



# City of Barrie

70 Collier Street (Box 400)  
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

## Minutes - Final General Committee

---

Monday, September 9, 2013

7:00 PM

Council Chamber

---

### GENERAL COMMITTEE REPORT

For consideration by the Council of the City of Barrie on September 16, 2013

**The meeting was called to order by Mayor Lehman at 7:01 p.m. The following were in attendance for the meeting:**

**Present:** 11 - Mayor J. Lehman; Councillor B. Ainsworth; Councillor L. Strachan; Councillor D. Shipley; Councillor B. Ward; Councillor P. Silveira; Councillor M. Prowse; Councillor J. Brassard; Councillor A. Khan; Councillor B. Jackson; and Councillor A. Nuttall

#### STAFF:

Chief Administrative Officer, C. Ladd  
City Clerk/Director of Legislative and Court Services, D. McAlpine  
Deputy City Clerk, W. Cooke  
Director of Business Development, H. Kirolos  
Director of Environmental Services, J. Thompson  
Director of Legal Services, I. Peters  
Director of Planning, S. Naylor  
Director of Roads, Parks and Fleet, D. Friary  
Economic Development Officer, P. Dyck  
Executive Director of Innovate Barrie, R. Bunn  
General Manager of Community and Corporate Services, E. Archer  
General Manager of Infrastructure and Growth Management, R. Forward  
Manager of Development Control, R. Windle.

**The General Committee met and reports that the following matter(s) were dealt with on the consent portion of the agenda:**

**The Committee met and reports as follows:**

**SECTION "A"**

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE DATED AUGUST 28, 2013.**

The Development Services Committee Report dated August 28, 2013 was received.

**This matter was recommended (Section "A") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

**The General Committee recommends adoption of the following recommendation(s) which were dealt with on the consent portion of the agenda:**

**SECTION "B"**

**147 TORONTO STREET - HERITAGE WOODLOT ASSESSMENT (WARD 2)**

1. That the memorandum from the Engineering Department to the Development Services Committee dated August 13, 2013 concerning the 147 Toronto Street - Heritage Woodlot Assessment be referred to the Heritage Barrie Committee for review and consideration.
2. That the Heritage Barrie Committee be requested to provide comments to the Committee of Adjustment with respect to the severance application and request for the heritage designation to be removed from the southern portion of the property, in light of the Urban Forester's memorandum on the sustainability of the southern portion of the property as a wooded area. (13-G-174) (File: C00)

**This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

**DECOMMISSIONING OF WELL 10 (WARDS 8 AND 9)**

That Well 10 - Huronia Road be discontinued as a source of municipal drinking water, as per Section 14 of Ontario Regulation 287/07 under the Clean Water Act. (ENG028-13) (File: W09-SO)

**This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

**EXPROPRIATION OF PORTION OF 2 VICTORIA STREET (WARD 2)**

1. That the Director of Legal Services be authorized to commence expropriation proceedings to acquire a fee simple interest in land for the purpose of a daylighting triangle on lands legally described as Part of Common Elements, Simcoe Standard Condominium Plan 354, designated as Part 8 on Plan 51R-38766 (the "Lands").
2. That the Corporation of the City of Barrie make an application to City Council, as approving authority, for approval to expropriate the Lands and that the Mayor, and the City Clerk be authorized to execute the necessary forms of application.
3. That the "Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate" be served and published and that any requests for inquiries received, pursuant to the "Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate" be forwarded to the Chief Inquiring Officer and the Chief Inquiring Officer be requested to report to Council with respect to any such request.
4. That the Director of Legal Services have delegated authority to settle the expropriation in an amount up to a maximum of \$30,000 and that the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to execute all associated and required documents in a form approved by the Director of Legal Services. (LGL010-13) (File: L07-969)

**This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

**AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING BY-LAW - 240 KOZLOV STREET - SIMCOE MUSKOKA CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD (WARD 4)**

1. That the Zoning By-law Amendment Application submitted by the Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board (SMCDSB) to rezone a portion of the lands known municipally as 240 Kozlov Street from Single Detached Residential Dwelling Third Density (R3) to Education Institutional (I-E) be approved.
2. That pursuant to Section 34 (17) of the Planning Act, no further written notice be required. (PLN022-13) (File: D14-1554)

