

MINUTES

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

08 AUGUST 2000

3:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chair: G. Hunter

Members: D. Beamish, M. Bellemare, B. Hill, P. Hume, A. Munter, W. Stewart
and R. van den Ham

Regrets: J. Legendre

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Planning and Environment Committee confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of 11 July 2000.

CARRIED

1. LOCAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 8
CITY OF NEPEAN (BARRHAVEN TOWN-CENTRE)
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 25 Jul 2000

Chair Hunter noted the relationship between City of Nepean's Local Official Plan Amendments (LOPAs) 8 and 24 and, with the Committee's concurrence, directed that staff make one presentation on both Amendments. Mike Boucher, Planner, Development Approvals Division, Planning and Development Approvals Department, then provided the Committee with an overview of staff reports pertaining to both of the Amendments.

- Notes:
1. Underlining indicates a new or amended recommendation approved by Committee.
 2. Reports requiring Council consideration will be presented to Council on 13 September 2000 in Planning and Environment Committee Report Number 63.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen recalled Nepean LOPA 7 had received final approval in 1997, at which time the Barrhaven Town Centre had been approved for 21,900 square metres of development. She was puzzled that three years later, they were seeking an expansion to 35,000 square metres, and that this had been approved by the City of Nepean. Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked what had occurred within this short period of time to warrant the City's approval of such an expansion.

Mr. Boucher explained the 21,900 square metre cap imposed through LOPA 7 was based on the initial urban design study done for Nepean in the early 1990's. He noted the text of the LOPA and the planned function of the major commercial area was to recognize the existing commercial development and to accommodate additional retail that would serve the travelling public, area residents and pedestrians. He said despite the cap, LOPA 7 did contemplate additional retail on-site, and specifically, a westward expansion.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen then asked about the possibility of approving LOPA 8 conditional upon timing (e.g. within a year or two), as opposed to proceeding with an immediate expansion to the Barrhaven Town Centre. Mr. Boucher advised Committee did have authority to direct staff to modify the LOPA but pointed out this was not what was being applied for. Further, Mr. Boucher emphasized it was staff's position the holding zone accomplished what was required under Nepean's Official Plan, that no modifications were required, and that the application was appropriate. He said he would be wary of making such a recommendation based solely on planning grounds, as there were other issues involved relating to market and competition. He noted the phrase "planned function" had been used to involve land use planning arguments, but said staff were of the opinion there were no legitimate planning reasons not to approve the LOPA.

The Councillor then asked if it was Mr. Boucher's opinion that, regardless of any decision made by Committee or Council, the matter was likely to be decided at the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) in any event. Mr. Boucher concurred with this.

Councillor van den Ham questioned why Nepean would have established a holding zone for LOPA 8 if the City felt confident in the studies, and that according to the City's own reports, growth had taken place to support additional retail space. Mr. Boucher explained the primary reason the holding zone provision was used in both cases was to ensure that Nepean (or the future City of Ottawa) would retain the ability to require certain studies. He noted the original application, approved to 21,900 square metres, had taken considerable time to develop. Using this example, he stated that if there was a five year lag between the time of approval and the time when an actual development proposal was brought forth, the use of the holding zone would allow Nepean to insist on market studies, etc., before dealing with the issue of a site plan.

Councillor van den Ham suggested if there was no desire by the proponent to build for five years, they could wait to apply until such time as the facts regarding required space were known. The Councillor felt the proponents were currently ‘guesstimating’ their future needs. Alternatively, he suggested the proponent could build to the current allowable limit, and submit an application for expansion in future when the need arose. Mr. Boucher replied the application by the proponent of LOPA 8 had not been made entirely speculatively, and that a specific tenant might have been lined up for this extra space. He said that besides the issue of competition for anchor tenants, there was a possibility the proponents of both LOPAs were competing for the same tenant.

Responding to a question from the Chair as to how much resulting retail space would exist in the South Urban Community if both LOPAs were approved, Mr. Boucher said the existing cap in the district retail area was approximately 45,200 square metres, consisting primarily of the property under the control of the South Nepean Development Corporation (SNDC) and partially that of the Trinity Development Group. The inclusion of the upset limit of 35,000 square metres requested by the Barrhaven Town Centre would result in a total of about 77,500 square metres.

