



Attendees: Councillor Dickerson - Chair
 Councillor O'Connell
 R. Pym, Principal Planner – Development Review
 L. Roberts – Committee Coordinator

Item / Ref #	Details & Discussion & Conclusion <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
1.	<p>Zoning By-law Amendment Application A 10/06 Coughlan Homes 2000 Brock Road Concession 1 Part of Lots 19, City of Pickering</p>
	<p>1. <u>Planner Comments</u></p> <p>Ross Pym, Principal Planner – Development Review provided an overview of the applicant's proposal pertaining to this site, as outlined in Information Report # 01-07. He went over the details of the development and surrounding land uses. He also explained the requirements of the Planning Act. He indicated in his outline that this proposal was downsized in comparison to the previously planned development. He discussed the written comments received to date in regards to this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to property • road classification • impact on sustainability of site • property values. <p>Sustainability of the site was also discussed. Mr. Pym reviewed the importance of the sign in sheets in order to be notified of any upcoming meetings pertaining to this report. At this point, it was decided to have the comments from the residents next, so that the applicant could respond accordingly.</p>

Item / Ref #	Details & Discussion & Conclusion <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p>2. <u>Comments from Members of the Public</u></p> <p>1) Peter Dowsett <u>1995 Royal Road, #113</u></p> <p>Peter Dowsett appeared before the Committee with respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment Application A 10/06. His concerns were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic concerns with Brock Road and Finch Ave. West • access off Brock Road North in the evening • questioned whether a traffic study had been done would like to receive info • trees/shrubs currently existing – would like to confirm that they will remain as a buffer <p>2) Cheryl England <u>1995 Royal Road, Unit 103</u></p> <p>Cheryl England appeared before the Committee with respect to Zoning By-law Amendment Application A 10/06 . She stated she was not opposed to the development, but questioned whether the existing shrubs and trees would be staying. She also questioned access into the development – there are only two ways in, you cannot get in from northbound. Finch Avenue is a single lane road, it is difficult to turn onto Royal Road. She questioned whether there were plans for Finch Avenue to have a left hand lane, she was worried traffic would be using Royal Road as an alternate route. She also questioned the road classification of Finch - Type C designation for Finch, had it been changed since the 2003 application, as it is now noted as a Type B road.</p> <p>3) David Loyst <u>1995 Royal Road, Unit 158</u></p> <p>David Loyst appeared before the Committee and stated he was not opposed to the development, but was concerned with traffic and the access in and out of the development. He also noted there needed to be a center left turn lane on Finch Avenue. He questioned what type of development was proposed, whether it would be an adult community or family oriented. He did not see a lot of open space for playgrounds, etc in the plans.</p>

Item / Ref #	Details & Discussion & Conclusion <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p>Steve Phillips, Property Manager <u>Fuller Spicer and Associates Ltd.</u></p> <p>Steve Phillips, Property Manager for Fuller Spicer and Associates Ltd. appeared before the Committee. He questioned the height of the units. He noted there were bungalows on the opposite side, and indicated his concern with shadowing problems.</p> <p>He also questioned whether the units would be freehold or condos and requested clarification on parking. Would this be underground or strictly visitor parking.</p> <p>Mr. Phillips also questioned the price range of the proposed units.</p> <p>Mark Speakman <u>1995 Royal Road Unit 150</u></p> <p>Mark Speakman appeared before the Committee and questioned why visitor parking was proposed on the west side as opposed to the south side of the site. He asked about the landscape design and what was planned for this.</p> <p>He also expressed concerns with the height of the second storey, and questioned whether it would be higher than the existing units. He also questioned what the square footage of the units would be and the number of parking spaces per unit.</p> <p>He questioned the provisions for a walkway between the two units and noted he was opposed to having this. He also questioned the elevation changes and what the exterior finish would be.</p> <p>3. <u>Applicant Comments/Responses</u></p> <p>Ron Halliday <u>2280 Whites Road</u></p> <p>Ron Halliday appeared before the Committee on behalf of the applicant in regards to the zoning by-law amendment application. He explained the parking was planned for the west side in order to save the existing trees. He indicated the height would be no higher than the shadows. He stated that when the previous shadowing study had been completed, there were no problems in this regard. The height to the top of the roof on the three storey elevation would be 10.5 metres or approximately 36 – 39 feet.</p> <p>Mr. Halliday indicated that a solid fence as well as trees already exist and made assurances that the trees would be saved and the landscaping would be in keeping with the previous development. He made note that there were colour drawings available with considerable detail shown at the meeting, and indicated he would be available after the meeting to go over the details.</p>

Item / Ref #	Details & Discussion & Conclusion <i>(summary of discussion)</i>
	<p>Mr. Halliday stated that all the parking would be outside. There would be three parking spaces per unit. Each unit would have a single or double car garage, depending on the square footage of the unit.</p> <p>Mr. Halliday indicated that traffic studies had been done on Finch Avenue during the previously proposed project. He did state the need to look into another study. This will be revised and forwarded to the Region again. He also made note that this development would have fewer units as opposed to the previous plan for development, and stressed the high quality of these units. He commented on the high level of property management in the existing area.</p> <p>He indicated that the height of some of the existing trees would be in excess of 60 feet, quite possibly higher than the proposed units. He stated the units would be condo style and the approximate values would range from \$275,000 for 1,700 square feet up to \$325,000 to \$350,000 for 2,600 square foot units. The exterior finish would be composed of man made stone and brick, which would be compatible with surrounding units. He confirmed walk throughs would not be likely as these are private units, there being no need to have public walkways. It was noted again that this development was approximately 100 units less than the application previously submitted.</p> <p>Discussion ensued on the problems with walkways as well as the plans for garbage removal. It was noted that this would be dealt with during the site plan approval process, and that they were looking for direction in this regard.</p> <p>4. <u>Comments from the Chair</u></p> <p>Councillor Dickerson thanked the applicant and the neighbours for coming out and voicing their concerns. He also reminded everyone to sign the sheets in order to keep informed on the matter.</p>

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm