

Issued February 13, 2012



MINUTES

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA

MONDAY, JANUARY 30, 2012 – 7:00PM

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

<http://www.mississauga.ca>

Members Present:

Mayor Hazel McCallion
Councillor Jim Tovey (Ward 1)
Councillor Chris Fonseca (Ward 3) (Chair)
Councillor Frank Dale (Ward 4)
Councillor Bonnie Crombie (Ward 5)
Councillor Ron Starr (Ward 6)
Councillor Nando Iannicca (Ward 7)
Councillor Pat Saito (Ward 9) (Arrived at 7:04 p.m.)
Councillor Sue McFadden (Ward 10)
Councillor George Carlson (Ward 11)

Members Absent:

Councillor P. Mullin (Ward 2)
Councillor Katie Mahoney (Ward 8)

Laura Wilson, Legislative Coordinator, Office of the City Clerk
905-615-3200 ext. 5425 / Fax 905-615-4181
E-Mail: Laura.Wilson@mississauga.ca

STAFF PRESENT:

Mr. E. Sajecki, Commissioner of Planning and Building
Ms. M. Ball, Director, Development and Design
Mr. D. Marcucci, Manager, Park Planning
Ms. D. Rusnov, Manager Development Central
Mr. S. Barrett, Manager, Transportation and Asset Management
Mr. D. Bryan, Supervisor, Sign Unit
Mr. R. Hughes, Planning and Building
Mr. H. Lynch, Planning and Building
Mr. D. Breveglieri, Planning and Building
Ms. A. Wilson - Peebles, Legal Counsel, Municipal
Mr. D. Morita, Manager Development Engineering
Ms. S. Smith, Legislative Coordinator, Office of the City Clerk
Ms. L. Wilson, Legislative Coordinator, Office of the City Clerk

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE – JANUARY 30, 2012

CALL TO ORDER:

Councillor Chris Fonseca, Ward 3, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

DECLARATIONS OF (DIRECT OR INDIRECT) PECUNIARY INTEREST

NIL

MATTERS CONSIDERED

1. Sign Variance Applications – Sign By-law 0054-2002, as amended
File: BL.03-SIG (2012)

Councillor Ron Starr, Ward 6, spoke to the matter and noted amendments he wished to make to the recommendation. Amendments were made as per Councillor Starr's request.

Councillor Pat Saito, Ward 9, and Councillor Bonnie Crombie, Ward 5, both noted their support for the Sign Variance Applications in the Wards which they represent.

Councillor Pat Saito, Ward 9, moved the following motion, which was voted on and carried.

PDC-0005-2012

That the Report dated January 9, 2012 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 Appendix 1 to 3 of the Report, be adopted in accordance with the following:

1. That the following Sign Variances **be granted**:
 - (a) Sign Variance Application 11-06355 - Ward 5
FleuraMetz Canada Ltd.
6685 Pacific Circle

To permit the following:

- (i) One (1) fascia sign with changing copy sign face.

- (b) Sign Variance Application 11-06055 - Ward 9
Meadowvale Professional Centre
6855 Meadowvale Town Centre Circle

To permit the following:

- i) Two (2) fascia signs erected on the 2nd and 3rd storeys of the west elevation.

- (c) Sign Variance Application 09-04758 - Ward 6
Traffic Paralegal Services
896 Burnhamthorpe Rd. W.

To permit the following:

- i) One (1) fascia sign on the south elevation of the unit which does not face a street or contain the main entrance for the public.

- (i) That the following Sign Variance **not be granted**:

- (a) Sign Variance Application 09-04758 - Ward 6
Traffic Paralegal Services
896 Burnhamthorpe Rd. W.

To permit the following:

- i) One (1) fascia sign on the west elevation of the building located on a unit not occupied by the business.

BL.03-SIG (2011)

APPROVED – (Councillor P. Saito)

2. PUBLIC MEETING

Information Report - Rezoning Application to permit the development of three 4-storey condominium apartment buildings with a total of 169 residential dwellings, 3015 Eglinton Avenue West, Northwest corner of Eglinton Avenue West and Winston Churchill Boulevard.

Owner: Great Gulf (Eglinton 10) Inc.

Applicant: Bousfields Inc. **Bill 51** (Ward 10)

File: OZ 11/005 W10

Councillor Chris Fonseca called this public meeting to order at approximately 7:07 p.m.

Councillor Sue McFadden, was satisfied with the recommendation and noted that there were no Ward 10 residents in the audience with respect to this matter as all concerns raised by residents had been addressed prior to the meeting. There was no further discussion.

Councillor McFadden moved the following motion which was voted on and carried.

PDC-0006-2012

That the Report dated January 10, 2012, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building regarding the application to change the Zoning from "D" (Development) to "RA1- Exception" (Apartment Dwellings), to permit three 4- storey condominium apartment buildings with a total of 169 residential dwelling units under file OZ 11/005 W10, Great Gulf (Eglinton 10) Inc., 3015 Eglinton Avenue West, be received for information, and, notwithstanding Planning Protocol, that the Supplementary Report be brought directly to a future Council meeting.

File: OZ 11/005 W10

AMENDED (Councillor S. McFadden)

File: OZ 11/005 W10

This public meeting closed at approximately 7:10 p.m.

3. PUBLIC MEETING

Information Report - Rezoning Application to permit 133 two– storey and three-storey townhouse dwellings, 5118 Winston Churchill Boulevard, Southwest corner of Destination Drive and Winston Churchill Boulevard. Owner/ Applicant: Daniels LR Corporation **Bill 51** (Ward 10)

Councillor Chris Fonseca called this public meeting to order at approximately 7:10 p.m.

Councillor Sue McFadden noted that she was satisfied with the application. There was no further discussion regarding the matter.

Councillor McFadden moved the following motion which was voted on and carried.

PCD-0007-2012

1. That the Report dated January 10, 2012, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building regarding the application to change the Zoning from "D" (Development) to "RM9- Exception" (Horizontal Multiple Dwellings with more than 6 Dwelling Units), to permit 133 two- storey and three- storey townhouse dwellings, under file OZ 11/010 W10, Daniels LR Corporation, 5118 Winston Churchill Boulevard, be received for information and, notwithstanding Planning Protocol, that the Supplementary Report be brought directly to a future Council meeting.
2. That the following correspondence be received:
 - (a) Email dated October 23, 2011 from Ken Lloyd with respect to the proposed development at 5118 Winston Churchill Boulevard, Southwest corner of Destination Drive and Winston Churchill Boulevard.

AMENDED (Councillor S. McFadden)

File: OZ 11/010 W10

This public meeting closed at approximately 7:13 p.m.

4. PUBLIC MEETING

Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning Applications – To permit an eleven-storey retirement building, a one-storey commercial building, a maximum of 54 townhouse units, to recognize the existing fitness club and medical building, and to reduce the width of the North Service Road Right-of-Way to 20 m (65.6 ft.) 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road. Owner: Gemini Urban Design (Cliff) Corp. Applicant: J. Levac, Weston Consulting Group Inc. **Bill 20** (Ward 7)

Councillor Chris Fonseca called this public meeting to order at approximately 7:13 p.m.

Hugh Lynch, Planner, Planning and Building Department, The City of Mississauga, presented the Supplementary Report. He outlined the location and characteristics of the site. He also outlined the history of the application. He noted that the original application included two (2) apartment buildings, a medical building and town homes. He noted that the current application would maintain the fitness centre and includes a retirement residence, town homes and a commercial building. Mr. Lynch specified that the current application was supported by the City of Mississauga's Planning and Building Department. He specified that the site was well located for the scale of the intensifications proposed. He described the plan and the studies that have been completed with respect to the application. He specified that the built form transition and building placement is appropriate. He indicated that the plan aligns with the Mississauga Plan and that the concerns of residents have been considered and incorporated into the plan. He stipulated that the fitness centre and medical building would be required to provide parking in accordance with the City of Mississauga's rates and zoning by-law but that a parking reduction had been suggested for the retirement facility. He also noted that a holding provision had been recommended which would withhold zoning permissions until certain conditions were met.

Mr. Lynch spoke to an Official Plan Amendment to reduce the planned Right-Of-Way width of North Service Road from twenty six meters (26 m) to twenty two meters (22 m) between Hurontario Street and Cawthra Road and specified that all service roads adjacent to the Queen Elizabeth Way in the City of Mississauga are planned for a twenty meter (20 m) width. He specified that while the Ministry of Transportation had recommended that the City of Mississauga maintain a twenty six meter (26 m) Right-Of-Way to accommodate a potential widening of the Queen Elizabeth Way, the Ministry of Transportation had also indicated that a preliminary design had not been undertaken. He spoke to the study conducted by the City of Mississauga's Transportation and Works Department with respect to the functioning of the roadway which concluded that a twenty two meter (22 m) Right-Of-Way would be serviceable.

Councillor Iannicca, Ward 7 outlined the history of the application, noted that the plan had come a long way from the initial proposal and stipulated that the plan was being recommended by staff because many of the issues initially raised by the community had been resolved. He outlined the community's concerns with respect to the current proposal including the height of the eleven (11) storey retirement residence. Councillor Iannicca also spoke to the twenty two meter (22 m) Right-Of-Way proposed in the report.

Councillor Iannicca asked staff why the eleven (11) storey retirement residence is favourable. Hugh Lynch responded that the context of the area allows for more than two (2) storeys and stipulated that the buffer zone to the north of the property impacted height allowances. Mr. Lynch also noted that retirement residences are different from typical buildings because they generate less traffic and because of this staff had recommended a reduction in parking ratios.

Andrew Gassman, resident, and President of the Cooksville Homeowner's Association and Secretary of the Cliffway Focus Group, made a deputation to the Planning and Development Committee with respect to concerns regarding the proposal. He expressed concern with the amount of time residents had been given to review the plan and with the change of contact information regarding the matter. He outlined the history of the proposal and noted that the community feels that the plan is too dense for the site and raised concerns with respect to changes in zoning permissions. He also stipulated that the community does not believe that the proposal aligns with the Official Plan. He noted that the community felt that if the proposal was approved, the development would adversely affect business, recreation and employment. He also stipulated that the community took issue with the possible decrease in commercial space. He suggested that the plan would increase strain on public and emergency services and would negatively impact infrastructure. He expressed concern regarding the negative impacts of increased traffic and reduced parking on the neighborhood.

Mr. Gassman presented a shadow study conducted by a member of the Cliffway Focus Group and raised concerns regarding the shadows that would be cast by the retirement residence. He also indicated concern regarding reduced privacy for residents, and the possibility of the proposed town homes being used as rental units. He also noted the possibility of health issues resulting from residents living within three hundred feet (300 ft.) of the Queen Elizabeth Way and in close proximity to high voltage hydro power lines.

Madam Mayor asked staff if residents had been involved when the application was changed. Hugh Lynch noted that the Corporate Report was circulated to residents twenty (20) days prior to the meeting in accordance with the Planning Act. Madam Mayor sought clarification as to whether or not the Rate Payers Association had been informed of the revised application. Andrew Gassman stated that the Rate Payers Association had not received the revised application dated August 2011. Staff clarified that the amendments made in August were minor site planning issues and were therefore not circulated but that the major change to the zoning application had been sent out in April of 2011.

Madam Mayor raised concerns with respect to shared parking facilities. Diana Rusnov, Manager, Development Central, indicated that while the plan shows a significant deficiency in parking, the Applicant had not requested a reduction in the number of spaces being provided. Therefore the Corporate Report stipulated that parking must be provided for the Fitness centre and medical building at the required rates set out by the Zoning By-Law. She also noted that underground parking was proposed to provide parking for the commercial building and Fitness centre. Madam Mayor asked if there would be a deficiency in parking and Ms. Rusnov noted that this would be addressed with site planning.

Mr. Lynch addressed the issue of shadow analysis. He noted that the Planning and Building Department had a shadow study conducted and noted how shadows would impact the surrounding area according to the study. He then addressed the community's concerns with respect to the School Board's ability to accommodate an increased number of students. He noted that neither the Peel District School Board or the Dufferin- Peel Catholic District School board had objected to the application.

Councillor Bonnie Crombie, Ward 5 asked what disruptions could be anticipated for members of the fitness centre and sought clarification regarding the severing of lands. Mr. Lynch outlined the implications of severing the land.

Councillor Crombie raised concerns with respect to the North Service Road being over used and under maintained and asked staff to respond. Steve Barret, Manager, Transportation and Asset Management stipulated that infrastructure issues on North Service Road would be addressed in 2012 or 2013 which would include a road re-surfacing. He also noted that there is capacity on the road and that the plans can be accommodated.