**This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

**APPROVED STREET NAME LIST - AL ZABA**

That in memory of Al Zaba and in recognition of his significant contributions to the community, staff in the Planning Services Department add Al Zaba to the approved street name list, subject to obtaining concurrence from the Emergency Service Partners and Council be notified via memorandum once a suitable street within the annexed lands has been identified. (Item for Discussion 8.1) (File: D00)

**This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

**CONSULTATION REGARDING REGULATING THE BUSINESS OF RESIDENTIAL RENTAL HOUSING UNITS**

That staff in the Building and By-law, Legal and Planning Services Departments and Councillor Ainsworth consult with representatives from the City of Oshawa concerning Oshawa's experiences with respect to regulating the business of residential rental housing units through their zoning and licensing by-laws. (Item for Discussion 8.2) (File: P00)

**This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

**SECTION "C"****INVESTIGATION OF POTENTIAL SPEED REDUCTION - COUNTRY LANE (WARD 9)**

That staff in the Engineering Department investigate the feasibility of lowering the speed limit along the entire length of Country Lane and report back to General Committee. (Item for Discussion 8.3) (File: P00)

**This matter was recommended (Section "G") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

**The General Committee met for the purpose of two public meetings at 7:05 p.m. and reports as follows:**

**Mayor Lehman advised the public that any concerns or appeals dealing with the applications for Official Plan Amendments and Amendments to the Zoning By-law should be directed to the City Clerk's Office. Any interested persons wishing further notification of the staff reports regarding the application were advised to sign the appropriate notification form required by the City Clerk's Office. Mayor Lehman confirmed with the Deputy City Clerk that notification was conducted in accordance with the Planning Act.**

**SECTION "D"****APPLICATION FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING BY-LAW - HARMONY VILLAGE - LAKE SIMCOE INC. - 51 - 83 BRADFORD STREET AND 20 CHECKLEY STREET (WARD 2) (September 9, 2013) (File: D14-1561)**

Mr. Andrew McNeil, Vice President of LiveWorkLearnPlay (LWLP) provided a summary on the proposed development, indicating that it is meant to be an innovative and vibrant addition to the existing neighbourhood. He noted that his firm has already had meetings with area residents to provide them preliminary details of the development and receive feedback. Mr. McNeil indicated that LVWP wants to work with the City and area residents to ensure that the development is compatible with the existing neighbourhood to create a legacy mixed use neighbourhood.

Mr. John Bousefield of Bousefield Inc., advised that the purpose public meeting is to review an application for an Amendment to the Zoning By-law submitted by Harmony Village - Lake Simcoe Inc., for lands generally located between Bradford Street and Lakeshore Drive, north of Vespra Street and south of Simcoe Street. Mr. Bousefield noted that the lands are known municipally as 51-83 Bradford Street and 20 Checkley Street. He provided an image of the proposed development plan.

Mr. Bousefield detailed the physical constraints associated with the site, including the discharge rate of Bunkers Creek and traffic circulation and advised how that these issues will be addressed by the culvert installation proposed for 2014 along Lakeshore Drive and the installation of the proposed connecting road (Harmony Road). Mr. Bousefield described the length of the current block along Bradford Street and suggested that additional connectivity through the installation of Harmony Road would provide for a more efficient and accessible downtown.

Mr. Bousefield noted the areas for public and private vistas, how these vistas can be exploited and associated public policy.

Mr. Roland Rom Colthoff of Raw Design provided conceptual renderings of the proposed development. Mr. Rom Colthoff described the four key ideas associated with the plan to create a complete community. He noted proposed amenities planned to be included as part of the overall development, including a foodstore, pharmacy, medical offices, Red Cross Office, satellite location for Georgian College, dinner theatre and a recreation facility.

Mr. Rom Coltoff described the five proposed towers on-site, noting that they are intended to have varying height from 22-13 storeys.

Mr. Rob Spanier of LWLP reiterated that Harmony Village is intended to be a vibrant destination and detailed key features of the proposed development.

In closing, Mr. Spanier, highlighted the economic benefits and overall amenities associated with the Harmony Village proposal.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

1. **Mr. Don Hamilton, 2 Toronto Street** advised that he was representing a number of residents from his condominium building. Mr. Hamilton indicated that the area residents realize that an infill multi-residential project is inevitable to complete the neighbourhood, but are concerned about the size and design of the proposed development and the impact it will have on the existing neighbourhood. He noted that the development should not overwhelm/overshadow existing development and requested careful consideration of the number of towers and total density.

Mr. Hamilton indicated that the residents welcome some form of new ideas on the plan but feel the existing proposal overwhelms existing development and needs to be harmonious with its neighbours.

2. **Mr. Lorne McDonald, 33 Ellen Street** advised that he represents some residents from his condominium building. Mr. McDonald advised that he is concerned with the size and layout of the proposed development and the traffic congestion that may be caused by new connecting road (Harmony Road).

He strongly objected to the proposed Harmony Road questioning the need for the road. He highlighted that the proposed development is substantially deficient in terms of parking.

He noted that there are no agreements for the amenities described in the Harmony Village proposal and question that the development would be built as proposed.

He also raised concerns with respect to the public and private views and access to the lake being diminished and the insufficient parking that is being proposed for the development. He indicated that the Developer should build the development in accordance with current City policies and plans including requirements regarding height.

3. **Mr. Robert Bishop, 33 Ellen Street** raised concerns about the impact the proposed development will have on the Eco Park and green space in the area. He noted that the developer should be made to conform to the City's policy of a 16-storey building height. He also noted concerns with respect to the insufficient parking due to the number of residents and amenities proposed as part of the development and suggested that the commercial portion be restricted to Bradford Street.
4. **Mr. Gary Bell, 365 Codrington Road** noted that his concerns relate to the proposed amendment to the zoning by-law, as the project itself will be dealt with through site plan discussions with the City. Mr. Bell

provided photographs of current views of the site from different areas around the Bay and conceptual drawings of lake view and of arterial roads to demonstrate the possible impacts of the proposed development on the area. He detailed that proposed zoning by-law not only includes the height variance but a variance for the distance between buildings. He stated that the proposed development is 13 storeys higher than its neighbours and of a greater mass and form.

Mr. Bell noted that in his opinion, that a rezoning should regulate the development of the site to compliment adjacent properties. He provided a comparison of the Barrie Growth Centre Intended Intensification versus the increase of intensification that would occur if the application to rezone the site is approved.

Mr. Bell also indicated his concern regarding the economic benefits provided by LVLP. He commented that the height and density would be wrong for the site.

5. **Ms. Darlene Rice-Reecho, 33 Ellen Street** raised concerns with respect to the potential impacts and proximity of the development to the Eco Park and Bunkers Creek. Ms. Rice-Reecho also noted her concerns to the size of the buildings and impact on area traffic.

She sought clarification on the location of the proposed Harmony Road in relationship to Bunkers Creek. She stated she opposed the road and commented on the need to look after the environment. She expressed concern regarding debris and garbage generated from the site, the height of the project and the neon lights from the commercial building.

A representative of Harmony Village provided information concerning the proposed road location and Bunkers Creek.

6. **Ms. Kathy MacLeod, Community Support Manager, Red Cross** indicated that the Red Cross has a memorandum of understanding with Harmony Village to provide community programming at the Barrie development. She described the programs and services provided by the Red Cross, noting that it looks forward to being part of the development.
7. **Mr. George Gibson, 33 Ellen Street** noted that a written submission had been provided. He raised concerns regarding the shadowing effect of that may result from the proposed development. He also noted concerns with respect to the timing of the shadow study conducted by the developer, as it was done in the summer only.

He detailed his concern regarding insufficient parking, as the parking at the proposed development will not only have to accommodate residents, but those using the amenities, and anyone providing service to the residents at any given time.

He noted that the pile driving can be loud and stated that he understood that there were undisruptive methods available.

Mr. Gibson also noted concerns with respect to the potential traffic and environmental impacts including the impact on Bunkers Creek, the Eco Park and water table that may result from the proposed development.

8. **Mr. Ian Rowe, 140 Dunlop Street** raised concerns that if the application is approved that other developers would follow requesting height variances over and above the approved City standard. He commented that City staff had recently reviewed the height study and found that the current height restrictions were appropriate. He noted his concerns with the height and massing of the development stating that the previous approval for additional height was provided based other municipal benefits detailed specifically in the site specific zoning by-law. He questioned whether the development will provide any of these benefits. He suggested that if any exceptions were provided to the developer, it be completed though the site specific zoning by-law to provide the offsetting municipal benefits.

He noted his concerns with respect to whether or not the amenities, employment will be a reality.

9. **Ms. Jill Price, 114 Ester Drive** advised she is a business owner in downtown Barrie and feels that that the new development together with the new amenities mentioned by LPLW will bring needed infrastructure and housing which will maintain and improve the quality of life and the benefit the economy in the downtown core.
10. **Mr. Brent Clarkson, 33 Ellen Street** noted that his building will directly face the proposed development and detailed his concerns. He advised that he supports the Intensification Study and Growth Plan but feels that the development proposal is not sensitive to surrounding neighbourhoods. He stated that the development should be assessed with respect to the character and sensitivity to surrounding properties.

Mr. Clarkson, also raised concerns regarding additional noise, security, insufficient parking for the proposed amenities and increase of traffic related to the proposed Harmony Road. He stated that the proposal is not sensitive to the neighbours and requires substantial modifications.

He suggested making the proposed Harmony Road internal to the site if it is truly required.

11. **Mr. Rod Burns, 2 Toronto Street** discussed that the site in question will be developed in some fashion but his concern is with the height variance. He noted that Provincial and City policies reflect that 16-storeys will meet required intensification standards. He highlighted concerns regarding the size of the units, the lack of parking and the



over intensification of the site.

12. **Ms. Gwen Peterson, 33 Ellen Street**, highlighted that the concept of the Harmony Village proposal provides within walking distance benefitting the environment and commented that she thought a mixed used development would be a good idea. She welcomed the shade from the tall buildings and expressed hope that the developer would implement the green spaces identified in the plan.
13. **Ms. Nancy Quinlan, 2 Toronto Street** raised concerns about the proximity of the proposed towers within the development in relation to each other and her condominium building. She further noted concerns related to the podium height and the insufficient parking being proposed for the development and impact on wind patterns due to height of the buildings. She noted that the amenities are not proposed in Phase 1. She suggested reconsideration of the height of the towers.
14. **Mr. Brian Rusnell, 6 Bayfield Street** indicated that the buildings would be a nice centerpiece to the downtown core and 5-6 storey buildings would cover a lot more area.
15. **Mr. Erich Jacoby-Hawkins, 49 Eden Drive** indicated that the height variance of the buildings would blend in well with the existing condominium buildings. He noted that high-density residential development ends up paying for itself more than the sprawl associated with single family dwellings.
16. **Ms. Mary Lindros, 37 Ellen Street** raised concerns that the proposed development is not in line with City Council priorities detailed in the City's planning documents. She quoted from the Downtown Barrie Next Wave document to support her position..
17. **Mr. Darren Stajic, 33 Ellen Street** indicated that he felt that the existing developments in the area are well thought out and this represents a radical change. He expressed concerns regarding the environmental impacts, shadowing, noise and traffic congestion. He also noted his concern regarding wind tunnel issues due to height and size of buildings and suggested the developer prepare a wind tunnel study in this regard.

Members of General Committee asked a number of questions related to the presentation and received responses from representatives of the developer and City staff.

#### **WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

1. Correspondence from Bell Canada dated August 23, 2013.

2. Correspondence from John H. Bray dated August 21, 2013.
3. Correspondence from the Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board dated August 26, 2013
4. Submission from Charles Gruchy received August 27, 2013.
5. Correspondence from George Taylor dated August 27, 2013.
6. Correspondence from William and Jacqueline Paterson dated August 28, 2013.
7. Correspondence from Robert and Nancy Bishop dated August 30, 2013.
8. Correspondence from Louis and Barbara Dyke dated September 3, 2013.
9. Petition signed by 63 residents received September 4, 2013.
10. Correspondence from Doug and Vera McKenzie received September 4, 2013 with additional signatures.
11. Correspondence from C.D. McKenzie dated September 4, 2013.
12. Correspondence from Simcoe Standard Condominium Corporation No. 360 received September 4, 2013.
13. Correspondence from Donald and Christina Jay dated September 4, 2013.
14. Correspondence from Synda Mcaskin received September 4, 2013.
15. Correspondence from Susan Bracken dated September 4, 2013.
16. Correspondence from Ian S. Malcom dated September 4, 2013.
17. Correspondence from James Fan dated September 4, 2013.
18. Correspondence from Valerie Holst dated September 1, 2013.
19. Correspondence from Lauraleigh Brumwell dated September 5, 2013.
20. Correspondence from David Phillips dated September 5, 2013.
21. Correspondence from John and Deanna Smythe dated September 7, 2013.
22. Correspondence from Deborah and Michael O'Dwyer dated September 9, 2013.

23. Correspondence from Nancy Quinlan dated September 7, 2013.
24. Correspondence from Michelle and Bob Tuck dated September 2, 2013.

**This matter was recommended (Section "D") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

**APPLICATION FOR A PROPOSED OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING BY-LAW - INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS ON BEHALF OF THE OWNER 1765469 ONTARIO INC. - 76 EDGEHILL DRIVE (WARD 4) (September 9, 2013) (File: D09-OPA32/D14-1558)**

Mr. Darren Vella of Innovative Planning Solutions advised that the purpose of the public meeting is to review applications for an Official Plan Amendment and an Amendment to the Zoning By-law for lands located on the north side of Edgehill Drive, north-west of Highway 400 and east of Anne Street North. He advised that the property is known municipally as 76 Edgehill Drive and has a total area of approximately 1.9ha. He described the site context and surrounding uses. Mr. Vella provided images of the existing high density development in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Vella indicated that the lands are considered to be designated Residential Area and Environmental Protection Area within the City's Official Plan and are currently zoned Single Detached Residential Dwelling R2 and Environmental Protection EP. He indicated that the owner has applied to amend Section 4.8 and Schedule "C" of the Official Plan to include the subject lands as a Defined Special Policy Area and to amend the current R2 zoning of the property to Residential Apartment Dwelling Second Density 2 (RA2-2) to permit the future development of the property for a twelve storey, 218 unit, residential apartment building. He further noted that current Environmental Protection designation and zoning on the subject lands is intended to remain.

Mr. Vella provided examples of other high density developments in the neighbourhood and reviewed the development proposal.

Mr. Vella provided architectural renderings of the proposed development and detailed the impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding neighbourhood.

Mr. Vella detailed the planning studies and reports that have been submitted in support of the application. He advised that in his professional planning opinion that the property achieves the locational criteria for high density residential as outlined in the City of Barrie's Official Plan.

In closing, Mr. Vella advised that the development is consistent with Provincial Policy Statement, Growth Plan and is a logical location for development in a high density residential area.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

1. **Mr. Dale McFarling, 90 Edgehill Drive** advised that he is representing the Board of Directors of the 90 Edgehill Drive in not supporting the proposed development. He raised concerns regarding the size and scale of the proposed high-rise, deterioration of the view from 90 Edgehill, additional noise and traffic as well as the impact on the green space and area wildlife.
2. **Mr. Todd Armstrong, Vine Crescent** noted that he was speaking on behalf of the concerned neighbours on Vine Crescent and advised that the concerns regarding the proposed development had been submitted in writing. He specified concerns including impact on wildlife and green space, additional noise and traffic. He indicated that the green space provides a unique oasis and will be significantly impacted by the proposed development. He stated a strong objection regarding the proposal as it stands. He noted that the location of the building may be impacted by plans for Highway 400 and that the property is the site of the 9 Mile Portage. Mr. Armstrong expressed concern with respect to the scale, loss of trees, excavation impact on the stability of the Vine Crescent homes and property values.
3. **Mr. Jack Frost, 5 Vine Crescent** advised of his concern regarding the proposed development including the impact on the green space and wildlife, additional noise and traffic. He noted of existing concerns regarding the lack of width of the pedestrian walkway on the bridge over the 400. He agrees that intensification is needed, but not to this magnitude if it doesn't consider the safety of the residents.
4. **Ms. Jane McLeod, 90 Edgehill** advised of her concerns regarding the proposed development including noise, shadowing and additional traffic.

Members of General Committee asked questions related to the presentation and received responses from the presenter and staff.

**WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

1. Correspondence from Bell Canada dated July 4, 2013.
2. Correspondence from Bell Canada dated July 9, 2013.
3. Correspondence from Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board dated August 26, 2013.
4. Correspondence from Paul and Jennifer Dunn dated August 26, 2013.
5. Correspondence from Asia Polus, dated August 26, 2013.
6. Correspondence from Ruth and John Wood dated August 23, 2013.

7. Correspondence from Marc Brenner and Patricia Murphy Brenner dated August 23, 2013.
8. Correspondence from Paul and Katherine Michael dated September 4, 2013.
9. Correspondence from Coleen and David Stewart dated September 3, 2013.
10. Correspondence from Allison M. Anderson dated September 5, 2013.
11. Correspondence from Allison M. Anderson dated September 5, 2013.

**This matter was recommended (Section "D") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

**Pursuant to Section 2 (18) of Procedural By-law 2013-072, the Committee adopted a procedural motion in order to extend the meeting past 11:00 p.m. to 12:00 midnight.**

#### **SECTION "E"**

##### **OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING BY-LAW TO PERMIT A CONCRETE READY MIX PLANT (WARD 8)**

That Staff Report PLN018-13 concerning the Official Plan Amendment and Amendment to the Zoning By-law to permit a Concrete Ready Mix Plant (WARD 8), be referred to the Development Services Committee for further consideration. (PLN018-13) (File D09-OPA028 and D14-1548)

**This matter was recommended (Section "E") to City Council for consideration for adoption at its meeting to be held on 9/16/2013.**

#### **SECTION "F"**

##### **OFFICIAL PLAN & ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT FOR 40 FERNDALE DR. S. TO PERMIT LOW AND MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ON TWO SEPARATE SITES ADJACENT THE BEAR CREEK WETLAND (WARD 6)**

That the following motion be considered by City Council on September 30, 2014:

1. That the application submitted by the Jones Consulting Group Ltd. on behalf of Pratt Development (998817 Ontario Inc. and 433513 Ontario Inc.) for lands identified as Part of the North Half of Lot 4 and Lot 5, Concession 14 to amend the Official Plan to permit residential development be approved to include the following (D09-OPA019):

- a) Amend Official Plan Schedule "A" - Land Use to designate the subject lands as Environmental Protection and Residential as illustrated in Appendix "A" attached to Staff Report PLN019-13;
  - b) Amend Official Plan Schedule "C" - Defined Policy Area to identify the Residential parcels as Defined Policy Area BB as illustrated in Appendix "B" to Staff Report PLN019-13;
  - c) Add text to the Official Plan Section 4.8 - Defined Policy Areas as follows:
    - 4.8.13 Part of the North Half of Lot 4 and 5, Concession 14 shall be permitted medium density residential units as four storey walk-up apartments to a maximum density of 70 units per net hectare.
  - d) Amend Schedule 2 - Land Use of the Ardagh Secondary Plan to designate the subject lands as Environmental Protection, Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential as illustrated in Appendix "C" attached to Staff Report PLN019-13; and
  - e) Add text to the Ardagh Secondary Plan Section 2.5.1.4 - Residential Densities (Medium Density) Policies as follows:
    - 2.5.1.4 m) Notwithstanding Section 2.5.1.4, Part of the North Half of Lot 4 and 5, Concession 14 shall be permitted medium density residential units as four storey walk-up apartments to a maximum density of 70 units per net hectare.
2. That the application, submitted by the Jones Consulting Group Ltd. on behalf of Pratt Development (998817 Ontario Inc. and 433513 Ontario Inc.), to amend the Zoning By-law from Environmental Protection (EP) and Residential Hold (RH) to Residential Single Detached Third Density (R3), Residential Multiple with Special Provisions (RM2-SPXXX)(RM2-SPXXX), and Residential Multiple Townhouse with Special Provisions (RM2-TH SPXXX) on the property legally described as Part of the North Half of Lot 4 and 5, Concession 14, be approved as illustrated in Appendix "D" attached to Staff Report PLN019-13.
3. That the following Special Provisions (SP) be referenced in the implementing Zoning By-law:
- a) RM2 (SP-XXX) identified as Block 45 on Appendix "G" to Staff Report PLN019-13:
    - i) Permit a maximum of 144 residential units to a

