



Attendees: Councillor Ashe - Chair  
 Councillor Dickerson  
 Councillor Johnson  
 Councillor McLean  
 Lynda Taylor, Manager, Development Review  
 Geoff Romanowski, Planner II  
 Rick Cefaratti, Planner II  
 Joyce Yeh, Planner I  
 Alison Haines, Recording Secretary

<b>Item / Ref #</b>	<b>Details &amp; Discussion &amp; Conclusion</b> <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
1.	<p> <b>PICKERING OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION</b>  <b>- OPA 05-003/P</b>  <b>ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION A 10/05</b>  <b>786 INDOPAK INC.</b>  <b>875 KINGSTON ROAD</b>  <b>PART OF LOT 27, B.F.C. RANGE 3</b>  <b>(40R-8710, PART 1, 2 &amp; PART OF PART 3)</b>  <b>CITY OF PICKERING</b> </p>
	<p> <b>1. Planner Comments</b>             Geoff Romanowski, Planner II provided an overview of the application and property. He stated that to date comments have been received by Veridian, the Region of Durham, CN Rail, St. Paul's on the Hill, Toronto Region Conservation Authority, Ministry of Transportation and a number of residents and property owners in the area.         </p> <p> <b>2. Applicant Comments</b>             The applicant explained that the building would include two levels of parking on the south side of the building, and a retail sector including an indoor mall. Residential space would begin on the fourth floor. He explained that to date a traffic study and draft analysis for acoustic study have been completed and both are favourable.         </p> <p> <b>3. Comments from Members of the Public</b>   <i>Sylvia Spencer</i>  <i>771 Sheppard Avenue</i> </p>

<b>Item / Ref #</b>	<b>Details &amp; Discussion &amp; Conclusion</b> <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p>Sylvia Spencer has an objection to the height of the structure, but would not oppose a 3 storey commercial building, and believes that if a shadow study was to be conducted, St. Paul's on the Hill daycare would likely fall in it. She is concerned with steam from the Nuclear Power Plant, the potential for a gas explosion from the station across the street, and questioned if the warnings from the Nuclear Power Plant would be blocked from residents that live beyond this building. She further expressed concern with the implications of a solar power building to City the budget, the amount of parking for the retail establishments and the number of handicap spots. Sylvia is concerned with the safety of children who reside in the building as trucks seem to use this area of Highway 401 to gear down and further, the migratory path for birds may be affected by the building.</p> <p><i>Catherine Bare</i> 1713 Sprucehill Road Catherine Bare is concerned with how schools in the area will be able to accommodate the new children in the community due to the fact a number of schools were closed as the neighbourhood was considered to be aging.</p> <p><i>Robert Jones</i> 878 Sheppard Ave. Robert Jones believes the building is too dense and is concerned with what will happen to the wildlife that depend on the stream on the subject property. He further expressed concern about the increase in traffic and the safety of children in the area, the building's aesthetic appeal and how the building would affect the new dealership. Mr. Jones advised that he would be in favour of a smaller building.</p> <p><i>John Dawson, Solicitor for Owner of the Volvo Dealership</i> 920 Kingston Road Mr. Dawson advised that his client was trying to assess what the impact would be and there appeared no justification to increase the density permitted on this lot. His client is concerned about the increase in noise and that it did not appear to adhere to guidelines and upgraded windows would be required. As the live-work style is not customary in the area, he questioned what would happen if the plan failed. Furthermore, the only access to the residential areas is through the commercial section of the building.</p> <p><i>Diane Marmena</i> 1724 Sprucehill Road Diane Marmena stated that the proposed plan was too large for what we require and would not oppose a smaller commercial facility. She noted that herself along with other neighbours were very concerned with loitering.</p> <p><b>4. Applicants Response</b></p> <p>The Applicant appreciates the residents concerns and stated the following. The</p>

