

September 1, 2016

DN/A-16:266

Recchia Developments Inc. (c/o Fernando Recchia)  
231 York Road, Dundas

Appearances were:

Glenn Wellings, Agent on behalf of the applicant; Fernando Recchia, Applicant. Interested parties were: Jennifer Lawrence, 8 Fieldgate Street, Dundas, ON L9H 6M6; Tracy Rivers, 16 Forestview Drive, Unit 4, Dundas, ON L9H 6H1; Barb Bucciachio, 4 Fieldgate Street, Dundas, ON L9H 6M6.

Those members present for the hearing of this application were: M. Dudzic (Chairman), V. Abraham, M. Smith, D. Serwatuk, N. Mleczko, D. Smith, L. Gaddy, W. Pearce.

A summary comment from the Planning and Economic Development Division together with comments from other departments and agencies were entered into the record.

Letters were entered into the record from: Jennifer Casciani & Fraser Bush, 12 Fieldgate Street, Dundas, ON L9H 6M6; Joey Coleman, 126 Catharine Street North, Hamilton, ON L8R 1J4; Barbara & Jim Bucciachio, 4 Fieldgate Street, Dundas, ON L9H 6M6; Bradley & Leigh Tutt, 241 York Road, Dundas, ON L9H 1N1; George & Magda Vnoucek, 10 Fieldgate Street, Dundas, ON L9H 6M6; Tracy Rivers & Bryan Fleming, 16 Forestview Drive, Dundas, ON L9H 6H1; Jennifer Lawrence & Cameron McKelvey, 8 Fieldgate Street, Dundas, ON L9H 6M6; Councillor Arlene VanderBeek, Councillor's Office, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, City Hall;

G. Wellings

- read from a prepared statement that was submitted for the record (see attached)

J. Lawrence

- stated that she has been working with the neighbours for many years
- she is a registered professional planner and takes that very seriously
- no one ever said that no development should take place; it's what makes sense for the neighbourhood
- read from a prepared statement that was submitted for the record (see attached)

T. Rivers

- all the neighbours fully understand that this doesn't fit in with the neighbourhood
- all the neighbours understand that development should front on York Road

- |                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| B. Bucciachio                    | - everyone is very frustrated  |
|                                  | - there has already been two OMB hearings and Council meetings                                   |
| W. Pearce<br>(Committee Member)  | - he thinks there is a problem with the process  |
|                                  | - the applicant is suddenly dealing with lower level processes and by-passing Council            |
|                                  | - he thinks that this is significant enough that it should go to Council                         |
| V. Abraham<br>(Committee Member) | - he also thinks it should go to Council   |
|                                  | - he doesn't think this is within the Committee's jurisdiction                                   |
| G. Wellings                      | - they have done the best they can to achieve the existing zoning                                |
|                                  | - a public vs. private road will have no impact  |
|                                  | - he doesn't know why Council would need to deal with this                                       |
|                                  | - Mr. Recchia needs some direction to be able to move forward                                    |
| W. Pearce<br>(Committee Member)  | - he thinks that getting a private road approval thru a variance would be a big foot in the door |

Following discussion it was moved by Mr. Pearce and seconded by Mr. Abraham that the relief requested be **DENIED** for the following reasons:

1. The Committee is of the opinion that the proposal would be more appropriately addressed through an application for rezoning.
2. The Committee having regard to the evidence is of the opinion that the relief requested is beyond that of a minor nature.
3. The relief requested is undesirable for the appropriate development of the land and building and is inconsistent with the general intent and purpose of the By-law and of the Official Plan as referred to in Section 45 of The Planning Act, 1990.
4. The Committee having regard to the intensity of use of the subject parcel of land is of the opinion that such development would not be appropriate for the lands.

5. The submissions made regarding this matter affected the decision by supporting the refusal of the application.

**CARRIED.**