Chair Hunter then asked if this was equivalent to what the previous Regional Official Plan (ROP) had envisaged for the South Urban Community Regional shopping facility. Nick Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals Department, said he did not believe the Region had specified square metreage in new centres outside the greenbelt, i.e., Kanata Town Centre or South Nepean. However, he noted this would be comparable in size to Ottawa’s St. Laurent Shopping Centre. Mr. Boucher said the afore-noted centres were all in the order of 70,000 square metres, St. Laurent comprising about 77,000 square metres.

Responding to further questions from the Chair, Mr. Boucher said that from the outset, the notion had been that the Town Centre and Activity Centre would collectively respond as a Regional shopping facility. Speaking to the objection launched by the appellants to LOPA 8 that one site or one designation had primacy over the other, Mr. Boucher said staff did not agree. He outlined the long term objective was for the Town Centre or Activity Centre to function as a “downtown”, and in the short term, to function as a Regional shopping centre or Regional scale facility.

Chair Hunter said he found it difficult to get excited about either LOPA, as he felt Nepean had made a major mistake in allowing its major retail facilities for the South Urban Community to be located away from the highway.

At Councillor Stewart’s request, Mr. Boucher addressed transit serviceability for both parcels of land. Speaking first to the area encompassed by LOPA 24, Mr. Boucher noted the subject

area consisted of 2.5 hectares of land but it is also part of a larger development (as shown in the concept plan on page 33 of the Agenda). He said one point of frustration in trying to deal with such a large piece of land was that the long term conceptualization envisioned an urban setting with streets and with street level activity. However, he noted this would not happen in the short term. He explained the City of Nepean and the Region have attempted to allow development which potentially allows a large department store or the types of retail likely to be seen in the short term, but in such a way that the long term expansion and “urbanization” of the lands is not compromised. He noted the public roads in the development have been taken up-front to ensure the City and the Region have some control over how this develops. As well, an extension of the Regional transit corridor was also planned to run behind the proposed Canadian Tire site on the north side of Greenbank Road. Mr. Boucher stated that from the outset, the development of a grid pattern has been planned to allow the long term redevelopment of the site in such a way that in future, the contemplated urban uses could be achieved, while not compromising interim transit and the Regional road network. He noted the LOPA 24 site has gone through a plan of subdivision, a detailed master site plan, and submissions in support of zoning.

With regard to LOPA 8, Mr. Boucher explained an existing approved site plan and detailed transportation analysis had been submitted, and would be further refined once a final detailed site plan was brought forth. He further noted it would be possible to put a public road through the property. He was uncertain whether the alignment of the Jockvale Road extension had been established, but noted this could be reexamined. Responding to an observation from Councillor Stewart on the proximity of the LOPA 8 area to the proposed Transitway extension, Mr. Boucher confirmed the area was too far away to be served by the Transitway, and would likely be serviced by local buses.

Councillor Stewart asked if Amendment 8 would change the area from being a mid-sized shopping district into a major one. Mr. Boucher explained a major commercial facility was defined as being up to 35,000 square metres, and that above this, the range from 35,000 to 70,000 square metres was seen to be a Regional level facility. He noted LOPA 8 would be at the bottom limit of regional and the upper limit of major commercial.

Jane Ironside spoke on behalf of the Barrhaven Town Centre, owners of the land affected by LOPA 8. Ms. Ironside explained the Barrhaven Town Centre had applied to amend Nepean’s Official Plan in 1996, prior to the approval of LOPA 7. She said a decision was made at that time to hold the application in abeyance pending the resolution of LOPA 7. Ms. Ironside said the Barrhaven Town Centre had been looking for a phased ability to expand. She noted LOPA 7 allowed the shopping centre, currently at 100,000 square *feet*, to expand to 250,000 square *feet*. She said even before LOPA 7 had been approved the proponents had wanted a fuller expansion, but decided to seek approval to expand to 250,000 square feet in the interim, then

reactivate the application for the larger expansion. She emphasized the proponents had not simply gone through the LOPA 7 process and then realized more space was needed; more space had been desired at the outset, but the decision was made to allow the implementation of the expansion to occur in phases.

The speaker said the need for expansion was primarily geared to changing retail trends. She noted supermarkets that once occupied 50-60,000 square feet in a 250,000 square foot mall now wanted 90-100,000 square feet and junior department stores (i.e., Zeller's) that once occupied 60-70,000 square feet now wanted 100-120,000 square feet of retail space. Ms. Ironside stated more floor space was now required to provide the same types of stores and services to the community.

She said the proponents believed the earlier market studies were sufficient to support the requirements of both the City's and Region's Official Plans, and she did not believe allowing the expansion of the Barrhaven Town Centre would delay development at the SNDC/Trinity site. She believed initial studies underestimated the amount of retail space required, as housing and employment growth had occurred much faster than anticipated a decade earlier. She spoke against phasing being instituted in the LOPA, as she felt there was adequate phasing built into holding provisions instituted in the zoning by-law. She felt this included sufficient safeguards with regard to the studies required for marketing and transportation to allow Nepean to have control over the time and rate at which development would take place. Ms. Ironside asked the Committee to support LOPA 8.

Speaking to her objections to LOPA 24, Ms. Ironside felt that anticipated requirements for additional land were premature in that LOPA 24 dealt with a vacant site on which no development had taken place. She said it was premature to add more land to the district retail area on the subject property to accommodate a less compact form of development. She noted that with the amount of development proposed for the Barrhaven Town Centre site, benefits included a more compact form of development and greater compliance with Nepean's urban design guidelines in terms of pedestrian-oriented development.

Chair Hunter noted the speaker's examples of the greater area required by a junior department store or grocery store showed a 10 to 15% increase in footprint size, yet the expansion from 21,000 to 35,000 square metres represented an approximate 40% increase in retail area. He asked Ms. Ironside to account for the difference. Ms. Ironside explained that each of the smaller retailers felt they needed more space to serve the market adequately.

The Committee Chair asked if studies undertaken by Ms. Ironside's clients had not concluded that once a junior size department store was constructed, there would be no need of another until the year 2016. Ms. Ironside believed this had been one of the conclusions, but she also felt

that holding provisions in the bylaws would look after questions of timing. She said the proponents would prefer to have the market determine the distribution and timing of development rather than having this determined by Committee or Council.

Based on Ms. Ironside's client's own market study, Chair Hunter suggested the other proponent would be negatively affected if the Barrhaven Town Centre were to secure the first junior department store. Ms. Ironside did not agree. She said Trinity was contemplating a number of uses on its site besides a junior department store, which could proceed in advance of 2016. She felt there were other retail opportunities, and did not feel the junior department store should be the only use to determine whether expansion would take place on either site.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen noted the Barrhaven Town Centre's main opposition to LOPA 24 was on the basis that Trinity Developments was adding more land. However, the Councillor stated it was her understanding that because of the dedication of a residential street through the Trinity site, potential development space had been eliminated. Therefore the total square footage that was perceived for development of retail space, would not change. Mr. Boucher stated he had heard the argument that the expansion was partially motivated by some of the land being taken up for the public street. He said he could not agree with this argument 100% and felt this alone was not sufficient to warrant the expansion. Having said that, Mr. Boucher stated it is staff's recommendation there is no planning detriment to approval of the expansion proposed in LOPA 24.

Bill Holzman, a planning consultant for Trinity Development Group. Addressing LOPA 8, Mr. Holzman felt it important for the Committee to visualize the sizes of the shopping centres proposed. He advised the South Keys shopping centre occupied 42,500 square metres (450,000 square feet) and would be equivalent in size to the district retail area of the Trinity/SNDC site (LOPA 24). He said the Barrhaven Town Centre (LOPA 8), at 35,000 square metres, would be comparable in size to either the IKEA (Pincrest) Mall or Billings Bridge shopping centre. He believed that if both LOPAs were approved, there would be very little difference between the two sites.

Mr. Holzman said his clients supported the staff recommendation for LOPA 24. He said LOPA 24 would add a very small piece to the existing district retail site, and noted his client's site was very different from the Barrhaven Town Centre site. Speaking to some differences between LOPAs 24 and 8, he noted his clients were required to go through a plan of subdivision, whereas the proponents of LOPA 8 were not. Whereas the Trinity site requires transit service, the same obligation did not apply to the Barrhaven Town Centre. Mr. Holzman said the Trinity site incorporated a grid pattern of roads as part of the concept which was the subject of Council approval at the City of Nepean for a master site plan approval and agreement; a significant step not required of the Barrhaven Town Centre site. Mr. Holzman felt

the application for LOPA 24 was straightforward. He said it did not add a square foot of building space, and did not impact negatively on the civic mixed-use lands to the south.

Mr. Holzman explained the boundary of the district retail area was established following studies by Nepean in the 1980's. He elaborated that a study commissioned in the late 1980's evolved into LOPA 7, which received final approval on 29 Oct 98. Subject to appeals, LOPA 7 was finalized in 1999. He noted his clients' concept, approved by Nepean Council, included elements that impacted the detailed design. He said the boundary of the district retail area, established through the 1990's, was taken by Nepean to be firm. However, Mr. Holzman stated that after filing a site plan application, determining the layout, and seeing how much land was to be taken up for road widenings, a transit corridor, future public roads, and pedestrian linkages, it was determined all the desired elements would not fit into the space allowed. He said City staff and Council had accepted Trinity's application as *bona fide*. Mr. Holzman emphasized the importance of his clients' regional shopping centre having a junior department store in order to achieve its planned function of a district retail area, and he noted that save for the landowners across the street, there had been no opposition to LOPA 24 from residents or other stakeholders throughout the whole public process

The speaker noted his clients did not support the staff recommendation on LOPA 8, and hoped Committee would leave the Barrhaven Town Centre at its 21,900 square metre cap. Mr. Holzman said the 40% increase in area would put it on an equal plane in terms of size, scale, and in terms of attracting the same type of tenants as the Trinity site, without imposing the same obligations the Trinity site proponents had to go through.

Regarding the issue of having the market determine development, Mr. Holzman said such a position had been taken by Nepean and by Regional staff, but he felt imposing specific caps through official plans and zoning limits development and serve to control the market. He said his clients were prepared to accept such constraints, and he hoped Committee and Council would accept this as reasonable for the LOPA 8 site.

In conclusion, Mr. Holzman noted the City's and Region's Official Plans contained a hierarchy of commercial uses and he felt approval of LOPA 8 would conflict with both Official Plans. He agreed the whole activity centre was a regional scale shopping facility, but noted it was made up of different components, including a *regional* shopping centre site, a *major* shopping centre site, a civic main street commercial area, and residential, institutional and public space uses, which combined to create a healthy core for South Nepean. The speaker felt that if any of these components were weakened, a weaker regional scale shopping facility site would result. He said his clients believed that if the right tenants could be attracted, and with favourable economics, a three to five year build-out could be expected. However, he felt that competing

interests attempting to secure the same tenants would result in a watered-down version of what was originally desired.

Dan Paquette, South Nepean Development Corporation (SNDC), explained the SNDC, made up of Minto Developments in partnership with the Shankman family, owned both the LOPA 24 site and 1,000 acres of land to the immediate east, and was marketing a community. He said that the SNDC had been happy from a marketing point of view to enter into a purchase and sale agreement with Trinity Developments. Mr. Paquette said the developers wanted to be able to tell prospective home buyers that a thriving shopping centre would soon be built at the corner of Greenbank Road and Strandherd Drive. He said his clients' efforts were directed towards providing the amenities that would bring South Nepean into a mature community. He was afraid the impact of increasing commercial permissions, as proposed by LOPA 8 would result in "two glasses that were half empty". He asked for recognition of the master plan which envisaged 42,500 square metres on the Trinity site and 21,900 on the Barrhaven Town Centre site. Mr. Paquette noted the Trinity site had been assigned larger build-out allowances for a variety of reasons, the main one being a Transitway corridor that would serve the site. He emphasized LOPA 24 was simply a land adjustment to accommodate the 42,500 square metres originally assigned to the site, noting the City had not originally assigned enough land to build out to the permitted square footage. He contrasted that LOPA 8, asking to build out to 35,000 square metres from 21,900, was a different type of application.

