

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD IN THE ADMINISTRATION OFFICE, 1024 HURLWOOD LANE, THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2010 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	Chair	Mark Taylor
	Members	Doug Beach Judith Cox Frank Coyle Ian Crichton Karen Marriott Phil Sled
STAFF:	Deputy Clerk	Sharon Goerke
	Director of Planning & Development	David Parks
	Chief Administrative Officer	Eric Peterson

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Taylor called the meeting to order.

DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST & THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

- "NIL"

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Public Meeting with respect to a Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment – 1935 South Sparrow Lake Road (*see attached notes*).

MOTION PD061710-01: *Moved by Member Cox and seconded by Member Coyle that an Application for a Zoning By-law Amendment with respect to 1935 South Sparrow Lake Road be approved; AND FURTHER THAT the Deputy Clerk be directed to prepare a Draft By-law for consideration of Council.*

CARRIED

Information Meeting with respect to a Proposed Plan of Subdivision – 2627 & 2628 Grand Tamarack Crescent (*see attached notes*).

MOTION PD061710-02: *Moved by Member Beach and seconded by Member Sled that comments received with respect to a Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment and Proposed Subdivision with respect to 2627 & 2628 Grand Tamarack Crescent be received as information.*

CARRIED

DELEGATIONS

- "NIL"

REPORTS FROM OFFICIALS (*for information*)

Building Report for the month of May 2010.

By-law Enforcement Report for the month of May 2010.

June 17, 2010

Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals – Statement of Pound Services for the month of May 2010.

MOTION PD061710-03: *Moved by Member Cox and seconded by Member Marriott that the following Reports from Officials be received as information:*

- (a) Building Report for the month of May 2010;*
- (b) By-law Enforcement Report for the month of May 2010; and*
- (c) Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals – Statement of Pound Services for the month of May 2010.*

CARRIED

REPORTS FROM OFFICIALS (for direction)

Planning Report No. P10-067, 06/03/10, with respect to North Country Baptist Church Site Plan Agreement – 4011 Burnside Line.

MOTION PD061710-04: *Moved by Member Cox and seconded by Member Beach that Planning Report No. P10-067, dated June 3, 2010, with respect to North Country Baptist Church Site Plan Agreement – 4011 Burnside Line be received; AND FURTHER THAT the Site Plan Control Agreement for this development be approved.*

CARRIED

Planning Report No. P10-068, 06/03/10, with respect to Roy Morris Collectible Vehicles Site Plan Agreement – 4187 Huronia Road.

MOTION PD061710-05: *Moved by Member Crichton and seconded by Member Beach that Planning Report No. P10-068, dated June 3, 2010, with respect to Roy Morris Collectible Vehicles Site Plan Agreement – 4187 Huronia Road be received; AND FURTHER THAT the Site Plan Control Agreement for this development be approved.*

CARRIED

Planning Report No. P10-069, 06/04/10, with respect to 1527102 Ontario Limited Site Plan Agreement – 2229 Pilkington Lane.

MOTION PD061710-06: *Moved by Member Cox and seconded by Member Marriott that Planning Report No. P10-069, dated June 4, 2010, with respect to 1527102 Ontario Ltd. Site Plan Agreement – 2229 Pilkington Lane be received; AND FURTHER THAT the Site Plan Control Agreement for this development be approved.*

CARRIED

Planning Report No. P10-070, 06/07/10, with respect to Mary Harth Site Plan Agreement – 3359 Muskoka Street.

MOTION PD061710-07: *Moved by Member Cox and seconded by Member Coyle that Planning Report No. P10-070, dated June 7, 2010, with respect to Mary Harth Site Plan Agreement – 3359 Muskoka Street be received;*

June 17, 2010

AND FURTHER THAT the Site Plan Control Agreement for this development be approved.

CARRIED

Planning Report No. P10-071, 06/09/10, with respect to Proposed Zoning By-law.