Councillor Crombie noted that a resident had raised a concern regarding the possibility of the proposed development increasing criminal activity in the area and asked staff to respond. Mr. Lynch noted that he would be speculating as to why this was raised as a concern. Councillor Crombie then sought clarification as to whether staff are confident that parking needs will be met. Mr. Lynch noted that the parking supplied for the Fitness centre and commercial building would be the same as any other of the type of building and that the building department will ensure that parking rates are met. He noted that the only parking variance requested was for a reduction in the retirement home rate, and ensured that he was confident that the rate is appropriate.

Councillor Crombie noted that the community felt that it had not been consulted with respect to the revised proposal and stated her hope that the Planning and Development Committee meeting had given them the opportunity to have their concerns addressed.

Councillor Nando Iannicca noted that the changes to the proposal outlined in the Corporate Report had occurred quickly and noted that he would be happy to turn the proposal down and go to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) however; he stipulated that this would involve challenging the staff who supported the application which would make winning at the OMB difficult. He outlined those concerns which could not be fought at the OMB. Councillor Iannicca also noted that the Applicant does not have to bring the current application to OMB but could bring the original application forward. He suggested that it would be appropriate to go back to a public meeting for discussion.

Madam Mayor noted that much progress had been made but indicated her concern that many issues raised would only be addressed once the proposal reached the site plan process. She noted her agreement that development should occur in the area but noted that the application would have a major impact on the community. She also noted that she would feel more comfortable with the application if there was more information with respect to how the application will go through the site plan process. She also raised concern with the Corporate Report's suggestion that the applicant could go through the Committee of Adjustment for parking variances. She stipulated that the issues should be settled with the Planning and Development Committee rather than taking the application to the OMB and recommended that staff provide the Planning and Development Committee with more information regarding the items that are of an uncertain nature. She sought clarification from Ed Sajeki, Commissioner, Planning and Building with respect to how the community's concerns could be addressed and asked for clarification regarding shared parking. Mr. Sajeki noted that the Applicant had not applied for a reduction in parking and that the Applicant will be required to meet the City of Mississauga's by-law standards and specified that he sees no issue with the parking.

Mr. Sajeki drew the Committee's attention to page 431 appendix I-2 of the Corporate Report, an aerial photograph of the site, and addressed the issue of the retirement residence's height. He noted that the proposed building site was adjacent to a hydro corridor and was across the street from an eight (8) storey apartment building and stipulated that considering area, the Planning and Building Department does not have an issue with the proposed height. He also suggested that all things considered the OMB would likely have no issue. He also noted that with respect to the site plan process it was very common that with the assistance of the local Councillor and the Community details can still be addressed. He noted that he and the Planning and Building staff stand by the recommendation.

Councillor George Carlson, Ward 11, noted that these types of re-development applications are difficult because they must be knitted into an existing fabric. He noted that residents are on the right track by focusing on a few issues including massing and parking concerns but stipulated that he would not suggest sending the matter to the OMB as the community and Applicant were very close to reaching a settlement.

Andrew Gassman raised concerns with process. He noted dissatisfaction with the process of severing the land after the plan is approved, and noted concern with the suggestion in the Corporate Report that the property owner could go to the Committee of Adjustment to request a parking variance after the proposal is approved. He stipulated that the community's major concerns included parking, density and massing. He noted that the community had suggested that the applicant reduce the height of the building but not reduce the number of units but that the developer had not been open to this idea. Mr. Gassman also noted his concern with the increase in height of the building from ten (10) to eleven (11) storeys being considered a minor change and suggested that this was a major change that should have been presented to the community with ample time for them to review the amended plan.

Councillor Ron Starr, Ward 6 sought clarification on the Fitness centre's tennis courts. Mr. Lynch confirmed that the tennis courts would be eliminated and the area used for parking.

Madam Mayor noted that she would not want the matter to go to the OMB but would like to know more about the plan before she offers support and noted that more time would be of benefit.

Mr. Gassman noted that the OMB had supported Council's decisions in the past. He also noted that the residents would like to come to an agreement but suggested that the developer is not interested.

