

## Minutes

### Planning Committee Minutes of 12/9/19

Location:	Tom Davies Square - Council Chambers
Commencement:	1:03 PM
Adjournment:	2:47 PM

## Councillor Cormier, In the Chair

Present Councillors McCausland, Kirwan, Cormier, Landry-Altman  
Councillor Leduc [A 2:33 p.m., D 2:42 p.m.]

City Officials Jason Ferrigan, Director of Planning Services; Robert Webb, Supervisor of Development Engineering; Kris Longston, Manager of Community and Strategic Planning; Wendy Kaufman, Senior Planner; Ed Landry, Senior Planner of Community and Strategic Planning; Mauro Manzon, Senior Planner; Glen Ferguson, Senior Planner; Brigitte Sobush, Manager of Clerk's Services/Deputy City Clerk; Lisa Locken, Clerk's Services Assistant; Nia Lewis, Clerk's Services Assistant

## DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

None declared.

## Public Hearings

1 LaSalle Boulevard Corridor Strategy - Associated Official Plan Amendment No. 102

**The Planning Committee meeting was adjourned and the Public Hearing was opened to deal with the following application:**

Report dated November 18, 2019 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding LaSalle Boulevard Corridor Strategy - Associated Official Plan Amendment No. 102.

Ed Landry, Senior Planner of Community and Strategic Planning, outlined the report.

### Planning Department Response to Committee Questions:

In response to questions from a Committee Member, Jason Ferrigan, Director of Planning Services, stated that with regards to existing rural cross-sections and Council's desire to transform them to urban cross-sections, if these changes are approved by Council they will set a different direction to the types of uses and the level of intensification and physical

change that the City is hoping to see. Mr. Ferrigan advised that these policies will primarily engage when development applications are advanced within the City and the City would use them to evaluate development applications. Mr. Ferrigan advised that when the changes are approved, they would be used to inform other policies and practices at the City, in particular around capital planning or the sidewalk priority index or urban to rural cross-sections.

Mr. Landry stated that the City is already seeing change along Lasalle Blvd. and that in some ways this is the City catching up to the changes it has seen over the years. Mr. Landry advised that one of the main thrusts of the Lasalle corridor study, as well as this official plan amendment, is to bring in the policy framework to transform Lasalle Blvd. from a go-through street to a go-to street and make it destination based.

Mr. Ferrigan stated that it is his understanding that the City's traffic and transportation group is developing a plan to track the difference in vehicular traffic on Lasalle Boulevard now that Maley Drive is open and that information will likely go to Council through the Operating Committee.

Mr. Landry stated that some of the major differences the City will see, changing from Living Area 1 to these regional corridors, is in the area from the taxation centre to Starlight Avenue, which is essentially neighbourhoods, fully serviced and small scale commercial. Mr. Landry advised that people are inquiring with the City about what kind of commercial uses they can put in the area and currently they're limited in the City's Official Plan policy to approximately 1,500 square feet. If they want to go larger, bigger, than they are required to come in for an Official Plan Amendment which takes time and takes money.

Mr. Landry advised that typically the City's land-use designations don't follow property fabric and at this time Pioneer Manor is still designated as Institutional. Mr. Landry further advised that some of the changes will become clear once staff comes back next year with the proposed zoning changes. Mr. Landry stated that there was a memo as part of the Lasalle Corridor Strategy that introduced the idea of mixed-use zone 1, mixed-use zone 2 and mixed-use zone 3 and this official plan amendment introduced the vision. How it will be implemented will be further clarified through zoning changes.

Mr. Ferrigan stated that the boundaries for this particular study were set some time ago, approximately 24 months ago, and the boundaries were drawn consistent with the intent of the study. Mr. Ferrigan stated that there are a broad range of uses that are permitted. One of the earlier intents of the study, listening to feedback from Planning Committee, was the concept of "up-zoning". He advised that one reason staff is doing this study is to look at the commercial elements of the corridor to determine what land use policy changes staff could make to "up-zone" them to allow a broader range of uses and activities to occur and in exchange for that, different urban design elements. Mr. Ferrigan advised that one of the key changes, if these policies are approved and when they come into effect, is over time as people begin to redevelop sites or develop sites the City will see buildings that are closer to the street than they are today. Mr. Ferrigan stated that because this study focused on commercial areas, the boundary was drawn not to include Pioneer Manor. Mr. Ferrigan advised that Council's deliberations around Pioneer Manor is something that staff is watching closely. Mr. Ferrigan advised that ultimately, the designations within the plans and the boundaries of the designations within the plans are choices that are made by City Council. Mr. Ferrigan advised that staff will be coming back in Q1 2020 with the final amendment, including text and mapping, at that time, should Planning Committee wish to recommend to Council a change in the boundary it can do so. Mr. Ferrigan advised that the one risk associated with doing that is the study itself has not examined that question so Council would be making that change

without the benefit of having any supporting information to make that decision.

Mr. Ferrigan advised that there are two possibilities, one possibility is to continue with the current time-frame of approximately seven years from start to finish, taking one corridor per year and one town centre per year. The City is beginning to implement the first phase of that seven-phase strategy. Mr. Ferrigan advised that the second possibility would be to pull up a little bit higher and look at some of the decisions that City Council has made since the November 2016 report and look at the City's land-use designations at a city-wide level. He advised that what you lose in a process like that is the level of understanding about the parcel fabric, what exists on ground and how the potential for the policy and the policy changes interact with that physical reality that exists. Mr. Ferrigan advised that there is a different risk associated with that, if City Council is making decisions that are more broad-based, he advised that there would be an increase in the potential that when those changes are made there is a little more friction in the system to interact with what exists today. Mr. Ferrigan advised that the Planning Committee can give direction to staff to do a study like that as part of the 2020 or the 2021 budget process. He advised that if it is the 2020 budget it would require re-prioritization of the projects that are set-out in the 2020 budget.

Mr. Landry advised that one area within the strategy is what the City calls Business Industrial Zoning, which is not necessarily manufacturing, but the City is already seeing a transformation to other uses.

Mr. Ferrigan advised that some of the lands are designated mixed-use commercial. He advised that what the Official Plan says in a mixed-use environment is that all uses are permitted, with the exception of heavy industrial and staff rely on the zoning to implement that policy direction. Mr. Ferrigan stated that in one particular case a choice was made in 2010 to maintain the M1-1 zone to give Planning Committee and City Council an opportunity to see proposals as they came forward. He advised that what they found was that friction was introduced in the system where perhaps friction didn't need to be introduced. Mr. Ferrigan advised that from a policy perspective, what is being proposed, is to change that direction. He further advised that details of the strategy will come through the subsequent phase of work which is the actual change to the zoning. Mr. Ferrigan stated that if this policy amendment is approved in Q1 of 2020 then staff will begin the difficult work of then drafting the zoning by-law amendment to implement the policy framework. He stated that as part of that work, staff would be looking for existing land-use permissions and comparing that against the new vision that is articulated with this policy change to find an appropriate balance. He stated that what Council doesn't want to happen is to find themselves in a position where Council is bringing a zoning amendment forward where it inadvertently makes somebody legal non-conforming.

Mr. Ferrigan stated that conceptually staff will be looking to maintain what exists today in a limited form while then introducing other permissions which suggests to the market that Council has a different vision for what Lasalle Boulevard should look like in the fullness of time.

Mr. Ferrigan advised that the intent of this report was to receive feedback on the draft, including feedback from the Planning Committee. He advised that staff made note of the comments and will be looking at them through their work and commentary will be provided in the next report.

Mr. Landry stated that the strategy as a whole considers gateways. For example, it recommends that staff look that the City has a public art policy for which a draft and implementation plan is being considered by Council. He advised that once that is

implemented, staff would go back to the public art master plan and go through the different documents to see if there's a recommendation for a gateway feature for public art.

Mr. Ferrigan stated that looking at Planning in Greater Sudbury and in other communities across the Province, long term strategic planning projects typically see relatively lower levels of engagement given the nature of the project versus a development application which is proposing more tangible physical change that is closer to somebody's primary residence. He advised that in relation to the residents that did go to the public meetings, staff valued their insights and feedback. He advised that looking at it from a numbers perspective, that the level of engagement is consistent with the level of engagement that staff sees in other long-range planning policy initiatives, including the City's Official Plan.

The Chair asked whether there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favour or against this application and seeing none:

**The Public Hearing concerning this matter was closed and the Planning Committee resumed in order to discuss and vote on the application.**

The following resolution was presented:

PL2019-164 Kirwan/Landry-Altman: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury receives the comments and submissions made at the public hearing on File 701-6/19-5, as outlined in the report entitled "LaSalle Boulevard Corridor Strategy - Associated Official Plan Amendment No. 102" from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure, presented at the Planning Committee Meeting on December 9, 2019;

AND THAT the City of Greater Sudbury directs staff to complete their review of the application File 701-6/19-5 and return with a recommended Official Plan Amendment No. 102 before Planning Committee no later than the end of Q1, 2020.

**YEAS:** Councillors McCausland, Kirwan, Landry-Altman, Cormier  
**CARRIED**

Public comment was received and considered and had no effect on Planning Committee's decision as the application represents good planning.

2 1594784 Ontario Ltd. – Application for Zoning By-law Amendment in order to recognize an existing aggregate transfer site operating on the lands, 1942 Municipal Road #4, Worthington

**The Planning Committee meeting was adjourned and the Public Hearing was opened to deal with the following application:**

Report dated November 18, 2019 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding 1594784 Ontario Ltd. – Application for Zoning By-law Amendment in order to recognize an existing aggregate transfer site operating on the lands, 1942 Municipal Road #4, Worthington.

Jim Laroche, T. Bell Transport, and Ted Bell, T. Bell Transport, the applicants, were present.

Glen Ferguson, Senior Planner, outlined the report.

The Chair asked whether there was anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favour or against this application and seeing none:

**The Public Hearing concerning this matter was closed and the Planning Committee**

**resumed in order to discuss and vote on the application.**

The following resolution was presented:

PL2019-165 Landry-Altmann/Kirwan: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approves the application by 1594784 Ontario Ltd. to amend Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, by changing the zoning classification on the subject lands from "RU", Rural to "RU(S)", Rural Special on those lands described as PINs 73383-0090, 73383-0101, 73383-0324 & 73383-0326, Lot 3, Concession 2, Township of Drury, as outlined in the report entitled "1594784 Ontario Ltd.", from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure, presented at the Planning Committee meeting on December 9, 2019, subject to the following conditions:

1. That prior to the passing of an amending zoning by-law the owner shall enter into a site plan control agreement with the City to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning Services;
2. That the amending zoning by-law contain the following site-specific provisions:
  - a. That the only permitted use of the subject lands be an aggregate transfer site and directly related accessory uses;
  - b. That any further and appropriate relief that is required from parking provisions of the Zoning By-law be provided for accordingly; and,
  - c. That those lands described as PINs 73383-0090, 73383-0101, 73383-0324 & 73383-0326, Lot 3, Concession 2, Township of Drury be designated as a "Site Plan Control Area" under Section 41 of the Planning Act, R.S.O.
3. That conditional approval shall lapse on September 24, 2021 unless Condition #1 above has been met or an extension has been granted by Council.

**YEAS:** Councillors McCausland, Kirwan, Landry-Altmann, Cormier

**CARRIED**

As no public comment, written or oral, was received, there was no effect on the Planning Committee's decision.

- 3 William Day Holdings Limited - Application for rezoning in order to permit a private elementary school and preschool, 1096 Dublin Street, Sudbury

**The Planning Committee meeting was adjourned and the Public Hearing was opened to deal with the following application:**

Report dated November 18, 2019 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding William Day Holdings Limited - Application for rezoning in order to permit a private elementary school and preschool, 1096 Dublin Street, Sudbury.

Luke Morse, Sudbury Christian Academy, the applicant, was present.

Mauro Manzon, Senior Planner, outlined the report.

Planning Department Response to Committee Questions:

In response to questions from a Committee Member, Mr. Manzon stated that the applicant's request is that zoning revert back to institutional. The City has special zoning that allows for alternative development scenarios, but it is not the applicant's intent to encompass a broad range of uses beyond institutional.

Mr. Manzon stated that there is no significant increase in the size of the building or the usability of the site and as such there is no basis, in his opinion, under the Planning Act to implement site plan control. In a situation where you have much smaller enrollment where there is no expansion to the built form proposed, implementing site plan control would not be a reasonable condition.

Mr. Manzon stated that introducing site plan control would be another layer of approvals which would potentially delay the start-up of the school. It would represent significant costs to the applicant and may set up for the basis of an appeal. The *Planning Act* does speak in very general terms about substantially increasing the usability of the site or the size of the building but in this instance this application would not meet those criteria.

Mr. Ferrigan, Director of Planning Services, stated that when the City looks at either development or redevelopment of a property through site plan, it is an opportunity for the City to use that tool to apply its modern community building standards to development. In terms of concrete examples, if this development were subjected to site plan the City would be looking at things such as the adequacy of landscaping and its ability to meet current standards. The City would be looking at how vehicles enter and exit the site, whether or not the required parking areas are sufficiently paved, and importantly stormwater management. However, as a City practice and to build Mr. Manzon's answer, the *Planning Act* is clear, the City can apply site plan when somebody is substantially increasing the usability of a property. Therefore, in terms of formulating the recommendation for this application, given all the differences between the former school and the proposed institutional use of the property, the City did not see a public interest rationale to imposing site plan because it is a lower intensity use than formerly existed on the property.

Mr. Manzon stated that given the size of the school and the limited amount of parking that is required, there are opportunities to re-green portions of the site and the applicant, through their cover letter, has advised that it is something that they are looking at in terms of future improvements. Mr. Manzon advised that the perimeter of the site does have existing green buffer along the north limit of the property which extends to Junction Creek along the southerly limit and this buffering will remain in place. In general, there was not a tremendous concern on the part of the City's drainage section in addressing quality and quantity of stormwater.

Mr. Manzon stated that there is no significant site alterations proposed with the application. The vegetative buffering would remain in place and no development is permitted within the flood plain designation, which includes a regulated area. Mr. Manzon advised that you can achieve certain improvements through a zoning provision that could be added to the site specific zoning in lieu of site plan.

#### Applicant or Agent's Comments and Response to Committee Questions:

Mr. Morse stated that although the school is fairly small, it does have a desire to expand its athletics program and to re-green the athletic field, which is mostly gravel at this point, for the purposes of a soccer field and also the space to the north tucked away in the L-shape back, which is currently paved, for the purposes of a preschool. Mr. Morse stated that the school has a good relationship with some local greenhouses and growers and would like to add some more tree planters to the yard if that meets the intended use of the space.

Mr. Morse stated that in the short-term the school intends to primarily use the space surrounding the courtyard and is still exploring best uses of the space in the easterly wing for school purposes. Mr. Morse advised that the school has no intention, at this point, of

incorporating a retirement residence facility. Mr. Morse further advised that the school has a desire to be a good neighbour and to provide good outreach opportunities for the neighbourhood to involve themselves in the school programming. If there is an opportunity for a senior's group, for example, to utilize the space, either for their own purposes or as part of a reading program, the school has considered those options.

Public Comments:

Kevin Squires, concerned resident, expressed safety concerns over the slope of the grade from the school to his property. Mr. Squires believes that the order issued by the LPAT should be enforced and that the applicant be required to install a guardrail as dictated in the LPAT decision.

Lori Ridley, concerned resident, expressed safety concerns and would like, as a condition to the rezoning, the requirement of the installation of a guardrail and fence in accordance with the order set out in the LPAT decision.

*At 2:33 p.m., Councillor Leduc arrived.*

Councillor Bill Leduc expressed his support of Kevin Squires and Lori Ridley and their safety concerns. Councillor Leduc requested that an amendment be done to require the installation of a guardrail, however he advised that he doesn't believe the fencing is necessary.

Applicant or Agent's Closing Remarks:

Mr. Morse stated that in the school's conversations with their neighbours, the school indicated that it is more than happy to install a guardrail along the south side of the driveway and the neighbours will find that the school is true to it's word.

The Chair asked whether there was anyone else in the audience who wished to speak in favour or against this application and seeing none:

**The Public Hearing concerning this matter was closed and the Planning Committee resumed in order to discuss and vote on the application.**

*At 2:42, Councillor Leduc departed.*

The following resolution was presented:

PL2019-166 Kirwan/Landry-Altman: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approves the application by William Day Holdings Limited (Agent: Sudbury Christian Schools Inc.) to amend Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, by changing the zoning classification from "R4(9)", High Density Residential Special to "I(Special)", Institutional Special on lands described as PIN 02124-0103, Part 1, Plan SR-713, Lot 18, Plan M-382 in Lot 2, Concession 5, Township of McKim, as outlined in the report entitled "William Day Holdings Limited" from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure, presented at the Planning Committee meeting on December 9, 2019, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the location of the existing building shall be permitted; and,
2. That existing landscaped open space including planting strips shall be permitted.

Rules of Procedure

Councillor Landry-Altman presented the following amendment:

PL2019-166-A1 Landry-Altman/Kirwan: THAT the resolution be amended to add a third and

fourth condition as follows:

3. THAT a steel guardrail, constructed in a manner consistent with applicable provincial standards, to prevent vehicles leaving the traveled portion of the south driveway, adjacent to the slope, to be constructed along the south boundary of the south driveway, as it extends to the north and the length of Part 1 on Plan 53R-3835, PIN 02124-0158; and
4. THAT a board-to-board fence of quality materials, at the maximum height permitted by the City's By-law(s) relating to fences shall be constructed along the length of the north boundary of Part 1 on Plan 53R-3835, PIN 02124-0158.

**YEAS:** Councillors McCausland, Kirwan, Landry-Altmann, Cormier  
**CARRIED**

The resolution as amended was presented:

Rules of Procedure

With the concurrence of the Committee, the reading of the resolution was waived:

PL2019-166 Kirwan/Landry-Altmann: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approves the application by William Day Holdings Limited (Agent: Sudbury Christian Schools Inc.) to amend Zoning By-law 2010-100Z, by changing the zoning classification from "R4(9)", High Density Residential Special to "I(Special)", Institutional Special on lands described as PIN 02124-0103, Part 1, Plan SR-713, Lot 18, Plan M-382 in Lot 2, Concession 5, Township of McKim, as outlined in the report entitled "William Day Holdings Limited" from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure, presented at the Planning Committee meeting on December 9, 2019, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the location of the existing building shall be permitted;
2. That existing landscaped open space including planting strips shall be permitted;
3. That a steel guardrail, constructed in a manner consistent with applicable provincial standards, to prevent vehicles leaving the traveled portion of the south driveway, adjacent to the slope, to be constructed along the south boundary of the south driveway, as it extends to the north and the length of Part 1 on Plan 53R-3835, PIN 02124-0158; and
4. That a board-to-board fence of quality materials, at the maximum height permitted by the City's By-law(s) relating to fences shall be constructed along the length of the north boundary of Part 1 on Plan 53R-3835, PIN 02124-0158.

**YEAS:** Councillors McCausland, Kirwan, Landry-Altmann, Cormier  
**CARRIED**

Public comment was received and considered and had effected the Planning Committee's decision in the following manner:

That conditions 3 and 4 were added to the resolution.

**Adopting, Approving or Receiving Items in the Consent Agenda**

The following resolution was presented:

PL2019-167 Landry-Altman/Kirwan: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury approves Consent Agenda Items C-1 to C-2.

**CARRIED**

The following are the Consent Agenda items:

### **Routine Management Reports**

C-1 Dalron Construction Ltd. - Application to extend a draft approved plan of subdivision approval, Remainder of Parcel 35336 SES, Lot 5, Concession 1, Township of Garson (Foxborough Subdivision, Garson)

Report dated November 18, 2019 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding Dalron Construction Ltd. - Application to extend a draft approved plan of subdivision approval, Remainder of Parcel 35336 SES, Lot 5, Concession 1, Township of Garson (Foxborough Subdivision, Garson).

PL2019-168 Kirwan/Landry-Altman: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury's delegated official be directed to amend the conditions of draft approval for a plan of subdivision on those lands described as Remainder of Parcel 35336 SES, Lot 5, Concession 1, Township of Garson, File # 780-3/86008, in the report entitled "Dalron Construction Ltd." from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure, presented at the Planning Committee meeting on December 9, 2019, upon payment of the processing fee in the amount of \$2,539.00 as follows:

1. By deleting replacing the words "one-foot reserves" with "0.3 metre reserves" in Condition #5;
2. By adding the following words at the end of Condition #12:  
"...to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure."
3. By deleting Condition #13 entirely and replacing it with the following:  
"13. That this draft approval shall lapse on November 23, 2022."
4. By replacing the words "General Manager of Infrastructure Services" with "General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure" and by replacing the words "Infrastructure Services" with "Growth and Infrastructure Services" in Condition #15;
5. By adding the following sentence at the end of Condition #18:  
"...A soils caution agreement, if required, shall be registered on title, to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official and the City Solicitor."
6. By adding the following sentence at the end of Condition #19:  
"...A lot grading agreement, if required, shall be registered on title, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning Services and the City Solicitor."
7. By deleting Condition #20 entirely and replacing it with the following:  
"20. A storm-water management report and associated plans must be submitted by the Owner's Consulting Engineer for approval by the City. The report must address the following

requirements:

a) The underground storm sewer system within the plan of subdivision must be designed to accommodate and/or convey the minor storm flow, that is, the rainfall runoff resulting from the subject site and any external tributary areas using the City's 2 year design storm. The permissible minor storm discharge from the subject development must be limited to the existing pre-development site runoff resulting from a 2 year design storm. Any resulting post development runoff in excess of this permissible discharge rate must be controlled and detained within the plan of subdivision;

b) The overland flow system within the plan of subdivision must be designed to accommodate and/or convey the major storm flow, that is, the rainfall runoff resulting from the subject site and any external tributary areas using the City's 100 year design storm or Regional storm event, whichever is greater, without causing damage to proposed and adjacent public and private properties. The permissible major storm discharge from the subject development must be limited to the existing pre-development runoff resulting from a 100 year design storm or Regional storm event, whichever is greater. Any resulting post development runoff in excess of this permissible discharge rate must be controlled and detained within the plan of subdivision;

c) "Enhanced" level must be used for the design of storm-water quality controls as defined by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks;

d) The drainage catchment boundary including external tributary catchments and their respective area must be clearly indicated with any storm-water management plan;

e) The final grading of the lands shall be such that the surface water originating on or tributary to the said lands, including roof water from buildings and surface water from paved areas, will be discharged in a manner satisfactory to the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure;

f) Minor storm drainage from the plan of subdivision shall not be drained overland onto adjacent properties; and,

g) Existing drainage patterns on adjacent properties shall not be altered unless explicit permission is granted."

8. By adding the words "to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure" after the words "The owner" in Condition #26;

9. By adding the word "Services" after the word "Planning" and replacing the words "General Manager of Infrastructure Services" with "General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure" in Condition #31;

10. By deleting Condition #31 entirely and replacing it with the following:

"31. Draft approval does not guarantee an allocation of sewer or water capacity. Prior to the signing of the final plan, the Director of Planning Services is to be advised by the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure, that sufficient sewage treatment capacity and water capacity exists to service the development."

11. By deleting Condition #32 entirely and replacing it with the following:

"32. The final plan shall be integrated with the City of Greater Sudbury Control Network to the satisfaction of the Coordinator of the Surveying and Mapping Services. The survey shall be referenced to NAD83 (CSRS) with grid coordinates expressed in UTM Zone 17 projection and

connected to two (2) nearby City of Greater Sudbury Control Network monuments. The survey plan must be submitted in an AutoCAD compatible digital format. The submission shall be the final plan in content, form and format and properly geo-referenced.”

12. By adding the word “Services” after the word “Planning” in Condition #33;

13. By deleting Condition #34 entirely and replacing it with the following:

“34. That the owner shall have completed all major outstanding infrastructure deficiencies that are critical to the overall function of the subdivision in previous phases of the plan that have been registered, or have made arrangements for their completion, prior to registering a new phase of the plan, to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure.”

14. By adding a new Condition #35 as follows:

“35. That in accordance with Section 59(4) of the Development Charges Act, a notice of agreement shall be registered on title to ensure that persons who first purchase the subdivided land after registration of the plan of subdivision are informed, at the time the land is transferred, of all development charges related to development.”

15. By adding a new Condition #36 as follows:

“36. The owner shall be responsible for the design and construction of any required storm-water management works to the satisfaction of the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure as part of the servicing plans for the subdivision and the owner shall dedicate the lands for storm-water management works as a condition of this development.”

**CARRIED**

C-2

Spectrum Telecom Group Ltd. – Application for public consultation on a proposed ground-based radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system, 210 Horseshoe Lake Road, Wanup

Report dated November 13, 2019 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding Spectrum Telecom Group Ltd. – Application for public consultation on a proposed ground-based radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system, 210 Horseshoe Lake Road, Wanup.

PL2019-169 Landry-Altman/Kirwan: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury directs the City’s Designated Municipal Officer to indicate a position of concurrence to Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada with respect to the proposed radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system that is to be located on those lands known and described as PIN 73470-0571, Part 1, Plan 53R-18249, Part 1, Plan 53R-20712, Parcel 49642, Part of Lots 5 & 6, Concession 2, Township of Dill, as outlined in the report entitled "Spectrum Telecom Group Ltd." from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure, presented at the Planning Committee meeting on December 9, 2019.

**CARRIED**

## **Referred and Deferred Matters**

R-1 Rogers Communications Inc. – Application for public consultation on a proposed ground-based radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system, 1887 Bancroft Drive, Sudbury

Report dated November 18, 2019 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding Rogers Communications Inc. – Application for public consultation on a proposed ground-based radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system, 1887 Bancroft Drive, Sudbury.

The following resolution was presented:

PL2019-170 Kirwan/Landry-Altman: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury directs the City's Designated Municipal Officer to indicate a position of concurrence to Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada with respect to the proposed radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system that is to be located on those lands known and described as PIN 73578-0041, Part of Lot 12, Concession 3, Township of McKim, as outlined in the report entitled "Rogers Communications Inc." from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure, presented at the Planning Committee meeting on September 9, 2019.

**CARRIED**

R-2 Rogers Communications Inc. – Application for public consultation on a proposed ground-based radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system, 960 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury

Report dated November 18, 2019 from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding Rogers Communications Inc. – Application for public consultation on a proposed ground-based radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system, 960 Notre Dame Avenue, Sudbury.

The following resolution was presented:

PL2019-171 Landry-Altman/Kirwan: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury directs the City's Designated Municipal Officer to indicate a position of concurrence to Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada with respect to the proposed radio-communication and broadcasting antenna system that is to be located on those lands known and described as PIN 02123-0002, Parcel 16869, Lot 4, Concession 5, Township of McKim, as outlined in the report entitled "Rogers Communications Inc.", from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure, presented at the Planning Committee meeting on September 23, 2019.

**CARRIED**

### **Members' Motions**

No Motions were presented.

### **Addendum**

No Addendum was presented.

### **Civic Petitions**

No Civic Petitions were submitted.

**Question Period**

No Questions were asked.

**Adjournment**

PL2019-172 Kirwan/Landry-Altmann: THAT this meeting does now adjourn. Time: 2:47 p.m.

**CARRIED**

Brigitte Sobush, Deputy City Clerk