



MINUTES
UNIONVILLE SUB-COMMITTEE
January 23, 2013
Ontario Room

Hughson Drive Working Group

Committee Members

Regional Councillor Jim Jones
Councillor Alan Ho

Residents

David Barber
Al Ladha
Daniel Ho Lung
Jeremy Tio
Ulisse Torelli

Staff

Richard Kendall, Development Manager – Central District
Fiony Lau, Assistant to Councillor Ho
Kitty Bavington, Council/Committee Coordinator

The Unionville Sub-Committee convened at 6:10 p.m. with Regional Councillor Jim Jones in the Chair.

**1. Introduction of Site Plan Control Approval and
Community Design Guidelines for the Hughson Drive Community
(Hughson Drive, Lunar Drive, Ankara Court, Polaris Drive and Athens Drive)
(SD 10 110091) (10.0, 10.7)**

The Committee had the following for background information:

- Extract of Council resolution, December 18, 2012
- Staff Report dated December 11, 2012
- Written submissions from Michael and Jacqueline Baranowsky, and Anne Chang, in support of site plan control

Staff reviewed the direction of Council at the time of the adoption of Zoning By-law 2012-13 that permitted severances:

“Council discussed Site Plan Control Guidelines for the Hughson Drive Study Area, dealing with such matters as tree preservation and building design. It was noted similar guidelines are in place for Sabiston Oakcrest area. Council directed staff prepare draft guidelines for the Hughson Drive Study Area to be brought forward to the Development Services Committee for consideration.”

Richard Kendall gave a PowerPoint presentation to explain the purpose of Site Plan Control. Following a lengthy consultation process, Council adopted By-law 2012-13 to permit severances and introduce new development standards for the Hughson Drive community. At that time, Council directed staff to prepare community guidelines to achieve sensitive infill and to facilitate site plan approval. There are four key themes to site plan control: landscape, streetscape and settings, building design, parking and garage location and design.

The outcome will be compatible development that respects the existing community. The process is consistent with other areas. It was noted that the Committee of Adjustment can also require site plan control as a condition of severance.

The working group discussed submission requirements and fees, as well as the appeal process. Submissions and costs are similar to the requirements for a Building Permit.

With respect to architectural control as a general component of site plan control, a concern was expressed for the subjective opinion of staff, although it was acknowledged that staff are fair and consistent in their assessments. An option was suggested that approval be delegated to Development Services Committee instead of staff to eliminate subjective opinions; however, the residents considered that this still does not address the issue of the additional fees. The residents further suggested that a neighbourhood consultation process be enacted for Building Permits, rather than site plan control.

Staff clarified that the intent of the process is not to design the houses for the developers, but to ensure it is sympathetic to the neighbourhood. The City is obligated to comply with Planning Act regulations with respect to materials, etc., and if the applicant is not satisfied with a staff decision, they could request a Council decision. Other appeal options were discussed, and the residents stated that they would challenge any site plan control by-law, in court.

The residents provided a report from City of Toronto regarding site plan control. Staff advised that the Markham By-law has similar provisions and that it is enacted in specific areas where Council feels it is warranted. Staff will consult with the City Solicitor for clarification of Toronto's position.

It was agreed that another Subcommittee meeting would be scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT

The Unionville Sub-Committee adjourned at 8 p.m.