- maximum density of 70 units per hectare;
- ii) Permit 4-storey walk-up apartment buildings to a maximum building height of 18 metres;
  - iii) Permit a rear yard setback of 5 metres;
  - iv) Require a minimum of 45% of the parking spaces for the apartment buildings be provided as structured/enclosed parking below the residential units;
  - v) Require a minimum of 3% of the parking spaces to be dedicated to barrier free and accessible parking;
  - vi) Permit a maximum of 50 surface parking stalls in the front yard;
  - vii) Permit the required outdoor amenity area of 12m<sup>2</sup> per unit to be unconsolidated and inclusive of the required rear/side yard setback in accordance with the approved Site Plan;
  - viii) Permit a 0 metre landscape buffer area along the side and rear property line to any parking area
  - ix) Permit an accessory structure (utility building) to be located in the front yard to a maximum size of 17m<sup>2</sup>;
  - x) Permit a maximum gross floor area of 70%;
  - xi) Permit construction columns in the structured parking area to encroach into the required parking space;
  - xii) Permit a minimum of 5 metres of landscape open space from the face of the building wall for each ground floor unit with a secondary means of access to the exterior area at ground level; and
  - xiii) Permit accessory buildings and structures to exceed a total of 50m<sup>2</sup> for the site in accordance with the approved Site Plan.
- b) RM2 (SP-XXX) identified as Block 44 on Appendix "G" to Staff Report PLN019-13:
- i) Permit a maximum of 96 residential units and a maximum density of 70 units per hectare;
  - ii) Permit 4-storey walk-up apartment buildings to a maximum building height of 18 metres;

- iii) Permit a rear yard setback of 5 metres;
  - iv) Require a minimum of 45% of the parking spaces for the apartment buildings be provided as structured/enclosed parking below the residential units;
  - v) Require a minimum of 3% of the parking spaces to be dedicated to barrier free and accessible parking;
  - vi) Permit a maximum of 65 parking stalls in the front yard;
  - vii) Permit the required outdoor amenity area of 12m<sup>2</sup> per unit to be unconsolidated and inclusive of the required rear/side yard setback in accordance with the approved Site Plan;
  - viii) Permit a maximum gross floor area of 78%;
  - ix) Permit construction columns in the structured parking area to encroach into the required parking space;
  - x) Permit a minimum of 5 metres of landscape open space from the face of the building wall for each ground floor unit with a secondary means of access to the exterior area at ground level; and
  - xi) Permit accessory buildings and structures to exceed a total of 50m<sup>2</sup> for the site in accordance with the approved Site Plan; and
- c) RM2-TH (SP-XXX) identified as Blocks 41-43 on Appendix "G" to Staff Report PLN019-13:
- i) Permit a minimum driveway length of 6 metres for street townhouses.
4. That no further notice is required in accordance with Section 34 (17) of the Planning Act. (PLN019-13) (File: D14-1533)

**Councillor, P. Silveira declared a potential pecuniary interest in the foregoing matter, as he is involved in business with the subject property owners. He did not participate in the discussion or vote on the matter and did not leave the Council Chamber.**

**Councillor, B. Jackson declared a potential pecuniary interest in the foregoing matter, as he is a director of a company that has been retained as a sub-consultant for the developer. He did not participate in the decision or vote on the question and did not leave the Council Chamber.**



**This matter was recommended (Section "F") to City Council for consideration for adoption at its meeting to be held on 9/30/2013.**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Members of City Council provided announcements concerning a number of matters.**

**The meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.**

**CHAIRMAN**