



MINUTES

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2009

AFTERNOON SESSION – 1:30 P.M.

EVENING SESSION – 7:00 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBER, 2ND FLOOR - CIVIC CENTRE
300 CITY CENTRE DRIVE, MISSISSAUGA, ONTARIO L5B 3C1

<http://www.mississauga.ca>

Members Present:

- Councillor Carmen Corbasson (Ward 1)
- Councillor Pat Mullin (Ward 2)
- Councillor Maja Prentice (Ward 3)
- Councillor Frank Dale (Ward 4)
- Councillor Eve Adams (Ward 5)
- Councillor Carolyn Parrish (Ward 6)
- Councillor Nando Iannicca (Ward 7)
- Councillor Katie Mahoney (Ward 8) (Chair)
- Councillor Pat Saito (Ward 9)
- Councillor Sue McFadden (Ward 10)
- Councillor George Carlson (Ward 11)
- Mayor Hazel McCallion

Contact: Jessica Reid, Legislative Coordinator, Office of the City Clerk
905-615-3200 ext. 5423 / Fax 905-615-4181
E-Mail: jessica.reid@mississauga.ca

STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. E. R. Sajecki, Commissioner of Planning and Building
Mr. J. Calvert, Director, Policy Planning
Ms. E. Irvine, Planner, Policy Planning
Ms. M. Ball, Director, Development & Design
Ms. L. Pavan, Manager, Development Team North
Mr. R. Poitras, Manager, Development Team South
Mr. J. Famme, Planner, Development & Design
Mr. R. Hughes, Planner, Development & Design
Mr. C. Rouse, Planner, Development & Design
Ms. I. Shulz-McDowell, Manager of Planning Services
Ms. L. Christie, Planner, Development & Design
Ms. M. Cassin, Manager, Zoning By-law Review
Ms. K. Dedman, Manager of Development Engineering T&W
Mr. S. Barrett, Manager, Transportation Asset Management T&W
Mr. G. Smith, Team Leader, Park Assets, Community Services
Mr. M. Minkowski, Legal Counsel, Litigation
Ms. J. Reid, Legislative Coordinator, Office of the City Clerk
Ms. M. Gerech, Administrative Assistant, Office of the City Clerk

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE – NOVEMBER 30, 2009

CALL TO ORDER – 1:30 p.m.

DECLARATIONS OF (DIRECT OR INDIRECT) PECUNIARY INTEREST

Councillor Nando Iannicca advised that he would reclude himself during Committee's consideration of Item 5 development application under file OZ 06/030 W7 and Item 6 development application under file OZ 06/031 W7 to avoid the perception of a conflict of interest because he resides in proximity to the subject area.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED

AFTERNOON SESSION – 1:30 P.M.

1. **SIGN VARIANCE APPLICATIONS - Sign By-law 0054-2002, as amended**

Councillor Carolyn Parrish moved a motion that all of the Sign Variance Applications contained in Planning staff's recommendation be granted. The following motion was voted upon and carried.

PDC-0097-2009

That the Report dated November 10, 2009 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building regarding Sign By-law 0054-2002, as amended, and the requested three (3) Sign Variance Applications described in Appendices 1 to 3 to the Report, be adopted in accordance with the following:

1. *That the following Sign Variances be granted:*

(a) *Sign Variance Application 09-06106*

Ward 5

Bell

5099 Creekbank Rd.

To permit the following:

(i) *One (1) fascia sign projecting 1.2m (3.93 ft.) from the building wall.*

(ii) *Three (3) directional signs each having a sign area of 1.67m² (17.9 ft²) and a height of 2.13m (6.99 ft.).*

(b) *Sign Variance Application 09-06003*

Ward 7

Bell

47 Dundas St. E.

To permit the following:

(i) *One (1) fascia sign with a sign area of 0.37m² (3.99 ft²) on the building façade.*

(c) *Sign Variance Application 09-04464*

Ward 6

TD Canada Trust

1151 Dundas St. W.

To permit the following:

(i) One (1) fascia sign not located on the unit occupied by the business.

Amended (Councillor Carolyn Parrish)
BL.03.SIG (2009)

2. PLANNING APPLICATION FEES REVIEW - Public Agency Applications Planning, and Building Department, City of Mississauga

Councillor Carmen Corbasson moved the following motion, which was voted upon and carried.

PDC-0098-2009

That the Report dated November 18, 2009, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building with respect to the Planning Application Fees Review - Public Agency Applications, be adopted in accordance with the following:

- 1. That Option 3, to collect fees and securities from all public agencies excluding City Departments, as of April 1, 2010, be approved;*
- 2. That the necessary amending by-law to the City's Planning Act Fees and Charges By-law be brought forward to Council prior to April 1, 2010, reflecting that City Departments are exempt from application fees and posting of securities;*
- 3. That at the appropriate time, a resolution of Council be approved to rescind Resolutions 42-78 and 593-82; and*
- 4. That staff be directed to inform the Peel District School Board, the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, the Region of Peel and Enersource Hydro Mississauga of the change in policy once adopted by City Council.*

Approved (Councillor Carmen Corbasson)
CD.21.PUB W1-11

3. SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT - Proposed Housekeeping Amendments, Mississauga Zoning By-law 0225-2007, City of Mississauga, Bill 51

Councillor Nando Iannicca moved the following motion, which was voted upon and carried.

PDC-0099-2009

That the Report dated November 10, 2009, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building recommending approval of proposed housekeeping amendments to Zoning By-law 0225-2007, be adopted in accordance with the following:

- 1. That notwithstanding that subsequent to the public meeting, additional housekeeping changes have been proposed, Council considers that the changes do not require further notice and, therefore, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 34(17) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, as amended, any further notice regarding the proposed amendment is hereby waived.*

2. *That the proposed housekeeping amendments to Zoning By-law 0225-2007 as detailed in Appendices S2-1 and S2-3 be approved.*

Approved (Councillor Nando Iannicca)
BL.09.COM W1-11

4. REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT 25 (ROPA 25) – Monitoring Policies and Planning and Conservation Land Amendment Act Conformity Policies

Councillor Nando Iannicca moved the following motion, which was voted upon and carried.

PDC-0100-2009

1. *That the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment 25 (ROPA 25) - Monitoring Policies and Planning and Conservation Land Amendment Act Conformity Policies, attached as Appendix 1, be supported subject to the modifications identified and detailed in Appendix 2 of the report titled “Regional Official Plan Amendment 25 (ROPA 25) - Monitoring Policies and Planning and Conservation Land Amendment Act Conformity Policies” dated November 10, 2009 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building.*
2. *That the report titled “Regional Official Plan Amendment 25 (ROPA 25) - Monitoring Policies and Planning and Conservation Land Amendment Act Conformity Policies”, dated November 10, 2009 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building, be forwarded, by the City Clerk, to the Region of Peel, the City of Brampton and the Town of Caledon.*

Approved (Councillor Nando Iannicca)
CD.01.REG

The afternoon session of this meeting recessed at approximately 1:40 p.m., and was scheduled to reconvene for the evening session at 7:00 p.m.

EVENING SESSION – 7:00 P.M.

Committee reconvened for the evening session of this meeting at approximately 7:00 p.m. Councillor Nando Iannicca reclused himself for this evening session.

5. SECOND ADDENDUM REPORT - Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Applications, Lot 3, Registered Plan C-24, northeast corner of Harborn Road and Grange Drive, Owner: Berkley Developments, Applicant: Korsiak & Company, Bill 20

Jim Levac, the applicant, explained that in December of 2008 this development obtained approval from Council and nothing has physically changed with this proposal. This is a phased development, the first phase to consist of 6 street townhouses and 1 detached dwelling is located on the north side of Harborn Road. The second phase to consist of 4 detached dwellings and 7 townhouse dwellings is located on the south side of Harborn Road. In June of 2009 the applicant submitted a site plan application for all 18 units. However, the City requires securities prior to registering the rezoning and at the same

time, financing is not available to the developer until legal zoning is in place. Therefore, the applicant is requesting approval of the application with an "H" Holding Symbol provision.

Responding to Chair Mahoney, Planning staff confirmed that the "H" Holding Symbol prevents issuance of building permits. A new application for removal of the "H" Holding Symbol must be submitted and processed and all conditions contained in Appendix A-2 of Planning staff's report must be met prior to lifting the "H" Holding Symbol. This allows the developer to move forward with their financing and is satisfactory to Planning staff.

Councillor Carmen Corbasson moved the following motion, which was voted upon and carried.

PDC-0101-2009

That the Report dated November 10, 2009, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building recommending that an "H" Holding Symbol be added to the previous approval of the applications under File OZ 06/030 W7, Berkley Developments, Lot 3, Registered Plan C-24, northeast corner of Harborn Road and Grange Drive, be adopted in accordance with the following:

1. *That Council Resolution 0301-2008 be rescinded and replaced with the following:*
 - (i) *That the application to amend Mississauga Plan from "Residential - Low Density I, Special Site 11" to "Residential - Low Density II, Special Site 11, as amended", be approved.*
 - (ii) *That the application to change the Zoning from "R1-47" (Detached Dwelling) to "H-R5-45" (Detached Dwelling) and "H-RM5-51" (Street Townhouse Dwelling) to permit one (1) detached dwelling and six (6) street townhouses in accordance with the zoning standards outlined in Appendix A-2 attached to the report dated November 10, 2009 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building subject to the following conditions:*
 - (a) *That the applicant agree to satisfy all the requirements of the City and any other official agency concerned with the development;*
 - (b) *That the school accommodation condition as outlined in City of Mississauga Council Resolution 152-98 requiring that satisfactory arrangements regarding the adequate provision and distribution of educational facilities have been made between the developer/applicant and the School Boards not apply to the subject lands;*
 - (c) *That CPD Recommendation 121-91, as approved by Council Resolution 160-91; pertaining to the requirement of 3.25 parking spaces per dwelling unit for all dwellings on lots less than 12 m (29.4 ft.) of frontage shall not apply, and that a parking requirement of three parking spaces per unit shall apply with no on-street parking requirement.*
 - (iii) *That the "H" Holding Symbol is to be removed from the "H-R5-45" (Detached Dwelling) and "H-RM5-51" (Street Townhouse Dwelling) zone categories by further amendment, upon confirmation from the applicable*

City Departments that the conditions identified in Appendix A-2 of the report dated November 10, 2009 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building have been satisfactorily addressed.

- (iv) *That the decision of Council for approval of the rezoning application be considered null and void, and a new development application be required unless a zoning by-law is passed within 18 months of the Council decision.*

Approved (Councillor Carmen Corbasson)
OZ 06/030 W7

6. ADDENDUM REPORT - Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Applications, 40 Harborn Road & 29 Premium Way, southwest corner of Harborn Road and Premium Way, Owner: Berkley Developments, Applicant: Korsiak & Company, Bill 20

Councillor Maja Prentice moved the following motion, which was voted upon and carried.

PDC-0102-2009

That the Report dated November 10, 2009, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building recommending that an "H" Holding Symbol be added to the previous approval of the applications under File OZ 06/031 W7, Berkley Developments, 40 Harborn Road and 29 Premium Way, southwest corner of Harborn Road and Premium Way, be adopted in accordance with the following:

1. *That Council Resolution 0301-2008 be rescinded and replaced with the following:*
 - (i) *That the application to amend Mississauga Plan from "Residential - Low Density I, Special Site 11" to "Residential - Low Density II, Special Site 11, as amended", be approved.*
 - (ii) *That the application to change the Zoning from "R1-7" (Detached Dwelling) to "H-R5-45" (Detached Dwelling) and "H-RM5-52" (Street Townhouse Dwelling) to permit four (4) detached dwellings and seven (7) street townhouses in accordance with the zoning standards outlined in Appendix A-2 attached to the report dated November 10, 2009 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building subject to the following conditions:*
 - (a) *That the applicant agree to satisfy all the requirements of the City and any other official agency concerned with the development;*
 - (b) *That the school accommodation condition as outlined in City of Mississauga Council Resolution 152-98 requiring that satisfactory arrangements regarding the adequate provision and distribution of educational facilities have been made between the developer/applicant and the School Boards not apply to the subject lands;*
 - (c) *That CPD Recommendation 121-91, as approved by Council Resolution 160-91; pertaining to the requirement of 3.25 parking spaces per dwelling unit for all dwellings on lots less than 12 m (29.4 ft.) of frontage shall not apply, and that a parking requirement of three parking spaces per unit shall apply with no on-street parking requirement.*

- (iii) *That the "H" Holding Symbol is to be removed from the "H-R5-45" (Detached Dwelling) and "H-RM5-52" (Street Townhouse Dwelling) zone categories by further amendment, upon confirmation from the applicable City Departments that the conditions identified in Appendix A-2 of the report dated November 10, 2009 from the Commissioner of Planning and Building have been satisfactorily addressed.*
- (iv) *That the decision of Council for approval of the rezoning application be considered null and void, and a new development application be required unless a zoning by-law is passed within 18 months of the Council decision.*

Approved (Councillor Maja Prentice)

OZ 06/031 W7

7. SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT – Streetsville Infill Housing Study, Proposed Zoning By-law Amendments, Bill 51

Planning staff explained the background for the review of the existing zoning in the Streetsville area and advised that there was a community meeting held in May of 2009 wherein written submissions and verbal concerns were received. The main concerns were with the affect the proposed zoning may have on property values and redevelopment potential. Adversely, a number of residents supported the proposed zoning and asked for tighter restrictions. The proposed zoning includes a maximum height cap, maximum infill Gross Floor Area ("GFA") cap, and requires applications to Committee of Adjustment. Proposed additional zoning restrictions include: a maximum dwelling unit depth (which is currently in place for the Mineola and Clarkson Lorne Park areas); garage projection restrictions; and flat roofs. Subsequently, Planning staff outlined the proposed Zoning By-law amendments for each zone and restriction.

Local Ward Councillor George Carlson thanked Planning staff for an outstanding job on the public consultation process. He commented that the result is the type of adjustments that will preserve and maintain the character of the Streetsville area and Meadowvale Village while allowing residents to build their dream home.

The following residents were in the audience and spoke to this matter:

Faria Khan

Frank Pisani

Elizabeth Sylvester

Faria Khan expressed concern for the proposed reduction of the GFA and the redevelopment potential of the property as well as the negative affect on the property value. Planning staff responded by explaining how the proposed zoning would maintain character. Councillor Pat Mullin also commented, as she has experienced in her own Ward in the Clarkson area, that this type of zoning will not discourage infill builders.

Frank Pisani expressed opposition to the proposed rezoning and commented that he would rather see one large home than three small homes.

Elizabeth Sylvester expressed support for the proposed zoning and commented that the value of homes will not be diminished and homes in Meadowvale are sold very quickly. She commented that those homeowners that have made additions have done beautiful jobs while maintaining the character of the area.

Councillor Carlson again expressed support for the proposed zoning and moved the following motion. This motion was voted upon and carried.

PDC-0103-2009

That the Report dated November 10, 2009, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building recommending amendments to the existing "R2 7" (Detached Dwelling) and "R3" (Detached Dwelling) zone standards within the Streetsville Infill Housing Study Area, in order to retain neighbourhood character and improve compatibility between existing housing and replacement housing and detached dwelling additions, be adopted in accordance with the following:

- 1. That notwithstanding that subsequent to the public meeting, changes have been proposed, Council considers that the changes do not require further notice and, therefore, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 34(17) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, as amended, any further notice regarding the proposed amendment is hereby waived.*
- 2. That the existing "R2 7" (Detached Dwelling) and "R3" (Detached Dwelling) zones within the Streetsville Infill Housing Study Area be changed to "R2 - Exception" and "R3 Exception", respectively, as detailed in Appendix S 4 of this report, be adopted and that an implementing Zoning By law be brought to a future City Council meeting.*
- 3. That correspondence from Andrew Carmichael and Mable Eng dated November 30, 2009, be received.*

Amended (Councillor George Carlson)

CD.06.STR W 11

8. SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT – Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Applications, Part of Lot 1, Concession 1, W.H.S., northwest Quadrant of Hurontario Street and Eglinton Avenue West, Owner: Pinnacle International (Ontario) Limited, Applicant: Philip Levine, IBI Group, Bill 51

