

MINUTES – JANUARY 22, 2018 – 751-6/17-24 & 701-6/17-9

1916596 Ontario Ltd. – Preliminary Planning Report - Applications for Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning to permit a place of amusement in the form of a casino, Kingsway, Sudbury

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

Report dated December 18, 2017, from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure regarding 1916596 Ontario Ltd. – Preliminary Planning Report - Applications for Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning to permit a place of amusement in the form of a casino, Kingsway, Sudbury.

Paul Szaszkiewicz of Cumulus Architects and Karl Tanner of Dillon Consulting, agents for applicant were present.

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, outlined the report.

Alex Singbush, Senior Planner, stated that this application is for a rezoning and Official Plan Amendment.

Mr. Tanner stated that this is a relocation of an existing use within the municipality. This application involves an Official Plan amendment and a Zoning By-law amendment. As part of his professional planning opinion, he will show how it is consistent with the Northern Growth Plan, the Provincial Policy Statement and the City's Official Plan. This application is an Official Plan designation in order to allow a place of amusement in the form of a casino and accessory uses like a hotel and a festival square. The existing Official Plan does not allow for this type of use in this area, and this is the appropriate format for that change. They are listening to comments from the public and will take those away as they relate to land use planning considerations for this particular file. From the pre-consultation process, the municipality did ask for a number of background reports which have been prepared and submitted. It is his experience that these applications are straightforward and the issues they are dealing with can be dealt with quite easily. When they come back in the spring with additional information, it will show how the application is consistent with the three (3) before mentioned plans.

Chris Duncanson-Hales stated that he is opposing the request to amend the Official Plan and rezone the subject lands from M-1 Business Industrial to M1-1 Business Industrial Special to permit a place of amusement in the form of a casino. He believes the land is unsuitable for this use for three (3) main reasons. The first reason is related to the increase in vehicular traffic in residential neighbourhoods; the second reason is the impact the proposed development will have on the health and safety of the community, and the third is the proposed amendments are inconsistent with the spirit the Provincial Policy Statement 2014. With respect to the traffic impact, the traffic report prepared by proponents limits the scope of its analysis to the main intersections. While this study considers the traffic impact on the main and secondary arteries, it fails to take into account the impact of increased volume on the side streets that exit on these primary and secondary arterial roads. For example, the traffic report does not include an analysis of delays to be expected for local residences that are turning left or right onto Second Avenue from Hebert Street, Wiltshire Street, Richard Street or Randolph Street. Having experienced significant delays exiting his street during the expansion of 2nd Avenue in 2017, he is concerned that the increased traffic will incur significant delays that are not accounted for in

the traffic report. He further stated that he suggests a more thorough Traffic Impact Report that takes into account the impact of increased volume of traffic on residential streets, and this needs to be completed before these amendments can be considered. He stated that he has reviewed the Official Planning and Zoning By-law Amendment Report (Dillon Consulting, Dec. 2017 -Amended) and is deeply concerned that "Section 1.1: Building Healthy Communities" does not consider in any way the health impacts of expanded gambling on neighbourhoods surrounding the proposed casino development. This despite the assertion by the proponents that the "scope and level of detail of the planning evaluation has been based on: Provincial Policy Statement 2014; Growth Plan for Northern Ontario; City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan policies and criteria." The absence of any consideration of the adverse health effects of the development of a full-scale casino on the Kingsway is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement 2014; Growth Plan for Northern Ontario, or the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan. Each of these planning documents includes directions for promoting healthy communities. In a briefing note from the then Sudbury & District Board of Health dated February 14, 2013, the City of Greater Sudbury Council was asked to "factor into their deliberations and decision making the anticipated health impacts of casino expansion and gambling." The note goes on to indicate that "although a health-based approach would refrain from increasing local gambling opportunities altogether, there are important mitigation measures that can be taken to reduce risk. The briefing note further indicates that 'Certain population groups are disproportionately affected by problem gambling: youth, older adults, Aboriginal people and individuals with low income'. This, with the public health concern that "communities with greater proximity to casinos are likely to experience greater impacts," strongly suggests that consideration must be given to the particular health impacts of gambling on vulnerable residential communities near the subject land. In 2013, the Sudbury Health Unit produced the "Opportunity for All: The Path to Health Equity" report. This report grouped areas across the City of Greater Sudbury according to their social and economic characteristics. The report stated 25% of ward 11 is an area that is considered economically depressed and of low income. This area is within 2.5 kilometres of the proposed casino. This fact is not consistent with what the Health Unit is saying and it is not consistent with what the other documents are saying with respect to healthy communities. A full healthy impact study of the expanded gambling led by the Health Unit should be conducted.

