

**Present:** Councillor Mulcahy, Chair of Planning and Development  
R. Saunders, Commissioner of Planning and Development  
W. Mar, Commissioner of Legal and Enforcement Services/Town Solicitor  
J. Austin, Manager, Development, Control, Design and Technical Services  
E. Belsey, Manager, Long Range Policy Planning  
K. Narraway, Manager of Legislative Services/Deputy Clerk  
L. MacDougall, Council and Committee Coordinator (Recording Secretary)

**Regrets:** None noted

---

Public Meetings - 7:00 p.m.

K. Narraway, Manager of Legislative Services/Deputy Clerk, provided an overview of the format of the public meeting to members of the audience.

1. Planning and Development Department Report, PL 1-20  
Re: Official Plan Amendment Application, Zoning By-law Amendment Application, 67 Harbourside Drive File No. DEV 28-19 (OPA-2019-W/04, Z-18-19)

Deanna Schlosser, Planner II, provided a PowerPoint presentation which included an overview of the applications.

Michael Testaguzza, Planner, The Biglieri Group Ltd., 20 Leslie Street, Suite 121, Toronto, provided a PowerPoint presentation which included a detailed overview of the applications. Mr. Testaguzza provided details regarding the condition of the Doctor's House which included frequent foundation flooding, roof structure damage, mold and other designated substances within the house, and the building not being structurally sound. He noted that the condition of the building was documented within the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment. He advised that in 2008 the Whitby-By-The-Lake Inc. subdivision was approved and the Doctor's

House was secured for preservation through the subdivision agreement. Mr. Testaguzza advised that in 2013 Whitby-By-The-Lake Inc. carried out due diligence regarding the repair of the building. It was determined that there would be a significant cost to repair the structure and that reuse of the building would be difficult. He noted that at that time there had not been any interest in office use of building. He stated that a Public Information session took place in 2013 which proposed the demolition of the structure and the construction of six townhouses. Mr. Testaguzza reported that the proposal was not supported by the public, noting that over one-third of the attendees recommended that a park or garden be constructed on the site should the house not be preserved. He advised that the proposed applications would make three significant changes to the site including allowing demolition of the structure, the removal of the provision for residential and office uses of the site, and to permit an open space on the site. He advised that on approval of the application, the ownership of the site would be transferred to Ontario Shores Centre for Mental Health Sciences and the privately owned, publicly accessible open space would be constructed. Mr. Testaguzza further advised that elements of the heritage building would be salvaged, including roof tiles and timber posts and that these items would be re-purposed as part of the project for heritage commemoration. He stated that the purpose of the proposal was to construct an open space to include a sensory garden and an interpretive zone, to serve as a connection between the Ontario Shores Campus and the community, and to preserve and recognize the history of the institution.

The Chair opened the floor for comments from the public.

Tina Powers, 110 Chestnut Street East, inquired about the precautions that would be taken to ensure that no asbestos or other designated substances would be released into the community during the demolition of the building and tunnels located under the building.

Michael Baker, 10 Southshore Street, stated that Ontario Shores Centre for Mental Health Sciences provided an Open House for area residents prior to residents being aware of the applications. He advised that residents were pleased that the structure would be demolished, and raised concerns regarding smoking and pedestrian traffic in the proposed open space site. He advised that smoking was not permitted on Ontario Shores Centre for Mental Health Sciences' property, but that it was not enforced, and raised concerns about the open space becoming a smoking area for residents and staff. Mr. Baker inquired whether smoking would be permitted in the proposed open space, whether no smoking signage would be installed and who would be responsible for enforcement. He inquired about restrictions for parking

and access to Ontario Shores Centre for Mental Health Sciences from the site. He noted that vehicles park on Southshore Street for extended periods of time and inquired whether parking restrictions would be included as part of the project. Mr. Baker raised concerns about the potential for increased noise, litter, vandalism, and pedestrian and vehicular traffic, noting that the footprint of the structure was in close proximity to the existing townhouses. He noted that he had previously submitted correspondence to the Town, and requested that he receive answers to his questions in writing. He stated he was in support of the intent of the proposed plan and requested that the Town ensure that the intentions of the developer would be upheld.

Michael Babier, 408 Brock Street North, stated that he has resided in Whitby for 20 years and is a strong proponent of architectural preservation. He further stated that the Ontario Shores Centre for Mental Health Sciences was one of the largest employers in Whitby and that the whole collection of former buildings were architecturally significant. He commented on his admiration of the buildings as they were 20 years ago, noting that he had hoped that some of the former hospital site would be preserved. Mr. Babier stated that the Doctor's House was the last remaining historic building on the site and that it would be expensive to preserve. He inquired about the feasibility of a partial rebuild or a full rebuild of the structure in order to preserve it. He asked about the possibility of providing zoning enhancements that would increase the value in order to attract additional interest in preserving the building. He noted that the Doctor's House and site was important and that it should be saved. Mr. Babier stated that eventually another proposal would be submitted for the site and the garden and all of the history would be lost. He commented on the lack of offers for reuse of the building and suggested that should the structure be rebuilt or restored there would be plenty of offers to use the building.

Margaret Clayton, 859 Bradley Drive, stated that her presentation was based on the question of why the significant historical building had not been designated as originally planned. She advised that for the past 20 years she had understood that the Doctor's House would be designated for adaptive reuse as part of the plan of subdivision. She advised that she reviewed minutes and other documents from the last two decades and had prepared a detailed chronological timeline associated with the site. She provided a summary of the noted document which included the publication of a heritage designation notice in 2002, a Heritage Committee recommendation to preserve Buildings # 22 (the Doctor's House) and # 28 in 2005, an oral decision noting that the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) was advised that the draft plan of subdivision would preserve the Doctor's House due to its significance in 2008, a subsequent recommendation by the Heritage Committee to proceed

with the designation in 2011, a Public Information session and a summary report which noted that the vast majority of attendees would like to see the retention and reuse of the Doctor's House in 2013, and a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment in 2019 that indicated that the Doctor's House was the last physical representation of the former hospital and that its heritage value was deemed to have expanded to include the overall cultural significance of the entire former hospital site. Ms. Clayton advised that of the nine criteria required to designate a property established under the Ontario Heritage Act only one of the criteria was required to be met for designation. She noted that the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment identified seven criteria for the Doctor's House of which five were rated as very good to excellent. She further advised that the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment identified four mitigation options for the Doctor's House. She commented on the Whitby Psychiatric Hospital being the first of its kind in Canada and possibly North American with new theories for the treatment of mental health, noting that the doctors and medical staff who practiced were at the forefront of developing new approaches in the treatment of mental health that continues today. Ms. Clayton stated that the Doctor's House was the last remaining building of a significant historic moment in not only Whitby's history, but the history of psychiatric care and treatment in Ontario and possibly across Canada and North America. She noted that originally there were more than thirty hospital buildings on the site and that there was only one left. She requested that the Doctor's House be preserved and designated. Ms. Clayton submitted her presentation to the Manager of Legislative Services/Deputy Clerk.

Deanna Hollister, 503-360 Watson Street West, advised that she was familiar with the former buildings as she used to walk through the area prior to the buildings being demolished. She commented on her disappointment on the removal of the buildings, but that she had understood that a compromise, which was reflected in the OMB Decision in 2008, was made for the developer to preserve the Doctor's House. She stated that the OMB Decision did not identify a maximum amount of funds associated with the preservation of the building, noting that the developer was permitted to develop south Whitby on the promise that the building would be preserved, at any cost. Ms. Hollister stated that there have not been any steps taken to preserve the building since 2006. She agreed that the site attracts wildlife and that it was an eyesore, but that it was not through the fault of the Town other than not requiring the developer to preserve the building over time. Ms. Hollister further stated that repairs to the building should have commenced in 2008 when the developer agreed to preserve the building. She suggested that it was the intention of the developer to let the building fall into disrepair to a point where a demolition permit would be requested. Ms. Hollister further stated that she wanted the developer to be held

accountable and to fix the building, noting that it was not fair for area residents to have to view a boarded up structure. She advised that it was a beautiful piece of architecture, that it has historical importance to the Town, and that it could be designated in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act. She stated that demolishing the building should not be considered.

Mark McGowan, 1 Guthrie Crescent, advised that he has been a resident in Whitby since 1992 and has been a professional historian since 1983. He stated that he was in agreement with statements made by previous delegates regarding the significance of the property. He commented on the local focus for the site, noting that people fail to recognize the provincial, national and global importance of the property. Mr. McGowan advised that in 1911 the site was under construction as a major medical facility by the Province of Ontario and by 1915 the Government of Canada commandeered structures, buildings and prisons across Canada to deal with injured soldiers who had returned from Europe. He advised that this site was one of those 65 such sites and that it was one of the largest institutions. Mr. McGowan further advised that the institution provided space for 1,500 veterans in need of prosthetics, healing and convalescence and assisted 3,000 service personnel before it was returned to the Province of Ontario in 1919. He noted that this was a national story because the men and women came from across Canada. He stated that national stories have greater possibilities for partnership and creativity for developers, municipalities, and institutions. He stated that the proposed development negates the fact that the last building on this nationally important site would be demolished. He commented on the support for commemorating Camp X in Whitby which served 500 service personnel during World War II for intelligence and covert operations purposes, noting that this proposal would demolish the last structure in Whitby that honours the memory of 3,000 veterans of World War I. He suggested that by engaging minds, creative energies, imagination, and renewed partnerships, something could be done with the building to honour the 3,000 men and women who passed through the site and assisted in putting Whitby on the map nationally.

Rick McDonnell, 600 King Street, stated that the subject property being referred to as a heritage resource was an understatement and that he believed that the building represented a national heritage site. He further stated that the Doctor's House had many heritage attributes. Mr. McDonnell cited the criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest in order to designate a property in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act. He advised that only one of the nine criteria was required for designation to be considered, noting that several reports over the last 10 years support that the structure known as the Doctor's House meets

at least seven of those criteria. He stated that by preserving the building for future generations the Town would be respecting and acknowledging its heritage. He further stated that the physical building respects the skill, dedication and quality of all parties involved in its design and construction, and that the use of the site as a military recovery hospital for World War I veterans highlights the compassion, care and respect that society had for soldiers and families that fought for our country. Mr. McDonnell commented on the features of the site which included a farm, recreation facilities and cottages where assistance, care and rehabilitation could take place, unlike common institutions of the time. He stated that the Doctor's House was a landmark and that the facility was one of the largest employers in the area and provided economic growth, pride and status for the Town of Whitby. Mr. McDonnell advised that the Town has lost many pieces of its heritage which were only commemorated by a small token as opposed to the mass of an original building. He requested that the Town not succumb to a plaque in a small park that would be noticed by a few people and to keep the original building to commemorate such an important part of our heritage. He implored the Town to ensure the preservation of the Doctor's House which represents so much to the Town, Region, Province and Country. Mr. McDonnell submitted his presentation to the Manager of Legislative Services/Deputy Clerk.

Katherine Hull, 3575 Cochrane Street, stated that she was an archaeologist and a cultural heritage specialist. She advised that she was in agreement with statements and comments made by previous delegates. Ms. Hull stated that the developer and the Town of Whitby had failed the structure, noting that all documentation related to the preservation of the building was contained within public records. She requested that thought and consideration be given to the opportunities that exist to restore the building.

There were no further submissions from the public.