Planning staff advised that this application is for the block fronting on Eglinton Avenue West, immediately to the west of the Esso gas station, on the west side of Hurontario Street, for Phase One of a broader development for the northwest quadrant of Hurontario Street and Eglinton Avenue West. Phase One includes the construction of two apartment buildings; the construction of Street 'C' on the western edge of the block, which will include a full moves access into the site; a portion of Street 'E' along the northern edge of the block; the dedication of a portion of the road along the easterly edge adjacent to the Esso gas station, which will allow for a right-in and right-out access to Eglinton Avenue West; and a water main connection to the northern limits of the Pinnacle land holdings. The existing surrounding uses are commercial and residential, including a 22-storey apartment building. Planning staff explained that the original broader application made in 2007, which included Phase One, consisted of medium and high density dwellings to

accommodate approximately 9,000 people. Planning staff are not in a position at this time to bring forward a recommendation on the remainder of the development proposal, as a number of outstanding matters must be addressed and resolved, which include density, traffic, land use compatibility, parkland dedication and servicing.

Planning staff commented that the Phase One proposal is in conformity with zoning, while increasing density and Floor Space Index ("FSI"), the development is setback from existing residential, located on the perimeter of the lands, and can be accommodated from servicing and traffic perspectives. The two buildings propose to sit on 2-storey or 3-storey footings, and to meet City parking standards. Planning staff commented that Phase One is located within a node and felt this was an appropriate location for high density development. In addition, transit services and City facilities support this development. Satisfactory studies were received by the Planning staff with respect to traffic, servicing, environmental and noise. Planning staff commented that this is a well designed proposal with no shadow and wind impacts on nearby residential lands with an entrance water feature.

Councillor Frank Dale commented that this has been a contentious quadrant with Ward 4 residents and there are concerns with this development. Councillor Dale pointed out that the local area high density developments built in the 1980's were all Official Plan Amendments for increased densities and felt that it was inappropriate to compare this development to them. The Councillor felt that this development has too much of an impact on the community and that this type of density belongs downtown. He also expressed concern for traffic. Councillor Dale suggested that this area cannot support this type of development until high order transit is built in this City. In addition, Councillor Dale expressed concern for the remainder of the development lands on the northwest quadrant. The Councillor suggested bringing the application for the entire parcel and phasing it in.

Councillor Maja Prentice supported the concerns outlined by Councillor Dale. In addition, she commented that this development is not in accordance with Council's intentions. Councillor Prentice expressed concern for traffic at the intersection of Eglinton Avenue West and Hurontario Street. She also expressed concern for Phase One and the uncertainty of the remainder of the development parcel. Transportation and Works staff commented that the City's consulting report indicated that all road networks and existing infrastructure would support this Phase One development; however, the remaining future development will require upgrades. He added that from a traffic perspective, this high density cannot be maintained throughout the remainder of the development lands. In addition, Councillor Prentice expressed concern for the proposed zoning standards for maximum FSI, minimum landscaped area, minimum amenity area at grade. Planning staff explained that the current Phase One proposal is in keeping with the Official Plan ("OP") designation for high density development and from a zoning perspective the maximum FSI is reflective of the OP standard. With respect to the proposed minimum amenity and landscaped areas, Planning staff explained that this is more of an urban compact development concept, whereas the City standards are for a suburban situation. The applicant is proposing an amenity area on the rooftop area including children's play area, and guest amenity area as well as private landscaping on street frontages. Councillor Prentice expressed concern for amenities being located on

the roof of the building and indicated that she would like more information about the remainder of the development parcel before she considers this Phase One.

Councillor Pat Mullin expressed concern for the intensification and high density.

Local Ward Councillor Eve Adams expressed concern for the affects this proposal will have on traffic and transit. She pointed out that there are a number of bus routes that currently have closed door service and this transit area is overcrowded. Councillor Adams commented that this density is unimaginable for this area and is a dramatic increase with insufficient landscaped area.

