

REPORT TO COMMITTEE(S) OF COUNCIL INTERNAL ROUTING CHECKLIST

ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT: PGM

DIVISION:

REPORT AUTHOR: Ian Cross

PHONE No.

REPORT TITLE: Urban Boundary Phase 2B Witness Statements

REFERENCE No. ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0168

DOCUMENT FILE NAME/PATH:

Subject to Provisions of Bill 51

Yes

No

Application date:

OWNER:

APPLICANT:

WARD:

CONTROVERSIAL: Yes No

TO BE PRESENTED TO		DATE OF MEETING	
Committees			
1. Planning Committee		June 26, 2012	
2.			
3.			
Council		June 27, 2012	
Other Divisions/Branches Consulted		Forwarded To	
Financial Services Unit or Financial Planning		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Supply		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Legal		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Others		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
Contacted / Consulted / Advised by Department			
Elected Official(s) / Ward(s)			
Public Groups / Individual(s)			
ADVERTISING/NOTICE			
Regular Advertising Required		<input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES Date:	
Municipal Act Notice Required		<input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES Date:	
For Originating Department's Use		Approved	Date
1.	Originating General Manager or Delegate - - Report is acceptable	John L. Moser	June 18, 2012
2.	Financial Services Unit Manager, Financial Planning or Delegate (if applicable) – Report Recommended to General Manager		
3.	Supply (if applicable) – Report Recommended to General Manager		
4.	Legal Services (if applicable) – Report Recommended to General Manager		
5.	Other	DCMO	
6.	Program Manager		
7.	Manager	Richard Kilstrom	June 14, 2012
8.	Deputy City Manager or Delegate – Report approved to leave Department	John L. Moser	June 18, 2012

Report to/Rapport au :

**Planning Committee
Comité de l'urbanisme**

and Council / et au Conseil

June 14, 2012

14 juin 2012

**Submitted by/Soumis par : Nancy Schepers, Deputy City Manager, Directrice
municipale adjointe, Planning and Infrastructure/Urbanisme et Infrastructure**

*Contact Person / Personne ressource: Richard Kilstrom, Manager/Gestionnaire, Policy
Development and Urban Design/ Élaboration de la politique et conception urbaine
Planning and Growth Management/Urbanisme et Gestion de la croissance
613-580-2424, ext. 22653, Richard.kilstrom@ottawa.ca*

CITY WIDE / À L'ÉCHELLE DE LA VILLE

Ref N°: ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0168

SUBJECT: URBAN BOUNDARY PHASE 2B WITNESS STATEMENTS

**OBJET : DÉCLARATIONS DE TÉMOINS SUR LA PHASE 2B RELATIVE À
LA LIMITE URBAINE**

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

That Planning Committee and Council receive this report for information.

RECOMMANDATIONS DU RAPPORT

**Que le Comité de l'urbanisme et le Conseil prennent connaissance du présent
rapport.**

BACKGROUND

As part of the amendments made by Bill 51 to the *Planning Act*, provisions were inserted to ensure that any possible new evidence, subsequent to a Council's consideration of an Official Plan or Zoning By-law amendment, are brought to the attention of that Council prior to the conclusion of any Ontario Municipal Board hearing on such amendment. This is to ensure that Council has the opportunity to consider any evidence that the Board will itself consider in reaching its decision.

It has been the long-standing practice of the Board to require the exchange of witness statements in advance of complex hearings so that each party is aware of the cases the other parties will present to the Board. The exchange of witness statements also permits a review to be done to determine if there is any new information or evidence that should be brought to Council in order to allow for a review of its previous decision on the matter.

This report and accompanying attachments and links fulfill the *Planning Act* direction to present any possible new evidence before Council.

DISCUSSION

Urban Boundary – Phase 2B Hearing

The Phase 2B hearing is the third and final hearing on the urban boundary and the last of a series of hearings with respect to Official Plan Amendment No. 76. With respect to the Urban Boundary, the Phase 1 hearing decided that 850 gross residential hectares of land should be added to the urban area to provide for needs up to 2031, excluding the Fernbank Lands approved by Council for inclusion the boundary expansion. Phase 2 of the hearing was separated into two parts. Phase 2A decided the City used appropriate methodology to evaluate candidate lands for expansion. Phase 2B will decide whether the methodology was applied appropriately to the evaluation of candidate parcels.

The Urban Boundary Phase 2B hearing will commence on July 3, 2012 and is scheduled for four weeks. Witness statements were exchanged on June 11, 2012. A link to all statements is attached at the end of this report. Planning staff have reviewed the witness statements provided by all parties with a view to summarizing for Committee and Council those which may contain information or evidence that may not have been before Council at the time that Official Plan Amendment No. 76 was adopted in June 2009. Accompanying each summary of information provided through the witness statements exchanged on June 11, 2012, is a staff response.

The expert witnesses for the appellants are as follows:

- Murray Chown is a planner called by 6095186 Canada Inc. (Brigil) and 7089121 Canada Inc. (Junic Multivesco);
- John Riddell is an engineer called by Kanata Research Park Corporation and J.G. Rivard Limited (Valecraft);
- Murray Chown is a planner called by Kanata Research Park Corporation and J.G. Rivard Limited (Valecraft);
- Tony Sroka is a planner called by James Maxwell;
- Brett Ifill is a land economist called by James Maxwell;
- Alexius Golob is an engineer called by James Maxwell;
- Jeffrey Celentano is a planner called by Rudolpho Mion, John Mion and M & A Rentals;

- Ronald Jason is a surveyor called by Rudolpho Mion, John Mion and M & A Rentals;
- Murray Chown is a planner called by Grace Bell, Ross Bradley and 1384321 Ontario Limited;
- Craig Houle is an engineer called by Grace Bell, Ross Bradley and 1384321 Ontario Limited;
- Nancy Meloshe is a planner called by 4840 Bank Street Limited;
- Jim Moffatt is an engineer called by 4840 Bank Street Limited;
- Peter Smith is a planner called by Minerva Kellam, Marjorie Dowler and Urbandale Corporation;
- David Gilbert is an engineer called by Minerva Kellam, Marjorie Dowler and Urbandale Corporation; and
- Richcraft Homes have advised it is not filing witness statements.

In addition to the above, the following witnesses representing other landowners are appearing in support of the City's position at the hearing:

- Lloyd Phillips is a planner called by Metcalfe Realty Company Ltd.;
- Demetrius Yannoulopoulos is an engineer called by Metcalfe Realty Company Ltd.; and
- Bernie Muncaster is an environmental planner called by Metcalfe Realty Company Ltd.

Having reviewed the witness statements provided by other parties to the Urban Boundary Phase 2B hearing, it continues to be the position of staff that the methodology for evaluating candidate parcels for urban expansion was correctly applied, is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and represents good land use planning. City planning staff recommend only one minor change to the scoring of one parcel to take account of new information contained in a witness statement. That change does not affect the parcels recommended for urban expansion. As noted in the accompanying report "Recommended Council Position for Urban Boundary – Phase 2 Hearing" there are revisions to two other parcels but these do not arise from information contained in the above witness statements.

RURAL IMPLICATIONS

The recommendations contained in this report are part of the process to establish which lands are redesignated from the rural area to the urban area. The process will conclude with a decision on the Phase 2B hearing.

CONSULTATION

A pre-hearing was held with respect to the hearing at which interested persons, who had made submissions with respect to the Amendment or who could otherwise provide a justification, could seek to be added as a party or participant to the hearing.

COMMENTS BY THE WARD COUNCILLOR(S)

Not applicable as this is a City-Wide report.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The final phase of the Urban Boundary hearing is to take place starting 3 July 2012 with witness statements having been exchanged on 11 June 2012 and reply witness statements on 22 June 2012. The evidence to be led and the position that any party can take at the hearing is thus confined to that outlined by these witness statements.

It is expected that the hearing will be conducted by in-house legal counsel and staff witnesses. Costs for a transcript and printing of materials for the hearing should not exceed \$15,000.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

There are no risk management implications association with the recommendation in this report

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

ONLY FINANCE STAFF MAY COMPLETE THIS SECTION. Report writers should provide the general finance information, details and rationale related to the topic in the Discussion section of the report. Finance will outline the financial impact to the City resulting from the report recommendations in the Financial Implications section. If there are no financial implications, Finance will provide a comment to that effect. All reports will be sent via the online RADAR tool to your Finance Account Manager to secure the necessary comment from the Finance Department. Reports cannot go forward without addressing this section and should be forwarded to Finance five (5) working days prior to the report deadline.

ACCESSIBILITY IMPACTS

There are no accessibility impacts.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

The Official Plan of the City of Ottawa, as proposed to be modified by Official Plan Amendment No. 76, implements the environmental objectives of the Provincial Policy Statement.

TECHNOLOGY IMPLICATIONS

There are no technology implications.

