

## **MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 11, 2013**

### **PRELIMINARY PLANNING REPORT - APPLICATION FOR REZONING AND PLAN OF SUBDIVISION IN ORDER TO PERMIT THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 63 LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION AND THREE MULTI-FAMILY BLOCKS FOR 72 CONDOMINIUM UNITS, KEAST DRIVE, SUDBURY - 1721074 ONTARIO INC.**

---

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

Report dated January 29, 2013 was received from the General Manager of Growth and Development regarding a preliminary planning report - application for rezoning and plan of subdivision in order to permit the development of a 63 lot residential subdivision and three multi-family blocks for 72 condominium units, Keast Drive, Sudbury - 1721074 Ontario Inc.

Letter of concern dated December 20, 2012 was received from Elaine G. Porter, area resident.

Letter of concern received November 26, 2012 was received from Dr. Robin & Barbara Bolton, area residents.

Letter of opposition dated December 21, 2012 was received from Naomi Grant, Chair, Coalition for a Liveable Sudbury.

Letter of concern dated October 15, 2012 was received from Rainbow Routes Association Board of Directors.

Letter of concern was received from S. J. Lane, area resident.

Letter of objection dated August 22, 2012 was received from Mark Browning, city resident.

Letter of concern dated August 30, 2012 was received from Dr. Elaine Porter, city resident.

Letter of objection dated August 20, 2012 was received from Norman Cheadle, city resident.

Letter of objection dated December 14, 2012 was received from Peter Villa, area resident.

Email of concern dated January 28, 2013 from Jo Duke, city resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of concern dated January 29, 2013 from Cathy Jakelski, area resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of support dated January 30, 2013 from Cliff B. Richardson, area resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of concern dated February 4, 2013 from John Lindsay, Chair, Minnow Lake Restoration Group – CAN, was distributed at the meeting.

Email of concern dated February 5, 2013 from Julie Noël de Tilly, area resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of concern dated February 7, 2013 from Klaus Jakelski, area resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Email of concern dated February 10, 2013 from Jan Browning, area resident, was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of concern dated February 11, 2013 from Lily Noble, Co-chair, Ramsey Lake Stewardship Committee was distributed at the meeting.

Letter of objection dated February 11, 2013 from Naomi Grant, Chair, Coalition for a Liveable Sudbury, was distributed at the meeting.

Norm Eady, the applicant, was present.

The Director of Planning Services outlined the application to the Committee.

Mr. Eady stated he is aware of the community's issues and concerns regarding development around lakes and he has had made many revisions to this application over that last couple of years. He has spoken with the neighbours regarding the development and is a member of the Community Action Network. He believes the existing properties pollute the lake from run-off and sewage systems more than this new development would. He stated the dedicated parkland is sized according to the requirements. He believes existing houses on Keast Drive have been built in the designated flood plain. He informed this development has no proposed buildings within the flood plain and believes the development will increase the quality of Lake Ramsey. He hired an engineering firm to conduct a traffic study which states there will not be an increase in traffic as the new traffic generated will be travelling in the opposite direction during rush hour traffic. He stated the drainage plans for the development take into consideration water run-off. He also believes the development will improve the water and sewer conditions and the quality of Ramsey Lake. He informed he held three meetings to inform the community about the development and believes there is a lot of misinformation regarding his application.

Lily Noble, Co-Chair, Lake Ramsey Stewardship Committee gave a powerpoint presentation demonstrating the concerns about the proposed development. She stated concern over Lake Ramsey being swimmable, fishable, drinkable and enjoyable in the future due to the increase of blue green algae. She believes the application has been completed; however, a number of studies including environmental impact, geotechnical, and water shed as well as a stormwater management plan have not been completed. These studies should be completed and considered to assess all the issues before the development is considered. She stated the applicant proposes a Comprehensive Planned Unit Development for reduced frontage and condo developments and will preserve unique environmental features, natural vegetation, sensitive to terrain and natural drainage but questions how this will occur if new roads and homes are to be built. She believes the dedicated parkland should be increased. She is concerned about the visual quality of the higher elevations from the lake as this should be protected and preserved. She feels the application should be denied.

Naomi Grant, Chair, Coalition for a Liveable Sudbury stated she has similar concerns regarding the safety of Lake Ramsey and believes the application should be denied. She stated over 1000 lots are being developed around Lake Ramsey and the studies required are not completed to be able to move ahead. She stated there are two species at risk and field studies which need to be completed. She believes the development does not meet existing policies. She stated the sewer and water requirements have not been met and the proposed septic lift station is located in the flood plain which is not acceptable to the City or the Ministry. The parklands are not located in an area that is convenient. Lots are being built on natural streams and the wetlands are being proposed to be filled in. Policies are in place that state there cannot be any interference with natural wetlands. She believes development of some proposed lots will require significant blasting. She stated there is a sensitive fish habitat located close to the development. She is concerned about traffic increases and believes this development does not meet the policies that are in place and is not in the interest of the community.

Cathy Jakelski, area resident, stated she is concerned about the traffic as there will only be one access point in and out of the development. She stated the traffic study reads that the existing traffic is at capacity. She believes the traffic issues are not seasonal. The development is not close to arterial roads, and is accessed off a collector road. She is concerned about public safety and the impact the heavy construction equipment will have on the roads. She feels the proposal does not keep with the natural topography and building is to occur in the flood plains and close to fish habitats. She is also concerned about the runoff into Bethel Lake and Lake Ramsey and feels this development is not compatible with the area.

Mark Browning, city resident, stated his mother resides on Ramsey Lake Road and is concerned about the increase of traffic. He believes it is the responsibility of the government to protect the natural resources especially Lake Ramsey as it is a drinking water source. He has seen the lake suffer with blue green algae and when this happens the community suffers. He believes a moratorium on development around Lake Ramsey should occur. He requested the application be denied and stop all development surrounding Lake Ramsey.

Steve May, area resident, stated Lake Ramsey should be protected as it is the main source of drinking water. He believes the plan of subdivision and the rezoning do not meet existing policies. He feels the plan should be refused or remove buildings in the flood plain. He stated the wetlands are being replaced with a storm water management plan and with the expectation of more extreme weather events due to climate change this will cause more flooding. He requested the application be refused due to lack of conformity to the Official Plan, flood plain lands be removed from development and all studies be completed before the applicant returns.

Peter Villa, area resident stated he is concerned about the water quality and storm water management. He does not believe that completing the sewer loop at Bethel Lake will improve water quality. He is concerned about storm water runoff from rain and melting snow as it carries silt, salt, fertilizers, pesticides, pet waste and garbage into the lake. Without proper management and studies the development will increase the pollutants and the growth of blue green algae and milfoil. He stated the wetlands are essential to the life of the lake and the pond should be located outside the wetlands. He does not believe that using the suggested alternative way to clean the water is appropriate as only the coarse debris will be removed not the salt, silt and oils. He requested construction of an appropriate storm water management plan and the reports be made public.

John Lindsay, Chair, Minnow Lake Community Action Network and Minnow Lake Restoration Committee stated the lake is for all residents to use. He is concerned about the values of the existing properties along the lake, especially if the lake dies. He believes there is no value to living on Minnow Lake and he does not want the same problems occurring in Ramsey Lake. He recommended other areas be reviewed to develop.

Claude Jakelski, area resident, stated he is concerned the sewer loop line hook up from Dixon Road to the development will require digging in the swamp bed and this could cause water contamination issues to the lakes. He stated Bethel Lake is high in phosphorous which could lead to more phosphorous in Ramsey Lake. He believes the septic systems along Keast Drive are threats to Ramsey Lake and adding more would increase the issues. He feels a water shed study needs to be completed before any new development occurs and requested the application be denied.

Elizabeth Bamberger, area resident, stated she supports the previous comments and requested the application be reconsidered. She does not believe that enough information has been collected to continue with the application and requested all reports and studies be completed before the application is approved.

Karathduvu Nagarajan, area resident, stated a report was completed in 1974 by the Ramsey Lake Community Improvement Plan to conserve the water shed including this piece of land being the last piece of the water shed left. He stated investments have been made in regreening the area. He requested other areas should be used for this development and the property should be left available for public use.

Recess

At 8:02 p.m. the Committee recessed.

Reconvene

At 8:13 p.m. the Committee reconvened.

Greg Dalton, Friends of Bennett Lake, stated he is concerned about the water quality of the lake and the impact the development will have on it as most of the development will be on rock and the runoff will be directly into the lake. He is concerned the development is being approved prior to the completion of necessary studies.

Councillor Caldarelli, Ward Councillor, stated she believes the people commenting have concerns about the proposal and the effects it will have on Ramsey Lake. She stated consideration must be given if intensification of the development surrounding the lake is to continue. The residents believe the lift station and the water pond are being located in the swamp lands. Consideration should be given of the development as a whole and requested the studies be completed and available before the application returns to the Planning Committee.

Mr. Eady stated most of the required studies have been completed and believes most of the concerns have been addressed. He informed the Storm Water Management Source Protection and Nickel District Conservation Authority have listed their concerns and he believes they can be mitigated. He feels the sewer and water systems will benefit the new development as well as the existing properties. He stated notice was given to the Ward Councillor regarding the development and a community meeting was held where the plans of development were distributed. He informed there will be 15 lots along the waterfront; the natural shoreline will be protected as the homes will be built on top of the hills. The Creighton fault is not being touched or built on. He stated the property is not greenspace, it is private land. He informed the subdivision is low density and all buildings are meant to blend into the community. He is following the policies set out by the Province and the City.

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.**

The following recommendation was presented:

PL2013-22 Belli/Rivest: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury receive the comments and submissions made at the public hearing on Files 751-6/11-6 and 780-6/11003;

AND THAT staff complete their review of files 751-6/11-6 and 780-6/11003 by 1721074 Ontario Inc. and schedule a second public hearing on this matter before the Planning Committee, when complete.

**YEAS: Councillors Dutrisac, Rivest, Belli, Craig, Kilgour**

**CARRIED**