



**CITY OF KINGSTON
PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING NO. 02-2012
MINUTES**

**Thursday, January 19th, 2012
6:30 p.m. Council Chambers, City Hall**

Present:

Councillor George, Chair
Councillor Berg
Councillor Hector
Councillor Paterson
Councillor Reitzel, Vice Chair
Councillor Scott

Staff Present:

Ms. Jannette Amini, Committee Clerk
Mr. Grant Bain, Director of Planning
Mr. Jason Budd, Senior Planner
Mr. Speros Kanellos, Director, Real Estate and
Construction
Ms. Cherie Mills, Manager, Policy Planning
Ms. Marnie Venditti, Manager, Development
Approvals

Regrets:

Other Councillors:

Councillor Glover
Councillor Neill

Also Present:

Approximately forty five members of the public

THIS IS NOT A VERBATIM REPORT

The Chair called the public meeting portion of the agenda to order at 6:33 p.m.

INTRODUCTION BY COMMITTEE CHAIR

Councillor George, Chair explained the purpose of the meeting and read the rights and obligations afforded to the Committee members and members of the public in this public meeting. He outlined the requirements under the Planning Act associated with the Notice of Passing in this matter and the right to an appeal process to the Ontario Municipal Board.

**PUBLIC MEETING
HELD PURSUANT TO THE PLANNING ACT
6:30 p.m.**

APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT

The following is a report to provide general information regarding an application for Zoning By-Law Amendment which has been submitted by Southwinds Enterprises Inc. with respect to a portion of the property at 3567 Genge Road.

The applicant is proposing to construct a multi-sport recreational facility. The development will consist of an air supported dome and ancillary building for waiting/meeting area, office, equipment storage, vending machine areas and change rooms. Amendments to the Zoning By-law are requested to add the multi-sport recreational facility as a permitted use, increase the building height and reduce the parking requirement.

(File No.: D14-225-2011)

**Zoning By-Law Amendment
3567 Genge Road**

Applicant – Southwinds Enterprises Inc.

(See Report PC-12-008)

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Ms. Venditti noted pursuant to the requirements of the *Planning Act*, a notice of the statutory Public Meeting was provided by advertisement in the form of a sign posted on the subject site 20 days in advance of the Public Meeting. A “Notice of Public Meeting” regarding this application was also sent by first class mail to all property owners within 120 metres of the subject property. There were approximately 15 property owners notified by mail. In addition, a courtesy notice was published in *The Kingston Whig-Standard*.

Mr. John Uliana and Mr. Tony Johansson, IBI Group provided the Committee with a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed Zoning By-law Amendments. A copy of the presentation is attached to the record in the Clerk’s Office.

Councillor Scott noted concerns expressed by a resident regarding the potential of elevated noise from equipment used to inflate the dome and asked Mr. Uliana if he could comment on that. Mr. Uliana noted this would be addressed during site plan; however the equipment and building will be located towards the golf course which was indicated in the noise study. He did note that all equipment will fall within the noise criteria set out by the Ministry of the Environment for rural areas. Councillor Scott also expressed concerns about what type of traffic would take place between the golf course clubhouse and dome, specifically by golf carts. Mr. Uliana noted the golf course is a separate business and a different type of recreational use; however there are cart baths located throughout the golf course. Councillor Scott asked what the traffic impact will be on the village of Westbrook and could traffic on Creeksford Road be redirected. Mr. Johansson noted the assumptions made in the traffic study included residents of the

area and the direction that people will take to the site would be based on where they live.

Councillor Hector noted the location of a barn to the south of the site and asked if there is sufficient set backs from this barn. Mr. Uliana noted the subject barn has long existed and is not used. Councillor Hector asked that the comprehensive report address the issue of the unused barn.

Councillor Paterson asked if the intersection of Westbrook Road and Princess Street was considered in the traffic report. Mr. Johansson noted he did consult the Manager of the City's Traffic Division and that intersection was not identified as a specific concern. Mr. Uliana did note the City has identified that intersection for signalization in the future.

