



**TOWN OF WHITCHURCH-STOUFFVILLE
COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
TUESDAY, JULY 23, 2002**

**COUNCIL CHAMBERS
37 SANDIFORD DRIVE, 4TH FLOOR
7:00 P.M.**

A Council Public Hearing was held at the municipal offices on the above date and time. All members of Council were present. Mayor Emmerson was in the Chair.

CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

MOVED by Councillor Dobrich
SECONDED by Councillor Bowes

THAT the agenda be confirmed as circulated.

CARRIED.

DECLARATIONS

There were no declarations from members of Council.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOVED by Councillor Dobrich
SECONDED by Councillor Dunkeld

THAT the minutes of the Council Public Hearings held on June 18, 2002 and June 25, 2002 be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED.

- 1. PROPOSED PLAN OF SUBDIVISION & ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT
MADORI LTD. Part of Lot 2, Concession 8, Community of Stouffville
File Nos. 19T(W)-98003 & ZBA00.006 (C10-DV & D12)**

NOTICE GIVEN:

The Acting Clerk advised the procedure by which notice was given.

PURPOSE:

The Planner advised that the purpose of the public hearing is to obtain public and agency comments with respect to a proposed Plan of Subdivision and proposed Zoning By-law Amendment as submitted by Madori Ltd.

The subject lands are located in Part of Lot 2, Concession 8, within the northwest quadrant of the community of Stouffville. The land area of the development parcel totals approximately 22.83 hectares (56.4 acres).

The development proposal envisages the creation of 329 residences comprised of single detached dwelling units. Blocks will also be created for a storm detention facility and park facilities. The proposed development of the subject lands will be serviced by municipal water and sanitary sewage infrastructure.

Access into the development lands will be provided from the Ninth Line, Glad Park Avenue, West Lawn Crescent and Winlane Drive. It is proposed that part of the extension of the mid-block collector road, Millard Street, westerly from the Ninth Line to Highway No. 48, will be constructed as part of this development initiative. It is anticipated that the balance of Millard Street, including the crossing over the Little Rouge River, will be constructed when the adjacent property to the west is developed.

The subject lands will be developed and released in a series of phases by the Town in consultation with review agencies (ie: School Boards, Region of York, Conservation Authority). The Town will utilize the provision of Holding (-h) symbols as a suffix to the zone classification under the authority of Section 36 of the *Planning Act* to allow for the co-ordinated release of lands for development purposes. It is anticipated that the lands will be developed over a five year time horizon.

The development of the property is contingent upon completion of the Ninth Line York Durham Sanitary Sewer (9th Line YDSS) project. At present, the Stouffville Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) is operating near its design limit. With the completion of the 9th Line YDSS project, new development lands can be serviced. It is anticipated at present that the 9th Line YDSS project will be completed in the last quarter of 2003.

The Zoning By-law Amendment proposes to rezone the subject lands from Rural (RU) to Residential Low Density Two (R2), Residential Low Density Eight (R8), Residential Shallow Six (RS6), Residential Shallow Seven (RS7) and Open Space (OS).

All of the residential classifications as identified are contemplated for use as single detached dwelling units. The zone standards for the residential classifications can be summarized as follows:

Zone Classification	Minimum Lot Frontage	Minimum Lot Area
R2	12 metres (39.4 ft.)	370 sq.metres (3983 sq.ft.)
R8	11 metres (36 ft.)	335 sq.metres (3606 sq.ft.)
RS6	12 metres (39.4 ft.)	312 sq.metres (3358 sq.ft.)
RS7	11 metres (36 ft.)	286 sq.metres (3078 sq.ft.)

The (R8), (RS6) and (RS7) Zones are new residential zone classifications that are proposed to be added to General Zoning By-law 87-34.

Council, as part of their consideration of the Zoning By-law Amendment to implement the development of the subdivision, may phase the release of parcels of land. Under this scenario, portions of the land area may be subject to Holding (-h) provisions to allow for phased development. The release of the Holding (-h) symbol could be contingent upon matters such as: water supply and infrastructure improvements; adequacy of the road network; school accommodation; etc.

