

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

3.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Application – 6682 Fisher Lane (Z-9002)

- *(Councillor S. Turner indicating that Ms. M. Sundercock, Site Development Planner, addressed his one question at the end that he could not find in the report, the Kettle Creek Conservation Authority has assessed for no negative impacts on the natural heritage features, he was worried about the natural heritage features having impact on the housing locations specifically the drain and he thinks that Ms. M. Sundercock, Site Development Planner, said that it was assessed for flooding and its proximity to any flood plain or flood limits and they do not believe that one exists; wondering if that is correct as it seems to be getting really close to that drain.); Ms. M. Sundercock, Site Development Planner, nodding yes; (Councillor S. Turner expressing concern with having the decreased front yard setback that it might get it too close to Wellington Road but when he looks at the map it is really Fisher Lane which is never really used at all other than perhaps as a driveway for this property and a very high speed cut through for anybody trying to shorten the corner on Wellington Road; indicating that he does not believe that anyone has contemplated these but in the west end of the city, there have been some questions of adjacency to cannabis cultivation operations in Hyde Park; pointing out that right across the street is where Believe is setting up shop in their greenhouses; advising that he does not think that there is any minimum distance separation calculations for cannabis operations but he does not know if we have any concerns about the adjacencies and impacts associated with that operation and land use and new residential land use here.); Mr. M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, responding that this is not something that they specifically contemplated in this application but if it is an agricultural use that is contemplated by the existing zoning; we certainly would not be in any position to refuse that proposed use; (Councillor S. Turner recognizing that there is probably not a circumstance here where because he does not think that cannabis operations are contemplated in the minimum distance separation, if there were anything that if there was a manure pit or a barn or something like that, those would trigger the minimum distance separation provisions and they would not be making this recommendation he would imagine if it was within the minimum distance separation, wondering if that is correct; noting that Mr. M. Tomazincic, Manager, Current Planning, is nodding yes; Councillor S. Turner indicating that at this point we do not have any contemplation of cannabis operations through a minimum distance separation either in the type one or type two reciprocally but he thinks that perhaps now that we are starting to see a couple of these and he thinks that they will probably see a lot more, is it prudent for the Committee to start contemplating that due to odours which are, as they are hearing in the Hyde Park situation, fairly significant, is that something that they might be getting into here, this is the greenhouse operation that is being contemplated on Wellington Road South so he thinks it would be very similar to what is happening in Hyde Park.); Mr. P. Yeoman, Director, Development Services, responding that is a very good question and is one that they do not have a good answer for on, the Councillor is correct that to their knowledge, minimum distance separation does not currently consider cannabis as part of the calculation, something that they can perhaps take up with the province and seek some further direction on for a future review of applications; (Councillor S. Turner indicating perhaps even on our own Zoning By-laws and considerations about how adjacencies work and how we might contemplate those going forward because he thinks that we are going to start seeing a lot more of those.)*
- *Councillor A. Hopkins enquiring about the temporary use, having two houses for six months on the property, can that be extended to a further term; she knows that it was suggested that there is a three month period after that that if it is not*

removed that they will come in but she just wants to know if the temporary use can be extended.); Ms. M. Sundercock, Site Development Planner, responding that yes the Temporary Use By-law can be extended in this case, the conditional occupancy permit cannot so it is limited to three months whereas the zone can be extended; the temporary use zone can allow for additional time for construction and once they have occupancy of that new dwelling, they will have to demolish the existing within three months; Mr. Peter Kokkoros, Deputy Chief Building Official, indicating that the conditional permit is issued at the sole discretion of the Chief Building Official, any conditions imposed on that conditional permit are again at the sole discretion of the Chief Building Official so should there be any hardship or for whatever matter of that three months needs to be four or five months that is a something that the Chief Building Official can consider.