban design standards. The concept plan also does not appear to be able to conform to the Zoning By-law. The Official Plan Amendment as submitted is not supported by Urban Design staff.

### **Residential Development Policies**

Section 9.3 of the Official Plan contains policies that apply to the residential land use designations. The proposed development does **not** satisfy the following residential objectives:

- Ensuring compatibility between various forms of housing and between residential and non-residential uses;
- Maintaining the general character of built form in existing established residential neighbourhoods while accommodating compatible intensification;
- To provide for higher densities of residential development in appropriate locations to ensure that transit-supportive densities, compact urban form, walkable communities and energy efficiencies are achieved;
- Ensuring new development is compatible with surrounding land uses and the general character of neighbourhoods; and
- Ensuring new residential development is located and designed to facilitate and encourage convenient access to employment, shopping, institutions and recreation by walking, cycling and transit.

Section 9.3.1.1 of the Official Plan identifies criteria that must be used to assess multi-unit residential development proposals, as well as for intensification proposals within existing neighbourhoods. This criteria is to be applied in addition to the applicable urban design policies of the Official Plan, as noted previously.

1. That the building form, massing, appearance, and siting are compatible in design, character and orientation with buildings in the immediate vicinity.

The proposed density and height are not compatible with the surrounding land uses. The applicant has not demonstrated that additional density and height can be accommodated without adverse impacts on adjacent land uses.

2. Proposals for residential lot infill will be compatible with the general frontage of lots in the immediate vicinity.

Not applicable.

3. The residential development can be adequately served by local convenience and neighbourhood shopping facilities, schools, trails, parks, recreation facilities and public transit.

This area is not well served by public transit, shopping or recreation facilities. The increased density can not be supported in this area.

4. Vehicular traffic generated from the proposed development will not have an unacceptable impact on the planned function of the adjacent roads and intersections.

The increase in density results in an additional 325 dwelling units in the approved subdivision. There is only one road in and out of the subdivision to Victoria Road. The existing and future residents of the recently approved subdivision will feel an impact with an additional 325 dwelling units.

5. Vehicular access, parking and circulation can be adequately provided and impacts mitigated.

It is unknown if parking can be accommodated on site in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning By-law.

6. That adequate municipal infrastructure, services and amenity areas for residents can be provided.

As this is a block on an approved plan of subdivision, engineering staff have confirmed adequate municipal infrastructure is available. It is unknown if adequate amenity areas for residents can be provided.

7. Surface parking and driveways shall be minimized.

The applicant is proposing that the majority of parking be underground, however, it is unknown if underground parking can be adequately accommodated.

8. Development shall extend, establish or reinforce a publicly accessible street grid network to ensure appropriate connectivity for pedestrians, cyclist and vehicular traffic, where applicable.

As this is a block on a registered plan of subdivision, public streets do exist.

9. Impacts on adjacent properties are minimized in relation to grading, drainage, location of service areas and microclimatic conditions, such as wind and shadowing.

It is unknown if the proposed development impacts the adjacent Natural Heritage System and the sun and shadow study was not prepared in accordance with the City's TOR.

10. The development addresses public safety, identified public views and accessibility to open space, parks, trails and the Natural Heritage System, where applicable.

The proposed development poses safety concerns with high retaining walls adjacent to the public trail.

11. The conservation and integration of cultural heritage resources, including identified key public views can be achieved subject to the provisions of the Cultural Heritage Resources Section of this Plan.

The City's Senior Heritage Planner has reviewed the development proposal and did not identify any cultural heritage resource impacts from the development.

The proposed development does **not** satisfy the criteria outlined in Official Plan Policy 9.3.1.1.

### **Natural Heritage System**

The subject lands are part of a larger subdivision that was draft plan approved in November 2013. Through the draft plan of subdivision approval, an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and Environmental Implementation Report (EIR) were prepared by the applicant and approved by City staff. Note that these approvals were based on consistency with the City's previous Greenlands System policies and predate the City's current Natural Heritage System policies. Further refinements to water balance calculations and the management of stormwater were made through detailed design and subdivision registration of Phase 1B of this subdivision.

The following comments are made based on requirements set out in the approved EIS and EIR, and refinements to water balance and infiltration approved through detailed design:



- The proposed stormwater management strategy does not demonstrate that the approved water balance for this Block can be met. Therefore, it is unknown whether the proposed development would have an impact on Torrance Creek or to the adjacent Torrance Creek Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW).
- Previous approvals for this Block included infiltration galleries designed to accommodate 40 mm runoff volume from rooftops, with an infiltration target of 916 mm/year or 5,003 m<sup>3</sup> annually (refer to drawing C-421 prepared by Urbantech west, dated 27 April 2020). The development proposes a roof area increase from 5,461 m<sup>2</sup> to 9,326 m<sup>2</sup>. The increase in roof area required a revised plan for stormwater management. The proposed design infiltrates 25 mm runoff volume from rooftops, rather than the approved 40 mm runoff volume. The Functional Servicing Report (FSR) does not address the proposed increase in runoff or capacity in Stormwater Management Facility 200 to accommodate an increase in runoff without having a negative impact on Torrance Creek.
- In the approved Stormwater Management Plan for the subdivision approval, design of SWM Facility 200 accommodates drainage from catchment 201 with an area of 6.92 ha. The proposed development appears to also include catchment 600 (0.41 ha) in drainage to SWM Facility 200. Previously, designs accommodated sheet flow from rear yards backing onto the natural heritage system in catchment 600 to maintain surface flow contributions to the adjacent Torrance Creek PSW. Runoff from catchment 600 appears to be redirected to SWM Facility 200 and Torrance Creek, and away from the adjacent Torrance Creek PSW. The FSR does not address proposed changes in runoff directed toward the PSW and does not demonstrate that the proposed development will not have a negative impact on the adjacent PSW.
- The proposed Landscape Plan does not appear to be compatible with the placement of infiltration galleries. Adequate space for trees and infiltration galleries must be provided.
- The placement of infiltration gallery #4 is near the apartment garbage collection area. This is not ideal from a water quality perspective.
- Placement and sizing of infiltration galleries shown on the P1 Underground Parking Plan drawing do not appear to match what is shown on Engineering Drawings.

From an environmental planning perspective, the proposal is not supportable for the following reasons:

- The proposed stormwater management strategy does not demonstrate that the approved water balance for this Block can be met.
- It is unknown if the Stormwater Management Facility 200 can accommodate the proposed increased runoff.
- It is unknown if the proposed increase in runoff would have a negative impact on Torrance Creek.
- It is unknown whether the proposed reduction in sheet flow runoff directed to the Torrance Creek PSW from catchment 600 would have a negative impact.

### **Affordable Housing Strategy**

The City's Affordable Housing Strategy (AHS) sets an annual City-wide 30% target for housing that is affordable with the goal of ensuring that affordable housing is included in the range and mix of housing provided for all households across the city. The goals and objectives of the AHS have also been incorporated into the Official Plan in Section 7.2 (Affordable Housing). These policies are intended to encourage and support the development of affordable housing throughout the city by planning for a range of housing

types, forms, tenures and densities and have been applied to the review of this proposed residential development application.

Implementing the City's affordable housing target is largely dependent upon designating a suitable amount of land and density for residential use, including mixed use developments. There is a high correlation between the City's growth management policies and the ability to meet both growth management and affordable housing targets. Apartment units represent the vast majority of residential units that are below the affordable benchmark price, as identified in the AHS.

This actual contribution is measured as the units are rented or sold. However, it is also noted that how much of any given development may be affordable cannot be assessed at the time of official plan and zoning approval, understanding that this would only be known when the first sale or rental price is established. For this reason, the measurement on the actual achievement of affordable housing targets is done on the basis of what has been constructed and then sold or rented in the previous year. The City's annual Affordable Housing Reports prepared over the past few years have indicated that the City has been meeting affordable housing targets.

The applicant indicates in the Planning Justification Report that City Council has not identified any lands as part of the subdivision for the purpose of affordable housing. The applicant states that, "stacked townhouses and apartment units are desirable and more affordable to first time purchasers, single professionals and the move down buyers." The applicant has not made a commitment to provide affordable housing and "more affordable to first time purchasers" is not justification for increased density.

### **On-going Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment**

The subject lands are currently zoned "Specialized General Apartment" (R.4A-38), according to Zoning By-law (1995)-14864, as amended, however, the zoning for these lands is not in full force and effect as the zoning has been the subject of an on-going Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) appeal since 2012. The zoning of these lands was deferred pending the submission and agreement on a future Site Plan application. The City has yet to receive an acceptable site plan that would form the basis for site-specific zoning regulations for the block.

### **Municipal Services and Infrastructure**

Policy 6.1.3 of the Official Plan requires all new development to be on full municipal services, including sanitary sewers, water supply, stormwater management and transportation networks. Engineering staff have reviewed the development proposal and supporting documents. Engineering has advised that since this is a block on a registered plan of subdivision, the majority of engineering items were addressed prior to plan registration or could be addressed at the time of site plan.

### **Transportation**

The applicant submitted a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) prepared by Paradigm Transportation Solutions, based upon an agreed upon Terms of Reference (ToR) as part of a complete application. The City's Transportation Engineer and Traffic Services staff have reviewed the TIS.

As per the conclusions of the Traffic Impact Study, traffic control signals are warranted at the intersection of Decorso Drive and Victoria Road by 2028 (i.e., five years after the built-out of the development). Without traffic control signals, the eastbound left-turning traffic would wait for over 7 minutes before a suitable gap becomes available in the mainstream traffic on Victoria Road during AM peak hours.

## **Parks and Trails**

Park and Trail Development staff do not support the proposed concept plan, specifically the retaining walls adjacent to the public trail and open space required to accommodate underground parking on the site. The proposed retaining wall adjacent to the public trail on Blocks 93 and 94 would negatively impact the trail function and user experience of the natural area in the following ways:

- The overall length and height of the retaining wall would effectively separate this development from the public open space and create a strong physical and visual barrier between the public and private realm.
- Maintenance of the space between the retaining wall and trail would be difficult due to the narrow, inaccessible space and required demarcation fence. This could contribute to the build up litter, debris and overgrowth.
- The difference in height between the development and the trail may create areas of overlook without natural surveillance and other sightline issues as areas maybe hidden from above and by overgrowth below.

A Neighbourhood Park (P.2 Zone) Block was dedicated to the City through the registration of Phase 1B of the larger subdivision, however, the current proposal represents an increase in density and would be subject to additional parkland dedication in accordance with the current Parkland Dedication Bylaw (2019) – 20366, as amended in the form of payment in lieu of conveyance of parkland.

Comments from Parks Planning are included in Attachment-8.

## **Comments Received on the Applications**

Questions and issues raised by Council and members of the public in response to the applications were discussed in detail throughout this analysis.