Michael Testaguzza, The Biglieri Group Ltd., David Eckler, Architects Rasch Eckler Associate Limited, 15 Lola Road, Toronto, and Chris Bovie, Community Relations Officer, Ontario Shores Centre for Mental Health Sciences, 700 Gordon Street, answered questions regarding:

- the heritage significance of the site;
- whether the Doctor's House was the most important architectural representation of the former hospital campus;
- the issues related to the condition and integrity of the structure and environmental issues associated with the structure;
- the use of tile and cement fill tile to support the building versus the use of studs in the construction of the house;
- hazardous materials embedded within the whole building due to



- the construction method;
- the rationale for the option provided in 2013 on the adaptive reuse of the site and reconstruction of the building;
- the future transfer of ownership of the property from the developer to Ontario Shores Centre for Mental Health Sciences, and their initiative to make the site open space;
- clarification on the legacy of Ontario Shores Centre for Mental Health Sciences in the community being about the care and support provided by staff and not about architecture;
- the desire to work with the community to construct a space that community can use and access that delivers on what the Centre stands for as a hospital as well as acknowledging and honouring the time that the facility was used for military convalescence;
- addressing concerns related to smoking on the property and including the open space in the landscape contract for maintenance and cleaning; and,
- the commitment to work with residents to ensure concerns would be addressed.

It was the consensus of the Committee to take a short recess. The Committee recessed at 8:06 p.m. and reconvened at 8:11 p.m.

**2. Planning and Development Department Report, PL 2-20**  
Re: Zoning By-law Amendment Application, 4680 Garrard Road,  
CSPAC Industrial Garrard GP, Inc., File Number DEV-32-19 (Z-20-19)

Peter Henley, Planner I, provided a PowerPoint presentation which included an overview of the application.

Michael Vani, Senior Planner, Weston Consulting, 19-201 Millway Avenue, Vaughan, provided a PowerPoint presentation which included a detailed overview of the application. Mr. Vani advised that the proposed development would consist of two buildings for the purpose of a warehouse and distribution facility. He stated that Building A was the tallest building with a height of approximately 13.7 meters, and that the full development would have a total lot coverage of about 48 percent. He advised that site would be accessible to vehicle traffic by two full moves driveways proposed on Conlin Road and three full moves driveways on Garrard Road. He further advised that the site would have 593 parking spaces including 32 accessible parking spaces, as well as a number of loading doors and service bays. He stated that the buildings would be designed with enhanced elevations and building materials for the office and entry portions of the buildings, and that the modern and clean look of the building would be facing the public roadways. Mr. Vani advised that there was a site specific zoning exception for relief of the minimum rear yard setback from 13.5 meters to 7.5 meters as well as permission

for outside storage of the trailers at the rear of the property as they wait for servicing at the bays.

The Chair opened the floor for comments from the public.

Robyn McLennan, 4655 Garrard Road, advised that she resided directly across the street from the proposed development. She stated that the proposed zoning was not consistent with the plan for the area and that the current zoning was residential/agricultural. She advised that the area consists of families with young children and raised concerns about the fumes from the trucks, increased traffic and traffic safety, noting that there would be three entrances to the site from Garrard Road. Ms. McLennan further advised that Garrard Road was a two lane road suggesting that the road would have to be widened to accommodate truck traffic. She raised concerns about the road widening and the impact it would have on her well and septic systems, the existing mature trees and the value of her property. She commented on the area being a heritage area, noting that her home was built in the 1800s and that there have been substantial renovations to her home. She suggested that the construction of one factory in the area would lead to more factories in the area and that her property value would be diminished. She stated that cutting down trees planted in the 1800s in order to widen the road would ruin the fabric of the neighbourhood. She asked about the products that would be manufactured on the site and the hours of operation for the business. Ms. McLennan inquired about the front yard setback for the proposed development, and whether trees would be planted to block the view of the building. She stated that she was opposed to the proposed development and that the zoning on this site should not be changed. She advised that this would be the first manufacturing use constructed on the street which would change the residential/agricultural use in the area. Ms. McLennan noted that only five homes received notice of the public meeting, but that many surrounding streets would be impacted by the proposed development.

Robert Gauntlett, 18 Northland Avenue, Brooklin, advised that the proposed development would be constructed on a site that has had significant groundwater for the last 20 years. He stated that there were two areas on the property surrounded by water from April to the end of May every year and inquired about provisions for water drainage for the site. He suggested that the depth of the groundwater on the site be determined in order to provide adequate drainage as well as soil testing. He further inquired whether there were any plans to install sanitary sewers, and who would be responsible for the provision of services and road widening, noting that there was not any sanitary or water to service the site or in the area. Mr. Gauntlett requested clarification on the proposed development and whether the building



would be a warehouse, a distribution centre or a factory. He advised that there was a stream nearby that and inquired about the impact that the development would have on the salmon habitat.

Bob Riddell, 4350 Garrard Road, advised that the property located across the street from the proposed development was owned by a home builder, Tribute Homes. He stated that he did not understand why the designation on the subject land would be changed from the existing zoning and why the Town would permit an industrial building to be constructed in what would likely become a predominantly residential area. He inquired regarding the availability of industrial land in Whitby where a facility could be constructed and not conflict with the residential designation in the area.

There were no further submissions from the public.

R. Saunders, Commissioner of Planning and Development, answered questions regarding:

- clarification on the designation of proposed site as well as the property located on the east side of Garrard Road in accordance with the Whitby Official Plan;
- confirmation of the existing zoning in the area;
- confirmation of the ownership of the property located on the east side of Garrard Road and clarification on the designation on the lands in this area; and,
- the rationale for a Zoning By-law Amendment and not an Official Plan Amendment for the proposed development.

Michael Vani, Senior Planner, Weston Consulting, answered questions regarding:

- the front yard setback from Garrard Road to the facility;
- clarification on the proposed use of the site for a warehouse and distribution centre;
- the submission of a Traffic Impact Study and a Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report;
- confirmation of sanitary, storm and water servicing to the site;
- the requirements for water drainage; and,
- the demolition of a house that recently occurred on the site.

- 3.** Planning and Development Department Report, PL 3-20  
Re: Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications, 423-435 Brock Street North, Whitby Brock Estates Inc., File Nos. DEV-31-19 (OPA-2019-W/05 and Z-19-19)

Deanna Schlosser, Planner II, provided a PowerPoint presentation which included an overview of the applications.

Bruce Hall, Partner and Planner, The Planning Partnership, 1255 Bay Street, Suite 500, Toronto, provided a PowerPoint presentation which included a detailed overview of the applications. Mr. Hall advised that the proposed development would be located in an area served by transit infrastructure. He further advised that the seven-storey building including the mechanical penthouse would be comprised of 119 units, 164 parking spaces including 10 visitor parking spaces, and approximately 3,000 square feet of amenity space. He noted that the unit types would consist of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. Mr. Hall stated that some of the urban design features included brick, a strong built form street edge, setback of the 5th, 6th and 7th storeys, a single vehicle access and egress point, a stepped down transition of the building to the existing residential, and integrated loading and waste. He stated that there was a significant landscaping plan that would include buffers along the property line and a variety of plantings to include 196 trees and 112 shrubs.

The Chair opened the floor for comments from the public.

John Dolstra, 23 Regency Crescent, advised that he was a former Councillor for Whitby and that he has resided at his property for 36 years. He stated that for the past 35 years the Centre Ward has been impacted by regular construction of apartment buildings. Mr. Dolstra stated that he was opposed to the proposed development. He advised that there were already number of apartment buildings located in the area as well as a proposed apartment building to be constructed on Perry Street. He noted that there were more apartment buildings in the Downtown Whitby than anywhere else in Whitby. Mr. Dolstra advised that he was not opposed to affordable housing, but that he was opposed to what has occurred in the area over the last 10 to 15 years. He raised concerns regarding the traffic, parking, garbage, water, noise, police response times, and environmental issues in the area. He advised that the Downtown Whitby Secondary Plan prevails over the Whitby Official Plan and that the Holding (H) zone on this site was to prevent developments on Brock Street within the heart of Whitby. He stated that he was not opposed to development, but that he was opposed to the application for the Official Plan Amendment to increase the building height from three to seven storeys and requested that the amendment be denied. Mr. Dolstra further requested the existing zoning on the property remain as is and that Town not issue any demolition permits for the buildings located on the proposed site until all matters were resolved.

Steve Siple, 420 Perry Street, advised that he purchased his property in September 2019 because he was attracted to the quaint, small town feeling in Whitby. He raised concerns regarding the lack of privacy in his

rear yard, due to the height, size and location of the proposed building. He raised further concerns regarding the flora and fauna in the neighbourhood. Mr. Siple indicated that the increased traffic from the proposed development would not be minor, but that it would have a major impact in the area. He expressed concerns about light pollution, and water drainage from the site. He advised that the grade of his property was lower than that of the properties located behind his property and that there was a culvert located at the side of his property which has created a water problem on his property. He stated that it appeared that the proposed development would include a lot of hard surfaces and not many soft surfaces to absorb water. Mr. Siple raised further concerns about increased traffic on Brock Street, noting that Chestnut and Perry Streets would be used as bypasses to access Mary Street which was already a thoroughfare. Further, he expressed concern about the removal of mature trees and that plantings on the site would not be mature and would take years to grow. Mr. Siple advised that he was opposed to the proposed development, and requested that Council deny the application for the seven-storey structure.

Lara Perroni, 305B Perry Street, raised concerns regarding the influx of traffic and garbage that would be created by the proposed development. She stated that over the last five years there have been a number of buildings constructed in the area, and noted various changes including flooding, garbage, and police presence in the area. She further stated that in addition to the proposed 300 apartment units within a two-block radius of her property, there would be 119 units generated from the proposed development and another 40 stacked townhouses constructed in the area. Ms. Perroni raised concerns about parking, noting that there would not be enough parking spaces for vehicles associated with the site. She raised further concerns about the speed of traffic on Perry, Ash and Mary Streets as those streets were currently used as bypasses for Brock and Dundas Streets. Ms. Perroni requested that consideration be given to the holistic impact of the increased traffic in the area.

Michael Babier, 408 Brock Street North, requested clarification on whether the term apartments meant rental units or condominiums, and further inquired whether the proposed units would be rentals or condominiums. He suggested that the Planning and Development Department was addressing the long term strategy for Whitby's main street to be a pedestrian oriented street with intensification and stated that he was in support of intensification. Mr. Babier stated that the proposed development was a good design for Whitby and the main street, however it was not a good design for rental apartments. Mr. Babier commented on the Town's lack of enforcement on rental properties with respect to garbage and parking issues, noting that he has seen instances of garbage that has been left sitting out on the street

for months. He stated that illegal dumping of waste should be dealt with by the property management of the building and preferred a condominium corporation to address this concern. He commented on positive details of the proposed building including its architecture, the facade, the entrance, the brick detail, and the setbacks. Mr. Babier raised concerns about the traffic speeds and the lack of enforcement on Brock Street between the nearby Tim Hortons location and Mary Street, noting that accidents would likely occur at the entrance of the proposed development due to speeding. Mr. Babier stated that it was difficult to cross the street between Maple Street and Mary Street, noting that the distance between the traffic lights located at Maple and Mary Streets was too great of a distance. He requested that a condominium be a condition for the proposed development and that the Town consider the density and the pedestrian oriented nature of the area.

Steve Webster, owner of 421 Brock Street South, stated that he purchased his property in 1996 and that it was located adjacent to the subject property. He advised that his building originally consisted of six units and that he was informed by the Town at that time that six units were not permitted and that he had to reduce the number of units to four. He commented on the amount of garbage produced and lack of parking for just four units, noting that garbage has to be monitored. He raised concerns about the aesthetics of a seven-storey building adjacent to a bungalow, the lack of privacy and the obstruction of view from his property due to the height of the proposed building. He raised concerns regarding the garbage, increased traffic and the number of visitor parking spaces for the number of residential units as well as the lack of parking for the residents living in the units. He indicated that typically there were two cars per unit. He advised that his tenant's visitors park in a nearby parking lot. He stated that upon reviewing the drawings it appeared that the entrance to the proposed development encroached on his property. Mr. Webster stated that other apartment buildings of this magnitude constructed in the area were located on corner lots with an entry and exit point on two different roads. Mr. Webster also noted that he received his notification of the Public Meeting one day prior to the meeting taking place and that the envelope was not sealed.

Wendell Perry, 123 Chestnut Street East, stated that he was opposed to the proposed development. He raised concerns regarding the removal of the mature trees from the site, traffic congestion, and inadequate parking provisions for residents and visitors. He stated that Brock Street was a busy major road noting that vehicles would not be able to safely enter/exit the site from Brock Street. He raised further concerns regarding traffic on Brock Street, noting the loss of time for emergency vehicles travelling on Brock Street. He stated that the area could not handle the increased number of vehicles and density. He raised further

concerns regarding the impact the proposed development would have on the water table, noting that there was water just ten feet below the surface on the proposed site, and that while digging to carry out work on his basement he came across two natural springs.

Steve McGitchie, 406 Brock Street North, advised that he resided directly across the street from the entry/exit of the proposed development and that he was in agreement with the comments and concerns raised by previous delegates. He stated that he owns a trailer and has difficulty accessing his own driveway from Brock Street. He further stated that four single family dwellings housing approximately 20 people would be replaced by a seven-storey building consisting of 119 units housing an additional 400 residents. He further stated that most families have two cars which would require 238 parking spaces and at least 20 to 30 visitor parking spaces. He advised that when the row houses were constructed in the area the developer was required to incorporate some of the historical elements of Downtown Whitby, noting that this would likely not occur with the proposed building. He stated that he would support construction of townhouses similar to those located on the west side of Brock Street.

Vic Sleeman, 70 Regency Crescent, stated that there was existing traffic congestion along Brock Street, particularly in the area of the nearby Tim Hortons location. He raised safety concerns regarding emergency vehicles and how they would be able to navigate the traffic with the additional vehicle traffic from the proposed development.

Tom Scott, 119 Chestnut Street, stated that the proposed building would be located at the rear of his back yard, noting that he spends a lot of time in his back yard. He raised concerns regarding the lack of privacy that would be created by a seven-storey building with residents looking down into his yard. He inquired about amending by-laws for existing residents in the area that may wish to develop their properties. He raised concerns about the value of his property and how it would be impacted by the proposed development.

Lisa Codlin, 414 Brock Street North, stated that the project looked beautiful, but that it was not consistent with the Whitby Official Plan, the existing zoning in the area or the Downtown Whitby Secondary Plan. She advised that when she purchased her property twelve years ago she was attracted to the small Town feel of Whitby, the walkability of the downtown core, and the live-work zoning on her property. She stated that 10 visitor parking spaces was not adequate for a building of this size and to assume that only five percent of residents may have a guest or delivery was not realistic. She raised concerns that overflow parking from the building would likely occur on Chestnut Street, noting there was already a problem with on-street parking on this street, and that it was

rarely enforced. Ms. Codlin noted that it was already difficult to turn either north or south onto Brock Street throughout the day, during rush hour, and on Saturdays and advised that traffic would be backed up in the underground parking due to vehicles attempting to access Brock Street. She raised further concerns regarding headlights from vehicles constantly shining into her house due to vehicles exiting the property, and that the natural light entering the front of her home would be completely blocked due to the height and location of the building relative to the location of her property. Ms. Codlin advised that the daylight entering her home was an important factor when purchasing her property because it was zoned for live-work and she works out of her home in the basement. She noted that a seven-storey building was more than double the height currently permitted. She expressed concerns about the lack of privacy that would be created by the proposed development due to its height and density, noting that 50 percent of the units would be facing the front of her home.

Nawaz Hirani, 421 Kent Street, stated that he liked the design of the proposed building and that the modern condominium look would likely have a positive impact on property values in the area. He raised concerns regarding the water drainage along Chestnut Street, and the impact that this project would have on the street. He inquired whether reports were available to the public. Mr. Hirani expressed concerns about traffic along Chestnut Street, noting that overflow parking from the proposed building would likely take place in front of the properties on Chestnut Street. He stated that the number of visitor parking spaces was not reasonable given the size of the development.

Lynn Perry, 123 Chestnut Street East, expressed concerns about existing health care, noting that health care in Whitby was not adequate to support additional residents. She raised concerns about the traffic and the additional vehicles that would park on Chestnut Street, noting that the existing on-street parking was already a problem. Ms. Perry stated that the downtown core was not ready for all of the development and additional traffic that would be created. She further stated that traffic would be forced to travel on the side streets. She expressed concerns regarding emergency vehicles, noting that should a fire occur at the proposed site traffic would have to be blocked on a major road. She raised concerns regarding having enough day care centres and schools to support the additional residents. Ms. Perry advised that when she moved to her property on Chestnut Street 32 years ago the house was raised to have a new basement constructed and the equipment used to dig under the house hit two natural springs that flooded her back yard. She requested that the Town investigate and present a plan on the water table to manage groundwater in the area. She expressed concerns regarding the lack of privacy and the property value of her



home. Ms. Perry inquired whether residents would be compensated for their losses. She stated that she was opposed to proposed development.

Brian Bathurst, 44 Coulton Court, advised that he was in agreement with the comments and concerns raised by previous delegates. He noted that he was also speaking on behalf of his daughter who resides on Chestnut Street. Mr. Bathurst advised that 25 years ago he moved to Whitby because of the characteristics and charm of the Town. Mr. Bathurst advised that he was not entirely opposed to the project, but suggested that a three-storey condominium building with adequate parking be constructed. He noted that the impact of parking alone from the proposed building would be significant. Mr. Bathurst advised of flooding in his daughter's back yard and raised concerns about water drainage in the area.

Jeff MacKenzie, 204 Chestnut Street West, stated the he was opposed to such a large building and raised concerns about the infrastructure in Downtown Whitby not being up-to-date. He advised that properties on Chestnut Street West still have ditches and raised concerns about excess water and vehicles parking on the drainage ditches. Mr. MacKenzie further advised that his home was on a transformer which he understood could handle a maximum of 11 homes. He stated that there were currently 16 homes on the transformer and that residents have experienced brownouts since 2002. He further stated that he understood it would be 3 years before up-to-date hydro infrastructure would be installed.

Josh Bozec 125 Chestnut Street, advised that many of his concerns had been raised by previous delegates. He raised concerns about the lack of parking and noted that Chestnut Street would be the obvious street for overflow parking from the proposed development. He expressed concerns regarding the large development on such a small parcel of land, the high water table and settlement due to pumping out the ground water. He requested that this be monitored during the construction period. Mr. Bozec stated that he was opposed to the proposed development.

There were no further submissions from the public.

Bruce Hall, Bruce Hall, Partner and Planner, The Planning Partnership, answered questions regarding:

- whether reports submitted to the Town were available to the public, and the opportunity for the Town to peer review reports;
- whether demolition permits had been issued for the subject properties, and clarification on the addresses involved in the project;

- the migration of light pollution from one site to another;
- water drainage and storage;
- waste disposal, storage and maintenance of the property;
- whether the units would be rentals or condominiums;
- clarification on the road widening, overflow parking, and the number of persons per unit;
- emergency vehicle access; and,
- visitor parking and the possibility of making adjustments to the number of visitor parking spaces.

The meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m.