

RESULTS OF PUBLIC MEETING

City File Number: OZS-2021-0041

January 17, 2022

Members Present via Virtual Option

Regional Councillor M. Medeiros – Wards 3 and 4 **(Chair)**

Regional Councillor P. Fortini - Wards 7 and 8

Regional Councillor P. Vicente - Wards 1 and 5

Regional Councillor M. Palleschi - Wards 2 and 6

City Councillor R. Santos - Wards 1 and 5

City Councillor D. Whillans - Wards 2 and 6

City Councillor J. Bowman - Wards 3 and 4

City Councillor C. Williams - Wards 7 and 8

City Councillor H. Singh - Wards 9 and 10

Members Absent

Regional Councillor G. Dhillon - Wards 9 and 10

Staff Present

D.Barrick, Chief Administrative Officer

Planning, Building and Economic Development:

R.Forward, Commissioner Planning and Development Services

A.Parsons, Director, Planning, Building and Economic Development

B.Bjerke, Director, Policy Planning, Planning, Building and Economic Development

J.Humble, Manager, Policy Planning

S.Ganesh, Manager, Planning Building and Economic Development

D.Vanderberg, Manager, Planning Building and Economic Development

C.Owusu-Gyimah, Manager, Planning Building and Economic Development

Corporate Services Department

S. Akhtar, City Solicitor

City Clerk's Office:

P. Fay, City Clerk

C. Gravlev, Deputy City Clerk

R.Ajitkumar, Legislative Coordinator

Members of the Public:

None

Results of the Public Meeting:

A Planning and Development Services Committee was held virtually commencing at 7:00 p.m. with respect to the subject application. Notices of this meeting were sent to property owners within 240 metres of the subject lands in accordance with the *Planning Act* and City Council procedures. As indicated in the minutes of the meeting there were no members of the public in attendance.

No members of the public attended to speak to the application. One (1) written correspondence letter was received expressing interest and concern/issues to the application. The correspondence letter can be found attached to the end of this Appendix. Concerns raised are presented and addressed in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Response to matters Raised by the Public

Matters raised by the public	Staff Response
Secondary Plan high density designation – Why does the high density designation not expand further north to encourage higher densities and intensification.	The proposed draft plan of subdivision was submitted in conformity with the permitted land uses of the Highway 427 Secondary Plan 47 (SPA47) and Block Plan Area 47-1. The high density designation is centered around the primary gateway intersection of The Gore and Castlemore Road as identified on the SPA47 Land Use Schedule. The furthest extent of the high density designation is approximately 900 metres north and 800 meters the east of the primary gateway. The radius of high density designation is anchored by the primary gateway, encouraging the bulk of intensification to this area where infrastructure and services such as transit is easily accessible.

Ramsammy, Andrew

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 2022/01/17 7:55 PM
To: Ramsammy, Andrew
Subject: [EXTERNAL]OZS-2021-0041 - comment/ concerns

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments that you do not trust or are not expecting.

Hello Andrew, I am writing for a question in response to the public meeting for the development application. My concern is the secondary plan density designation.

Why does the high density end at that designation location.(red line) and not continue to the alterliery road. Why does it only incorporate that lot south?

Wouldn't it be more appropriate to encourage developers to increase density and reduce urban sprawl by intensifying all new developments that are adjacent to the city hub (gore meadows complex) .



Thank you

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]