<b>Item / Ref #</b>	<b>Details &amp; Discussion &amp; Conclusion</b> <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p>developer intends to have 50% of power consumption through solar resources. The concept of the live-work building is to reduce the need to go elsewhere, thus minimizing traffic impacts.</p> <p><b>5. Planner Response</b></p> <p>Geoff Romanowski advised that the proposed plan has been circulated to the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and a site visit had been conducted to view the undeveloped area. Geotechnical and additional information has been requested in order for TRCA to give their approval. Additionally, staff will be generating a report for Council and the community will have an opportunity to make submissions at that time.</p> <p><b>6. Comments from the Chair</b></p> <p>Councillor Ashe advised the public that Councillors would be happy to facilitate the process for another meeting to discuss the issue with residents before proceeding to more formal meetings of Committee and Council.</p>
2.	<p><b>ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION A 22/05</b> 1430658 ONTARIO INC. 1050 BROCK ROAD, UNIT 25 SOUTH PART OF LOT 19, CONCESSION 1 CITY OF PICKERING</p>
	<p><b>1. Planner Comments</b></p> <p>Joyce Yeh, Planner I outlined the application. She advised that to date the City had received a petition signed by 12 business owners within the subject property and 10 business owners south of the subject property, expressing concerns with safety, crime and property values.</p> <p><b>2. Applicant Comments</b></p> <p>The applicant provided a history of massage and the need for such services for mental health. Advised that under the name Pickering Spa the premises is being used as a massage or spa parlour, they do not conduct business outside hours and they serve men, women and children.</p> <p><b>3. Comments from Members of the Public</b></p> <p>No comments from members of the public.</p>
3.	<p><b>ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION A 28/05</b> RENATA TRENT DURHAM CONDO PLAN 105, LEVEL 1, UNIT4 (905 DILLINGHAM ROAD) CITY OF PICKERING</p>

<b>Item / Ref #</b>	<b>Details &amp; Discussion &amp; Conclusion</b> <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p><b>1. Planner Comments</b> Geoff Romanowski, Planner II provided an overview of the application, current zoning for the property and staff comments to date.</p> <p><b>2. Applicant Comments</b> No comments</p> <p><b>3. Comments from Members of the Public</b> No comments from members of the public.</p>
4.	<p><b>ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION A 25/05</b> 974735 ONTARIO INC. 3880 KINSALE ROAD PART OF LOT 3, CONCESSION 6 (NOW RP 40R-23226 PARTS 2&amp;3) CITY OF PICKERING</p>
	<p><b>1. Planner Comments</b> Rick Cefaratti, Planner II provided an overview of the application and comments provided so far. Concerns from residents have been received with respect to access from Highway 7 and the potential increase in traffic, along with the impact on the quality of the well water in the area. Staff advised that the Region of Durham's Planning Department and other agencies require more information on the proposal.</p> <p><b>2. Applicant Comments</b> <i>Valerie Cranmer, of Cranmer Associates, Applicant Representative</i> Ms. Cranmer stated that the applicant is working closely with TRCA and the City of Pickering to provide required information. Additionally, a hydro-geological study had been prepared determining that there should not be any implications to health and an independent study was being completed and will be provided to the City along with area residents.</p> <p><b>3. Comments from Members of the Public</b> No comments from members of the public.</p>
5.	<p><b>ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION A 26/05</b> 1044910 ONTARIO INC. 1890 GLENVIEW ROAD PART OF LOT 41, PLAN 509 CITY OF PICKERING</p>
	<p><b>1. Planner Comments</b></p>