The following members of the public spoke to the proposed amendments.

Mr. J.P Shearer, KEDCO stated, from a business and tourism perspective, that he fully supports this venture and applauded a private enterprise taking on and developing a sports facility. He noted this development strengthens Kingston's ability to apply for sports tourism events which have the potential to create a \$3.5M impact on the city. He also noted this is a multi-sport venue that supports local sports organizations while at the same time takes away the tax burden of residents. It also provides opportunities for hosting seminars and symposiums.

Mr. Dale Neill, Cataraqui Clipper Soccer Club noted that Club has 2500 members who currently suffer due to the loss of its previous facility. He noted this Club provides an opportunity to further develop young soccer players, some of which have gone on to national teams. He noted the proposal includes 4 soccer fields that require 4 referees who are youth referees and young adults which create part time jobs that pay approximately \$20/hour. He concluded by noting that soccer is the #1 sport in Kingston.

Ms. Kim McClelland noted this will be a wonderful facility for coed sports groups. She further noted she is involved with tennis and would advocate for this as Kingston currently does not have indoor tennis facilities.

Councillor Glover asked, with respect to noise resulting from equipment use, how regulations for safeguarding public interests will be applied and respected. Ms. Venditti noted under the legislation, there are MOE requirements and a noise study will be required that will look at the various equipment for the site. The noise study will also look at other background sounds such as noise from Highway 401 etc. and the recommendations may speak to where equipment may be located. This will be addressed in the site plan.

The Public meeting concluded at 7:28 p.m.

**PUBLIC MEETING
HELD PURSUANT TO THE PLANNING ACT
6:30 p.m.**

APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT

The following is a public meeting report for a Zoning By-Law Amendment for the property municipally known as 148 Nelson Street.

The subject property is proposed to be redeveloped and is an existing single detached dwelling. The applicant is requesting permission to construct a rear addition to create a second dwelling unit. The second dwelling unit would not comply with the provision requiring a minimum lot area of 370 square metres per dwelling unit in the One and Two Family Dwelling 'A' Zone applied to the subject lands. Additional provisions that need to be amended include the minimum side yard setback, minimum aggregate side yard setback and minimum rear yard parking area.

**(File No.: D14-224-2011)
Zoning By-Law Amendment
148 Nelson Street
Applicant – Bruce Patry, Aimee Patry,
Chad Parslow, Michelle Parslow
Agent – S. Clark Homes Ltd.**

(See Report PC-12-009)

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Mr. Budd noted pursuant to the requirements of the *Planning Act*, a notice of the statutory Public Meeting was provided by advertisement in the form of a sign posted on the subject site 20 days in advance of the Public Meeting. In addition, prepaid first class mail was sent to all 129 property owners (according to the latest Assessment Rolls) within 120 metres (400 ft.) of the subject property and a courtesy notice was placed in the Kingston Whig-Standard.

Mr. Simon Clark provided the Committee with an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.

Councillor Reitzel questioned when intensification is considered too much and he is concerned with the ghettoization of this areas as well as crowding too many people into too small of a space. Mr. Budd noted these issues will be addressed in the comprehensive report. There are provisions in the zoning by-law regarding setbacks and these are all details that will be reviewed before the proposal is brought back to the Planning Committee.

The following members of the public spoke to the proposed amendments.

Ms. Helen Finley, 52 Earl Street, asked when does intensification become overbuilding and wondered where the garden is here. Just because an area has student housing

does not mean it should not have pleasant surroundings. She feels this lot is being overbuilt and noted the recent proposal on Alfred Street opposite Mack Street and suggested members look at that.

Ms. Beth Rubenstein 106 Nelson Street stated that Nelson Street is not all student housing and has many single family dwellings. She supports intensification in general; however overcrowding and large numbers of students in one area creates problems.