Stephen Caruso stated that he read an article in the fall in the Economist and it was focused on the casino industry, specifically in Las Vegas. He further stated that casinos in Las Vegas are struggling to bring in new customers. The casino industry is not a booming industry; the younger generation does not go to casinos generally. The City is currently proposing supporting a 100 million dollar investment into a facility that is losing popularity very quickly. There are many negative impacts that other speakers will surely bring up. He would like to stress that money should not be invested in casinos as they are a business that is dying. They should reconsider and use this as the opportunity to not accept the proposal; there are many other ways to go forward in the future.

John Lindsay, Chair of the Minnow Lake Restoration Group, stated the information he has given in regards to the effect of salt on the environment, particularly on water bodies, has recently been learned. Ramsey Lake has reached a level 3 times that that affects people on sodium restricted diets. The levels in Ramsey Lake are close to 60 mg/L, which is well above the provincial guideline of 20 mg/L. We are getting close to a level where we will be harming aquatic life. He is not against development but we do have to protect our environment. If this site goes ahead, over 2000 parking spaces will contribute tons of salt into our environment that cannot be removed except through distillation. The cost of distillation is extremely high and there is basically no other alternative for road salt. Salt is used in parking lots and roads all across the country. Taking all the other factors away, we are poisoning our lake that over 50,000 people

use as drinking water and there is no way we can stop it. If nothing else is considered tonight, take into account that we will be responsible for the contamination of one of our main water supplies. He stated he does not have much to say in regards to the casino, but most people already know that he is not a casino friendly person. At the last annual general meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, the head of Music Canada spoke. This individual is also chair of the Ontario Chamber of Commerce and Mr. Lindsay has him for his opinion on a casino coming to Sudbury. He said it would be a disaster and it will destroy the cultural community. Some of the organizations within the arts and cultural community are already suffering financially; do we want to destroy our cultural community with a casino?

Ursula Sauve stated that this application claims to be straight forward and this may be so, but it is an application with profound impacts on the development of our community for a very long time. The decision was taken by a previous Council that a casino would be accommodated. She was under the impression that this decision was attached to conditions that should a casino come to Sudbury, it would come with a free arena/events centre. If this Council feels bound given previous Council's decision, she would expect that input would be taken before they go ahead and continue with what is assumed to be done deal. The applications are correlated and we are paying 100 million to accommodate a casino in our community. She has not been able to get any answer on what the cost would be, in addition to the 100 million dollars for various additional infrastructure. She is concerned about her children and grandchildren having to deal with the burden of the cost of the arena, additional infrastructure, and the casino money leaving the community. This "straightforward" application requires very careful consideration.

Steve May stated that he is not here on behalf of his employer or any other organization, he is here as a citizen of Greater Sudbury expressing his opinion. He stated that the Official Plan Amendment before the Committee is both premature and for an area that is too small. He is not a frequent visitor of casinos but does partake in black jack, and should a casino be built in the city he would go. It has been stated that this new facility is the relocation of an existing facility which is not the case. This would be a full gaming casino with card tables, dice, roulette, etc., and currently we only have slot machines. Our City's Official Plan requires that multiple studies be submitted at the time where significant development proposals come forward. One of these studies is an economic study that looks at the impacts of the use. We currently do not have this study and they need to have this information in order to make an evaluation of the economic impact that this new use will have. It is in fact a new use, it is not the relocation of an existing use. Without this study an informed decision cannot be made. He further stated that the elements associated with the integrated site plan, such as the festival square and additional transit routes, are not found within any policies associated to this application in order to ensure they happen. It is just a change in use to allow a single facility without supporting policies to make all the elements contained within the integrated site plan happen. He understands that they will be advised that these elements can be addressed at the Site Plan stage, but the Site Plan process, under the Planning Act, is not a public process. It should be public and until they see these things in policy this application is premature. The proposed stormwater management facility for this site is not located on this site. It is to be located on the lands that the City is intending on acquiring, which he does not believe is appropriate. When the City owns land, the process of disposing and planning on the land are very different. This site needs its own unique stormwater management facility in order to function properly.