The (OS) Zone recognizes lands that will be transferred to the Town for the purposes of parkland, a stormwater management facility and public view corridors.

As of the date of submitting this Report for inclusion in the July 23rd Public Meeting Agenda, the following pieces of correspondence have been received:

Through electronic mail, dated June 6th, 2002, Jeremy Wideman has indicated his support for the proposed subdivision.

Daniel Neal, 104 O'Brien Ave. Mr. Neal expresses concerns about scale of growth. Suggestions made to Council include: building an east / west by-pass prior to any future development; protect heritage areas by dead-ending all streets in heritage area; and, protection of the 'Country' atmosphere by having lots with + 40 ft. frontages.

Kenneth & Janet Green, 12606 Ninth Line. The Green's wish to be notified of any decisions of Council with respect to the two planning files.

Margaret & Wally Hayes, 8 Katherine Crescent. The Hayes' state that Stouffville is one of the few remaining self-contained Towns close to Toronto; the community has a strong sense of identity; and, recent residential developments have been on lot sizes of 40 to 60 feet in width to provide a sense of openness; and, has included parks, open space and protected woodlots.

John & Aileen Pander, 108 Katherine Crescent. The Pander's on behalf of themselves and five other area households have provided the following comments: Stouffville is one of the few remaining self-contained Towns close to Toronto; the community has a strong sense of identity; and, recent residential developments have been on lot sizes of 40 to 60 feet in width to provide a sense of openness; and, has included parks, open space and protected woodlots. The Pander's continue by raising other concerns, namely: Main Street traffic volume; the cost of expanded infrastructure; demands for additional services such as fire & police protection, etc.

Joyce Turman, 618 Millard Street. Ms. Turman notes that Stouffville needs a variety of housing and employment options. Townhouses, semi-detached homes are needed, as well as more apartment housing. Ms. Turman raises concerns that the subdivision plans are unimaginative in their scope and are not up to current urban planning standards.

K. Duprey, 612 Elm Road. K. Duprey has written the word "rejected" on the Notice of Public Meeting.

Joyce & Elaine Richardson, Doris Morden, Jane Arseneau & Victor Richardson have noted that they are in opposition to any future applications for zoning by-law amendments or plans of subdivision that are to be built on agricultural lands.

Pat & Don Beauchamp, 501 Elm Road. The Beauchamps have rejected the development proposal. The reasons for the opposition are namely: the lot sizes are too small, especially where development backs onto the current Elm Road homes which have 60 ft. frontages; a utility feeder (hydro, phone & cable) runs across the back of the current Elm Rd. properties. Has the accommodation of these utilities been accounted for in the plan?; an access road from Millard St. through to Highway No. 48 should be part of the initial plan, not staged over time; what protective measures will be incorporated to protect the established mature trees that are present at the rear of the Elm Rd. homes; and, why is the pond and wetland area not preserved.

John Lilleberg, 515 Elm Road. Mr. Lilleberg advises that the plan should be rejected because it has many flaws, namely: density is too high; excessive traffic flow to Winlane Ave. & Westlawn Crescent; the existing pond is not incorporated into the plan; and, not enough exits for the number of houses in the plan.

Garth Krisman, 32 Bramble Crescent. Mr. Krisman has written the word "rejected" on the Notice of Public Meeting.

The TRCA has advised in letters dated June 5/00 and May 31/02 that they are not in a position to recommend approval of the planning applications until such time as the Functional Servicing Study for this quadrant is finalized and the limits to development have been established. The Authority Staff have advised that they are in receipt of a revised Functional Servicing Study and are now reviewing the document consistent with the requirements of the TRCA's Valley & Stream Corridor Management Program and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.

The York Region District School Board, in a letter dated January 28/02, has identified that there are no requirements to locate a school within this plan of subdivision.

The York Catholic District School Board, in a letter dated February 12/02, has indicated that they wish to secure a Block of land from the subdivision, to the rear of the present St. Mark Separate Elementary School fronting onto the east side of West Lawn Crescent, for school purposes. The subdivision plan, which has been revised on May 10/02 and certified by an Ontario Land Surveyor, now excludes the lands requested by the School Board from the subdivision holding. It would appear that these lands have already been transferred to the York Catholic District School Board consistent with their earlier request.