Mr. James Ward, 489 Victoria Avenue stated that Victoria Avenue is less than 50% student housing. He noted that Mr. Clark, in his presentation, stated that this is a student housing project; however the Official Plan prohibits specific design for student accommodation. Once this student housing has been built, the property will never go back to a single family dwelling units. Given this information, he is surprised why this is even being discussed.

Councillor Neill asked if the unfinished basements are just in the new buildings and if the existing building has a basement or cellar and if so, are there bedrooms in that space. He noted the proposed addition identifies basements with proposed walls. He felt the biggest frustration by residents is the potential for this 4 bedroom addition to become 6 or 7 bedrooms. He noticed there is a bathroom proposed in the basement. He also noted amenity space requirements are linked to the number of bedrooms.

Mr. Clark clarified that this property will be advertised as a rental unit; however you do not know who will apply so to say this is a student rental is hard to predict. You always look for quality tenants. With respect to the basement, this is still a preliminary plan. The current basement is unfinished with no rooms. The intent for the addition is finished basements for a laundry room and storage. As a builder, he can note that most building blueprints identify a rough in for basement washrooms. Councillor Neill noted the price point of a rental per bedroom will be students because families will not pay the equivalent of what is charged per room.

Councillor Glover emphasized this is a mixed neighbourhood and should be balanced. He realizes applications are on a case by case basis; however the neighbourhood needs to be balanced. A 3 bedroom unit can be a family unit or it can be student rentals; however once you go to 4+ bedrooms it becomes the threshold where you start getting problems as student housing.

The Public meeting concluded at 7:54 p.m.

**PUBLIC MEETING
HELD PURSUANT TO THE PLANNING ACT
6:30 p.m.**

APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT

The following is a public meeting report for a Zoning By-Law Amendment application for the property municipally known as 278-280 Frontenac Street.

The subject property is an existing 282 square metre two unit dwelling house consisting of 3 bedrooms per unit. The applicant is requesting permission to construct a 445 square metre rear addition to convert the existing building to a three unit dwelling house with 4 bedrooms per unit and a total gross floor area of 710 square metres (7642 square feet).

**(File No.: D14-227-2011)
Zoning By-Law Amendment
278-280 Frontenac Street
Applicant – William Lee
Agent – IBI Group**

(See Report PC-12-010)

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Mr. Budd noted pursuant to the requirements of the *Planning Act*, a notice of the statutory Public Meeting was provided by advertisement in the form of a sign posted on the subject site 20 days in advance of the Public Meeting. In addition, prepaid first class mail was sent to all 123 property owners (according to the latest Assessment Rolls) within 120 metres (400 ft.) of the subject property and a courtesy notice was placed in The Kingston Whig-Standard.

Mr. Mark Touw, IBI Group, provided the Committee with a PowerPoint presentation of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.

Councillor Berg asked if the existing building will be re-done inside and outside and what will it look like from the street. Mr. Touw stated from the street it will look the same; however will have new doors and windows. The interior will be renovated. He is not certain of the exterior cladding of the addition. Councillor Berg stated her concern is that the property have the same quality from front to back.

The following members of the public spoke to the proposed amendments.

Mr. John Grenville, 24 Jenkins Street stated he owns a property on Frontenac Street and his major concern is the possibility of increasing the density of these 3 units from what is being proposed, as there is the potential of this site accommodating a total of 21 bedrooms. He noted there is a bathroom on each floor and this is high ratio of bathrooms to bedrooms. He is also concerned with the significant increase in density with respect to the neighbourhood population with the potential to convert dining rooms,

storage rooms and dens into bedrooms. He noted both Queen's University as well as the students have made it clear that students prefer to live with 2 or 3 others but not 7 others. If this is to be approved, he would strongly encourage that the number of bedrooms to be limited to 4. A copy of his summation is attached to the record in the Clerk's Office.

Mr. James Ward stated it cannot be confirmed that this development is for the wider rental market. It appears clear that this is geared towards the student market which again is in contravention of the Official Plan.