TERM OF COUNCIL PRIORITIES

This report supports the following priorities:
ES2 – Enhance and protect natural systems
GP3 – Make sustainable choices

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Document 1 Issues List
Document 2 Witness Statement Summary and Response
Document 3 Witness Statements - Issued separately and held on file with the City Clerk

DISPOSITION

The City's legal representatives will advance the position of Council before the Ontario Municipal Board.

ISSUES LIST(as specified in the Ontario Municipal Board Procedural order)

1. Was there new information to justify the change to the division of parcels 1B and 1C from May/09 to Oct/11.
2. Is parcel 1B more appropriately evaluated as a single parcel or as 1BE and 1BW?
3. Is parcel 1C more appropriately evaluated as a single parcel or as 1CE and 1CW?
4. Have the appropriate deductions been made from the gross area of the following parcels to arrive at gross developable area:
 - a. 9B
 - b. 1B
 - c. 1C
 - d. 2
 - e. 9C.1
 - f. 9C.2
 - g. 1FS
5. What is the appropriate means of breaking a tie in the scoring of candidate parcels?

CRITERIA AT ISSUE

(Issues raised by Owners unless otherwise identified)

Parcel 1a (6095186 Canada Inc., 7089121 Canada Inc.)

1. Criteria 7-Accessibility to existing or planned retail/commercial focus.
2. Criteria 12-Existing Bus Service

Parcel 1d (6095186 Canada Inc., 7089121 Canada Inc.)

1. Criteria 7-Accessibility to existing or planned retail/commercial focus.

Parcel 1h (6095186 Canada Inc., 7089121 Canada Inc.)

1. Criteria 7-Accessibility to existing or planned retail/commercial focus.

Parcel 1c-, Kanata Research Park Corporation, J.G. Rivard Limited

1. Criteria 2-Servicability-Wastewater
2. Criteria 7-Accessibility to existing or planned retail/commercial focus
3. Criteria 11-Connectivity to the Community

Parcel 1fS-Jim Maxwell

1. Criteria 2-Servicability-Wastewater
2. Criteria 3-Servicability-Stormwater
3. Criteria 4-Roads
4. Criteria 5-Accessibility-Arterial and Collector Roads
5. Criteria 7-Accessibility to existing or planned retail/commercial focus
6. Criteria 9-Accessibility to Community Facilities
7. Criteria 10-Availability of existing or planned emergency services
8. Criteria 12-Existing Bus Service
9. Criteria 13-Potential Conflicting Land Uses
10. Criteria 14-Potential Conflicting Land Uses
11. Criteria 15-Depth to Bedrock
12. Criteria 16-Land Absorption

Parcel 2-Richcraft Homes Ltd

(Richcraft subsequently advised they have withdrawn all but Issue 5) (Connectivity)

1. Criteria 5-Accessibility-Arterial and Collector Roads
2. Criteria 6-Accessibility to Transit
3. Criteria 9-Accessibility to Community Facilities
4. Criteria 10-Availability of existing or planned emergency services
5. Criteria 11-Connectivity to the Community
6. Criteria 13-Potential Conflicting Land Uses

Parcel 3- Rudolpho Mion and M & A Rentals

1. Criteria 6-Accessibility-Transit
2. Criteria 11-Connectivity to the Community

Parcel 6c-Grace Bell, Ross Bradley, 1384321 Ontario Limited

1. Criteria 1-Servicability-Water
2. Criteria 2-Servicability-Wastewater
3. Criteria 3-Servicability-Stormwater
4. Criteria 6-Accessibility-Transit
5. Criteria 12-Existing Bus Service
6. Criteria 15-Depth to Bedrock

Parcel 8a-4840 Bank Street Inc.

1. Criteria 1-Servicability-Water
2. Criteria 15-Depth to Bedrock
3. Criteria 16-Land Absorption

Parcel 9b-Kellam-Dowler

1. Criteria 1-Servicability-Water
2. Criteria 5-Accessibility-Arterial and Collector Roads
3. Criteria 8-Ability to work in the community

4. Criteria 12-Existing Bus Service
5. Criteria 15-Depth to Bedrock
6. Criteria 16-Land Absorption

Parcel 9c.1-Issues Raised by Friends of the Greenspace Alliance

1. Criteria 1-Servicability-Water
2. Criteria 15-Depth to Bedrock
3. Criteria 16-Land Absorption

Parcel 9c.2-Issues Raised by Friends of the Greenspace Alliance

1. Criteria 1-Servicability-Water
2. Criteria 15-Depth to Bedrock
3. Criteria 16-Land Absorption

DRAFT

Murray Chown (parcels 1a, 1d and 1h)

Responds to General Issue 5 (what is the appropriate means of breaking a tie?) and issues on Criteria 7 (for parcels 1a, 1d and 1h) and Criteria 12 (parcel 1a).

Issue 1 – Accessibility to existing or planned retail/commercial focus (Criteria 7):

- Parcels 1a, 1d and 1h should be scored 2 points, 1 point and 1 point respectively.

Staff Response:

Distances for the parcels were measured to the edge of the commercial core of the Kanata Town Centre (KTC) as defined in the Official Plan (Volume 2B). This is the appropriate measure since the eastern portion the KTC is almost entirely residential and contains no retail/commercial focus. The parcels were scored appropriately in the September 1, 2011 staff report, and all received a score of 0 points for being more than 7.4 km distant.

Issue 2 – Existing bus service (Criteria 12):

- Parcel 1a should be scored 1 point for having peak period service from Route 60.

Staff Response:

Parcels receive points for having “service at the parcel”. Route 60 terminates south of the parcel and therefore received 0 points.

General Issue 5 – appropriate means of breaking a tie:

- Ties should be broken based on an evaluation of potential for competing parcels to contribute to the development of complete neighbourhoods or communities.

Staff Response:

Ties are best resolved by picking the parcel or combination of parcels that come closest to achieving the 850 total hectares decided by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). The alternative of evaluating potential to contribute to complete communities introduces inherent subjectivity. In addition, it offers no means to resolve situations where parcels have equal potential to complete communities.

John Riddell (parcel 1c)

Responds to General Issues 1, 2, 3 and the issue on Criteria 2 for parcel 1c.

General Issue 1 – Was there new information to justify the change to dividing parcels 1B and 1C from May/09 to Oct/11?

- There was no new information received by the City to justify a change in approach to evaluating candidate parcels in Kanata North. Parcels 1b and 1c should continue to be split into east and west parts.

Staff Response (Issue 1):

Parcels 1b and 1c can be serviced whether they are single parcels or split. The scoring for water and wastewater services is similar. Servicing in this case should not be the determining factor for the parcel configuration.

General Issue 2 – Is parcel 1B more appropriately evaluated as a single parcel or as 1BE and 1BW?

- Splitting parcel 1b was a logical approach to evaluating areas for urban expansion.

Staff Response (Issue 2):

Splitting 1b may optimize on servicing, however we would have to extend this methodology to other areas also. We would also have to do this on other criteria besides servicing to establish the optimal parcel sizes. This is beyond the intent of the evaluation.

General Issue 3 – Is parcel 1C more appropriately evaluated as a single parcel or as 1CE and 1CW?

- Splitting parcel 1c was a logical approach to evaluating areas for urban expansion.

Staff Response (Issue 3):

Splitting 1c may optimize on servicing, however we would have to extend this methodology to other areas also. We would also have to do this on other criteria besides servicing to establish the optimal parcel sizes. This is beyond the intent of the evaluation.

Criteria Issue 1 – Wastewater servicability (Criteria 2):

- Area 1c should be scored 8 points for criteria 2 (wastewater servicing).

Staff Response (Criteria 2):

This area would likely be serviced by a new gravity sewer on March Road to accommodate the westerly portion of the property and a new gravity sewer to the Briar Ridge Pump Station to accommodate the easterly portion. Some pumping upgrades were anticipated for the Briar Ridge Pump Station. A weighted score of 6 was assigned to account for the added capital, operating and maintenance costs to the pump station. This applied to 1b and 1c.

Murray Chown (parcel 1c)

Responds to Issues 1, 2, 3, 5 and Criteria Issues 1, 2, 3 (for parcel 1c).

His positions on Issues 1, 2 and 3 are the same as John Riddell and the same staff responses apply.

Issue 1 – Wastewater servicability (Criteria 2):

- Area 1cW should be scored 8 points for Criteria 2.

Staff Response:

A score of 8 points would only apply if parcel 1c were to be split into east and west parts. Staff are not proposing this be done.

Issue 2 – Accessibility to existing or planned retail/commercial focus (Criteria 7):

- Parcel 1cW should be scored 1 point for Criteria 7.

Staff Response:

Distances for the parcels were measured to the edge of the commercial core of the Kanata Town Centre (KTC) as defined in the Official Plan (Volume 2B). This is the appropriate measure since the eastern portion the KTC is almost entirely residential and contains no retail/commercial focus. The parcels were scored appropriately in the September 1, 2011 staff report, and all received a score of 0 points for being more than 7.4 km distant. Even if parcel 1c were to be split the west portion would still be more than 7.4 km from the commercial focus of the KTC.

Issue 3 – Community connectivity (Criteria 11):

- Parcel 1cW should be scored 3 points for Criteria 11.

Staff Response:

Parcel 1c was scored 0 points for having obstructions to the east and north. In May 2009 parcel 1cW was scored 2 points for having an obstruction to the north due to the presence of an existing country lot subdivision. Staff are not now proposing that 1c be split, therefore 0 points apply for Criteria 11.

General Issue 5 – appropriate means of breaking a tie:

- Ties should be broken based on an evaluation of potential for competing parcels to contribute to the development of complete neighbourhoods or communities.

Staff Response:

Staff's opinion is that ties are best resolved by picking the parcel or combination of parcels that come closest to achieving the 850 total hectares decided by the OMB. Alternatives such as attempting to evaluate the potential to contribute to complete communities introduce inherent subjectivity and offer no means of resolving situations where tied parcels may equally contribute to completing a neighbourhood or community.

Tony Sroka (parcel 1f South; Maxwell)

Responds to Issues 5 to 10 inclusive for Parcel 1fS – Jim Maxwell.

Issue 5 – Accessibility to existing or planned retail/commercial focus (Criteria 7):

- Parcel 1fS should be scored 1 point for Criteria 7.

Staff Response:

Distances for the parcels were measured to the edge of the commercial core of Kanata Town Centre. The distance is 8.2 km and scores 0 points based on the approved methodology.

Mr. Sroka also takes issue with the scoring of Criteria 11 – Connectivity. However this was not listed by the appellant as an issue for the hearing on this parcel.

Brett Ifill (parcel 1f South)

Responds to Issue 12 – Land Absorption (Criteria 16)

- The land absorption rates upon which scores are based should have taken account of differences in absorption rates for parcel locations within each of the urban centres rather than applying the average 10-year consumption rate for the whole of each urban centre.

Staff Response:

Staff do not support this approach. It is unclear how the proposed approach could be made workable. In any case the methodology was approved by the Board in the Phase 2A hearing and is not open to revision.

Alexius Golob (parcel 1f South)

Responds to Issue 11 – Depth to Bedrock (Criteria 15)

- Tests done in May 2012 show average depth to bedrock to be 5 or more metres. The parcel should therefore score 2 points.

Staff Response:

Staff do not disagree with the engineering assessment. If scored, the parcel would receive 2 points for Criteria 15.

Jeffrey Celentano (Area 3)

Responds to Issues 1 and 2 for Area 3 – Accessibility to Transit (Criteria 6) and Connectivity (Criteria 11).

Issue 1 – Accessibility to Transit (Criteria 6):

- Distance should be measured to the park and ride lot on Carp Road. Based on a survey by Ronald Jason that distance is 0.8 km. (By implication the parcel should therefore score the full 10 points.)

Staff Response:

Staff do not consider the Carp Road park and ride lot to meet the definition for Criteria 6, which is “distance to existing or planned rapid transit network or to park and ride”. The Carp Road lot is far from rapid transit and is served only by a bus operating at peak periods. The appropriate measure is to the planned rapid transit line to the east, a distance of 3.0 km from the parcel centroid. The parcel was scored 4 points.

Issue 2 – Connectivity to Community (Criteria 11):

- Because connections can be planned to the east and south the score of 0 for Criteria 11 should be reconsidered.

Staff Response:

The OMB-approved point rating system for Criteria 11 provides 0 points where there are obstructions in two or more directions. The question is not that connections are possible in two directions (east and south) but that obstructions exist in two directions (west and north). The parcel was appropriately scored 0 points.

Note: Area 3 was the highest-scoring parcel not to be included in the urban area in the September 2011 staff report. It is recommended for inclusion in the urban area in the accompanying report to this meeting of Planning Committee on additional parcels to be added to achieve the 850 ha decided by the OMB.

Murray Chown (parcel 6c)

Responds to General Issue 5 (breaking a tie) and Criteria Issue 1 (Existing Bus Service, Criteria 12).

General Issue 5 – appropriate means of breaking a tie:

- Ties should be broken based on an evaluation of potential for competing parcels to contribute to the development of complete neighbourhoods or communities.

Staff Response:

Staff's opinion, previously noted for parcel 1c, is that ties are best resolved by picking the parcel or combination of parcels that come closest to achieving the 850 total hectares decided by the OMB.

Issue 1 – Existing Bus Service (Criteria 12):

- The parcel should receive 2 points for all day service by route 163 and for peak period service by route 263, instead of the 1 point assigned by the City.

Staff Response:

Route 163 terminates on West Ridge Drive approximately 120 m west of parcel 6c. It therefore does not provide service “at the parcel”, which is the description of Criteria 12. The parcel was appropriately scored 1 point for peak period service provided by route 263 on Stittsville Main Street abutting the west side of the parcel.

Murray Chown and Craig Houle (parcel 6c)

Responds to Criteria Issue 2 (Depth to Bedrock, Criteria 15).

Issue 2 – Depth to Bedrock (Criteria 15):

- Based on tests conducted in early June, the parcel has bedrock in the range of 2.3 to 5.5 metres below the surface. The parcel should receive 1 point.

Staff Response:

Staff agree with the engineering assessment, which is new information for this parcel. The Criteria 15 score has been increased from 0 points to 1 point and the total point score for parcel 6c will increase from 51 to 52 points. The parcel is recommended for inclusion in the urban area with either score.

James Moffatt (parcel 8a)

Responds to Criteria Issue 1 – Water Servicability for Parcel 8a.

- Parcel 8a should receive the full 8 points for water serviceability.

Staff Response:

The staff analysis had previously scored the parcel 4 points due to higher elevations on part of the property. However, to take account of increased future design water supply pressures a weighted score of 6 points would be appropriate.

Peter Smith (parcel 9b)

Responds to General Issue 5 (breaking a tie) and Criteria Issue 2 (Accessibility – Arterial and Collector Roads, Criteria 5), and Issue 4 (Existing Bus Service, Criteria 12). Issue 3 (Ability to Work in Community, Criteria 8) is also listed but no evidence is presented.

General Issue 5 – appropriate means of breaking a tie:

- Ties should be broken by including all tied parcels in the urban expansion, unless it would lead to an unreasonable result (e.g. if there are numerous large parcels which are tied). This recognizes that 20-year land needs analyses are inherently imprecise.
- In the alternative, a tie should be resolved through planning judgment and principles of good planning, including completion of communities and establishing logical boundaries.

Staff Response:

Staff's opinion, previously noted, is that ties are best resolved by picking the parcel or combination of parcels that come closest to achieving the 850 total hectares decided by the OMB. The opinion expressed by Mr. Smith does not address issues such as what defines an "unreasonable result", nor does it explain why alternatives such as excluding all tied parcels could not be equally valid if the analysis is inherently imprecise.

The alternative opinion expressed (planning judgment) risks becoming quite subjective because it is unclear at what point a community becomes complete and what constitutes a logical boundary.

Issue 2 – Accessibility - Arterial and Collector Roads (Criteria 5):

- The parcel should receive 6 points rather than the 4 points assigned by the City. The collector road system planned as part of the Leitrim CDP would be extended south to parcels 9a and 9b, warranting 2 additional points.

Staff Response:

The collector road north of the parcel within the urban area is shown in the Transportation Master Plan as turning west to connect with Analdea Drive. There

is no indication it would continue south through parcels 9a and 9b. There is no existing or planned collector to the parcel, which is the definition in the approved methodology. The parcel was appropriately scored 4 points, the same as parcel 9a to the north received for Criteria 5.

Issue 4 – Existing Bus Service (Criteria 12):

- The parcel should receive 2 points for all day service at the corner of Bank Street and Findlay Creek Drive, instead of 0 points assigned by the City.

Staff Response:

Route 144 turns off Bank Street west onto Findlay Creek Drive north of parcel 9b. The nearest bus stops are approximately 140 m from the nearest corner of the parcel. The property therefore does not have existing bus service “at the parcel”, which is the description of Criteria 12. The parcel was appropriately scored 0 points for Criteria 12.

David Gilbert

Responds to Issue 5 (Depth to Bedrock, Criteria 15):

- A test pit showed no bedrock at a depth of 5.4 m.

Staff Response:

A single test pit is not sufficient to ascertain depth to bedrock across the 29 ha area of the parcel. Therefore a score of 1 point for bedrock depth of 2 to 5 m is maintained for parcel 9b.

Lloyd Phillips

Responds to General Issues 1 to 5 inclusive.

- Mr. Phillips is in general agreement with the City’s position on every issue.

Demetrius Yannoulopoulos

- The witness statement supports the City’s methodology for Servicability criteria.