Noting Trinity Developments was faced with a number of subdivision requirements not required of the Barrhaven Town Centre, Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen questioned how such elements factored into the cost and timing of development. Mr. Boucher noted the two sites were different in that the LOPA 24 site was vacant and was in the path of a Transitway. He confirmed Mr. Holzman's assertion the site required transit, which would take up land. The site was also required to be based on a modified grid, imposed by a plan approved through consultation and years of development. Mr. Boucher said the function of the Barrhaven Town Centre (subject of LOPA 8), as outlined in the Nepean Official Plan and secondary plans, was to accommodate existing development. He noted this was an existing shopping centre already serving the public and area residents, which wished to expand westward.

He explained the LOPA 24 site had higher standards imposed on it because Nepean, in consultation with the Region, ratepayers and other agencies, decided it wanted to achieve something on these lands which could not be achieved by attaching onto an existing shopping centre. Mr. Boucher acknowledged that in all likelihood there would be either a public road through the LOPA 8 site or an extension of the Jockvale Road, and that there would be transit service in the area. However, he did not believe this would be the same as in the subject area of LOPA 24 and lands to the immediate north. He noted all the planning documents and work

that had gone into creating the Official Plan and Secondary Plan recognized that the two were two entirely separate sites.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen asked Mr. Boucher to comment on the view that if both sites were allowed to proceed, it would be detrimental to both because it would take longer to develop. She asked if the market studies had not indicated otherwise. Mr. Boucher was wary of speaking to detailed market analyses as the Region had not hired an independent marketing consultant to critique the marketing studies that had been performed. He said that from what he had reviewed and from what was before Nepean Council before it made its decision, he understood that Nepean had its own marketing advice that it considered up-to-date, and that the applicants had submitted additional market analyses. Further, each applicant had submitted critiques of the other's market studies. Nepean took the position, supported by independent peer review, that there would be no impact to the long term planned function of either site. Mr. Boucher said Nepean acknowledged there might be interim competition issues, but it was felt these were not so much planning matters as they were matters falling within the purview of business cases for each of the facilities. He believed both Nepean and Regional staff were recommending that this was not a planning matter, and that arguments regarding the issue of planned function had not been made to the point where it could be said that Nepean had erred in making its decisions.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen felt that no matter what Committee and Council decided, one party or another would appeal any decision made on LOPA 8 to the OMB. Mr. Boucher's assessment was that the Amendment would go to the OMB in any case, as the zoning by-laws had been appealed. As Mr. Boucher believed there were no planning grounds with which the Region should involve itself at a hearing, he recommended that Regional staff not take part in the hearing, unless subpoenaed.

Councillor Hume asked Mr. Holzman to comment on why the market should not decide timing of development, and to explain his view as to how LOPA 8 offended the ROP. Mr. Holzman explained the ROP stipulated there should be a town centre. He noted a town centre is made up of a number of functions, and he felt that if one of the main functions was faulty, or if two of them suffered, he believed the whole planning area would be suspect. He felt it was up to Regional Council to determine whether the right decisions were being made in implementing its own Official Plan.

Regarding market driven development, Mr. Holzman believed substantial work had been done, and that there had been a great deal of influence by City planners and politicians in imposing market conditions by virtue of caps that had been placed on development. Mr. Holzman questioned why, when market studies were something of a gray area, updates were required as a condition of lifting the holding provisions. He believed this was beyond a market issue, and

rather was a planned function issue of the whole Town Centre which included the district retail and major commercial areas.

Councillor Hume noted Mr. Holzman had indicated Nepean was placing a holding zone on the Barrhaven Town Centre pending an updated, or new market study. He asked why the Region would allow the Barrhaven Town Centre to move up into a similar scale of development when it seemed their market study did not justify this. Mr. Boucher suggested that Nepean staff, the independent consultant hired to review the market studies and the applicant submitting the studies felt they had met the tests of the Nepean Official Plan. He noted that market, and the feasibility and desirability of commercial structures, were issues that planners looked at every day, however, he said he could not concur the analyses and studies were designed to decide who would get a department store. Rather, he felt these were ways of ensuring that Regional facilities such as roads and transit were in place, and that the land was not over-designated.