Mr. Malcolm Griffin, 307 Frontenac Street asked about the trees in the rear yard and why they will be cut down. He stated he knew the 2 families that lived in the upper apartment that had garden parties under those trees. Both families had children that went to K.C.V.I. and this will no longer be a possibility if it is turned into one unit and once this is done to this property, other properties on the street will follow suit. He feels this is destabilizing. He has lived at 307 Frontenac Street since 1973 and would like to see Kingston have a vibrant downtown that can retain a downtown base. He noted that over the past 25 years, some of the homes have changed from owner occupied to rentals with the majority being student rentals and since then, Victoria School has closed. He felt that in 2003, a tipping point was reached with respect to clashes between single family dwellings and student rentals and now only 6 of 31 of these homes are owner occupied. The properties on Frontenac Street have large backyards and are prime properties for infill. A copy of his summation is attached to the record in the Clerk's Office.

Mr. Floyd Paterson agrees with previous points made and feels there seems to be no concern for tangible assets. He also feels the City should be pushing back on the Province regarding its push for intensification and let them know the complaints being received by residents regarding intensification. He noted there are 4 addresses in this short block that over the past 4 years have added 16 bedrooms to the neighbourhood and these historic buildings have large backyards where homeowners create perennial gardens; however these large backyards also attract developers to build additions on these homes. He stated he does not object to property owners using their property to earn a living; however there should be a limit. There needs to be planning policies that set limits on the number of bedrooms within a certain block and the Planning Department requires the discretion to take a city block and determine the number of bedrooms it can accommodate. Once that limit is reached, people should be told no when requesting amendments to the Zoning By-law to add additional bedrooms.

Mr. Ken Ohtake, 216 Union Street stated he is speaking on behalf of the Sydenham District Association. He stated it is unclear as to the purpose of the zoning amendment and asked why a particular area is zoned the way it is. The subject property is zoned 'A' for one and 2 single family units; however the proposal is requesting 4 bedrooms per units which by design could result in 7 bedrooms per unit. The proposal is asking for increased density and he recognizes that density is not measured by the number of bedrooms; however he believes this is a serious problem. With respect to the

Provinces priorities regarding intensification, he feels this is based on what local Councils have decided with regards to Official Plans and what is best for neighbourhoods and spot re-zoning is not in the best interests of this neighbourhood.

Mr. Touw stated he is not certain about the trees; however he will go back to the owners with this concern. With respect to the number of bedrooms per unit, the drawings submitted did show separate rooms. With respect to the question regarding the use of the rooms, there is need for storage space, dining space, and interior garbage space. He agrees that intensification should not proceed without merit and controls and increase in density was seen as something good. This is a very large lot and this merits consideration. Regarding zoning, he stated that zoning sets out the standards to what is appropriate and feels this would be appropriate and it meets the standards of a 'B' zone. He agrees it started as an 'A' zone neighbourhood; however cities are dynamic and change and the *Planning Act* recognizes that. This amendment provides opportunities to recognize those changes that would be appropriate. With rising gas prices, many people want to live close to where they work and this is an opportunity to accommodate more people in an appropriate manner through rental units. There are two markets looking to be in this area and the City needs to look at appropriate ways to accommodate those markets.

Councillor Paterson noted the current proposal is requesting 3 units with 4 bedrooms each totaling 12 bedrooms. He asked if the applicant wanted 2 units with 6 bedrooms each which also totals 12 bedrooms, would zoning amendment be required. Mr. Touw stated no.

Councillor Glover stated it is worth noting who has been speaking against this proposal including his predecessor on Council, the Chair of the Sydenham District Association and the Vice Chair of the Near Campus Neighbourhoods Advisory Committee. He hopes staff will address the concerns expressed tonight in the comprehensive report as well as the change from the 'A' zone to the 'B' zone as the Official Plan states we should be protecting our residential neighbourhoods. He noted the addition at the rear is larger than the original house so it is naïve to believe there would be no visual impact on the street. Intensification does not mean zone changes and he hopes the comprehensive report can justify why a zone change is necessary. Compatible use does not mean a zone change and residents everywhere look for a coherent structured environment to have homes and raise families. This is the tipping point of "flight of family" and he questioned the impact on K.C.V.I and Winston Churchill Public School.

Councillor Neill stated there is tipping point in neighbourhoods and streets experiencing this and Aberdeen Street would not have developed the way it has if there were 5 or 6 family homes on that street. This will create the potential of issues seen on Aberdeen Street. When you change the zoning on a property, it is the quickest way to increase the value of a piece of property. Right now the City has an Official Plan that has been approved by Council and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing that came about in 2010 with a comprehensive zoning by-law review to follow that will take 3 to 5 years to complete yet developers are asking for approvals based on the Official Plan. He

asked what type of access there would be to the attic. Mr. Touw noted the original house already had an attic as a living space with stairway access. There will be no stairway access to the addition.

The Public meeting concluded at 9:15 p.m.

**PUBLIC MEETING
HELD PURSUANT TO THE PLANNING ACT**

6:30 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT & OFFICIAL PLAN
AMENDMENT**

The purpose of this report is to provide general information regarding applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment with respect to 1138 – 1200 Highway 15.

The applicant is requesting to permit a 6,700 square metre commercial plaza. The application is proposing to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law in order to retain existing Medium Density Residential permissions or to permit the development of a commercial plaza. Amendments are requested to permit the commercial use, add a bank or financial institution and a clinic as permitted uses, and reduce the required size of a parking area.

**(File No. D09-062-2011 and D14-226-2011)
Zoning By-Law Amendment & Official Plan Amendment
1138 – 1200 Highway 15
Applicant – Tamarack (Rideau) Corporation**

(See Report PC-12-011)

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Ms. Venditti noted pursuant to the requirements of the *Planning Act*, a notice of the statutory Public Meeting was provided by advertisement in the form of a sign posted on the subject site 20 days in advance of the Public Meeting. A “Notice of Public Meeting” regarding these applications was also sent by first class mail to all property owners within 120 metres of the subject property. There were approximately 130 property owners notified by mail. In addition, a courtesy notice was published in *The Kingston Whig-Standard*.

Ms. Margot Watson, FoTenn Consultants, provided the Committee with a PowerPoint presentation of the proposed Zoning By-law and Official Plan Amendments.

Councillor Reitzel asked for clarification as to the need for two designations on the property. Ms. Watson noted if the applicant does not receive zoning for a commercial plaza or determines that a commercial plaza is not viable, the owner will develop medium residential. Councillor Reitzel asked if there will be other roads leading into the plaza from the rear. Ms. Watson stated yes and noted the various entrances to the site.

Councillor Hector noted concerns regarding the effect on the centre of the village commercial area with two proposed pending commercial developments. Ms. Venditti noted both sites have provided a market study and both market studies took into consideration the existence of each site. Councillor Hector asked if there is any way of taking into consideration that people need to walk to these buildings from the parking lot and feels this design should be viewed from a walking perspective.

Councillor Scott is concerned about the layout of the site and would like to see staff consider setbacks that reflect positioning of these buildings as a neighbourhood concept and not big box stores. He asked if there is a possibility of this site being more integrated. Ms. Watson noted she has had those discussions with the applicant and they would be open to that being included in the zoning. Councillor Scott noted the size and uses of the proposed buildings seem to be similar as to what is currently in the Rideau Town Centre and asked if there is a concern these will be two duplicate sites resulting in three commercial hubs.

The following members of the public spoke to the proposed amendments.

Mr. Scott Craft, 21 Schooner Drive stated he is disappointed in this proposal, noting he relocated to Schooner Drive under the understanding it would be zoned low to medium density residential and now is finding out the applicant is requesting it to be zoned commercial. His concerns are with noise and traffic flow. He is also concerned there is no overall traffic plan for the area yet there are a lot of traffic lights along Highway 15. He feels this area will attract younger customers and is concerned about the number of young pedestrians crossing a busy highway.

Ms. Watson stated comments made this evening will be taken back to the applicant.

The Public meeting concluded at 9:49 p.m.

**PUBLIC MEETING
HELD PURSUANT TO THE PLANNING ACT
6:30 p.m.**

APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT

The applicant is requesting to amalgamate the site specific Restricted General Industrial (M6-23) and site specific General Industrial (M1-12 and M1-13) zones, reduce the parking requirements for a manufacturing and warehouse use, retain business and professional office uses along the Resource Road frontage, permit a maximum of 25% of the total floor area of a permitted use for the purposes of a showroom, display area and retail sales for products that are manufactured, processed, fabricated or assembled on the premises, permit parking in the front and exterior yards and loading in the exterior yards and to relocate the open space zone.

**(File No. D14-230-2011)
Zoning By-Law Amendment
Cataraqui Estates business Park
Lands bounded by Resource Road, Venture Drive and Centennial Drive
Applicant – City of Kingston Real Estate & Construction
Services Department**

(See Report PC-12-014)

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Ms. Venditti noted pursuant to the requirements of the *Planning Act*, a notice of the statutory Public Meeting was provided by advertisement in the form of a sign posted on the subject property 20 days in advance of the Public Meeting. In addition, prepaid first class mail was sent to all property owners (according to the latest Assessment Rolls) within 120 metres (400 ft.) of the subject property. There were approximately 60 owners notified. In addition, a courtesy notice was published in *The Kingston Whig-Standard*.

Mr. Kanellos provided an overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.

No members of the public spoke to the proposed amendments.

The Public meeting concluded at 9:58 p.m.

Regular Planning Committee Meeting No. 02-2012

MEETING TO ORDER

Councillor George, Chair, called the regular portion of the meeting to order at 9:59 p.m.

CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

Moved by Councillor Hector
Seconded by Councillor Paterson

THAT the agenda for meeting 02-2012 of the Planning Committee held January 19th be amended to include the addendum and as amended be approved.

CARRIED

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Moved by Councillor Berg
Seconded by Councillor Reitzel

THAT the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting No. 01-2012 held December 1st, 2011 be approved.

CARRIED

DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

DELEGATIONS / BRIEFING

BUSINESS

- i. **PUBLIC MEETING AND COMPREHENSIVE REPORT
(File No. D14-230-2011)
Application for Zoning By-Law Amendment
City of Kingston
Cataraqi Estates Business Park
Lands bounded by Resource Road, Venture Drive and Centennial Drive**

Moved by Councillor Hector
Seconded by Councillor Paterson

THAT it be recommended to Council that the application for Zoning By-Law Amendment (Our File No. D14-230-2011) submitted by the City of Kingston's Real Estate & Construction Services Department, for the lands within the Cataraqi Estates Business Park and bounded by Resource Road, Venture Drive and Centennial Drive, **BE APPROVED**; and,

THAT the Township of Kingston Zoning By-Law No. 76-26, as amended, be further amended as follows:

1. Map 3 of Schedule "A", as amended, is hereby further amended by changing the zone symbol of the subject lands from 'M6-23', 'M1-12', 'M1-13' and 'OS' to 'M1-13' and from 'BP-2' to 'OS' as shown on Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of amending By-Law No. 2012-_____.

2. By **deleting** subsection 24(3)(m) in its entirety and replacing it with the following:
 - "(m) **Cataraqui Estates Business Park (bounded by Resource Road, Venture Drive and Centennial Drive)**
On the approximately 11.9 hectare parcel of land bounded by Resource Road, Venture Drive and Centennial Drive and zoned 'M1-13', the following regulations shall apply to the entire area zoned 'M1-13':
 - (a) Notwithstanding any provisions of Sections 4 or 5 hereof to the contrary, for the lands zoned 'M1-13' on Schedule "A" hereto, the Venture Drive frontage will be considered the front yard.
 - (b) Notwithstanding any provisions of Sections 5 or 24 (1) hereof to the contrary, the lands zoned 'M1-13' on Schedule "A" hereto, may be used in accordance with the provisions of Sections 5 and 24 except that:
 - (i) **ONLY PERMITTED USES:**
Manufacturing, assembling, fabricating, and processing operations;
Construction and transportation activities and facility;
Storage, warehousing and wholesale trade activities;
Communications and utilities facility;
Institutional uses with General Industrial characteristics, such as a trade school;
Business and professional office provided that such use is located within 90 metres of the Resource Road frontage;
and,
Public use in accordance with Section 5(18) of By-Law No. 76-26.
 - (ii) A maximum of 25% of the total floor area of a permitted use may be used for the purposes of a showroom, display area and retail sales for products that are manufactured, processed, fabricated or assembled on the premises.
 - (iii) **ONLY COMPLEMENTARY PERMITTED USES:**
Office and business services such as printing and equipment repair intended to serve the General Industrial area;
Restaurant;
Financial institution;
Personal services and convenience commercial;
Automotive, heavy equipment or truck repair facility;
Public and private parks and recreation facilities; and,
Parking lots and parking structure.

- (iv) MINIMUM FRONT YARD DEPTH : 10 metres
- (v) MINIMUM EXTERIOR SIDE YARD WIDTH : 10 metres
- (vi) MINIMUM INTERIOR SIDE YARD WIDTH: 3 metres
- (vii) MINIMUM REAR YARD DEPTH : 7.6 metres
- (viii) MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 20 metres
- (ix) MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENT FOR
MANUFACTURING OR WAREHOUSE USE: 1 space
per 100m² of gross floor area
- (x) YARD IN WHICH REQUIRED PARKING AREA
PERMITTED: Parking area may be permitted in the front
yard, exterior side yard and rear yard provided that no
part of any parking area, other than a driveway, is located
closer than 7.6 metres to any street line
- (xi) YARD IN WHICH LOADING SPACES ARE
PERMITTED: Loading spaces shall be located in the
exterior side yard or rear yard only provided that such
loading space is located no closer than 18.3 metres to
any street line"; and,

THAT the Amending By-Law be presented to City Council for all three readings;
and

THAT this recommendation be forwarded to the January 24th, 2012 Council
meeting for approval.

CARRIED AS AMENDED

Ms. Venditti noted the revised recommendation contained in the addendum and
requested, given the time sensitivity of this matter that this recommendation be
forwarded to the January 24th, 2012 Council meeting.

MOTIONS

NOTICES OF MOTION

OTHER BUSINESS

CORRESPONDENCE / DOCUMENTS

- i. Correspondence received from the Gilian Ward, Marketing & Research
Co-Coordinator, DTZ Barnicke The Royal Block, responding on behalf of
Peter Kostogiannis of George Alexander Realty, regarding Zoning By-Law
Amendment for property located at 148 Nelson Street.

- ii. Correspondence received from Jim and Dianna Lancaster, responding in regards to the Zoning By-Law Amendment for property located at 3567 Genge Road.
- iii. Correspondence received from Marilyn Freeman, responding in regards to the Zoning By-Law Amendment for property located at 148 Nelson Street.
- iv. Correspondence received from IBI Group with respect to revised floor plans for the application for Zoning By-law Amendment – 278-280 Frontenac Street.
- v. Correspondence received from Kathryn Morrissey with respect to the application for Zoning By-law Amendment – 148 Nelson Street.
- vi. Correspondence received from Susan Conway with respect to the application for Zoning By-law and Official Plan Amendments – 1156 Highway 15.
- vii. Correspondence received from Leda Raptis and Kevin Firth with respect to the application for Zoning By-law Amendment – 148 Nelson Street.
- viii. Correspondence received from James Ward with respect to the application for Zoning By-law Amendment – 148 Nelson Street.
- ix. Correspondence received from Rupa Patel with respect to the application for Zoning By-law Amendment – 148 Nelson Street.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Planning Committee is scheduled to be held on Thursday, February 2nd, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Councillor Hector
Seconded by Councillor Scott

THAT the meeting of the Planning Committee adjourn at 10:01 p.m.

CARRIED