



Final
Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 8, 2022

6:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT
For consideration by Barrie City Council on February 14, 2022.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor, J. Lehman at 6:03 p.m. The following were in attendance for the meeting:

- Present:** 11 - Mayor, J. Lehman
Deputy Mayor, B. Ward
Councillor, C. Riepma
Councillor, K. Aylwin
Councillor, A. Kungl
Councillor, R. Thomson
Councillor, N. Harris
Councillor, G. Harvey
Councillor, J. Harris
Councillor, S. Morales
Councillor, M. McCann

STAFF:

- Chief Administrative Officer, M. Prowse
City Clerk/Director of Legislative and Court Services, W. Cooke
Committee Support Clerk, B. Thompson
Committee Support Clerk, T. Maynard
Coordinator of Elections and Special Projects, T. McArthur
Deputy City Clerk, M. Williams
Director of Development Services, M. Banfield
Director of Economic and Creative Development, S. Schlichter
Director of Finance/Treasurer, C. Millar
Director of Information Technology, R. Nolan
Director of Operations, D. Friary
Executive Director of Access Barrie, R. James-Reid
General Manager of Community and Corporate Services, D. McAlpine
General Manager of Infrastructure and Growth Management, B. Araniyasundaran
Manager of Corporate Asset Management, K. Oakley
Planner, A. Sajecki

Planner, T. Wierzba
 Senior Manager, Corporate Finance Investments, C. Gillespie
 Service Desk Generalist, K. Kovacs.

Pursuant to Procedural By-law 2019-100, as amended, Section 4, Subsection 10, the order of business was altered such that Staff Report DEV001-22 concerning the Proposed City of Barrie Official Plan and Municipal Comprehensive Review was considered ahead of the Public Meeting concerning an Application for a Zoning By-law Amendment - 189, 191, 195, and 197 Duckworth Street.

Planning Committee held Staff Report DEV001-21 for further discussion after the conclusion of the Public Meeting scheduled for 7:00 p.m.

Planning Committee recessed from 9:02 p.m. to 9:13 p.m.

The Planning Committee met and recommends adoption of the following recommendation(s):

SECTION "A"

22-P-006 PROPOSED CITY OF BARRIE OFFICIAL PLAN AND MUNICIPAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW - AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Councillor, S. Morales declared a potential pecuniary interest on the foregoing matter as he and members of his family could be financially impacted in the future. He did not participate or vote on the foregoing matter. He left the virtual Planning Committee meeting.

That the proposed City of Barrie Official Plan 2051, provided as Appendix "A" to Staff Report DEV001-22, be amended by replacing the following sections:

6.4.2 Affordable Housing

- e) iv) All new residential development and *redevelopment* in Medium Density and High Density land use designations shall provide 15% of their housing units as *affordable*, in accordance with policy 2.5(l), unless a greater percentage is required as per the applicable policies in Section 2.3, across a range of unit sizes, including three-bedroom units or larger; and,

2.5 General Land Use Policies

- l) The City will require the provision of a minimum of 15% of all new housing units each year to be *affordable* housing, as per the policies in Section 6.4.2 of this Plan. The City will be guided by provincial direction and the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to implement this

affordable housing target.

This matter was recommended (Section "A") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 2/14/2022.

SECTION "B"

22-P-007

PROPOSED CITY OF BARRIE OFFICIAL PLAN AND MUNICIPAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

1. That the proposed City of Barrie Official Plan 2051, provided as Appendix "A" to Staff Report DEV001-22, be approved as the new Official Plan being presented to Council for adoption as per Section 17(22) of the *Planning Act*.
2. That the municipal comprehensive review that is comprised of the following, be accepted and endorsed:
 - a) A table demonstrating policy conformity with *A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe* (the "*Growth Plan*") provided as Appendix "C" to Staff Report DEV001-22;
 - b) The Barrie land needs assessments provided as Appendix "D" to Staff Report DEV001-22; and
 - c) The Municipal Comprehensive Review Report: Servicing Growth, provided as Appendix "E" to Staff Report DEV001-22.
3. That the written and oral submissions received relating to the application and provided as Appendix "B" to Staff Report DEV001-22, have been, on balance, taken into consideration as part of the deliberations and the final decision related to the adoption of the City of Barrie Official Plan 2051, and includes the consideration of the oral and written submissions leading up to and at the Public Meeting held on June 2, 2021.
4. That the requirements set out in Section 16 of the *Planning Act* have been met, meaning:
 - a) No further public meeting or open house is required;
 - b) Adequate information and material, including a copy of the City of Barrie Official Plan 2051, have been made public; and
 - c) The prescribed public bodies and the approval authority have been consulted on the preparation of the Plan and given an opportunity to review all supporting information and material.
5. That Council permits staff to prepare a City of Barrie Official Plan 2051 adoption package, which will be delivered to the Approval

Authority, being the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
(DEV001-22) (File: D08-2018-OP)

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 2/14/2022.

The Planning Committee met for the purpose of a Public Meeting at 7:01 p.m.

Mayor Lehman advised the public that any concerns or appeals dealing with the application that were the subject of the Public Meeting should be directed to the Legislative and Court Services Department. Any interested persons wishing further notification of the Staff Report were advised to contact the Legislative and Court Services Department at cityclerks@barrie.ca. Mayor Lehman confirmed with the Director of Development Services that notification was conducted in accordance with the Planning Act.

SECTION "C"

22-P-008

APPLICATION FOR A ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT - 189, 191, 195, AND 197 DUCKWORTH STREET (WARD 1) (FILE: D30-019-2021)

Councillor, S. Morales declared a potential pecuniary interest on the foregoing matter as he owns property in the vicinity that was subject to the Public Meeting. He did not participate or vote on the matter. He left the virtual Planning Committee meeting.

James Hunter from Innovative Planning Solutions Inc. advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting is to review an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment submitted by Cygnus Development for lands known municipally as 189, 191, 195, and 197 Duckworth Street, Barrie.

Mr. Hunter discussed slides concerning the topics:

- The existing site context and surrounding land uses;
- A rendering illustrating the development proposal;
- A conceptual elevation of the proposed development;
- The Official Plan designations for the subject lands;
- The current zoning and proposed rezoning;
- The proposed site-specific special provisions;
- The studies completed in support of the application; and
- A summary of the application.

Michelle Banfield, Director of Development Services provided an update concerning the status of the application. She reviewed the public comments received during the neighbourhood meeting. She advised that the primary planning and land use matters are currently being reviewed by the Technical Review Team. Ms. Banfield discussed the anticipated timelines for the staff

report regarding the proposed application.

VERBAL COMMENT(S):

1. **Catherine Mercer, 9 Mountbatten Road**, provided a brief background about herself and her reasons for choosing to live in the City of Barrie's East End Neighborhood. She discussed the character of the East End noting that it is made up of single storey homes and bungalows. She requested that Council ensure intensification doesn't destabilize the neighborhood as there are several proposals of intensification that are currently underway.

Ms. Mercer provided an overview of the Draft Preliminary Report prepared by the neighborhood's residents which outline concerns related to the proposed development. She requested that Council adopt an Interim Control By-law to allow time to explore future development of the site. Ms. Mercer discussed examples of other intensification developments that fit within the existing character of the neighborhood due to appropriate setbacks, tree buffering and building heights that are consistent with the surrounding residences.

Ms. Mercer expressed concerns regarding the potential uses permitted under the Mixed- Use Zoning, noting that the developer has only submitted a conceptual site plan to date. She requested that the developer be required to submit a detailed design before the zoning is approved and reiterated the request for an Interim Control By-law or the creation of a Secondary Plan for the area. Ms. Mercer questioned how the development fits within the City's Official Plan.

2. **David Russell, 6 Mountbatten Road**, expressed his concerns regarding the proposed amendment to change to mixed-use zoning. He noted that the proposed development is 100 percent residential and that there is no public benefit or commercial use associated with the site. He stated that if the zoning is approved, it could allow many other types of uses permitted under the designation. Mr. Russell also expressed concerns regarding the high density of the proposed development as it is located a significant distance away from services such as food or shopping centres. He noted that this distance will require residents to have cars to access these services resulting in potential traffic and parking issues in the neighborhood.

Mr. Russell questioned why the Duckworth Corridor is referenced as evolving with intensification, stating that he cannot find intensification of this nature in the area over the past 50 years. He commented that he supports the passing of an Interim Control By-law, as the area will soon have its intensification designation changed under the City's new Official Plan. Mr. Russell expressed further concerns with respect to the lack of consultation as his property abuts the site, as well as the proposed development's impact on the character of Mountbatten Road.

3. **Sarah Dawson, 5 Mountbatten Road**, stated that her home is located directly adjacent to the proposed development and that she is against the application for Zoning By-law amendment to change the site to a mixed-use designation. She expressed her concerns with respect to the density and fronting of the proposed development on Mountbatten Road and that she feels that it is out of scale and not compatible with the historic neighborhood.

Ms. Davison expressed further concerns regarding the elevated nature of the development and its impact on the neighborhood streetscape, sightlines, safety, and accessibility. She also noted her concerns with respect to the underground parking garage and its impact on traffic in the area. She shared her opinion that the development does not fit within the character of the neighborhood and that she feels that this is a good opportunity to set a precedent regarding infill developments to ensure compatibility with existing neighborhoods.

4. **Robert Simmonds, 9 Napier Street**, stated that he agrees with the comments made so far with respect to the proposed development. Mr. Simmonds noted that the neighborhood is located in a historic area surrounded by mature trees and that he does not believe the proposed development fits within the character of the neighborhood. He expressed his concerns regarding the height of the development and its impact on privacy, noting that he feels that having the building front on Duckworth Street would help alleviate this concern and improve the overall development. Mr. Simmonds inquired as to whether there is a plan to preserve the mature trees in the neighborhood, noting that he feels that preserving the trees is important in order to maintain privacy and provide a buffer to noise.

Mr. Simmonds indicated that he opposes the Zoning By-law Amendment to change the zoning of the site to permit mixed-use and that he feels that the density of the proposal is driven by the desire to maximize profits. He expressed his concern regarding the lack of site plan detail provided, noting that only a conceptual plan has been submitted and that the development could change substantially after the zoning has been approved. He requested that Council request an official site plan in order to make an informed decision on the Zoning By-law Amendment application.

5. **John Batstone, 3 Mountbatten Road**, stated that he shares the concerns already mentioned by other residents. He expressed further concerns with respect to the building fronting Duckworth Street and the impact of the parking garage on the properties located across the street. Mr. Batstone commented that he feels that the proposed development is too large for the site and that it does not fit in with the character of the neighborhood.

6. **Allison Moore, 7 Mountbatten Road**, advised that she has been a resident of East End Barrie for over 27 years and lives almost directly across the street from the entrance to the proposed development. Ms. Moore stated that she agrees with her neighbour's comments provided at the meeting and that she does not support the rezoning of the property to mixed use. She acknowledged that development is necessary to sustain and grow the City and that she has no objections to development provided it fits the neighbourhood.

Ms. Moore discussed her concerns related to the proposed development's impact on traffic, the single entrance and exit onto Mountbatten Road, pressures on municipal services such as snow removal, garbage collection and emergency vehicles, and safety issues for residents and children. She requested that a traffic impact study be completed to analyze the appropriateness of the traffic flow onto Mountbatten Road versus Duckworth Street. Ms. Moore also commented on the proposed tandem parking spots in the underground parking garage and suggested that tandem parking only be allowed in the driveways of the individual townhouses.

Ms. Moore expressed concerns with the loss of trees on the property and questioned the tree study included in the application which states that the remaining trees will likely not survive the development process. She commented that she feels that none of the setbacks would have sufficient space to provide appropriate buffers required to protect the existing trees and promote new tree growth. Ms. Moore provided her opinion that the proposed tree removal is not in keeping with the City's priorities to preserve and protect the existing tree canopy and is contrary to Section 9 of the City's Urban Design Manual. She advised that mature trees promote shade, soil stability, runoff retention, air quality, privacy and maintains the character of the neighbourhood.

In closing, Ms. Moore advised that the scope of the project, the proposed rezoning to mixed use, and the location of this project is not appropriate and should be focused north towards the growth areas and closer to the College. She noted that this property fronts onto a quiet street and will forever change the nature and charm of the East End neighborhood.

7. **Jeff Gardner, 10 Belcourt Avenue**, advised that he has been a resident of Ward 1 his entire life, has deep attachment to the East End neighborhood and residents, and is a member of the East End Neighbourhood Group. He stated that he is opposed to the rezoning of the application and that the proposed development does not fit into the quiet well-established neighbourhood. Mr. Gardner advised of an online petition in opposition to the application that has 586 signatures and is growing daily.

Mr. Gardner discussed his concerns that the proposed development

would drastically change the character of the neighborhood and that the rezoning of the lands to mixed use would allow up to 53 different permitted uses, and without a formal site plan the design could change several times. He provided an example of a similar upward townhouse design alongside an existing townhouse complex on Georgian Drive that is located on a four-lane high traffic road. He expressed his concern that the proposed development is located on a two-lane road and is only 280 metres to Codrington Street School.

Mr. Gardner commented on the original proposal presented at the neighbourhood meeting outlining townhouses geared to student rental and stated that he feels that the focus of the design should be on accessibility, ground floor main entrances, fewer stairs and wheelchair access.

In closing, Mr. Gardner asked that Council not approve this rezoning application, and that the developer work with City Planners and residents to develop a proposal that fits with the neighborhood.

8. **Sarah Moore, 15 Marwendy Drive**, advised that she has lived in the area for 20 years. Ms. Moore advised that she agrees with the issues raised by other residents at the meeting and that she is not in support of the application but would be supportive of a more appropriate development and intensification on the property. Ms. Moore suggested that the proposal needs to respect the height density and green space that defines the character of the existing neighbourhood.

Ms. Moore advised that she provided a copy of a preliminary report from the East End Neighbourhood to City staff. She summarized the key issues and requests contained within the report, including that any permitted uses be restricted to residential, that student housing only be permitted in detached homes, that the building height be restricted to two storeys, that building setbacks follow the established building setback on the street facing the development, and that tandem parking only be allowed in the driveways of individual townhomes in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Ms. Moore noted that the report identifies a number of design issues with the proposed development and provides recommendations related to frontage, parking, trees, and road access.

In closing, Ms. Moore asked that Council not allow the East End Neighborhood to be irrevocably damaged by an inappropriate rezoning and a bad design. She noted that the group looks forward to working with the City and the developer to welcome new neighbours to attractive housing that will be suitable and accessible for the neighbourhood.

9. **Susan McKendry, 13 Mountbatten Road**, provided a description of Barrie's East End Neighbourhood in the vicinity of the proposed

development. She discussed concerns related to the loss of greenspace, lack of privacy and inadequate buffering, the mixed-use rezoning, and the size, concept and scope of the development. She reiterated that she is in complete agreement with the concerns mentioned by her neighbours and does not support the mixed-use rezoning for the property.

10. **Peggy Manos, 17 Mountbatten Road**, explained that she is a new property owner in the vicinity of the proposed development and advised that before purchasing the property she researched the area to determine if the location would be suitable. She mentioned that she had been unaware of the development proposal at the time of purchase. Ms. Manos discussed concerns related to the mixed-use rezoning, traffic volumes, loss of trees, lack of privacy, and the number of parking spaces. Ms. Manos advised that she agreed with the concerns stated by her neighbours related to the application and that she felt that the mixed-use rezoning for the property should not be approved.
11. **Marshall Green, 71 Highland Avenue**, explained that he is not directly affected by the proposed development but acknowledged the concerns of the residents in the neighbourhood. He provided an example of his own property being redeveloped to add more properties. Mr. Green provided a description of the East End Neighbourhood, including the types of housing, lot sizes, and noted that the properties are established and well-maintained. Mr. Marshall advised that there are storyboards describing the history of the East End of Barrie located in the vicinity of the North Shore Trail.

Mr. Green described the current Official Plan and the new proposed Official Plan as they relate to intensification within existing neighbourhoods. He quoted a recent decision by the Ontario Land Tribunal related to developments in the Cities of London and Burlington that highlight the need for intensification developments to be compatible with existing neighborhoods. He felt that the municipality should not be concerned about meeting its intensification targets given there are multiple high-rise projects underway, particularly in the downtown core.

Mr. Green discussed his concerns with respect to the proposed development relating to its incompatibility with the existing neighbourhood, the size and scope of the development, the preservation of trees and the importance of protecting the integrity of the neighbourhood.

12. **Scott Laurin, 17 Napier Street**, spoke on behalf of his family and reiterated the concerns already stated by residents. He commented that he feels that the proposed development will not alleviate the affordable housing crisis and he questioned the definition of affordable housing.

Mr. Laurin discussed concerns related to the proposed development with respect to intensification, its type and scope, its overall concept, and the potential for increased traffic on Duckworth Street and Mountbatten Drive. He explained his background as a professional educator and outlined safety concerns related to the location of the proposed development in the vicinity of Codrington Public School. Mr. Laurin advised that he felt the size and scope of the development proposal does not make sense for the neighbourhood.

13. **Karen Ulan-Melnick, Resident**, reiterated that she was in full support of comments made by previous speakers and does not support the rezoning of the property. She discussed concerns related to Barrie's affordable housing crisis for both rental and ownership, and its impact on young adults, seniors and single individuals, particularly women, who may be economically disadvantaged. Ms. Ulan-Melnick provided a description of the East End of Barrie and noted its strong sense of community with modest and well-maintained homes. She commented that she feels that the neighbourhood is unique and special and that it should be protected and celebrated.

Ms. Ulan-Melnick discussed further concerns with respect to the proposed development related to the affordable housing crisis and its impact on established neighbourhoods, accessibility, parking, and safety. She stated that she felt that the proposed development lacks transparency as only conceptual plans have been submitted. Ms. Ulan-Melnick urged members of Council to ensure that this property is responsibly developed in keeping with the character of the East End Neighbourhood. She requested that the Zoning By-law Amendment application be rejected as she felt that there should be a more thoughtful approach to the development of the property.

14. **Peter Koetsier, 51 Highland Avenue**, advised that he is against the proposed development. He discussed concerns with respect to the proposed development related to the intensification and density of the development, the size and height of the buildings, parking, accessibility, and its overall scope and concept. Mr. Koetsier also expressed concerns regarding the frontage of the buildings, the removal of historic trees, the increase in vehicular traffic, and safety concerns for students attending school in the vicinity of the development.

Mr. Koetsier questioned whether the proposed development application is compatible with the City's Official Plan as it relates to active transportation. He urged members of Council not to approve the rezoning application as he felt the proposal is not appropriate for this property and future plans. Mr. Koetsier suggested that the developer should return with a more reasonable plan that respects the future and the new Official Plan currently in development.

15. **Danielle Hachborn, 211 Wellington Street East**, explained that she purchased her first home in the East End of Barrie because of the age of the homes, mature trees and aesthetics of the neighbourhood. She advised that she felt that other neighborhoods in the area will also be impacted by the proposed development. Ms. Hachborn expressed concerns with the proposed development related to density, parking, traffic, active transportation, and its proximity to the elementary school. She expressed further concerns related to waste disposal, snow removal, the impact on the aesthetics of the neighbourhood, and the access to the development being located on Mountbatten Road.
- Ms. Hachborn also addressed concerns related to tree removal and the protection of the tree canopy. She commented that trees are important for the privacy of the abutting properties, noise buffering and air pollution, and the mitigation of flooding and water runoff and the associated impact on municipal infrastructure. Ms. Hachborn advised of her concern regarding the potential for the development to become student centric housing in a family-oriented neighbourhood and its impact on property value.
- Ms. Hachborn questioned whether the Simcoe County Historical Association or the Heritage Barrie Committee has been consulted in relation to the cultural heritage resources or any potential archaeological findings on the property. She reiterated and agreed with the comments made by the neighbours concerning the proposed development related to density, the need for a traffic impact study and a development that fits with the existing neighbourhood.
16. **Bryan Wood, 250 Codrington Street**, stated that he has been a resident of Barrie for 34 years and that he concurred with the comments already provided by other residents. Mr. Wood expressed concern with respect to the proposed development's proximity to the school within the area and the traffic flow from Mountbatten Road to a few areas nearby, such as the Blake Street Plaza. He explained that there is presently a high volume of vehicles parked on the side of the road within the area with vehicles dropping off and picking up children that attend the school in the area.
- Mr. Wood reiterated his concerns associated with the proposed development relating to increased traffic as there is already a proposed residential development located in close proximity to the area. He expressed further concerns for the safety of the children that attend the school in the area. He inquired as to whether the Simcoe Muskoka District School Board had been asked to provide their input on the development.
17. **Evan Boyce, 385 Osler Street, Toronto, Ontario**, stated that he is a former resident of the City of Barrie and expressed his support for the development, citing its proximity to the downtown area, Georgian College, the Royal Victoria Hospital, and City transit. Mr. Boyce

discussed the affordable housing crisis, the growing population, and the lack of available affordable housing in Ontario. He commented that housing prices in the City of Barrie are so high that home ownership is unaffordable for younger and low-income individuals and that he feels this demographic has not been well represented at meetings regarding the proposed development.

Mr. Boyce stated that a wider diversity of housing options is needed and that this requires that higher density development be built when possible. He stated that such developments would allow for more young people, new Canadians, and people raising families to live within the City. Mr. Boyce concluded that he feels that the proposed development would allow for more opportunities for attainable housing within the City and encouraged Council to consider a broader perspective than those provided by residents of the neighborhood.

18. **Lori Levere, 10 Mountbatten Road**, expressed her concerns with respect to traffic congestion in the area. Ms. Levere commented that she feels that there are safety issues as a result of cars parked on the street which obstructs site lines, reduces visibility and makes roads difficult to navigate. She expressed a fear of being hit by another car while pulling onto the street. Ms. Levere stated that she feels that the potentially increased amount of vehicular traffic resulting from the proposed development could create a risky and unsafe situation.

Ward 1 Councillor, C. Riepma asked a number of questions to Mr. Hunter and City staff and received responses.

WRITTEN COMMENT(S):

Correspondence from Angelia Simmonds dated February 3, 2021.

Correspondence from Simcoe County District School Board dated November 24, 2021.

Correspondence from Susan Cadogan dated December 2, 2021.

Correspondence from Lori Levere dated December 14, 2021.

Correspondence from Lori Levere dated December 16, 2021.

Correspondence from Catharine Mercer dated December 27, 2021.

Correspondence from Catharine Mercer dated December 30, 2021.

Correspondence from Enbridge dated January 6, 2022.

Correspondence from Franca and Phil Marinelli dated January 10, 2022.

Correspondence from Allison Moore dated January 11, 2022.

Correspondence from Heather Morgan dated January 14, 2022.

Correspondence from Ministry of Transportation dated January 14, 2022.

Correspondence from Karen Melnick dated January 16, 2022.

Correspondence from Kevin and Susan McKendry dated January 16, 2022.

Correspondence from Cheryl Lawson dated January 24, 2022.

Correspondence from Jerry Lediard dated January 24, 2022.

Correspondence from James and Patricia Borho dated January 24, 2022.

Correspondence from Susan Cadogan dated January 25, 2022.

Correspondence from John Batstone dated January 26, 2022.
Preliminary Report by the East End Neighbours dated January 26, 2022.
Correspondence from Carl Tomlins dated January 27, 2022.
Correspondence from Steve and Kathleen Marion dated January 29, 2022.
Correspondence from Peter Koetsier dated January 31, 2022.
Correspondence from Cheryle Russell dated January 31, 2022.
Correspondence from Andrew Telford dated February 4, 2022.
Correspondence from Stuart McMillan dated February 6, 2022.
Correspondence from Peggy Manos dated February 6, 2022.
Correspondence from Gary Patrick dated February 6, 2022.
Correspondence from Glenn Straughan dated February 7, 2022.
Correspondence from Craig Graham dated February 7, 2022.
Correspondence from Betty Mosher undated.
Correspondence from Cate Tilden undated.
Correspondence from Sarah Moore undated.
Correspondence from Paul Mosley undated.
Correspondence from Bertha Abbott undated.
Correspondence from Sharon Boyle undated.
Correspondence and presentation from Robert Simmons undated.
Petition signed by 480 individuals.
Presentation by Dave Russell undated.
Presentation by Jeff Garner undated.

This matter was recommended (Section "C") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 2/14/2022.

ENQUIRIES

Members of Planning Committee did not address any enquires to City staff.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:43 p.m.

CHAIRMAN