Enbridge Consumers Gas, in a letter dated January 14/02, has requested the inclusion of several standard design conditions into any future subdivision agreement. The standards include the preparation of an overall utility plan to the satisfaction of the affected authorities, and, the necessary field survey information required for the installation of the gas lines.

Canada Post, in a letter dated February 7/02, has outlined Conditions to Draft Plan Approval that they wish to be included in any future decision rendered by the Town. These Conditions are representative of design matters associated with the development of neighbourhood super mail box facilities.

Rogers Cable, in a letter dated January 16/02, has indicated no objections to the proposal.

Hydro One, in a letter received on January 25/02, has indicated no objections to the proposal.

Shaw Cablesystems, in a letter dated May 30/00, has requested the desire to review and comment on the composite utility plans that will be prepared for future infrastructure and utility services necessary to support the development of the subject lands.

Ministry of Transportation, in a letter dated June 28/00, has stated that they have no comments to offer.

A memorandum dated January 2/02 has been received from the Fire Department advising that they have no objections.

Electronic mail, dated February 11/02, has been received from the Leisure Services Department advising that a small parkette near the centre of the subdivision is required due to the lack of parkland facilities in the NW Quadrant.

FURTHER NOTICE:

The Mayor advised that any persons wishing further notice must print their name, address with postal code and telephone number on the sheets provided in the lobby.

Requests for further notification:

Donna Topping, 344 Glad Park Avenue, Stouffville, L4A 1E6
David & Lori Brooker, 125 Glengall Lane, Stouffville, L4A 1W5
Nora McElroy, 138 Booth Drive, Stouffville, L4A 4R8
Leonel Fonseca, 341 Hoover Park Drive, Stouffville, L4A 1L3
Elizabeth Ward, 353 Hoover Park Drive, Stouffville, L4A 1L3
Bryan Millsip, 97 Rose Avenue, Stouffville, L4A 4J6
Duncan MacLean, 391 Glad Park Avenue, Stouffville, L4A 1E9
Colin MacLennan, 472 Elm Road, Stouffville, L4A 2S1
Walley Hayes, 4 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K4
John Pander, 108 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K5

Requests for further notification from the meeting of June 25, 2002:

Susanne & Ian Hilton, 383 Elm Road, Stouffville, L4A 1E7
Carole & John Sherwood, 514 Elm Road, Stouffville, L4A 1W8

Garth M. Krisman, 32 Bramble Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 7Y5
Paul Davies, 135 Winlane Drive, Stouffville, L4A 1W9
Philippe Guillard, 613 Elm Road, Stouffville, L4A 1W9
Don Beauchamp & Pat Beauchamp, 501 Elm Road, Stouffville, L4A 2S3
John Lilleberg, 515 Elm Road, Stouffville, L4A 1W8
Rheal Duprey & Kathy Spada, 612 Elm Road, Stouffville, L4A 1W7
William Child, 123 O'Brien Avenue, Stouffville, L4A 4J8
Jim Priebe, 356 Glad Park Avenue, Stouffville, L4A 1E6
L. Beauchamp, 42 Geoffrey Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 5C1
Fred Robbins, 12392 Ninth Line, Stouffville, L4A 1C1
Frank & Marg Daigle, 72 Aspen Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 5C7
Liam & Hilda Kelly, 148 Alderwood Street, Stouffville, L4A 5E3
Susan Kaunismaa, 99 Wheeler Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1L4
Corrina Dilisi, 642 Elm Road, Stouffville, L4A 1A3
Keith A. McMinn, 212 Hwy 47, Goodwood, L0C 1A0
Jill McWhinnie, P. O. Box 378, Stouffville, L4A 7Z6
Randy Mole, 128 Rose Avenue, Stouffville, L4A 8A4

Requests for further notification from letters received:

Margaret & Wally Hayes, 8 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K4
Chris & Sharron Thomas, 85 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K5
Gary & Connie McQuaid, 37 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K4
Bryan & Laura Gray, 28 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K4
Linda Marano, 21 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K4
B. Rgds/Paul Greco, 111 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K5
John & Aileen Pander, 108 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K5
Kenneth George Green, Janet Joyce Green, 12606 Ninth Line, R. R. 2, Stouffville L4A 7X3
Glen MacMillan, 94 Geoffrey Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 5B9
Jason & Elaine Richardson, 158 Burkholder Street, Stouffville L4A 4J4
Doris L. Morden, 99 Millard Street, Stouffville L4A 4Y7
Jane Arsenseau, 6601 Main St, Apt 1, Stouffville, L4A 6A8
Victor J. Richardson, 299 Sunset Blvd., Stouffville L4A 3A4
Jeremy Wideman, c/o Alsop Insurance Brokers Inc., 6224 Main Street, Stouffville L4A 2S4
Joyce Reesor Turman, 618 Millard Street, Stouffville, L4A 7Y3
Gladys Jackson, 12455 Ninth Line, #A103, Stouffville, L4A 1J3
T. Vohl, 459 Elm Road, Stouffville, L4A 2S2
William Menar, 539 Elm Road, Stouffville L4A 1W8
Mac GlenMillan, 94 Geoffrey Cres. Stouffville L4A 5B9
Daniel A. Neale, 104 O'Brien Avenue, Stouffville L4A 4J7

GENERAL QUESTIONS:

The following people had questions and/or concerns:

Sandra Mathers, 111 Westlawn Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1E9
John Donovan, 295 Loretta Crescent, Stouffville L4A 1H4
Ted Dennis, 449 Elm Road, Stouffville L4A 2S2
Eliza De Souza, 16 Jacob Way, Stouffville L4A 1L1
Paul Davies, 135 Winlane Drive, Stouffville L4A 1W9
Duncan MacLean, 391 Glad Park Avenue, Stouffville L4A 1E9
Victor Goldman, 465 Elm Road, Stouffville L4A 2S3
Nora McElroy, 138 Booth Drive, Stouffville L4A 4R8
Susan Robertson, 533 Rupert Avenue, Stouffville L4A 1V3

The following people had questions and or concerns at the meeting of June 25, 2002:

Dave Brooker, 125 Glengall Lane, Stouffville L4A 1W5
William Child, 123 O'Brien Avenue, Stouffville, L4A 4J8
Susan Robertson, 533 Rupert Avenue, Stouffville, L4A 1V3
Mark Lakin, 103 O'Brien Avenue, Stouffville L4A 4J8
Joan Gomes, 2299 York Road 30, Stouffville L4A 7X4
Edwin Auch, 584 Rupert Avenue, Stouffville L4A 1W5
William Menar, 539 Elm Road, Stouffville L4A 1W8
Cathy Passafiume, 60 Aspen Crescent, Stouffville L4A 5C7
Kathy Moyer, 161 Bramble Crescent, Stouffville L4A 7Z3
Jim Priebe, 356 Glad Park Avenue, Stouffville L4A 1E6
Mary Catherine Ramsden, 8 Bramble Crescent, Stouffville L4A 7Y6
Joseph Rao, 6660 Main Street, Stouffville L4A 7W9
Frank Daigle, 72 Aspen Crescent, Stouffville L4A 5C7
Terry Epp, 595 Elm Road, Stouffville L4A 1W9
Tammy Thornton, 145 Alderwood Street, Stouffville L4A 5E5
Jill McWhinnie, 50 Westlawn Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1T2
Susanne Hilton, 383 Elm Road, Stouffville L4A 1E7
Daphne Goldman, 465 Elm Road, Stouffville L4A 2S3
Kathy Moyer, 161 Bramble Crescent, Stouffville L4A 7Z3
Randy Mole, 128 Rose Avenue, Stouffville L4A 8A4
Fred Robbins, 12392 Ninth Line, Stouffville L4A 1C1
K. Johnston, 67 Geoffrey Crescent, Stouffville L4A 5C1

Inquiries and comments related to:

- Do not want "cookie cutter" style of development - Need better grid pattern
- Construction vehicles must not be allowed to use existing streets
- Cannot visualize the proposed traffic patterns and street layout
- Unreasonable pressure will be put on existing streets

- Overflow parking will be a problem on streets
- Parking concern now with the apartments at Winlane Drive
- Not viable to increase traffic in this area
- There are not enough parks being planned and they are too small
- Lot sizes should be minimum of 40' to 60' in width
- Keep "County Close to the City" and reduce density and form of development
- Concern with some easements that back onto existing lots (issue to be addressed)
- Water supply and ability to service new areas
- Protection of greenlands, animals, water and sensitive environmental areas
- Existing homes could devalue with density
- Proposed roads are too narrow
- There is concern for children walking to school
- Suggestion that developers be required to supply environmental friendly faucettes, low flush toilets and compost containers.
- Development does not tie into the existing homes and the design is not compatible
- Natural pond must be preserved

Inquiries and comments from the meeting of June 25, 2002

- Why are there water restrictions if the Town is proposing large new developments? (The rates and restrictions are in accordance with Region wide water control)
- More recreational areas are needed in parklands (all existing park systems are being reviewed throughout the Town to determine requirements).
- Consideration requested for traffic lights in more areas.
- The speed of traffic must be controlled.
- Will there be by-pass roads and where will the roads be? (access will be from the Ninth Line, Glad Park Avenue, West Lawn Crescent and Winlane Drive)
- Where will stop signs be located? (additional stops will be at Highway #48 and Millard Street in the future).
- Not in keeping with the OPA if plans are to double existing number of homes. Too many homes being planned per hectare. (All planning is in conformity with official plans).
- Main Street cannot handle the additional cars that this development would bring. It is not designed to take more traffic.
- Development charges only cover some expenses. Crime, loss of community, safety, infrastructure upgrades will all be affected.
- Trying to ad affordable housing to this community will fail. Prices will still be too high for many families.
- Existing roads need improving prior to building new ones.
- Why is there no industrial or commercial building which would help with taxes? (The south/west quadrant is where the industrial and commercial will be located. Development proposals for this area will be coming to Council later in the year).
- Are there going to be townhouses or semi-detached in this development? (This proposal is for 329 single detached dwellings).
- Lot sizes should be larger.
- Density not wanted and it will affect parks and schools.

- Do trees have to be removed? (most agriculture hedgerows can be incorporated - parkettes to include trees).
- Did people understand what the Secondary Plan was about? (numerous public meeting information sessions were held).
- Is a Catholic School planned for this area? (The York Catholic District School Board have indicated that they wish to secure a block of land to the rear of the present St. Mark school fronting onto the east side of West Lawn Crescent for school purposes).
- The York Region District School Board have advised that there are no requirements to locate a school within this plan of subdivision. (The School Boards are requested to give input on all new development).
- Desire for sidewalks on all roads.
- Community centre needed for teens. Youth must be taken into consideration in addition to parkettes.
- Large developments are not wanted in Stouffville. Concerns relate to infra-structure, greenlands, new homes bordering on existing homes.
- Rural lands should remain for agriculture use. Concern for ponds, streams, trees that could be affected.
- Area neighbours do not want the crowding that will occur on streets, parks, schools, etc.

IN SUPPORT:

Fred Robbins, 12392 Ninth Line, Stouffville L4A 1C1 expressed support for this development. It was noted that he was involved with the Urban Design Guidelines and believes that this is the best plan at this time with proposed lots being 36' to 40' in width which is larger than some other plans for development. A concern was noted that Millard Street needs to be opened to Highway #48 as soon as possible.

IN OPPOSITION:

Jill McWhinnie, 50 Westlawn Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 7Z6
Karen Lepard, 131 Westlawn Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1E9
David Brooker, 125 Glengall Lane, Stouffville, L4A 1W4
John Lowrie, 12165 Tenth Line, Stouffville L4A 6B9

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE IN OPPOSITION WAS RECEIVED FROM:

Carole & John Sherwood, 514 Elm Road, Stouffville L4A 1W8
Jim W. Priebe, 356 Glad Park Avenue, Stouffville L4A 1E6
Pat & Don Beauchamp, 501 Elm Road, Stouffville
Kenneth George Green & Janet Joyce Green, 12606 Ninth Line, Stouffville L4A 7X3
Sig & Teresa Kusatz, 100 Burkholder Street, Stouffville L4A 4J7
Michelle Davies, 135 Winlane Drive, Stouffville L4A with a petition signed by 25 youth

RESPONSE FROM THE APPLICANT:

Steve Wimmer, Allan Kimble and Kevin Phillips, Agents for the Owner noted that some lots will be 36' and 40' in width and extra deep with rear yard garages. Plans are being designed for some homes to view the parkette. Concerns relating to open space, ponds and natural environment are being addressed. Traffic studies have been conducted based on future and existing traffic patterns. They do not foresee problems with any of the Main Street intersections. A new storm water management pond will be built to the west and will be larger than what is presently there. The Little Rouge is being protected with a 100 metre buffer.

MOVED by Councillor Dunkeld
SECONDED by Councillor Bowes

THAT the Minutes of the June 25th, 2002 Public Information Meeting convened for File Nos. 19T(W)-98003 & ZBA00.006 be included as comments received from members of the public for the purposes of the July 23rd, 2002 Public Meeting;

AND THAT all Public and Agency comments be referred to Staff for a future Report regarding the disposition of this matter.

CARRIED.

**2. PROPOSED PLAN OF SUBDIVISION & ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT
VARKIM DEVELOPMENTS INC., 1366790 ONTARIO INC. & LEILA FEMSON
Part of Lots 32, 33 & 34, Concession 8 (M), Community of Stouffville
File Nos. 19T(W)-01.003 & ZBA01.015 (C10-DV & D12)**

NOTICE GIVEN:

The Acting Clerk advised the procedure by which notice was given.

PURPOSE:

The Planner advised that the purpose of the meeting is to obtain public and agency comments with respect to a proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment as submitted by Varkim Developments Inc., 1366790 Ontario Inc. & Leila Femson.

The subject lands are located in Part of Lots 32, 33 & 34, Concession 8 (M), within the southwest quadrant of the community of Stouffville. The land area of the development parcel totals approximately 90.239 hectares (222.97 acres).

The development proposal envisages the creation of 791 residences comprised of single detached, semi-detached and townhouse dwelling units as well as three Blocks totaling 8.16 hectares (20.2 acres) for employment / business park uses. Blocks will also be created for storm detention facilities, park facilities, an elementary school site, a secondary school site, and the greenland system. The proposed development of the subject lands will be serviced by municipal water and sanitary sewage infrastructure.

Access into the development lands will be provided from the Ninth Line and the extension southerly of West Lawn Crescent. In the future, extensions southerly of Mostar Street and Sandiford Drive have been accommodated in the proposed road / lot layout of the plan of subdivision. It is proposed that part of the extension of the mid-block collector road, Hoover Park Drive, westerly from the Ninth Line to the Little Rouge River, will be constructed as part of this development initiative. It is anticipated that the balance of Hoover Park Drive, including the crossing over the Little Rouge River, will be constructed when the adjacent property to the west is developed.

The subject lands will be developed and released in a series of phases by the Town in consultation with review agencies (ie: School Boards, Region of York, Conservation Authority). The Town will utilize the provision of Holding (-h) symbols as a suffix to the zone classification under the authority of Section 36 of the *Planning Act* to allow for the co-ordinated release of lands for development purposes. It is anticipated that the lands will be developed over a seven to ten year time horizon.

The development of the property is contingent upon completion of the Ninth Line York Durham Sanitary Sewer (9th Line YDSS) project. At present, the Stouffville Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP) is operating near its design limit. With the completion of the 9th Line YDSS project, new development lands can be serviced. It is anticipated at present that the 9th Line YDSS project will be completed in the last quarter of 2003.

The Zoning By-law Amendment proposes to rezone the subject lands from Rural (RU) to Residential Low Density Two (R2), Residential Low Density Eight (R8), Residential Low Density Nine (R9), Residential Shallow Nine (RS9), Residential Medium Density Ten (R10), Residential Shallow Four (RS4), Open Space (OS), Institutional (I), Industrial Light (IL) and Open Space Environmental (OSE).

The residential classifications, as identified, will permit single detached dwelling units, save and except the RS4, RS9 and R10 Zones. It is proposed that the RS9 and R10 Zones will permit semi-detached dwellings, while the RS4 Zone will permit townhouse dwelling units. The zone standards for the residential classifications can be summarized as follows:

Zone Classification	Minimum Lot Frontage	Minimum Lot Area
R2	12 metres (39.4 ft.)	370 sq.metres (3983 sq.ft.)
R8	11 metres (36 ft.)	335 sq.metres (3606 sq.ft.)
R9	9.1 metres (29.8 ft.)	275 sq.metres (2960 sq.ft.)
R10	7.5 metres (24.6 ft.)	228 sq.metres (2454 sq.ft.)
RS9	7.5 metres (24.6 ft.)	195 sq.metres (2099 sq.ft.)
RS4	6.4 metres (20.9 ft.)	161 sq.metres (1733 sq.ft.)

The (R8), (R9), (R10), (RS9) and (RS4) Zones are new residential zone classifications that are proposed to be added to General Zoning By-law 87-34.

Council, as part of their consideration of the Zoning By-law Amendment to implement the development of the subdivision, may phase the release of parcels of land. Under this scenario, portions of the land area may be subject to Holding (-h) provisions to allow for phased development. The release of the Holding (-h) symbol could be contingent upon matters such as: water supply and infrastructure improvements; adequacy of the road network; school accommodation; etc.

The (OS) Zone recognizes lands that will be transferred to the Town for the purposes of parkland, a stormwater management facility and public view corridors.

The (I) Zone recognizes two blocks of land to be dedicated to the York Region District School Board for a secondary school site and an elementary school site.

The (OSE) Zone recognizes lands associated with the Little Rouge River and tributary which traverses the subject property and tableland woodlots. No buildings or structures, except for flood or erosion control purposes, are permitted within lands zoned OSE.

The (IL) Zone recognizes lands on the west side of the Little Rouge River adjacent the Highway No. 48 corridor that are to be set aside for employment purposes. Permitted uses within this zone include: business offices, warehousing, manufacturing, adult retraining schools, dry cleaning or laundry establishments, private clubs and accessory commercial uses. No outside storage is permitted within this zone classification.

As of the date of submitting this Report for inclusion in the July 23rd Public Meeting Agenda, only one piece of correspondence has been received.

Don Given, of the consulting firm of Malone Given Parsons Ltd., acting on behalf of 1147796 Ontario Ltd. (Landowner to the immediate south of the Varkim Development Inc. et al lands), has raised concerns that the plan of subdivision as proposed does not allow for portions of his Client's lands to be accessed. This matter should be resolved prior to the final consideration of the draft plan proposal.

The TRCA has advised in letters dated June 5/00 and May 31/02, that they are not in a position to recommend approval of the planning applications until such time as the Functional Servicing Study for this quadrant is finalized and the limits to development have been established. The Authority Staff have advised that they are in receipt of a revised Functional Servicing Study and are now reviewing the document consistent with the requirements of the TRCA's Valley & Stream Corridor Management Program and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.

The York Region District School Board, in letters dated January 28/02 and July 15/02 have identified that there is a need for an elementary school and a secondary school within the plan. The School Board has raised concerns about the configuration of the property boundary for the secondary school site and that it may have to be re-oriented to achieve their objectives.

The York Catholic District School Board has advised that they do not require a school site within this plan.

Enbridge Consumers Gas, in a letter dated January 14/02, have requested the inclusion of several standard design conditions into any future subdivision agreement. The standards include the preparation of an overall utility plan to the satisfaction of the affected authorities, and, the necessary field survey information required for the installation of the gas lines.

Canada Post, in a letter dated February 7/02, has outlined Conditions to Draft Plan Approval that they wish to be included in any future decision rendered by the Town. These Conditions are representative of design matters associated with the development of neighbourhood super mail box facilities.

Rogers Cable, in a letter dated January 16/02, has indicated no objections to the proposal.

Hydro One, in a letter received on January 25/02, has indicated no objections to the proposal.

Shaw Cablesystems, in a letter dated May 30/00, has requested the desire to review and comment on the composite utility plans that will be prepared for future infrastructure and utility services necessary to support the development of the subject lands.

Ministry of Transportation has advised that they will be forwarding comments to the Town within the next 2 to 3 week period.

A memorandum dated January 2/02 has been received from the Fire Department advising that they have no objections.

Electronic mail, dated February 11/02, has been received from the Leisure Services Department advising that they support the creation of a neighbourhood park site and linkages to the area greenlands system.

FURTHER NOTICE:

The Mayor advised that any persons wishing further notice must print their name, address with postal code and telephone number on the sheets provided in the lobby.

Requests for further notification:

Donna Topping, 344 Glad Park Avenue, Stouffville, L4A 1E6
David & Lori Brooker, 125 Glengall Lane, Stouffville, L4A 1W5
Nora McElroy, 138 Booth Drive, Stouffville, L4A 4R8
Leonel Fonseca, 341 Hoover Park Drive, Stouffville, L4A 1L3
Elizabeth Ward, 353 Hoover Park Drive, Stouffville, L4A 1L3
Bryan Millsip, 97 Rose Avenue, Stouffville, L4A 4J6
Walley Hayes, 4 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K4
John Pander, 108 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 1K5

RESPONSE FROM THE APPLICANT:

John Bousfield, Planning Consultant for the Proponent noted that the draft plans are reflective of the Town Secondary Plan. There will be seven different lot sizes and three different home types. The variety will be mixed through out the plan with some properties having rear yard garages. The overall draft plan was reviewed, noting the streets, parkettes, and home styles.

GENERAL QUESTIONS:

The following people had questions and or concerns:

John Lowrie, 12165 Tenth Line, Stouffville L4A 6B9
David Brooker, 125 Glengall Lane, Stouffville, L4A 1W5
Glen McMillan, 94 Geoffrey Crescent, Stouffville, L4A 5B9
Jim Cowan, 12150 Ninth Line, Stouffville, L4A 7X3
Nora McElroy, 138 Booth Drive, Stouffville, L4A 4R8
Don Given, Malone Given Parsons Ltd., 140 Renfrew Drive, Suite #201, Markham
L3R 6B3 representative for 1147796 Ont. Ltd.

Inquiries and comments related to:

- How many additional schools will be needed and where will they be built.
- Will this development affect the Parkview Seniors Complex.
- The type of businesses that would be allowed were questioned. Each proposal is dealt with at the Site Plan Control stage and includes a range of office and light manufacturing options.
- Adequate supply of water was a concern.
- Traffic congestion associated with only one exit from the Ninth Line.
- The Ninth Line should be made into a four lane road.
- More public transportation is needed. (York Region Transit and GO Transit are being consulted for future requirements).
- The development is too dense.
- Abutting landowners need to have input on the rear lots of bordering homes.

IN SUPPORT:

There were no persons present who wished to speak in support.

IN OPPOSITION:

John Donovan, 295 Loretta Crescent, Stouffville L4A 1H4
John Pander, 108 Katherine Crescent, Stouffville L4A 1K5
Jeanne Major, 65 O'Brien Avenue, Stouffville L4A 4J8

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE IN OPPOSITION:

Sig & Teresa Kusatz, 100 Burkholder Street, Stouffville L4A 4J7
Jim Priebe, 356 Glad Park Avenue, Stouffville L4A 1E6

MOVED by Councillor Carroll
SECONDED by Councillor Sherban

THAT all Public and Agency comments be referred to Staff for a future Report regarding the disposition of this matter.

CARRIED.

CONFIRMATORY BY-LAW

MOVED by Councillor Dobrich
SECONDED by Councillor Bowes

THAT Confirmatory By-law 2002-131-MS read a first, second and third time.

CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor Pliakes
SECONDED by Councillor Carroll

THAT there being no further business, the Council Public Hearing be adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

CARRIED.

DATED at the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville this day of , 2002.

Mayor

Clerk