MOTION PD061710-11: *Moved by Member Cox and seconded by Member Coyle that Planning Report No. P10-071, dated June 9, 2010, with respect to the Proposed Comprehensive Zoning By-law be received;*
AND FURTHER THAT the recommendations contained in the Planning Report from Planscape Planning Consultants be adopted;
AND FURTHER THAT the proposed Comprehensive Zoning By-law be placed on the August 5, 2010 Council Agenda for consideration;
AND FURTHER THAT pursuant to Section 34(17) of the Planning Act, no further public notice is required with respect to the proposed Zoning By-law as the changes being made to the Zoning By-law are a result of public comments received at the Statutory Public Meeting.

CARRIED

CORRESPONDENCE (for information)

Recurrent Energy, 06/03/10, with respect to Proposed Solar Developments - Waubaushene 4 & Waubaushene 5.

G. Raeburn Smith, 05/10/10, with respect to OMC Development Corporation – Orsi/Locke Draft Plan of Subdivision.

O. Fiorese, 05/26/10, with respect to Survey & Fence Line – Hewitt Quarry.

Hatch Ltd., 06/01/10, with respect to Recurrent Energy – Waubaushene 5.

Dave & Kerry Heckendorn, 06/14/10, with respect to Draft Plan of Subdivision – 2627 & 2628 Grand Tamarack Crescent.

MOTION PD061710-12: *Moved by Member Cox and seconded by Member Marriott that the following correspondence be received as information:*

- (a) Recurrent Energy, 06/03/10, with respect to Solar Energy Projects;*
- (b) G. Raeburn Smith, 05/10/10, with respect to OMC Development Corporation – Bass Lake Woodlands;*
- (c) O. Fiorese, 05/26/10, with respect to Survey & Fence Line – Hewitt Quarry;*
- (d) David & Kerry Heckendorn, 06/14/10, with respect to Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment – 2627 & 2628 Grand Tamarack Crescent;*
- (e) Simcoe County District School Board, 06/10/10, with respect to Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment – 2627 & 2628 Grand Tamarack Crescent; and*
- (f) Simcoe County District School Board, 06/10/10, with respect to Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment – 1935 South Sparrow Lake Road.*

CARRIED

CORRESPONDENCE (for direction)

- "NIL"

UNLISTED ADDITIONS

- "NIL"

Motion to close the meeting to the public.

MOTION PD061710-08: *Moved by Member Cox and seconded by Member Marriott that this meeting be and it is hereby now closed to the public pursuant to the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, Chapter 25, Section 239.(2), for the purpose of considering:*

- (a) *litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board; and*
- (b) *advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose.*

CARRIED

- CONFIDENTIAL -

Motion to reopen the meeting to the public.

MOTION PD061710-09: *Moved by Member Marriott and seconded by Member Coyle that this meeting be and it is hereby reopened to the public.*

CARRIED

CONFIDENTIAL AGENDA

Reports from Officials

- "NIL"

Correspondence

Russell, Christie, LLP, 06/14/10, with respect to Severn Falls Chapel Seniors' Christian Housing Development.

MOTION PD061710-10: *Moved by Member Cox and seconded by Member Marriott that correspondence from Russell, Christie, LLP, dated June 14, 2010, and Graham Partners LLP, dated June 16, 2010, with respect to Severn Falls Chapel Seniors' Christian Housing be received; AND FURTHER THAT this Committee recommends to Council the reconsideration of Resolution Nos. PD052010-09 and C060310-18 with respect to this development.*

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT – 9:50 p.m.

MOTION PD061710-13: *Moved by Member Cox and seconded by Member Coyle that this meeting be and it is hereby now adjourned*

CARRIED.

Mark Taylor
Chair

Sharon R. Goerke
Deputy Clerk

NOTES OF INFORMATION/PUBLIC MEETINGS - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE ADMINISTRATION OFFICE, 1024 HURLWOOD LANE,
THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2010 AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:	Chair	Mark Taylor
	Members	Doug Beach Frank Coyle Judith Cox Ian Crichton Karen Marriott Phil Sled
STAFF:	Deputy Clerk	Sharon Goerke
	Director of Planning & Development	David Parks
	Chief Administrative Officer	Eric Peterson

The Chair stated that a public meeting and an information meeting have been called with respect to development within the municipality.