Councillor Sue McFadden, Ward 10 noted that she would like to see a consensus and would like all parties to be satisfied with the application. She suggested that the matter be deferred and suggested that Councillor Iannicca continue discussions with residents to attempt to come to an agreement.

Councillor Frank Dale, Ward 4 noted that this is a difficult application and the plan is getting closer to being complicit with the neighbourhood. He also noted that if the application went to the OMB, it would be difficult to make a strong case as the professional opinions of staff would have to be challenged. Councillor Dale stipulated that he had concerns with parking and requested confirmation from staff that they would not support a parking variance application at the Committee of Adjustment until further studies had been conducted. Mr. Sajeki noted that the Planning Department supports evidence based solutions. Councillor Dale stated that the plan would involve a change for the community and that it is not a perfect solution but that it does meet the test of the City of Mississauga's planning policies and supports the Province's Growth Plan and the City's intensification policies. He noted his support for taking the application back to the community and making adjustments to make the plan more compatible with the neighbourhood.

Councillor Starr also expressed concern with taking the application to the OMB and noted his support for taking the application back to the community.

Councillor Crombie raised concerns with traffic flow. Mr. Barrett noted that the amount of traffic generated by this application could be handled by the current infrastructure and that circulation would be well serviced with respect to access and infrastructure. He also noted that while there would be an increase in traffic, the study addressed the issues.

Councillor Iannicca noted his wish to defer the matter to the next meeting of the Planning and Development Committee on February 13, 2012 and his intention to host a public meeting on Wednesday, February 9, 2012 to discuss the site plan and address other issues. He noted that this will present an opportunity to review the matter again.

Councillor Iannicca made a motion that the Report dated January 10, 2012, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building with respect to an Official Plan Amendment and Re-zoning Applications, for 2021 – 2041 Cliff Road, File OZ 06/019 W7, Gemini Urban Design (Cliff) Corp., be deferred to the Planning and Development Committee meeting on Monday, February 13, 2012 to allow the Ward Councillor to host a public meeting on Thursday, February 9, 2012 with respect to the application.

The motion was voted on and carried.

Mr. Gassman noted that the residents question how well the plan will work despite staff's support of the recommendation. He requested that the public process for planning applications be addressed and noted that residents need places to play despite the Province's mandate that residents require places to grow. He also noted his concern with the owner of the fitness centre stipulating that he had no concerns with parking because he and his partners had done deal with Ken Slater in the past.

Councillor Fonseca thanked those present for their participation and reiterated the motion put forward by Councillor Iannicca.

Councillor Nanado Iannicca moved the following motion which was voted on and carried.

PDC-0008-2012

1. That the Report dated January 10, 2012, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building with respect to an Official Plan Amendment and Re-zoning Applications, for 2021 – 2041 Cliff Road, File OZ 06/019 W7, Gemini Urban Design (Cliff) Corp., be deferred to the Planning and Development Committee meeting on Monday, February 13, 2012 to allow the Ward Councillor to host a public meeting on Thursday, February 9, 2012 with respect to the application.

2. That the following correspondence be received:
 - (a) Email dated January 27, 2012 from Gareth Skipp, resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
 - (b) Email dated January 27, 2012 from Jeff Gordon resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
 - (c) Email dated January 28, 2012 from Carol Johnston resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
 - (d) Email dated January 30, 2012 from Peggy Tyers resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
 - (e) Email dated January 29, 2012 from Mark Fenton resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
 - (f) Email dated January 29, 2012 from Charles Brown resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
 - (g) Email dated January 29, 2012 from Jamie McLean resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.

- (h) Email dated January 30, 2012 from Nick Stock resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
- (i) Email dated January 30, 2012 from Lilian Horvath resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
- (j) Email dated January 30, 2012 from Steve Boecker resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
- (k) Email dated January 30, 2012 from C. W. Irving resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
- (l) Email dated January 30, 2012 from Don Wisenden resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
- (m) Email dated January 30, 2012 from Lynn Buckerfield resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
- (n) Email and attachment dated January 30, 2012 from Beverley and Bill Carty resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
- (o) Email dated January 30, 2012 from Brian Main resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.
- (p) Email dated January 29, 2012 from Annette Papaenella resident, with respect to the proposed development at 2021-2041 Cliff Road Part of Block 13, Registered Plan B-27 Northeast corner of North Service Road and Cliff Road.

APPROVED – (Councillor N. Iannicca)
File: OZ 06/019 W7

This public meeting closed at approximately 9:22 p.m.

5. PUBLIC MEETING

Rezoning and Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications - To permit 13 detached dwellings on a common element condominium private road 1551, 1559, 1569 Cormack Crescent and 1556 Marionville Drive East of Dixie Road, south of the Queen Elizabeth Way. Owner: Sedona Lifestyles (Rometown) Inc., Boris Duniskvaric, Boris Poletto and Brian Paul Sousa. Applicant: Brutto Consulting, **Bill 51** (Ward 1)

Councillor Chris Fonseca called this public meeting to order at approximately 9:24 p.m.

David Breveglari, Planner, Planning and Building Department presented the supplementary report with respect to the plan. He outlined the location of the subject lands, the context of the area, the proposed development and the policy framework. He noted that the plan does not require an Official Plan amendment as the site is zoned Residential Low Density 1 and that the plan proposed to re-zone the site to an R16 which permits detached dwellings on a condo road. He stipulated that there would be an exception schedule to recognize the concept plan. Mr. Breveglari outlined the concerns raised at community meetings including uncertainty related to the implications of the planned interchange and Hanlan water project, concern related to precedent being set for the community, construction access, access for the 13 proposed homes being from Marionville Drive and concern with the size of the lots and heights of the dwellings. He noted that the plan originally presented to the Planning and Development Committee had a split ingress and egress which had been raised as a concern. Mr. Breveglari stipulated that the plan has now been changed for a consolidated access point onto Marionville Drive. He noted that the laneway identified in the plan was seven meters (7m) in width and seven point four meters (7.4m) with the curbing which is more narrow than the permissible eight point five (8.5m) driveway in an R3 zone. He noted that the consolidated access point allows for ample landscaping and outlined the lot characteristics and the height of the proposed dwellings. He also noted that Planning is asking that the Applicant provide a more generous setback for some of the lots. He stipulated that the Transportation and Works Department had requested that the road width be increased at various points which would impact visitor parking. In conclusion, Mr. Breveglari noted that the proposal conforms with the Official Plan in both built form and density, the condo homes are compatible with the surrounding land uses and the area context and that the access through Marionville Road will not generate significant changes to the character or function of the neighborhood.

Councillor Jim Tovey, Ward 1 expressed that the report and presentation were well done and that this proposal has come a long way and it speaks to the work of the residents and the willingness of the developer. He noted that the proposal was not exactly what the residents were hoping for that that the greatest issue with the proposal is the access through Marionville Drive. Councillor Tovey stipulated that he does not support approval of the recommendation.

Don Champaign, resident and representative of the Orchard Heights development committee spoke to the report and noted that the majority of residents do not support the proposal for the reasons listed by Mr. Breveglari. He also noted that the community feels that the buildings do not conform to the character of this established neighbourhood. Mr. Champaign requested that the developer provide a contractual agreement stipulating that when the interchange is re-developed the Marionville Drive access to the site would be closed and access provided through Cormack Crescent. He made the Planning and Development Committee aware of the fact that the Transportation and Works Department were open to creating an access from Cormack Crescent to the site. Mr. Champaign also expressed concern with the amount of time that residents had been given to review the report.

Claudio Brutto, Planning Consultant, Brutto Consulting, Applicant spoke to the matter and noted the changes that had been made to the application including the fact that the Applicant is now proposing that thirteen (13) single family dwellings be built as opposed to the original seventeen (17) units and town homes to ensure that the proposal aligns with the Official Plan and places to grow. He noted that the planned height is within the By-law and stipulated that the community had received the report at the same time as the Applicant and that no major changes had been made. Mr. Brutto also noted that the Applicants are prepared to go with the staff report.

Mr. Brutto informed the Planning and Development Committee that with respect to the access there would likely never be traffic through Cormack Crescent due to various constraints. He also noted that a heritage house sits on the site and stipulated that it would remain.

Councillor Ron Starr, Ward 6 inquired as to the estimated value of the homes. Mr. Brutto suggested that based on similar sales in the Lorne Park area, the homes could sell for approximately \$700 000.00 to \$900 000.00.

Discussion arose with respect to creating an access from Cormack Crescent. Councillor Starr inquired as to whether or not there was a way to ensure that if the land became available, an access would be created by the Applicant. Andrea Wilson-Peebles, Legal Counsel for the City of Mississauga noted that the property owner has the right to release their own restrictions. Discussion arose with respect to one foot (1ft.) reserves. Steve Barrett, Manager, Transportation and Asset Management, stipulated that it is unlikely that a one foot (1ft.) reserve would be implemented on private property.

Sandra Karpowich, resident, requested clarification with respect to signage in the area. Mr. Barrett noted that the signs to which Ms. Karpowich referred prohibited heavy trucks from using the roadway with the exception of trucks used for deliveries and construction. Ms. Karpowich sought clarification as to whether or not heavy snow removal trucks would be permitted and Mr. Barrett confirmed that they would be allowed.

Garry Smith, resident raised concerns with respect to increased traffic and access to the site through Marionville Drive and expressed disappointment with respect to the demolition of the house currently situated on the subject lands.

Robert Comrie, resident, expressed concern regarding construction vehicles accessing the site via Rometown Drive. He requested that that access from Cormack Drive be considered to reduce heavy truck traffic along Rometown Drive.

Catherine Colenco (ph), resident raised concerns with respect to traffic in the area and noted that she shared the concerns that have been raised by residents.

Mark Machinck (ph), resident, noted that this plan could have been a natural extension of the areas existing landscape and raised concerns with the precedent that would be set by approving the proposal.

Discussion arose with respect to access to the site through Marionville Drive. It was noted that residents were requesting for access to the site from Cormack Crescent with no access through Marionville Drive. Madam Mayor stipulated that closing the access through Marionville Crescent once a Cormack Crescent access was opened could prove difficult. Mr. Brutto noted that access from Cormack Crescent through the properties to the west of the site would not be possible as the properties were leased out and revenue generating and as a result were not part of the proposal. He also noted that the developer made an attempt to create an access to the site through Cormack Drive but noted that the Ministry of Transportation would not support this. Mr. Brutto expressed that with the current proposal, traffic can be managed, school boards are not in opposition and Planning and Building Department staff are supportive.

Councillor George Carlson, Ward 11 noted that this type of plan has proven popular and beneficial in other areas. He noted that this type of development would likely increase home values in the area and noted that traffic would be minimally impacted.

Councillor Bonnie Crombie, Ward 5, noted that the proposal would change the character of the community and noted that the development is not consistent with the community. She noted that although Councillor Carlson felt the proposal would increase housing prices, she felt that it could decrease home values. She also noted concern with respect to the public consultation process.

Councillor Nando Iannicca, Ward 7 and Councillor Sue McFadden, Ward 10, and Madam Mayor expressed satisfaction with the proposal.

Councillor Ron Starr, Ward 6 moved the following motion which was voted on and carried.

PDC-0009-2012

That the Report dated January 10, 2012, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building recommending approval of the applications under Files OZ 09/013 W1 and T-M11002 W1, Sedona Lifestyles (Rometown) Inc., 1551, 1559, 1569 Cormack Crescent and 1556 Marionville Drive, east of Dixie Road, south of the Queen Elizabeth Way, be adopted in accordance with the following:

1. That notwithstanding that subsequent to the public meeting, changes to the applications 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 application to change the Zoning from "R3" (Detached Dwellings - Typical Lots) to "R16-Exception" (Detached Dwellings on a CEC-Private Road) to permit 13 detached dwellings on a common element condominium private road in accordance with the proposed zoning standards described in the Information Report, be approved subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) That the draft plan of subdivision be approved;
 - (b) That the applicant agree to satisfy all the requirements of the City and any other official agency concerned with the development;

- (c) 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.
3. That the Plan of Subdivision under file T-M11002 W1, be recommended for approval subject to the conditions contained in Appendix S-5, attached to the report dated January 10, 2012, from the Commissioner of Planning and Building.
4. 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 36 months of the Council decision.

APPROVED – (Councillor R. Starr)
File: OZ 09/013 W1 and T-M11002 W1

This public meeting closed at 10:37 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT – 10:37 p.m.
(Councillor N. Iannicca)