Mr. Boucher went on to say it was his belief that each applicant, in objecting to the other's application, had failed to make the case that the market analysis was faulty or insufficient to allow the amendment to proceed. He said that rather than using the holding zone, Nepean could have refused both applications and made the final market study a requirement, but it was Nepean's position that development could take five years. He said Nepean thought it was responsible to proceed with the amendment and then, in response to a detailed submission, make the update, if later required, a condition of the lifting of the holding zone. Mr. Boucher said Nepean might have to answer for its decisions at the OMB, but said he did not believe either appellant had made the case that there was a problem.

Responding to another query from Councillor Hume as to whether he believed LOPA 8 offended the ROP in that it stratified commercial development, Mr. Boucher said he could not agree with Mr. Holzman's argument that one site was more important or had a primary interest over the other. He noted the whole of the area in the activity centre was to act as a Regional facility, that in the long term would be a "downtown" for South Nepean. He noted Nepean agreed with this assessment.

Councillor van den Ham saw the whole of the issue as a competition for square footage of retail space. He noted LOPA 8 was seeking to increase retail space after the master plan had been developed, whereas LOPA 24 sought an expansion to permit the proponents to do what had originally been allowed, and was now limited because of municipal requirements. The Councillor felt that if a doubt existed, he would prefer to remain with the original allocation of square footage both areas had started with. On this basis, he indicated he would support LOPA 24 and not support LOPA 8.

Chair Hunter pointed out that a Notice of Decision would have to be issued in either case, and he suggested that if refusal of the amendment was Councillor van den Ham's intent, a Motion to amend the wording from "approve" to "refuse" LOPA 8 would be in order.

Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen said Barrhaven needed commercial development. She found the present situation regrettable, as without LOPA 8 and the appeals to LOPA 24, construction could otherwise have commenced shortly. She, too, felt it was prudent to return to the starting point. The Councillor acknowledged Mr. Boucher's assertion that the Barrhaven Town Centre's application for an expansion of its square footage occurred prior to LOPA 7. However, she recalled that the proponents had not decided to come forward with expansion plans until SNDC/Trinity were preparing to develop. She felt the community of 34,000 needed a junior department store, more services and new jobs to help support the community so it would not have to fulfill its retail needs elsewhere. Councillor McGoldrick-Larsen believed that at the present time, Trinity Developments would provide better retail and a more comprehensive development than the Barrhaven Town Centre could provide with the additional square footage it was applying for. She said that at Council, she would also support LOPA 24 but not LOPA 8.

There being no further discussion, Committee considered the amended recommendation.

Moved by R. van den Ham

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council refuse Local Official Plan Amendment 8 to the City of Nepean Official Plan and that the Clerk issue the Notice of Decision.

CARRIED as amended
(D. Beamish and G. Hunter
dissented)

2. LOCAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 24
CITY OF NEPEAN (TRINITY DEVELOPMENTS)
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report
dated 25 Jul 2000

Please note, the minute for LOPA 24 is included with that of LOPA 8, as both LOPAs were considered together at the Committee's direction.

That the Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council approve Local Official Plan Amendment 24 to the City of Nepean Official Plan and that the Clerk issue the Notice of Decision attached as Annex 1.

CARRIED
(A. Munter dissented)

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES ITEM

3. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS – IN-HOUSE COLLECTION - ZONE C4
- Director, Solid Waste Division, Environment and
Transportation Department report dated 28 Jul 2000

Councillor Munter congratulated staff on fulfilling the Region's collection contract at a lower cost, and with a lower complaint ratio, than those of the private sector.

That the Planning and Environment Committee and Council receive this report for information.

CARRIED

INFORMATION PREVIOUSLY DISTRIBUTED

1. Merivale Road Watermain - Amberwod Crescent to Beckstead Road - 2000 Urban Watermain Upgrades/Extensions Program
- Director, Engineering Division, ETD memo dated 26 Jul 2000
2. Pressure Zone 2C/1E Water System Reliability and Functional Design Study
- Director, Engineering Division, ETD memo dated 24 Jul 2000

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

Original signed by Dawn Whelan
COMMITTEE COORDINATOR

Original signed by Gord Hunter
COMMITTEE CHAIR