Mayor McCallion expressed concern for this development. She explained that Light Rail Transit ("LRT") on Hurontario Street may be ten or fifteen years away. She commented that the entire Pinnacle developable parcel should be designed and planned. She questioned the affect this development would have on the Cooksville Creek and Planning staff responded that Credit Valley Conservation accepted the storm water management means proposed, however, with the remainder of the development parcel they do have concerns. The Mayor was also concerned with following the Ontario Growth Plan when there is no financing from the Province to support the Growth Plan. In addition, she was concerned that GO Transit has issues with parking at its stations within Mississauga. She expressed concern for traffic in the local area and with not having the LRT in place before approving an application such as this. She further commented that Metrolinx has identified a multi-million dollar need for public transit which is currently unfunded.

The following residents were in the audience and spoke to this matter:

Ray Dalchand

Jim Cruickshank, President of Peel Condominium Corporation No. 457

Phil Esvico, Peel Condominium Corporation No. 421

Peter Ganglani

David Fisher

Diana DiScipio

Ray Dalchand expressed concern for traffic at the intersection of Eglinton Avenue West and Hurontario Street. He added that drivers take side streets to avoid the intersection and it creates a safety concern for residents of Ceremonial Drive and for children attending the nearby school.

Jim Cruickshank, President of Peel Condominium Corporation No. 457, expressed concern for the density of this development and for the access alignment of Street 'C' with the access of their condominium located at 50 Eglinton Avenue West, south side of Eglinton Avenue West, which will create a four-way intersection which he felt the road is not designed for.

Phil Esvico, Peel Condominium Corporation No. 421, expressed opposition to this development. He added that emergency vehicles already have difficulty traveling through the intersection of Eglinton Avenue West and Hurontario Street.

Peter Ganglani questioned what would be permitted on the subject lands without City approval. Planning staff responded that the existing zoning designation for the subject lands is "D" (Development) and the owner would be permitted to construct apartments up to the existing rights under the current Official Plan.

David Fisher suggested that the City deal with the traffic problems on a City wide basis by improving transit services and enforcing a one-car per unit standard.

Diana DiScipio expressed concern for traffic and opposed this application. She indicated that she would like to see town homes and single family dwellings in the subject location.

In response to Councillor Carolyn Parrish's inquiry, Planning staff advised that the LRT is in the public consultation stage and there is no decision on funding at this time.

Mayor McCallion commented that the City has conformed with the Growth Plan. However, she felt that it may be appropriate to wait for confirmation on the LRT to build the density.

Councillor Frank Dale felt that the Province should be supporting the density of the Growth Plan with funding for transit.

Councillor George Carlson agreed that this development should hold off until confirmation on the LRT.

Philip Levine, the applicant, responded to the feedback from Committee and explained that they have taken into consideration that the LRT is in the future by the reduction in units from 700 to 400. He also explained that they considered the traffic study in the proposed number of units. He advised that the remainder of the development lands will include a significant amount of community landscape area. Phase One development was brought forward in the spirit that the broader plan has been in progress for a year and a half and is virtually complete. With respect to infrastructure, storm water will connect into a pipe on Eglinton Avenue West.

Councillor Adams advised that she supports phasing the development lands. She pointed out that the Hurontario LRT may require lands for future stations and some road connections are of massive concern. The proposed access to Salishan Circle is not appropriate with the school; it is a safety concern. She expressed concern for how this development will filter onto local streets and would like to maintain the character of the existing neighbourhoods. She felt that this application needs to be refined. There is currently a great deal of density in the local area.

Councillor Adams moved the following alternate motion. This motion was voted upon and carried.

PDC-0104-2009

- 1. That the Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Applications to permit two apartment towers on Part of Lot 1, Concession 1, W.H.S., northwest Quadrant of Hurontario Street and Eglinton Avenue West, Owner: Pinnacle International*

(Ontario) Limited, Applicant: Philip Levine, IBI Group, Bill 51 file OZ 07/025 W5, as outlined in the Report dated November 10, 2009, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building, be refused based on the reasons stated by members of Committee during the discussion of this matter.