<b>Item / Ref #</b>	<b>Details &amp; Discussion &amp; Conclusion</b> <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p>Rick Cefaratti , Planner II provided an overview of the application and advised that two letters from adjacent property owners had been received concerning traffic and parking accommodation abilities of the property.</p> <p><b>2. Applicant Comments</b></p> <p>Dr. David Fletcher stated that he wanted to renovate the dwelling to double the current size. He further stated the he did not believe parking would be an issue as there will be only a small number of staff and limited patients. The Applicant further believes the proposal is a logical transition between high density on the south side of Kingston Road and low density on the north side. Dr. Fletcher further advised that he would be planning the ingress and egress on Glengrove Road.</p> <p><b>3. Comments from Members of the Public</b></p> <p><i>Richard Spows</i> 1890 Glengrove Road Richard Spows stated that this building is part of the original downtown core. He is interested in how the structure will be increased and what exactly the Applicant means by mixed use. He is concerned about the impact on the school and other traffic concerns.</p> <p><i>Bill Mankinen</i> 1899 Glengrove Road Bill Mankinen is hoping that as the subject property is adjacent to a residential area the application will be considered with the least amount of change as to not disturb the neighbourhood. He would like to know the proposed structure usage and maximum size, including the parking layout. He is concerned with the proposed egress for the structure as its location could potentially clog the area.</p> <p><i>Doreen Adair</i> 1892 Glengrove Road Doreen Adair is concerned with the increase in traffic and students in the area. She also wants specifics on the size of the new building and how many doctors will practice at the facility.</p> <p><i>Kathy Smith</i> 1896 Glenview Road Kathy Smith is concerned with seniors and students in the area who utilize the street and the bus stop, as there are no sidewalks in the area.</p> <p><b>4. Applicant Response</b></p> <p>The applicant advised that the conceptual study has been completed for the subject property and it was determined that the area could accommodate a two storey structure approximately 500 sq feet. The Applicant revised his plans and is proposing</p>

<b>Item / Ref #</b>	<b>Details &amp; Discussion &amp; Conclusion</b> <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p>an “L” shaped building in order to retain topical geography. The Applicant also advised his intent to use the property as a clinical facility and be the sole doctor.</p> <p><b>5. Planner Response</b> The Planner responded that they have not received any comments from Municipal Property &amp; Engineering. He emphasized that the plan is conceptual and the applicant would be required to proceed to the site plan process before being approved and at that time the appropriate entrance would be determined. The Planner advised that the City has no current plans to urbanize the area.</p> <p><b>6. Applicant Response</b> The Applicant emphasized that they have not submitted a site plan and would be agreeable to moving the driveway.</p>
6.	<p><b>ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION A 27/05</b> SILVER LANE ESTATES INC. SOUTH PART OF LOT 32, CONCESSION 1 (NOW BLOCKS 39 AND 46, PLAN 40M-2119 AND 40R-11901, PART 4) EAST OF ALTONA ROAD AND SOUTH OF STROUDS LANE CITY OF PICKERING</p>
	<p><b>1. Planner Comments</b> Rick Cefaratti, Planner II provided an overview of the application.</p> <p><b>2. Applicant Comments</b> Todd Coles, Humphries Planning Group appeared on behalf of the applicant.</p> <p><b>3. Comments from Members of the Public</b></p> <p><i>Jeff Bowers</i> <i>2002 Tillson Court</i> Jeff Bowers stated he is unclear of what is being proposed. He requested clarification on the open water containment area. He stated that he would like to ensure that the correct groups within the TRCA is made aware of the proposal and there is a water table concern. Mr. Bowers is concerned with storm water management in the area. He also suggested a stop sign at Calvington Drive and Strouds Lane.</p> <p><i>Valerie Chuvie</i> <i>Branby Court</i> Valerie Chuvie is concerned of future development in the conservation area near the subject property. Additionally she commented that Altona road is extremely busy and had witnessed several near accidents.</p> <p><i>Marjorie Tonner</i></p>