The Chair stated that the purpose of public and information meetings are to inform and provide the public with the opportunity to ask questions or to express views with respect to development proposals. In accordance with By-law No. 2007-153, members of the Planning & Development Committee were there to observe and listen to comments.

The Chair continued by outlining the format of the information/public meetings to those in attendance as follows:

- (a) The Township Planner will generally explain the purpose and details of the application;*
- (b) Next, the applicant will present any further relevant information;*
- (c) Next, the public will be permitted to ask questions and express views on the proposal.*
- (d) Next, members of the Committee will be given an opportunity to ask questions for clarification on the proposal.*

At the conclusion of the meetings, the applicant, and where possible, Township staff will be given the opportunity to respond to the questions and comments received.

The Chair advised that after the formal public meeting for 1935 South Sparrow Lake Road is concluded, the Committee will consider the application with due regard to the presentations and views expressed this evening.

The Chair advised that the comments received during the information meeting for 2627 & 2628 Grand Tamarack Crescent will be deferred pending receipt of additional information from staff and the scheduling of a formal public meeting.

The Chair stated that if Township Council decides in favour of the application by adopting the Committee's recommendation, members of the public who have provided oral submissions or written objections but disagree with the decision may appeal the decision to the Ontario Municipal Board, as entitled under the Planning Act.

PUBLIC MEETING

Chair Taylor requested the Township Planner to present the particulars of a Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment for 1935 South Sparrow Lake Road.

June 17, 2010

The purpose of the public meeting is to present to the public and the Planning & Development Committee an Application for a Zoning By-law Amendment for property described as Part of Lot 17, Concession 13, geographic Township of North Orillia, now the Township of Severn, municipally known as 1935 South Sparrow Lake Road, from the Rural (RU) Zone to a Rural Exception Zone. The effect of the proposed amendment to the Zoning By-law is to restrict the development of the property in accordance with the restrictions of the Provincially Significant Wetland, the Waste Disposal Assessment Area and the CN Rail Line in proximity to the property. The lands affected by this application are also subject to Consent Application B-01-10.

The Planner advised that notice of the public information meeting was given in accordance with the Planning Act on May 27, 2010 and a sign was posted on-site. The following correspondence has been received:

Simcoe County District School Board, 06/10/10

Thank you for circulating a copy of the Notice of a Complete Application to this office. The subject property will be rezoned from its current Rural (RU) Zone to a Rural Exception (RUxx) Zone. This will restrict the development of the property in accordance with the restrictions of the Provincially Significant Wetland, the Waste Disposal Assessment Area and the CN Rail Line in proximity to the property.

Planning staff have no objection to this rezoning application as it will not impact upon the Board's schools. Should you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Chair Taylor requested if the applicant had any further information to provide with respect to this application.

There were no further comments from the applicant.

Chair Taylor requested if there was any persons present who required clarification or wished to speak in favour of or in opposition to this application.

There were no comments from the public.

Chair Taylor requested if there was further information which staff or the applicant may wish to provide.

There were no further comments from staff or the applicant.

As there were no further comments, the Chair declared the public meeting on this application to be closed at 7:35 p.m.

Chair Taylor requested if there were any questions or comments from members of the Committee.

There were no comments from the Committee.

(See Resolution No. PD061710-01)

INFORMATION MEETING

Chair Beach requested the Township Planner to present the particulars of the Proposed Plan of Subdivision for 2627 & 2628 Grand Tamarack Crescent.

June 17, 2010

The Township Planner advised those in attendance that the purpose of the information meeting is to present to the public and the Planning & Development Committee an Application for a Plan of Subdivision on lands described as Part of Blocks B & C, Registered Plan 1233, geographic Township of North Orillia, now the Township of Severn, municipally known as 2627 & 2628 Grand Tamarack Crescent. The proposed redevelopment would involve the creation of a subdivision which would support single family detached residences and multi-unit townhouse style freehold units, for a total of 48 units. The subdivision will be serviced with municipal water and sewer services and connection to the subdivision will be via Grand Tamarack Crescent.

The subject property will be rezoned to allow this residential development and the Township is in receipt of a Complete Application for a Zoning By-law Amendment for this proposal. The purpose and effect of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment is to amend Zoning By-law No. 1993-50 of the former Township of Orillia to rezone the subject property from the Rural (RU) Zone to a Residential Type One (R1) Zone, a Residential Type Three (R3) Zone and an Environmental Protection (EP) Zone in order to permit a mixture of low density residential and medium density multi-residential units on Grand Tamarack Crescent to be developed by the Draft Plan of Subdivision while ensuring that sensitive environmental areas on the property are adequately protected.

The intention of this meeting is to obtain feedback from the public and the Planning & Development Committee. The Planner advised that notice of the public information meeting was given in accordance with the Planning Act on June 2, 2010 and a sign was posted on-site. The following correspondence has been received with respect to this application:

Simcoe County District School Board, 06/10/10

Thank you for circulating a copy of the Notice of a Complete Application to this office. The subject property will be rezoned from its current Rural (RU) Zone to a Rural Type One (R1) Zone. This will permit a mixture of low density residential and medium density multi-residential units on full municipal services to be developed by Draft Plan of Subdivision while ensuring that sensitive environmental areas on the property are adequately protected. A total of 48 residential units are proposed.

Planning staff have no objection to this development application. We have already suggested that our standard conditions be imposed. Pupils generated by this development may attend Ardtrea-Cumberland Beach Public School and Orillia District Collegiate and Vocational Institute. Should you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Kerry Heckendorn, 06/14/10

I am sending an e-mail of opposition in regards to the rezoning application in the Grand Tamarack area Application No. Z-10-04. I am concerned for many reasons and highly oppose the rezoning application.

We moved into the area 7 years ago and was promised at that time only detached homes could be built in the area. We liked the idea of a quiet rural setting to raise our children and considered the Cumberland Beach area the perfect setting. We have had many obstacles thrown our way including the expensive water and sewer upgrades that we will be paying for many years. My family love the forest that is in front of us and the river that runs through it. We see many wildlife in the area including foxes, rabbits, coyotes, turtles, wild turkeys, chipmunks, birds, to name some which will also be effected as their habitat gets invaded even more. The idea of 48 dwellings including many rentals and townhomes is of great concern. This will take away from our rural lifestyle as there will be too many people in a small area. We came from a metropolitan area and know the problems that can occur when there are too many people in small areas. These are just a few of my concerns and I will be at any of the meetings to express my opposition and concern.

June 17, 2010

Dave Heckendorn, 06/14/10

This is in regards to the rezoning (Application # Z-10-04) in and around the Grand Tamarack Crescent area. I am very concerned and opposed to this rezoning. I live at 3563 Shadow Creek Road and will be directly affected. Many of the residents in the area feel the same and we hope this rezoning does not go through. I am okay with detached homes in limited quantity in the area but very against the proposed rezoning and plan. Please see attached letter.

We are Dave and Kerry Heckendorn, 3563 Shadow Creek Road. This will acknowledge receipt of your correspondence with respect to the proposed rezoning of the areas generally bounded by Shadow Creek Road, Grand Tamarack and Timberline.

Quite frankly, the proposal to rezone this area is cause for great concern. You should be advised that before we purchased our property, we enquired with the Township of Severn and were assured that and new development in the noted area would consist of detached homes and only of detached homes. To rezone this area to accommodate multi occupancy residential housing contradicts the assurances given to us in 2003. While we cannot speak for others in our area, it is likely many new residents here were either given the same assurances or had no reason to expect such a change. It was and is our expectation that life in this community could be enjoyed without the hustle and bustle of too many people. One of the motivating factors we chose to move here was to avoid high population. This area has an abundance of trees and foliage and by necessity, much of it will disappear to make room for the new dwellings. You are fully aware that there are many open areas to the west of highway 11 which could be developed without the need to cull the foliage of this area. Certainly the developer will argue that he will ensure that trees and foliage will be integrated into the new development. Who will determine how much is to be cut down? Establishing a series of detached homes rather than the proposed number of new dwellings would likely be embraced by the area residents and fewer trees would not have to be culled.

This is a quiet neighbourhood and introducing too many people into this area will adversely impact upon our enjoyment of our homes and the quality of our life. Having come to the Orillia area from Metropolitan Toronto, we know first hand the difficulties that arise when too many people are packed into such a small area. Establishing 48 new dwellings with the associated increase in population in such a small area is a recipe for downstream problems. For instance we know from past experience that rental housing is a problem generator. Crime increases and along with that issue comes the problems with safety and security of us and of our children. We know that the police are under staffed and simply cannot provide the deterrence to crime that we, or you for that matter, would like.

Are you prepared to provide us with written assurances that none of this rental housing will be Ontario housing or low-rental housing? Have no illusions about our concerns with respect to either Ontario housing or low-rental housing. We strongly oppose it.

I am also interested in learning the identity of the construction company that will be doing the work. We would like to check the credentials of this company. We will be very concerned if the company is not located in fairly close proximity and readily available to field enquiries about the project. What guarantees will there be to ensure that the construction meets with standards? In our opinion, and this opinion is shared by a friend of ours who is in the construction business, that notwithstanding the standards, too many times failed standards are not kept are hidden from view and are not detected by building inspectors.

June 17, 2010

We are also interested in learning the price ranges for each type of dwelling unit. If the price range is low, you can be sure that it will attract the type of people that will negatively impact upon the social fabric of our area.

It is our opinion that by rezoning this area, a negative impact will occur with respect to the value of our homes. It is our expectation and on a personal level it is also yours, that the value of our homes will increase. We cannot imagine the value of our homes increasing with the increased population density and multiple-occupancy housing in such close proximity.

You are aware that a small creek runs through this area. It is likely there is a variety of wildlife that would be adversely impacted with such a huge new development. We would like to see if there has been an environmental assessment by a competent authority and what conclusions were drawn from such an assessment. In the event such an assessment has been completed, please make it available to us and provide us with the identity of the assessors.

Having lived here for a number of years, we are also aware that the spring thaw can cause flooding problems. For instance, Grand Tamarack has been under water for a number of days in the past two years. This year was an exception because of the lack of snow during the winter. Personally we would dislike (as would you) to move into a new home only to find that we are flooded out in the springtime. Since we cannot predict weather patterns, it is reasonable to assume that flooding will be an issue in the future.

As noted earlier, other more open areas are available west of highway 11 and likely there are other sites in the area that would be suitable for multiple occupancy housing. The substantial culling of trees and foliage would not be such a problem, the impact upon existing wildlife would be minimized and flooding is not likely to be an issue.

For approval to be given to this rezoning application, the reasons must be compelling, the affect on residents in the area must be considered and the effect it will have upon the environment must be taken into account. The decision process be transparent and fair. Anything less brings the competency of the process into disrepute and erodes confidence in our elected representatives.

It is my expectation that the majority of responses you will receive about this rezoning application will indicate clearly that this is not what we would like to see in our area. In the event the majority of residents indicate they oppose this application and in face of this opposition, approval is granted, then the meeting on June 17 will be cosmetic and a waste of time.

In conclusion, we accepted the assurances of your staff in 2003 that this area would be residential, detached housing. To rezone after assurances were given and after we have put so much time, effort and money into our home, is unfair. The common denominator between us, the residents of this area and of those who will read this letter is that we are all consumers who attempt to spend our money wisely. As noted we accepted the assurances of your staff in 2003 and we ask you; would you (and your families) be comfortable with this type of new development in your area? How would you feel if after the time, effort and money had been expended, you would be faced with a situation similar to ours? Is it not your expectation that home values would increase? It certainly is our expectation. Consider also, that a few years ago we were forced to accept municipal water and sewage services. As you are aware the cost was substantial and the residents of this area were faced with a huge unexpected expense. To bring this type of development into our area will in effect, cost us a lot in diminished house values.

Again we wish reiterate that those who read this submission, would almost certainly oppose such a development if it were to be located in close proximity to their own homes.

Chair Taylor requested if the applicant had any further information to provide with respect to this application.

Barry Peyton, representative for the applicant, addressed the Committee and provided the following information:

- The applicant has been working on this proposed development for many years.
- An Application has now been submitted to the County of Simcoe for a Plan of Subdivision for 2627 & 2628 Grand Tamarack Crescent.
- Several studies have been completed and referred to the County for a peer review.
- The applicant is proposed a mixed density with multi-residential dwellings adjacent to the commercial land and single family dwellings across from the existing residential homes.
- The Province is now encouraging this type of intensification of development on full municipal services.
- The proposed road will be located on an existing easement which provides services to the properties on Highway No. 11.
- There is a total of 48 units proposed for this development with a mixture of freehold townhouses, rental townhouses and single family dwelling units.
- All the drainage from this development will be drained into the stormwater management pond located on the property which will be designed to control the flow of water from the site while cleansing the runoff.
- The Environmental Impact Study is recommending a 15 metre buffer along both sides of the creek to protect the water, foliage and wildlife.
- Some trees may need to be removed to accommodate the construction, but a tree replacement program is proposed for this site.
- The County Official Plan designates this as a settlement area and it is currently zoned Shoreline Residential. A Zoning By-law Amendment is required to accommodate the multi-residential units.
- The Traffic Study is indicating that the increase in traffic will have a minimal affect on the surrounding area.
- Mr. Peyton briefly reviewed the studies completed to-date which are currently under peer review by the County of Simcoe.
- The Archeological Study resulted in native remains being found on Lots 7 & 8 dating back to the 1400's which cannot be developed until the review is completed.
- The proposed subdivision constitutes good planning, is in keeping with the Provincial policies and is in the best interest for future development with the services provided.

Chair Taylor requested if there was any persons present who required clarification or wished to speak in favour of or in opposition to this application.

Rob Einarson, resident of 3466 Timberline Avenue, addressed the Committee and expressed his concerns with the creek being tampered with by the developer in the past and the flooding that occurs in this area now. Mr. Einarson also advised that he is no in favour of the multi-residential use and that the larger lots should be retained in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood. He also has concerns with the increased traffic from the additional homes.

Consultant:

- There was flooding in the road area in the past, but the Township has resolved these issues.
- This will be reviewed again during the stormwater management approval process.

Lorraine Robertson, resident of 3421 Timberline Avenue, addressed the Committee and advised that as stated by the Consultant these are not minor changes for the community, she is concerned with the fish habitat in the stream and the increase in traffic will affect the neighbourhood.

Consultant:

- Traffic will increase slightly with new development. The Traffic Study indicates it will have a minimal affect on the neighbourhood.

Laura Black, resident of 3429 Timberline Avenue, addressed the Committee and advised that the most recent home built in this area does not appear to be 15 metres from the creek and the property floods into the back yard on an annual basis. She advised that any development in this area will change the water table and have a detrimental affect on the water tables. Ms. Black advised she is totally opposed to the townhouses and would only support single family residential units for this development.

Tracy Knight, addressed the Committee and advised that she is opposed to the townhouse units as it will devalue the properties in the area and the neighbours wish to keep their rural lifestyle as Bayou Park is not as densely populated as Cumberland Beach.

Mr. Heckendorn, addressed the Committee and inquired if the unopened road allowance leading to Highway No. 11 would be opened in the future to provide access to this site and if low rental housing was included with the proposed townhouse development.

Township Planner:

- There is no plans to open the unopened road allowance between Webers and Tim Hortons.

Applicant:

- There are no low income rental units proposed for this area. A portion of the units will be rental and a portion will be freehold. The lots across from the current homes will be single family dwelling units.

Ron Stevens, resident of 2702 Westshore Crescent, addressed the Committee and inquired who will be responsible for monitoring and protecting the 15 metre buffer along the stream, if the stormwater management pond was designed for a 100 year storm and clarification of erosion measures to be taken during construction.

Consultant:

- The homeowners will have ownership of the 15 metre buffer zones.
- The stormwater management pond is designed to a 100 year storm.
- The erosion will be monitored and inspected daily during construction.

Applicant:

- There is no provision for zoning for affordable housing and there is no affordable housing or subsidized units proposed for this development.

Darrin Devine, resident of 3459 Timberline Avenue, addressed the Committee and expressed his concerns with the density of the development and advised that the neighbourhood should be kept with single family dwellings with a reduced density for future development.

Christie Graham, resident of 3329 Park Road, addressed the Committee and expressed her concerns with the environmental impact of this development on the local wildlife which should be protected and not displaced by development.

Christa Little, resident of 3536 Shadow Creek Road, addressed the Committee and advised that she has witnessed the creek rising dramatically at times and expressed her concerns with the flood impact for the area from this development.

Mr. Heckendorn, addressed the Committee with concerns over the cost of recent water and sewer services, the increase in the value of homes in the area and now this development could reduce the values of homes with rental housing.

Lorraine Robertson, addressed the Committee and advised that the current rural zoning is more appropriate and inquired if there would be rebates for water charges due to this development.

Township Planner:

- There are no rebates for the water and sewer charges.

Patti Sears, resident of 3466 Timberline Avenue, advised that she purchased her property because of its size and the distance from neighbouring properties. She is not in favour of the development in her back yard and inquired if the developer or the Township would be fencing the back of her property. She also had concerns with an increase in noise pollution in the area.

Chair Taylor requested if there was further information which staff or the applicant may wish to provide.

There were no further comments from staff or the applicant.

As there were no further comments, the Chair declared the public meeting on this application to be closed at 8:20 p.m.

Chair Taylor requested if there were any questions or comments from members of the Committee.

Member Coyle inquired as to the proposed use of Block 24 within the Draft Plan of Subdivision.

Consultant:

- Block 24 will not be developed as it contains part of the creek.

Member Marriott requested the Consultant to forward a copy of the findings of native remains and expressed concerns that rental units are usually lower income families which is not in keeping with this community. She also expressed concerns with past flooding in this area and that the removal of more trees will add to the flooding problems. Member Marriott also advised that she would prefer the Stormwater Management Study be completed over 4 seasons to study the full affects of this development on the area. She also advised that there will be a petition coming to Council in opposition to this development. Member Marriott advised that this development will not be part of the private beach owned by the area ratepayers.

Member Cox expressed her concerns with stormwater management and the future monitoring of the 15 metre buffer zone along the creek to protect the water and wildlife.

Member Beach requested clarification on the number of units proposed for this development, the total number of dwellings using the cul-de-sac for access may not be sufficient and the location of the Environmental Protection areas.

Consultant:

- There will be a total of 6 rental units, 26 freehold units and 16 single family dwellings.
- The Environmental Protection area is along the buffer zone only.

June 17, 2010

Member Sled inquired as to when the peer review would be completed by County and if the Severn Sound Environmental Association could be requested to review the Environmental Impact Study on behalf of the Township.

Township Planner:

- Severn Sound Environmental Association is not available to assist due to their current workload.
- It will be a few more weeks before the peer review will be completed by the County.
- Once staff has collected all of the information available, they will be in a better position to comment on this proposed development.

Member Cox inquired if the cul-de-sac and road access has been reviewed by the Fire Department and Public Works Department and also if there is parkland included.

Township Planner:

- The Township will be reviewing the proposed roadway and cash-in-lieu of parkland is proposed for this development.

Member Marriott expressed concerns with the traffic in the area at this time and that the increase proposed by this development will only add to the inability to gain access to Highway No. 11.

Member Coyle advised that he could not support this type of density for this area.

(see Resolution No. PD061710-02)