2. *That a motion be prepared for the next Council meeting summarizing the reasons for refusal of Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Applications under file OZ 07/025 W5.*
3. *That correspondence from Doris Galea dated November 29, 2009 and John Ng dated November 29, 2009, be received.*

Please note that recommendation PDC-0104-2009 was amended by Council on December 9, 2009 (see Committee Reports section of Council Minutes).

Alternate (Councillor Eve Adams)
OZ 07/025 W5

9. SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT – Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Applications, 1969 and 1971 Lakeshore Road West, northeast corner of Lakeshore Road West and Walden Circle, Owner: 607074 Ontario Limited, Applicant: Makow Associates Architect Inc., Bill 20

Planning staff advised that the subject lands are located on the northeast corner of Lakeshore Road West and Walden Circle. Surrounding land uses include recreational facilities associated with the Walden Club to the north; 3 storey row dwellings to the east; 17 storey apartment building south of Lakeshore Road West; and 15 storey apartment building west of Walden Circle. Staff showed photographs providing street level context. The applicant requested amendment to the Mississauga Plan from "Mainstreet Commercial" to "Main Street Commercial-Special Site" to accommodate a 15 storey apartment building with ground level commercial uses. In addition, the applicant requested to change the zoning from "C4" (Mainstreet Commercial) to C4-Exception" (Mainstreet Commercial) to: eliminate the minimum distance separation between residential and restaurant; implement a maximum number of apartment dwelling units; implement maximum Gross Floor Area ("GFA"); implement maximum Floor Space Index ("FSI"); implement maximum building height; parking standards; and zoning with setbacks and landscape requirements. Planning staff advised that a community meeting was held in May of 2007 and a public meeting of the Planning and Development Committee was held in March of 2008 as well as various focus groups. The restaurant access is proposed off Lakeshore Road West and Walden Circle, surface parking and 3-levels of underground parking are proposed. Planning staff provided visuals of the proposed building elevations from the south and the west. The proposed building is stepped, descending toward Lakeshore from 15 storeys to 11 to 3 to 1, and provides landscaping, and internally contained garbage. Planning staff opined that the development represents good planning, includes provincial policy planning framework, is within major transit station areas and near major arterial roadways, and the subject lands are deemed suitable for intensification. In addition, daily services for residents are within the Clarkson Village community and the development is consistent with the local area. The subject lands are within the Clarkson node boundaries and apartment buildings in this area range in height toward the GO Transit station. In addition, other developments

in the area range in FSI from 4.5 to 1.89 and Planning staff felt that that this proposal is consistent with the established area.

The following residents were in the audience and spoke to this matter:

Gillian Blair
Sally Shelley
Anne Curran
Boyd Upper

Gillian Blair, member of the satellite restaurant focus group, expressed opposition to this development. She expressed concern for the density, showing photographs of other buildings in the local area. She also showed a comparison chart of lot areas for other developments in the area. She commented that smart growth should consider the number of new development applications in the area and must not only focus on density, but on more broad community issues. She commented that smart growth does not mean unlimited intensification. Ms. Blair noted the intensification in the local area, indicating that on January 2009 the number of units in the local area were 1,061 and with approval of the subject site would total 3,600 units in the local area. Ms. Blair also expressed concern for: the proposed setback from the building to the nearest abutting home's fence; for the Special Site exceptions proposed in the amendment to the Official Plan; for the wind tunnel that the building may create; for the transition to local communities; and for Mississauga Intensification Policies.

Sally Shelley, member of the satellite restaurant focus group, expressed concern for the shadowing affects on the local lands. She showed a shadow study which she undertook based on the City's standards obtained from the Planning and Building Department. Her shadow study indicated more impact on the local lands than the shadow study provided by the applicant. Ms. Shelley's study found that the impacts do not meet the City's standards and if approved, the proposed building will put most of the Walden Spinney community under shadow.

Anne Curran advised that she moved to the Walden Spinney community approximately five years ago for its lifestyle. The Walden Spinney community won a Mississauga Urban Design Award and she reviewed the criteria for winning that award. She commented that if this development is approved, it will circumvent all of the judging criteria for that award. She also expressed concern for the quality of life, sun vistas and space, ecosystem, and creating a walled in Walden Spinney community.

Boyd Upper, member of the satellite restaurant focus group as well as a number of community review groups, advised that he is a forty-year resident of Clarkson, Lorne Park areas. Mr. Upper explained that "Our Future Mississauga" contains a plan for sensible development over the next thirty years and includes an action plan to nurture our historic villages; Clarkson is the oldest village in Mississauga. That plan identifies that intensification and redevelopment of the community should take place within major nodes (City Centre and intensification corridor on Hurontario Street) with high rise developments and population density between two and three hundred people per hectare. The community nodes would be low rise redevelopments approximately four storeys with population densities of one hundred to two hundred per hectare. The Clarkson Village

vision is a result of a four-year study with the community, urban design institute, planners, businesses, and developers. The main village characteristics are scale and architecture, mainstreet on a human scale, maximum mixed-use commercial residential, maximum three to four storey heights, pedestrian friendly and access to sunlight. He commented that this application is inconsistent with the Mississauga Plan and the Clarkson Village study. Mr. Upper reviewed the density per hectare of existing buildings surrounding the Walden Spinney community. He expressed concern for the lack of providing community space with this development, it exceeds the node density, it is tight to the lot boundaries, has no community amenities, has no transition to the streetscape, has no transition to the surrounding community, has no landscaping (except on the roof), and it is out of character with the local community. Mr. Upper expressed concern for the underground garage setback to the adjacent lands. He explained that the Walden Spinney community is an historic village, and the local area has already exceeded the density designated by the Province and that this proposal does not conform to the Mississauga Plan.

Mayor McCallion questioned whether the principles of the Clarkson Village study should be considered when making a decision on this site. Mr. Upper explained that the study looked at restoration of an historic village and he felt that should be considered for this site. It was noted that the Clarkson Village policy was not approved by Council at this time. However, Councillor Mullin commented that at no time did the focus group envision this type of proposal on this site. The Mayor expressed concern for the massing in relation to the Walden Spinney community.

Councillor Maja Prentice questioned the inclusion of the number of condominium units; the school board response on capacity; as well as the units per acre versus Floor Space Index.

Councillor Pat Saito sought clarification relating to the proposed setbacks.

Mr. Lethbridge explained that the Walden Spinney community was a successful experiment at that time and there was a different set of planning criteria. He commented that the proposed building will complete the community, it incorporates a pedestrian and commercial streetscape, it is close to transit and reflects the intensification and use of facilities in the community. He added that vehicular traffic will use Royal Park Drive and Lakeshore Road. He felt that the proposal is an appropriate solution for the location and there will be impacts on every development but that this meets the shadow standards.

Councillor Mullin thanked the satellite restaurant focus group for their input on this proposal. Councillor Mullin expressed opposition to this development. She questioned the justification for the residential component of this site, and suggested that C4 would have very little impact and would not wall in the Walden Spinney community. She indicated that this community already exceeds intensification. She also commented that it is inconsistent with Clarkson Village, it is out of scale with Walden Spinney, it will shadow the community, and provides no community amenities.

Councillor Prentice supported the local Ward Councillor for opposition of this application. She explained that there is no justification and rational, there is no transition

to Walden Spinney, shadowing is unfair, and the Clarkson Village study has not been taken into consideration.

The Mayor suggested that the staff report was inconsistent while considering the Clarkson Village study in some cases and not others. She supported C4 zoning for this site.

Councillor Mullin moved the following alternate motion. This motion was voted upon and carried.

PDC-0105-2009

1. *That the Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Applications to permit a 15 storey, 113 unit condominium apartment building with 544 m² (5,856 sq. ft.) of ground level commercial uses 1969 and 1971 Lakeshore Road West, northeast corner of Lakeshore Road West and Walden Circle, Owner: 607074 Ontario Limited, Applicant: Makow Associates Architect Inc., Bill 20 file OZ 05/043 W2, as outlined in the Report dated November 10, 2009, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building, be refused based on the reasons stated by members of Committee during the discussion of this matter.*
2. *That a motion be prepared for the next Council meeting summarizing the reasons for refusal of Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Applications under file OZ 05/043 W2.*

Alternate (Councillor Pat Mullin)
OZ 05/043 W2

ADJOURNMENT - 10:11 p.m.