<b>Item / Ref #</b>	<b>Details &amp; Discussion &amp; Conclusion</b> <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p><i>1991 Calvington Drive</i> Marjorie Tonner commented that Strouds Lane had become very busy and is concerned that construction vehicles would be using Calvington drive.</p> <p><b>4. Planner Response</b></p> <p>The Planner clarified that the original draft plan for the subdivision had previously been approved by Council and this application is only to amend the zoning in order to permit the building of the approved townhomes. The property is partially in the original subdivision area and therefore required the change in zoning in order to allow the dwelling to be constructed.</p> <p><b>5. Chair Response</b></p> <p>Clarified that no new dwelling, not previously approved, is being considered. Addressed concerns of Altona Road stating this street had been recognized by the Region of Durham as a priority area for revamping (sidewalks etc.) Also, a traffic study had been completed on Strouds Lane with no concerns found but perhaps now with the new development further studies would be required.</p> <p>Lynda Taylor, Manager, Development Review clarified that this proposal is only to modify the zoning subdivision plans that have already been approved.</p> <p><b>6. Applicant Response</b></p> <p>The Applicant advised that they will work with the TRCA and tree preservation will be complied with. Additionally Block 39 could not be alternated from its approved development because of the size of the lot.</p>
7.	<p><b>ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION A 30/05</b> AL-KARIM &amp; SHOLINA RHEMTULLA 1778 FAIRPORT ROAD PART OF LOT 10 &amp; 11, PLAN 820 (PART 2 40R-9225 &amp; PART 2, 40R-11504) CITY OF PICKERING</p>
	<p><b>1. Planner Comments</b></p> <p>Joyce Yeh, Planner I provided an overview of the application.</p> <p><b>2. Applicant Comments</b></p> <p>The Applicant believes there is a profound need for quality daycare in the neighbourhood.</p> <p><b>3. Comments from Members of the Public</b></p>

<b>Item / Ref #</b>	<b>Details &amp; Discussion &amp; Conclusion</b> <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p><i>Christine Gibson</i> 1772 Fairport Road The resident raised concerns with the noise levels but mentioned she has recently spoken to the applicant and has been ensured that the daycare will be moved away from her yard and trees etc. planted to eliminate noise. She would like to see restrictions placed on the times and days the daycare may operate.</p> <p><i>Victor Lesiks</i> 1773 Fairport Road The resident has no objections to the proposed use, however does have concerns with traffic on Fairport Road and questioned if stoplights could be placed at the corner of Welrus Street and Fairport Road.</p> <p><b>4. Applicant Response</b></p> <p>There were no additional comments from applicant</p> <p><b>5. Planner Response</b></p> <p>The Planner stated that the Planning &amp; Development Department would consider traffic and noise concerns.</p>
8.	<p><b>ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION A 29/05</b> 2075729 ONTARIO INC. 1962 GUILD ROAD AND 1640 KINGSTON ROAD (PART OF LOTS 1 AND 2, PLAN 316 AND PART OF LOT 20, CONCESSION 6) CITY OF PICKERING</p>
	<p><b>1. Planner Comments</b></p> <p>Rick Cefaratti, Planner I provided an overview of the application.</p> <p><b>2. Applicant Comments</b> Tony Biglieri, Planning consultant, Applicant Representative Stated his client is requesting a temporary zoning for an antique market and they intend to clean up the subject property.</p> <p><b>3. Comments from Members of the Public</b></p> <p><i>Ian Rankin, Charter Home Management (owners of Pickering Flea Market)</i> Ian Rankin believes this application has caused great concern with the definition of antique market, and temporary market and believes the by-law, as it stands, leaves the potential for this establishment to become a flea market. He stated that “temporary retail” needs to be clarified.</p> <p><i>Rick Gallant</i> 1961 Guild Road</p>

<b>Item / Ref #</b>	<b>Details &amp; Discussion &amp; Conclusion</b> <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p>Rick Gallant is concerned with the appearance of the property and wants the driveway to be on Kingston Road.</p> <p><i>Kathy Quinn</i> 1976 Guild Road</p> <p>Kathy Quinn is concerned with the lack of a fence around the property and the issue of people walking directly into their backyard.</p> <p><b>4. Applicant Response</b></p> <p>The Applicant Representative advised that their intent is for an antique market; they will look at the entrance off Kingston Road, work with staff with respect to fencing and they are already cleaning up the property. With respect to parking, the representative's understanding was that a ten-year lease was purchased and there are 8 years remaining on the lease.</p>

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm.