

23-202-CD Appendix C - Public Comments Matrix

Commenter	Comment	Applicable Plan	Nature of Comment	Response
Oz Kemal, MHBC on behalf of Devcam Properties Ltd.- 355 Hespeler Road	<p>The Draft 2 Secondary Plan identifies that the Subject Lands in Schedule B: Land Use Plan continue to be designated as Regional Corridor but with a Site Specific Policy 1 (SSP1). This site specific policy (3.2.9.1) states in part:</p> <p><i>In addition to the permitted uses outlined in Regional Commercial section 3.2.8.2 of this Plan, the following permissions also apply:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) Medium to high density residential uses such as mid to high-rise apartments and other multiple dwellings.</i> <i>b) The permitted height for new residential and/or mixed use shall range from a minimum of four storeys up to a maximum of 20 storeys.</i> <i>c) All other relevant policies of Official Plan and this Secondary Plan.</i> <p>Please note that the updated HRCSP identifies 'Natural Hazards and Floodplain' in section 3.2.8. The Regional Commercial section is 3.2.3, and does not have a subsection. The numbering needs to be corrected.</p>	Hespeler Road	Policy numbering/ referencing corrections	Noted
	<p>The above policy (3.2.9.1) does not indicate that the site specific density and height are 'notwithstanding' section 3.1.4 Permitted Height and Density policies that are applicable to 'all' designations. This creates a conflict/discrepancy between minimum heights in Table 3-1 and the minimum heights in table 3.2.9.1. Section 3.1.4 also defers to section 3.3.4 Private Realm Urban Design Guidelines regarding podium heights and should more accurately reference specific policy 3.3.4.4 Tall Buildings.</p>		Clarity in policy language, reference numbers and policy intent	Noted
	<p>Re: Policy 3.3.3.5</p> <p>It is unclear why the HRCSP places a policy under the Parks Section requiring a master plan for the Subject Lands rather than in the general policies of the plan and that should apply equitably to any lands where it may be relevant (i.e. any lands within an MTSA). As well, the Planning Act does not require a portion or entirety of parkland dedication as lands, but defers to local Parkland Dedication By-laws and Parks Master Plans for the City and where cash-in-lieu is also an option. And as noted through Bill 23, Planning Act, s.42, the maximum amount of land that can be conveyed or paid in lieu is capped at 10% of the land or its value for sites under 5 ha, and 15 % for sites greater than 5 ha. And the maximum alternative dedication rate was reduced to 1 ha/600 units for land and 1 ha/1000 units for cash in lieu. Parks plans to be required prior to the passing of any future parkland dedication by-law.</p>		Concern with policy language and requirements	Section 3.3.3 provides direction on community parks and mid-sized parks on larger sites and identifies the locations as conceptual. Section 4.1.4 identifies the link to the City's Parks Master Plan, which is an ongoing activity. The City's Park Master Plan is looking at the identified parks as part of the city-wide

				strategy and tools to implement through development approvals. The policy indicates that “The proposed and potential parks as noted in this Secondary Plan, will be acquired through parkland dedication, purchase of lands, cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication, and/or expropriation if necessary.”
	<p>‘Schedule F – Transit and Active Transportation Plan’ shows a proposed multi-use trail path bisecting the entire subject lands from north to south. It is unclear why such a trail is required given that such trails are proposed along Hespeler Road and where an existing north-south path exists along Conestoga Boulevard. We believe the identification of such a trail is premature at this time given that there will be a future Area Specific Plan and possibly a master plan for the Cambridge Centre lands. The proposed and existing trails about the subject lands and provide access to the proposed MTSA station on Hespeler.</p>		<p>Concern with identification of trail and requirements of trail; Request for clarity as to why it is required</p>	<p>Trails identified on Schedule F are conceptual and intended to be further refined through subsequent area specific plan/draft plan processes.</p>
	<p>In regards to 3.3.4 Private Realm Urban Design Guidelines, it may be advised that these policies are revisited in context of recent legislative changes under Bill 23 as they pertain to site plans and the appearance of building elements.</p>		<p>Concern with requirements of 3.3.4 in light of Bill 23</p>	<p>The policies of section 3.3.4 are design guidelines that are intended to support the review of development proposals. Bill 23 provides limits to</p>

				site plan control with regards to exterior design.
	<p>1. Given that the Regional policies pertaining to MTSAs require that local municipalities undertake Area Specific Plans that should provide applicable policy direction for intensification, we would appreciate clarification as to whether this document is intended to fulfill that function given it was drafted prior to MTSAs being established, and there hasn't been any substantial changes to the policy since the 2019 draft.</p>		Clarity on intensification direction	The Hespeler Road Secondary Plan is being undertaken to provide the area specific planning for the Pinebush, Cambridge Centre and Can-Amera MTSAs.
	<p>2. As the Region has identified a minimum density target of 160 ppj/ha, it is recommended that only minimum building heights and densities are established, and should not identify maximums as shown in 4.2.16.1. This would allow optimization of lands to ensure minimum density targets are exceeded in light of the future ION LRT.</p>		Request no height/ density maximums	The provincial policy framework on protected MTSAs and Regional Official Plan Amendment #6 provide direction on minimum density targets at build out for each of the MTSAs. While height does not have a linear correlation with density, analysis on the provincial target was undertaken as part of the ROPA #6 based on a series of density and height assumptions, which

				demonstrate that Pinebush, Cambridge Centre and Can-Amara could achieve the minimum density target. Maximum density targets have not been proposed in the Secondary Plan. Providing maximum height limits is an appropriate scope for a secondary plan to address the range of impacts that need to be considered as it relates to built form.
	3. We would recommend that the MTSA areas as identified in <i>Figure 8.d</i> of the adopted Regional Official Plan be identified within the Secondary Plan.		Request map edits to identify ROPA MTSA boundaries	Noted, Mapping has been updated
	4. We request clarity on why an additional master plan is required under the Parks and Recreation policies. If a Master Plan is required is should be identified in 3.2.9.1, and park spaces would be part of that Master Plan study.		Concern with policy language and requirements	See response above regarding City Park Master Plan currently underway.
	5. We object to Figure F depicting a proposed north-south trail in advance of an Area Specific Plan or Master Plan. These types of details should be determined through the master plan exercise in the future. If policy language is to be included regarding proposed parks and trails, it should be flexible and determined by landowners in partnership with the City who may determine highest/best location when designing future developments.		Concern with identification of trail and requirements of	See comments above re trails

			trail; Request for clarity as to why it is required	
	6. Acknowledging policy 3.1.1(c), notwithstanding the future direction of Cambridge Centre, we would like City confirmation that the shopping centre is allowed to expand as a single-storey structure whether contiguous or through free standing commercial buildings.		Concern with ability to expand as single storey structure	Section 3.1.1 identifies that legally existing uses, building and structures and replacement and expansions to existing legal uses, buildings and structures in conformity with the policies of the Official Plan and this Secondary Plan are permitted in all designations.
	7. Fix numbering of document in both table of contents and within sections; e.g. current policy 3.2.9.2 SSP2 is referenced as "3.2.8.2" in policy; s. 3.1.1. Uses Permitted in All Designations and 3.1.1 Transition for Existing Auto-Oriented Uses.		Policy numbering/ referencing corrections	Noted
Oz Kemal, MHBC on behalf of KS Cambridge Properties Inc.- 15 Sheldon Drive	The height and density for new development in Mixed Use Medium Density is identified in s.3.2.2.3 to be a minimum of three storeys up to a maximum of eight storeys. It is unclear why s.3.2.2.4 states that "stand-alone uses, such as high density or medium density residential development may be permitted as infilling elsewhere on the site (e.g. rear lot area). Would the subject lands represent a 'rear lot area' where high density residential is permitted, given the lack of clarity	Hespeler Road	Clarity in what constitutes a rear lot/ potential map changes for clarity	Lands designated Mixed Use Medium Density have a min height of 3 storeys and a max height of 8 storeys. Policy 3.2.2.4 outlines the preference for distribution of the

	in the policies of 3.2.2? If so, then it would be more clear to designate 'rear lot areas' as higher density.			mix of uses and heights across a lot, and is not intended to suggest development beyond the maximum height established.
	As the Region has identified a minimum density target of 160 ppj/ha, it is recommended that only minimum building heights and densities are established, and should not identify maximums as shown in 4.2.16.1. This would allow optimization of lands to ensure minimum density targets are exceeded in light of the future ION LRT.		Request no height/ density maximums	See response above re max heights.
	Redesignate the subject lands from Mixed Use Medium Density to Mixed Use High Density to support the goal of intensification and to exceed the minimum Regional density of 160 ppj/ha. (ROPA 6). In terms of context, with the lands near the PSEZ and business industrial designated area to the east, the form of a tall building is more compatible than a street townhouse given the need to address Land Use Compatibility matters. A three storey street townhouse form on a site not fronting onto Hespeler Road will not support the achievement of the Region of Waterloo's minimum density target.		Request for reconsideration of land use designation	MUHD designation has been extended south to include the subject lands and align with designation boundaries to the west.
	Request confirmation as to whether a mixed use building is required, or whether a single-use building (i.e. residential) is permitted. Based on the policies, given that the subject lands do not front on Hespeler Road, it appears that a residential building would be permitted, but we request confirmation of the same.		Clarity in what would be permitted/ potential map and policy changes	Given the subject site does not have frontage on Hespeler Road, stand-alone

	<p>Permitting a High Density stand-alone residential building is supported through policy 3.2.1.4 'Form of Mixed Use Development and Redevelopment' of the Mixed Use High Density section that says that "stand-alone uses, such as high density ... residential development may be permitted as infilling elsewhere on the site (e.g. rear lot area)." The subject lands represent the 'rear lot area' of the lots fronting onto Hespeler Road.</p>			residential would be permitted.
	<p>Fix numbering of document – both table of contents and within sections; e.g. Table of Contents shows 4.1 General Implementation, followed by 4.1.1 General Implementation. It is not clear if the policy is to be quoted as "4.1.4.1.1".</p>		Policy numbering/ referencing corrections	Noted
<p>Les Kadar, Garden Gate Ltd.</p>	<p>most important factor is the timeline of the closing date for public input in January which to me is not acceptable and not just because of Christmas holidays and for many January holidays as well, but as an overall policy. Far too short a period to obtain educated responses from a non-professional public especially for such a monstrous long range project and life altering impacts. the public needs a fair shake at expressing concerns, providing educated input and the feeling that being consulted was just that, consulted and their opinions weighed into the mix. This cannot be done in the timeline established at this point.</p>	Non-specific	Timing	Timeframe has been extended
	<p>High density buildings are proposed at a few intersections that are already a nightmare for traffic. Just to name one, at Hwg 24/Pinebush there is a Smart Center project with some 10,000 units, quite possibly 30,000 people in high/mid-rise mixed use buildings. Add to that the customers of the various businesses that will also be located there. This project</p>	Hespeler	Traffic, density, safety concerns	Noted

	<p>as you are well aware was rammed thru by the MZO decision. The current proposal could easily double such volumes of people, vehicles at that intersection. If memory serves correctly, at this time the map is yet be loaded, the proposal calls for similar density type buildings across the road. This will make access to and from the 401, along Hespeler road to Hespeler, Preston or Galt simply impossible. Foot traffic will be monumental. Hespeler road if intensified with residential units at such vital corners and elsewhere, will create immediate foot/bike traffic. Without overhead cross walks, such additional foot traffic will be a real big issue. People will be forced to run across the 4/5 lane road as traffic lights at major intersections are too far away from each other to use, especially in winter. In this country bike lanes are being put in place but not all that well and are not highly respected by drivers.</p>			
	<p>Trucks into any of the core areas even once it is diverted via the “bypass” if completed before I die, must be limited to max 20ft tractor trailers and 26 ft straight trucks for only delivery purposes only. No through traffic. 53 foot tractor trailers cannot be allowed either onto # 24/Hespeler Road into the core areas.</p> <p>Industrial Road, Conestoga Blvd and Franklin Blvd are there for that purpose. While they have been poorly planned for long term usage and growth of a community, they are there to use. Consultation with the trucking industry is a must as time is money and lost time in traffic is extremely expensive. Hopefully this plan has been provided to them for their valued input. The industry understands such restrictions as they are subjected to rules in many other communities.</p>	Hespeler/ General	Truck traffic, truck traffic safety, truck traffic permissions	Noted

<p>Frank and Barbara DaTerra</p>	<p>In the last 10 years (approximately) we have at times experienced major flooding in our backyards. The water has flowed into our backyards as a result of Groff Mill Creek overflowing into the sluiceway. We have video of this water flowing into our yards during a heavy rain and it was happening within a short period of time. Once Groff Mill Creek cleared the water receded. As a result of all of this, the GRCA changed our land status to indicate we were in a secondary flood zone which in turn more than doubled our house insurance premiums. We highlighted this issue several times to the City and through Mike Mann our previous Councillor. After several conversations, emails and meetings, they recently installed a backflow valve on our side of the culvert. This solution is supposed to mitigate the risk of water flowing into our yards when Groff Mill Creek overflows. Since the installation of this backflow valve we have not experienced heavy rains to test the solution. Of note, one such heavy rain was after Frito Lay built a new warehouse and paved previous greenspace for trailer parking. The water reached our back doors but thankfully did not go inside our basements. We did not get any notices of this development and therefore no opportunity to voice our concerns and ask for a solution as part of that process. We are not aware of any solutions that Frito Lay was required to put into place to contain storm water as a result of their development. This is just an example to provide context. So with this background, this now takes us to today's proposed Secondary Plan and our concerns regarding this flooding issue. With the development continuing along Hespeler Road and other industrial lands around Hespeler Road we are</p>	<p>Hespeler Road/ Generally applicable to both</p>	<p>request for strong policy language to require new developments to contain stormwater runoff</p>	<p>The Secondary Plan includes policies on natural hazards and identifies Groff-Mill Creek two-zone floodway on Schedule C. The Secondary Plan refers to the OP policies on environmental management and floodplains. The expectation is that new development would need to address flooding through onsite measures. Policy 4.1.9 identifies the need for require supplementary studies, prior to site plan approval, plan of subdivision/condo, ZBA or OPA, including hydrogeological, stormwater management studies, and other</p>
----------------------------------	---	--	--	---

	<p>concerned that Groff Mill Creek is not capable of handling additional storm water runoff. Continuing to hardscape existing lands and developing greenspace is concerning. In reading the Secondary Plan, the language that is used to highlight this concern is very passive. For example, using terms like encouraging or incentivizing developers to use methods to contain storm water runoff is not harsh enough. We are concerned that if passive language is used developers will ignore requirements as it will increase the cost of their development. This could result in further flooding issues downstream. We would like to see more firmer language included to ensure developers include these requirements in their development. If the City doesn't review and include in the plans proactive solutions to deal with the storm water runoff, we could all be dealing with major flooding impacts after the fact! This is not acceptable given that we already know that Groff Mill Creek is currently unable to handle the existing storm water. This highlights the need to include proactive solutions within the plans of any new development or changes to existing properties.</p> <p>Also we have concerns that existing property owners who wish to develop their property to add medium or high density buildings that they will not need to notify low density property owners in the neighbourhood of their plans. Similar to the Frito Lay example we gave above. This would not give the low density homeowners an opportunity to raise concerns and work with the City and developers on solutions. This is especially concerning for existing low density housing that is near or next to properties that are eligible for redevelopment as per the new Secondary Plan.</p>			<p>studies as the City deems appropriate.</p>
--	---	--	--	---

Taylor Bridges, Zelinka Priamo Ltd. On behalf of Branthaven Belmont Pinebush Inc., 108 & 112 Pinebush Road	We are pleased to see that, notwithstanding the height and density permissions associated with the MUMD designation, the policies for lands identified SSP3 allow for building heights ranging from 2 storeys to 15 storeys, pursuant to the approved site-specific City of Cambridge Official Plan Amendment No. 41.	Hespeler Road		Noted
	According to “Schedule D – Public Realm Improvement Plan” of the Secondary Plan, the portion of Pinebush Road that fronts the subject lands is identified as being subject to “Potential Major Streetscape Improvements”. According to Section 3.3.3.2 of the Secondary Plan, Major Streetscape Improvements may require a right-of-way width of 45.0m. The portion of Pinebush Road fronting the subject lands already has a significant and established urban cross-section which includes two vehicle lanes, a dedicated bicycle lane, and sidewalk on both sides of the centreline. We have concerns that, given the modest depth of the undeveloped subject lands fronting Pinebush Road, any requirement to provide additional land dedications would unnecessarily restrict the future potential developability of the subject lands. As such, we would request that the existing right-of-way width of this section of Pinebush Road be maintained.		request that the existing right-of-way width of this section of Pinebush Road be maintained.	Noted
	According to Section 3.2.2.2 of the Secondary Plan, no street townhouses or stacked townhouses shall be permitted on lands fronting onto Hespeler Road. We		Request for Clarity	Lands designated Mixed Use Medium Density permit

	are seeking confirmation that the intent of this policy is to restrict the construction of townhouses specifically on lands fronting Hespeler Road and not in other locations within the Secondary Plan area.			street townhomes, stacked townhomes, however these uses are not permitted on lands fronting Hespeler Road (policy 3.2.2.2). These uses would be permitted on lands which do not front on Hespeler Road, subject to the remaining policies of the Secondary Plan.
Taylor Bridges, Zelinka Priamo Ltd. On behalf of 1084079 Ontario Inc., 688 Hespeler Road	The subject lands are located in proximity to the north-easterly corner of the Hespeler Road and Pinebush Road intersection, and just south of the 401 Highway. Notably, the lands to the northwest, southwest, and southeast of this intersection are designated in the Secondary Plan to allow for both commercial and residential uses via the “Mixed Use High Density (MUHD)” designation. It is our professional opinion that the “Mixed Use High Density (MUHD)” or the “Mixed Use Medium Density (MUMD)” designation would also be appropriate for the subject lands, as the omission of residential permissions could result in a missed opportunity for intensification. The subject lands are an excellent candidate site for future mixed-use development, given its location within the Pinebush Major Transit Station Area (MTSA), where intensification is encouraged, and near a major	Hespeler Road	Request for re-designation/permissions for Residential	Lands to the north and west of the subject area are proposed to be designated Regional Employment Area through ROPA #6 and are currently designated Employment Corridor in the City’s Official Plan. The MUO designated is intended to support higher density uses

	intersection and provincial highway. Further, this request to include residential permissions on the subject lands would better align with the land use permissions currently afforded to the subject lands through the City of Cambridge Official Plan, which designates the subject lands “Hespeler Road Mixed Use Corridor”.			while addressing compatibility with adjacent employment lands.
Taylor Bridges, Zelinka Priamo Ltd. On behalf of Legion Heights Hespeler Inc., 506-510, 516 Hespeler Road, and 1000 Langs Drive	On June 13, 2022, a combined Official Plan Amendment/Zoning By-law Amendment application was submitted on behalf of LHHI for the subject lands to permit a high-rise (i.e., up to 20-storeys), mixed-use development consisting of 1,366 residential dwelling units, office and retail uses, and a large public park (City of Cambridge File No. OR06/22). Through the pre-consultation process, City staff confirmed that the “Mixed Use High Density (MUHD)” designation would be appropriate for the proposed development. On September 27, 2022, the Statutory Public Meeting was held for the proposed applications, where general support for the proposal was received by City Council. The subject lands have been split-designated “Mixed Use High Density (MUHD)” and “Mixed Use Medium Density (MUMD)” as per “Schedule B – Land Use Plan” of the Secondary Plan. The planned function of the MUHD designation is to provide opportunities for mixed-use development in a high-density format, where residential and non-residential uses can be mixed across a parcel or mixed within buildings ranging up to 20-storeys in height. It is our understanding that the split-designation being applied to the subject lands is a drafting error. It is our professional opinion that the “Mixed Use High Density (MUHD)” designation should be applied to the entirety	Hespeler Road	Request for re-designation/ mapping correction	Noted, mapping has been updated.

	of the subject lands, to align with the mixed-use, high-density development applications currently being processed on the subject lands, and in order to better realize the intent of the Secondary Plan, which encourages concentrations of high-density, transit-supportive development around the nearby major transit station.			
	According to “Schedule D – Public Realm Improvement Plan” of the Secondary Plan, the subject lands are identified as an area for “Potential Public Realm Enhancements”. Further, a “Community Park” is identified as a Potential Public Realm Improvement on the lands located directly to the south of the subject lands. As noted above, the development proposal includes a large 1.0ha programmable public park in the westerly quadrant, running the entire length of the subject lands. We are seeking confirmation that the proposed public park will satisfy the Public Realm Improvement requirement for the subject lands as delineated in the Secondary Plan.		Request for clarity/ confirmation/ Mapping revision	We confirm that the proposed public park will satisfy the Public Realm Improvement requirement for the subject lands
Bell Canada	<p>Moving forward, Bell Canada would like to continue to ensure that the landowners are aware and familiar with our conditions as they pertain to forthcoming Site Plans, Draft Plans of Subdivision and/or Draft Plans of Condominium as follows:</p> <p>Condition: “The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell. The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities or</p>	General/ Non-specific	Condition for agreements	Noted

	<p>easements within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost.”</p> <p>The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development. It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada’s existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the even that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure. If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.</p>			
	<p>Bell Canada understands the City’s desire to support high quality urban design through built form to enhance the appearance and livability of its urban areas. We strive to minimize the impact of our infrastructure, however with the evolving nature of telecommunication/communication technology it is not always possible for a number of reasons, and appreciate the opportunity to work with the City to find solutions that align as much as possible with the municipality’s urban design interests in principle, where feasible.</p>		<p>Consider urban design solutions for telecommunications/ communication s technology in instances where meeting urban design guidelines or policies may not be possible</p>	<p>Noted – will require further consideration from staff.</p>

	We do note, significant future investment in an LRT for Hespeler Road, and would request that Bell be circulated on this future project as details become available in order to assess the impacts on our existing plant/equipment, in particular costs for relocation or opportunities for future network provisioning.		Request to be notified/ informed	Noted
Waterloo Catholic District School Board	Requests for further discussion and meetings with school board representatives to understand population/ unit projections to assist in school accommodation planning	General/ Non-specific		We have reviewed the population and employment assumptions and analysis that went into the ROPA #6 work. Based on a minimum build out of 160 people and jobs/ha, the study area could accommodate a total of approx. 23,000 people and 15,000 jobs.
	School board asked about how to provide a broad range of units that support families, outlined policy			Housing policy 3.1.3 provides minimum 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units for development containing more than 80 new units.
Verbal, at public meeting	Concern with shrinking size of condo units and the impacts on an aging population; and, requests to include policies that would require developers to provide a range of unit layouts that are large enough to accommodate accessible design standards (for	General/ Non-specific		

	example, ensuring washrooms, hallways/ living spaces are large enough to accommodate wheelchairs)			
	Concerns with eroding housing affordability and impacts on future residents; and, requests to include policies that would require developers to ensure affordable ownership and rental options are provided in every development			
	Concerns with traffic congestion and levels of heavy truck transportation along the corridor and potential for worsening conditions as the areas intensify/ redevelop			Noted
	Requests for clarity on locations for schools and whether any school sites have been identified, with a desire to ensure there are policies to permit schools within the secondary plan areas			Ongoing discussion with School boards
	Questions about implications of Bill 23 on the secondary plan process and other future planning processes			Ongoing review
	Questions about how density will be regulated given the absence of floor space index or units per hectare metrics in the policies			Height and urban design policies can work together to address community building objectives in the absence of density permissions such as UPH and FSI
	Questions about mechanisms and tools available to incentivize change/ what if landowners are content to keep existing uses and do not want to redevelop Concern with limited setbacks along the street edge and impacts of proximity to road infrastructure on residents in new buildings- have there been any health impact studies/ noise impact studies/			Existing uses that don't conform to the plan would become legal non-conforming and redevelopment would have to

	vibration studies completed that demonstrate the minimal setbacks are safe/ adequate/ appropriate for residents?		conform to the policies of the secondary plan and Official Plan.
	What will happen to uses such as the Galt Curling Club and the flea market? How can these types of community uses continue in the new framework		