John Caruso stated that he has spent 25 years of his career in public service and 20 of them doing economic development and industrial adjustment all over northern Ontario. He also served as Chair of the Greater Sudbury Development Corporation. It has been said, by

proponents of the casino, that this will be an economic driver for our community. He asks that they show him a community where a casino has been an economic driver when it is not situated on the border. He encourages members of Council to use taxpayer money to visit Thunder Bay to see the impact that a full service casino has had on their community. OLG built a full service casino in Port Arthur because they believed it would be an economic driver in an economically depressed part of the city. At the time, 90% of the businesses said they believed in it and supported it. It is now an economic wasteland and only 30% of the businesses support a casino. If we go out and learn what happened in Thunder Bay, we could learn what will happen in Sudbury.

Jim Hallows stated that he learned to be an engineer in Manitoba, and while there he noticed that many individuals were gambling and there was a large negative impact. When he heard of a casino coming to Sudbury, he was concerned. He did a lot of research about the negative impacts of casinos. Divorce rates, suicide, and bankruptcies all increase and can be contributed to casinos coming into a town. 94% of people at casinos will lose their money. He stated that guns are considered to be bad, but they are legal, and casinos can be much worse than guns. We should be concerned and care for our city and children. He does not want his children growing up in this environment. He would move from the City should this happen. Taxes are going to go up and will continue to go up with the addition of a casino. There are many individuals that will suffer with all the losses associated with casinos. He strongly believes that we should not allow a casino as we must think of the children, and there are some very serious consequences to take into consideration.

Jeff MacIntyre stated that the reason we are here is because the OLG Modernization Act. The OLG has decided that casinos do not bring tourists anymore. People don't want to travel to go to a casino and even the casinos on borders are not drawing tourists anymore. There have been comments circulated in the community that the casino is just like Costco; a corporate citizen. A casino is a different beast than Costco or a bar, as you cannot self-exclude yourself. Casinos have very specific ramifications around them. He has been told by many that this decision was made by the last Council and we must move forward, which he understands. However, the last Council did not pick a location, which was decided by this Council. When the OLG decided to have this modernization, they made it clear that the location would be decided by the community. We have not had this discussion in this community. The reason the province said this is because many had large concerns. These discussions happened because individuals were concerned about a casino being next to a school, church, etc. We are considering having a casino next to our community arena/events centre, which in the past has hosted "The Wiggles". This arena is said to become "a model OHL franchise", it will be hosting aspiring hockey players as young as 15. These young men can't even go to the casino until they are 19 and they are sharing a space with a casino. The location of this casino matters greatly, we cannot just worry about grabbing as much money as possible. We are looking at spending \$800,000 a year to bring in events and make the events centre a place that encourages entertainment right next to a casino. We will be the only City in Ontario that is paying to try to convince people to go to the casino. It would be bad enough if we were doing this to convince people to go to Costco, but at least business owners can compete with a company like Costco. A business has no chance to compete against a casino because they legally cannot get the licence. However, the casino can at any time open a restaurant and compete with local businesses on an unfair basis. We have a responsibility to locate this casino in an area that has the highest benefit and the least harm to the community through planning decisions.

Dorothy Klein stated that she has been a community nurse in Sudbury for almost 53 years. She has seen addictions and it knows no boundaries. You might think that it only affects people of lower incomes but she has seen wealthy, professional individuals lose everything to addiction. There is health research that shows the problems of addictions. She is speaking about the people and not the economics of this issue. She is thinking of the families and health of those in the community. She stated that this is what people should be thinking about when making this decision. The addition of the casino will change the atmosphere of the City. The proposed location is right within the community, close to schools and where families live. You are bringing children to the entertainment centre on the pretext of sports, and making addiction and gambling a normality. She has seen so many families broken, all of which have said that it started as a game, started as fun but it did not become fun anymore and now we do not know how to get out of it. She is asking that the Committee to really look at the decision they are making. She and other taxpayers do not want to see their money spent on a detriment to the health of our community.

Erin Danyliw stated that she is speaking to represent young people like herself in the City. Sudbury as a whole has a hard time retaining young people. They leave for school and often do not come back. Those who came back did so because they saw Sudbury moving in a certain direction based on the various planning documents set in place by the City such as the Official Plan, the Downtown Master Plan and the From the Ground Up Plan. They chose to stay because they wanted to be a part of the Sudbury those documents envisioned. They chose to stay in a city that focused on establishing a healthy community. Casinos, increasing urban sprawl and spending an hour in your car to exit a parking lot after an event do not create healthy communities. To imagine families will go out to eat before an event to dinner at a casino and advocate this type of entertainment to children and some grandchildren is horrifying in her opinion and will not lead to a healthy future. They chose to stay in a City that was making smart and fact based decisions. Section 19 of the Official Plan asks the City to examine the financial impact of major developments. The financial impact of a casino is not good. It drains money from the community and will harm local businesses, restaurants and retail. These local businesses are owned by citizens who have invested their lives in improving our community. She stated that the casino will also harm charities. Charity bingos will lose their patrons to the OLG casino and our charities will need to look elsewhere for funding or perish. They chose a community that was moving towards a greener future. One of Sudbury's greatest accomplishments is the regreening effort. Part of moving to a greener future is infilling our City instead of sprawling. There are going to be additional costs associated with upgrading the transit system, sidewalks and bike lanes to stay in line with our City's green initiatives. They chose to live in a community that was moving towards rejuvenating the downtown, not building a new downtown in an industrial park. She does not believe an industrial park is a place to send young people for entertainment and is not the first face they want tourists to see when coming into the City. This build also takes opportunity away for industrial projects and makes the industrial park less attractive to industrial ventures. Industrial parks, casinos and arenas do not mix, and forcing them together will lead to reduced economic development. She does not want people her age pushed out of the City due to these poor decisions.

Andre Dumais stated that he is objecting to the Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning applications regarding the casino. There are countless examples in the province where casinos have been added and have had negative impacts on the communities. Casinos compete against local businesses. There are designed with the sole purpose of sucking people in and never letting them go. The casino that most people visualize is what a casino would look like for a few hours on a Friday or Saturday night. However, for the other times during the week it is a depressing place. The province is delegating what is a City service and we are getting into a

situation where the province is imposing a voluntary tax of 100 million dollars every year and give back five (5) million dollars. Only five (5) percent of what we lose is given back to us. We have to stop looking at this as a revenue stream, it is an expense line. Council's predecessors decided to have a casino in Sudbury, but it was predicated with the condition of them bringing us something. Now we are spending our tax dollars to bribe them to come to our community, which is backwards. He does not want the issues of gambling addiction that will occur in the City to be on his conscience.

Vicki Jacobs stated that she is objecting the rezoning and Official Plan Amendment to allow a casino and the proposed expansion of gambling in Greater Sudbury. She finds it morally appalling to have a community arena attached to a casino, and encouraging patrons to go into the casino to use the restaurants. There is no such thing a family friendly casino. There is no evidence of casinos being good for economic development or for people's financial health. They are good for the provincial government and the casino operator. They are not businesses, they are government controlled monopolies. They are bad for businesses and charities in the communities that surround them. Entertainment dollars are limited and the casino and OLG will be pushing Sudburians to spend their disposable income in their facility. Existing businesses, who have invested in Greater Sudbury, will lose out and jobs in the hospitality sector will be lost if the casino expansion goes through. Her primary objection is that the decision to pursue this has been made with no evidence that the casino will be good for the citizens of Greater Sudbury or good for economic development. It will not make us a healthy community.

Daniel Wood stated that the current status and next steps for the Kingsway Entertainment District and Arena/Event Centre says that there will be a Planning Committee Public Hearing regarding an application for rezoning and Official Plan Amendment in order to permit a place of amusement in the form of a casino. We are applying for a place of amusement. He then gave multiple definitions of the word amusement. He stated that none of these definitions represent a casino. He cannot believe that we are discussing a place of amusement and a casino in the same breath.

Tom Fortin stated that he is opposing the Official Plan Amendment and rezoning for a casino. He is at the meeting representing the group "Casino Free Sudbury", a group of local businesses in opposition to the casino strictly on economic terms. The casino was added roughly two (2) weeks before the vote on June 27th for the arena location. There was no discussion and no time for public consultation on the matter. Then the vote on the 27th took place and we defacto approved a casino with the arena. In the process of building large public infrastructure, including arenas, section 19 of the Official Plan requires an examination of the financial impacts, which did not happen after the addition of the casino. Local business owners are concerned about being able to attract people to start companies and produce the wealth needed to grow. He is optimistic about the future because he feels as though many people have woken up.

