

Industrial Comment Summary

Comment #	Comment Received	Date Comment Received	Staff Recommendation	Current Staff Recommendation	Did the comment result in change to Staff Recommendation
1	Permit Funeral Service Provider in the LI Zone only and create a new definition to separate it from Funeral Home Establishment	9-Jan-14	Permit Funeral Service Provider in the LI Zone only and create a definition for the new use	To allow for the use in the LI zone only and add a new definition in the Zoning By-law.	No. comment matched Staff Recommendation
2	Existing Zoning being maintained- Those lands are municipally know as 131, 160, 166 Saunders Road and 655, 670, 680 and 680 Bayview Drive. These lands which are currently zoned EM3 and share the characteristics of the LI zone and they should remain in that zone.	26-May-14	Certain properties on Saunders Road and Bayview Drive be rezoned to General Industrial (GI) from Service Industrial (EM3)	Staff have reviewed the subject properties and have determined that the lands should be placed in the LI zone to currently reflected the existing zoning and the uses on site and in the area.	Yes
3	Allowable Uses- Those lands are municipally know as 676 and 372 Veterans Drive, 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 312, 322, 341, 351, 361 and 371 King Street, which are zoned EM3 SP(393 and 397). The existing SP restricted uses that Staff should considering allowing as of right.	26-May-14	Those uses that are listed as prohibited in Special Provisions EM3 SP(393 and 397) that are permitted as of right in the LI zone, would be permitted.	As there is no evidence as to why uses such as banks, recreational establishments, fitness or health clubs are to be excluded from the EM3 SP(393) and as these uses would be permitted as of right in the LI zone, Staff have determined that they are appropriate and should be permitted as of right.	Yes
4	Places of Worship- Support the inclusion of sensitive land uses in the LI zone such as Place of Worship, and Private Clubs, but not on site-specific basis	26-May-14	Permitted Sensitive Land Use subject to a site specific bases	Permit these uses as-of-right basis in LI zone	Yes
5	Landscaping all Industrial Area's - 50% of the frontage be landscaped when Industrial and Residential on the same street (Current EM1 Standard).	26-May-14	Staff were not proposing a change to this provision.	Staff do not support the existing standards for landscaping in the EM1 zone being applied to all industrial zones as this may create operation constraints such as parking. If landscaping standards were applied to all industrial areas parking would be located in the side and rears, which could impact the operations to the permitted industrial uses. Parking areas in the front provide a separation from the use to the road which is appropriate for industrial areas. No change recommended.	No
6	Height of Industrial Buildings- Restricting the max. height of Industrial Buildings to 9.0m when they are within 200m from a single family dwelling	26-May-14	Staff were not proposing a change to this standard.	Staff support the existing provisions that restrict the height of industrial buildings to 9.0m when they are on a lot that directly abutt a residential zone. It should be noted that the maximum height in most single detached residential zones is 10.0 m. No change recommended.	No. Existing provisions in place
7	Setbacks for Places of Worship in Industrial Areas	26-May-14	Staff at the Public Meeting recommended that Places of Worship be subject to site specific provisions and not be permitted as of right.	Permit these uses as-of-right in the LI zone with the existing setbacks as outlined in the Zoning By-law.	No. Existing provisions in place
8	Communication Towers located in industrial areas have established setbacks when adjacent to residential areas	26-May-14	Staff were not proposing changes to the current requirements.	Planning Staff are not recommending any new provisions for telecommunication towers in Industrial Areas, as the existing protocol as adopted by Council address would address this item	No. Existing provisions in place
9	Self Storage is currently permitted within the EM3 Zone, why is this not permitted within the new LI Zone	26-May-14	Not allowing self storage as a permitted use in the LI Zone	Staff have reviewed the Self Storage use and have determined that the use is appropriate and should be a permitted use in the new LI zone.	Yes
10	Existing SP's- Assurance that uses permitted through SP's would continue to be permitted	26-May-14	Existing uses granted through previously approved Site Specific Special Provisions will continue to be permitted.	It is not the intention of this review to eliminate the allowable uses that are permitted through Special Provisions. Any use that is permitted through an SP will continue to be permitted, and those uses that are permitted as a result of this review would now be allowed as of right	No. comment matched Staff Recommendation
11	Outdoor Storage- Council direction to consider allowing outdoor storage of non-aggregate materials and finished products as an accessory use in all industrial zones, subject to appropriate screening through Site Plan Control	26-May-14	Staff did not recommend any changes to the outdoor storage provisions in the Zoning By-law	To allow for the Outdoor Storage of non-aggregate materials and finished products in the HI zone subject to being properly screened by the main building and only be permitted within the side yards, which would be subject to Site Plan Control. That it be permitted within the LI Zone subject to existing lot coverage and lot area and fencing requirements in the Zoning By-law.	Yes

Comment #	Comment Received	Date Comment Received	Staff Recommendation	Current Staff Recommendation	Did the comment result in change to Staff Recommendation (Yes or No)
12	Increase to Accessory Retail- That we should be increasing the accessory retail in the industrial areas.	26-May-14	Staff did not recommend any change to the Accessory Retail provisions in the Industrial Zones	Staff are proposing to increase the permitted accessory retail from 25% to 35% gross floor area for those lands that are zoned LI and abut an Arterial Road.	Yes
13	Increasing the accessory retail in the new Highway Industrial (HI) zone.	4-Sep-14	Staff did not recommend any changes to the Accessory Retail provisions in the HI zones	In Staff's opinion no changes should occur within the HI Zone as additional retail would generate additional traffic which has the potential to negatively impact the operations of the industrial areas. Retail uses can be located within a number of different zones and areas where as HI type uses are more limited in potential locations. Also maintaining the existing allowable accessory retail will preserve the Highway 400 frontage for prestige industrial and office based uses.	Yes
14	Rezoning of the Anne Street Area to LI- Concerns that rezoning the lands to LI and C4 would impact the industrial operations of the area	8-Jul-14	Recommend zone changes in the Anne Street Area to LI zone and C4	Staff reviewed this area and determined that the area should remain zoned General Industrial (GI) zone as this is an established industrial area. This would ensure that the area is protected from further erosion of non industrial type uses.	Yes
15	Business Park Zone- Comments received from EMT and public was that we should preserve our BP zone		Eliminate the current Business Park Zone and merging it with the Light Industrial (LI) Zone	Staff recommend to retain the Business Park zone, but would rezone 2 of the 5 areas to Highway Industrial (HI) and Light Industrial (LI). The remaining 3 areas would stay zoned as BP.	Yes
16	The rezoning of 164 Innisfil Street to General Commercial	9-Feb-15	Maintain the existing General Industrial Zone(Please see comment #14).	In order to protect the existing industrial operations of the area, Staff recommended that the area remain in the General Industrial (GI)Zone. It is acknowledged that the existing intersection of Brock and Anne Street is zoned General Commercial on three corners. However, Staff are of the opinion that the subject land is a large parcel of Industrial lands that provides a benefit to the industrial land base and should be preserved.	No.

Public Participation- Source of Comments
Mailing list complied with 98 stakeholders
Invitations sent to 98 stakeholders mailing list introducing the Industrial Rationalization Review project and offering to meet with staff.
18 interested parties met with staff
Preliminary Briefing Report prepared and sent to 79 primary stakeholders
14 interested parties responded in both verbal and written on comments on the Briefing Report
29 Interested Parties specifically notified of Public Meeting
114 people notified of Public Meeting through statutory notification
Notice of Public Meeting was placed in newspaper, on social media and City Website
7 letters received at the Public Meeting, 3 people spoke at Public Meeting and 7 letters were received after the public meeting
38 interested parties notified advising Staff Report was to be presented at the September 8, 2014 General Committee Meeting.
2 letters received from parties regarding the recommendation of Staff Report