Charles Tossel stated that he is speaking in opposition to relocating the casino to the eastern part of town. There has been a large amount of evidence and studies across other municipalities that suggest that having a casino with easier access points lead to an economic downturn for people of lower income. This is due to wanting to spend their entire social assistance cheque gambling. Adding more varieties of gambling options is never a good idea and could at times result in individuals becoming homeless. Homelessness can cost taxpayers from \$69/day for shelters, \$140/day to be in jail or \$1100/day to be in a hospital. He believes this will all result in having far more tenants and landlords than property owners in this town. Going to the casino during the day is not enjoyable but rather depressing. Getting only five (5)

percent of the revenue would mean losing 95% of the community's money. Municipalities have a duty and responsibility to ensure they protect the less fortunate and vulnerable population, which includes but is not limited to those of low income. Another concern would be the seniors at Finlandia Village; with their large amount of savings, they can become subject to temptation and would have easy access to the casino through the Moonlight bus route. Other evidence has suggested that there will be the same problem that downtown has with loiterers hanging around the popular area. This will also cost taxpayers in the long run due to the need of additional resources through the police departments, courts, lawyers, etc. Municipalities not near the US borders have had negative economic and social impacts on their communities, which he cannot support. He highly urges the municipality to not have a casino in town at all. He would rather see them invest in other options.

David Robinson stated that he is in favour of modifying the Master to Plan under two (2) circumstances. One, there is a change that is in line with the spirit of the plan. The other is if there is such a big payoff to changing it, that we cannot resist it. He believes the second option is the one that Council believed when it made the decision about this site. It is not the first option because this is not consistent with the Official Plan, which means it is not consistent with this Council's previous decisions. He is inquiring if we are going to make so much money from this development that it will benefit the City's budget or economy. Casinos do not improve the local economy, except in special circumstances to which we do not adhere. The supposed revenue for Council is less than what it loses in damage to property value elsewhere. This decision is not a winner economically. Economically speaking, this is a loser for the City's budget and a loser for the regional economy. These are the reasons why modifying the Master Plan because we are going to make a great deal of money does not hold up. He is in favour of changing the Master Plan when it is good for us, but he does not believe it is in his professional opinion.

Mathieu Labonte stated that the report states that the City retained Dillon Consulting and he is still quite confused regarding who represents who for these applications. He stated that we should go see the communities in Michigan in order to see how degraded they have become because of the casinos in the area. If this is the vision that Council has for the City of Sudbury, they would not be voting on this as it is the death to a city. This gives young people the impression that we are giving up and building a casino so we can gamble our money away and forget our troubles.

Councillor Signoretti stated that he wanted to give a recap of many of the issues brought up by other speakers. There will be traffic issues with only one entrance point. The extra traffic will likely impact the side streets and there is no traffic impact study of this nature. The addition of a casino does not build a healthy community. There is a large concern with the probability of addiction to gambling. Ward 11 is in a desperate area and is not a good location for the casino. Casinos are struggling to thrive, not growing. There will be a negative social and economic impact. Stormwater management is not on the land where the casino is being located. Casinos are not economic drivers. North Bay is getting a casino and Sault Ste. Marie already has one, therefore, where will people travel from to visit the one in Sudbury? We do not draw from a population of millions of people. Taxpayers have a limited amount of disposable income. Business owners do not want a casino close to their community and affecting their employees. Over 100 million dollars will be taken from our community and we will be given very little back. He would rather keep 100 million dollars in our community rather than seeing it go to southern Ontario. Local businesses and charity bingos in Greater Sudbury will suffer and close. The taxpayers are paying for the infrastructure of this casino. Council's decision was supposed to be about an arena, not a casino. He visited Thunder Bay and the casino was supposed to be an

economic driver when it came to their community; however, it ended in disaster for the community. This generation and future generations do not want casinos, they can gamble online. Casinos will not help local businesses; they will open their own restaurants, taking patrons away from others. People who live in communities with casinos often lose their homes to bank repossession. Taxpayers have not had the opportunity to voice their opinions about the casino and its location. He stresses that we should reconsider having a casino in such close proximity to a community arena.

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:

PL2018-16 Jakubo/Sizer: THAT the City of Greater Sudbury receives the comments and submissions made at the public hearing on Files 701-6/17-9 and 751-6/17-24, as outlined in the report entitled "1916596 Ontario Ltd." from the General Manager of Growth and Infrastructure, presented at the Planning Committee meeting of January 22, 2018;

AND THAT staff complete their review of the applications and schedule a second public hearing on these matters before the Planning Committee when complete.

YEAS: Councillors Lapierre, Jakubo, Sizer, McIntosh and Landry-Altmann.

CARRIED