

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
<p>Trans Canada Pipeline (TCPL)</p>	<p>Request that the Zoning By-law schedules show TCPL's pipelines and facilities, where applicable, as UT (or as an appropriate 'Infrastructure' symbol). We can provide GIS shape files to the Township; however, A data sharing agreement is required prior to sharing of GIS shape files.</p> <p>Recommend the following changes to the proposed draft Zoning By-law:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add in Section 3.2 Defined Terms, the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS 2020) definition of 'Infrastructure.</li> <li>2. Create a new zone symbol for Infrastructure to distinguish these corridors and facilities from public utilities.</li> <li>3. Rename the proposed title of Section 4.45 from 'Utilities Permitted in All Zones,' to 'Utilities and Infrastructure'.</li> <li>4. Add the following new regulations to 4.45 Utilities and Infrastructure, as renamed: 4.45.3 In any zone where lands about a pipeline right-of-way, permanent buildings and structures, as well as retaining walls, driveways, parking spaces and parking areas, shall be setback a minimum of 7 metres from the edge of the pipeline right-of-way; and, accessory structures, including pools, decks and sheds, shall be setback a minimum</li> </ol>	<p>TCPL's pipelines and facilities will be integrated under an informational attachment to the draft Zoning By-law once a data-sharing agreement is entered into. Such attachment is intended to show facilities of infrastructure operators. The Preamble will be updated to note that the relevant infrastructure operator should be consulted for any development proposed near these areas.</p> <p>With respect to the requested revisions, we prefer not to incorporate the definition of infrastructure from the PPS 2020, as the definition is written in the context of interpreting the policies of the PPS 2020. We note the term public use is defined which incorporates various elements of the PPS infrastructure definition, including oil and gas pipelines. This type of infrastructure is permitted in all zones.</p> <p>We do not agree with creating a new infrastructure zone. The zoning by-law already contains a utility zone. Comment number 3 is no longer applicable as these provisions have been merged under Section 4.29 of the draft Zoning By-law.</p> <p>With respect to the requested setbacks, these have not been incorporated. The Preamble will be updated to note that the relevant infrastructure operator should be</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	3 metres setback from the edge of the pipeline right-of way.	consulted for any development proposed near these areas in which case the infrastructure operator can apply setbacks accordingly.
Resident/Landowner 3430 Seventh Concession Road	The CZBL indicates this parcel of land as Agricultural - A. However, there is an existing golf course on the subject lands zoned A/GC under amending By-law 5076/00, permitting the golf course. The CZBL Agricultural zoning does not permit a golf course.	The mapping is updated to reflect A/GC and OS-HL zoning on the site as per site-specific exception By-laws 5706/00 and 5720/00.
Resident/Landowner Park Crescent	Update zoning to open space. It is in the hazard zone and owned by the TRCA or City.	These lands are rezoned to OS as requested by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.
Resident/Landowner 509 Park Crescent	Incorrect Zoning - Should be rezoned to OSW/OS.	These lands are rezoned to OS as requested by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.
Resident/Landowner 5375 Sideline 4	Requested clarification about whether the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law allow secondary dwellings in the Oak Ridges Moraine.	<p>The City has reviewed its policies and zoning provisions for Additional Dwelling Units (ADUs, i.e., secondary dwellings) based on recent provincial policy changes through the More Homes Built Faster Act (Bill 13). The provisions have been updated in both the current zoning by-laws and in the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law to permit ADUs on most lots.</p> <p>5375 Sideline 4 is situated within the Oak Ridges Moraine, and presently is zoned ORM-EP – Oak Ridges Moraine - Environmental Protection zone by Zoning By-law 3037, as amended. The proposed</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>zoning in the draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law for your property will remain ORM-EP. The current and proposed ORM-EP zoning does not permit an ADU either within a second structure or accessory structure or in the principal dwelling. The intent of not permitting ADUs within a second structure or accessory structure within the Oak Ridges Moraine is related to servicing, environmental protection and engineering concerns.</p>
<p>Malone Given Parsons representing North- East Pickering Landowners Group (NEPLOG)</p>	<p>Section 1.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preferred approach to zoning is to permit a range of built forms and typologies (from single detached dwellings to higher density townhouse units such as stacked and back-to-back units) within the same general residential zone.</li> </ul> <p>Section 2.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the parking requirements of 2 parking spaces for all residential building types is overly restrictive and request the City to require a lower parking rate of 1 parking space per unit.</li> <li>• Request the City to use driveway and garage standards that are inclusive for all built forms such as a reduced parking space dimension of 2.6 metres by 5.6 metres.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 1.0 Response</p> <p>The Consolidated Zoning By-law is principally a consolidation exercise, and efforts were made to appropriately integrate MZOs into the second draft Consolidated Zoning By-law. Please note the current in-effect MZOs can be found by selecting Schedule 2 of the Layers List in the Interactive Map.</p> <p>Section 2.0 Response</p> <p>The first draft of the Consolidated Zoning By-law consolidates all existing Residential zones, many of which, such as the Residential- General zones, were not organized by density (despite numbering such as R1 to R6 which suggest otherwise). The first draft was preliminary. Now that the Exception Zones have been</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage the City to consider more modern and flexible building zone standards for new residential communities in the Residential Second and Third Density zones.</li> <li>• Request that the prohibition of a temporary sales office until an applicable plan of subdivision or condominium has received draft plan approval or the property is in a zone the permits the proposed development be removed from the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law.</li> </ul> <p>Section 3.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request that the City consider including stacked and back-to-back townhouses within the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law.</li> <li>• Clarification requested if landscaping area in any yards can be counted towards both amenity area and landscaping area, and how indoor amenity areas can be regulated for individual dwelling units such as townhouses</li> </ul> <p>Section 3.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request clarification that the MU1 zone adequately captures the range of mixed uses and built forms intended for the mixed-use category.</li> </ul>	<p>reviewed, further work was completed to reorganize and streamline the Residential zones in the second draft.</p> <p>At the time that NEPLOG Secondary Plan process is complete and when there is an area specific zoning-by-law amendment, the City will consider how best to integrate this area-specific by-law into the Consolidated Zoning By-law. It is not expected that the new Zoning By-law will include the zones which will be applied to these lands, as the zoning and standards should be informed by the Secondary Plan process.</p> <p>Section 3.1 Response</p> <p>Further refinements to the permitted uses and amenity area requirements have been incorporated into the second draft.</p> <p>Section 3.2 Response</p> <p>The Mixed-Use Zone category was developed to reflect the City's Official Plan designations and provide a zone basis for the City to use when reviewing zoning by-law amendments for mixed-use development applications instead of developing new zone codes. The Mixed-Use zones are organized by density with Local Node (LN) zone permitting smallest scale and uses and the Mixed-Use General</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>Section 3.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the parking requirement of 2 parking spaces for all residential building types is overly restrictive.</li> </ul>	<p>(MU1) zone permitting an increased scale and range of uses.</p> <p>The MU1 zone has been revised to address smaller-scale mixed use development, generally up to 5 storeys. It is intended that this zone could serve as a starting point for future development applications. As this project is primarily a consolidation exercise, it is anticipated that further effort will be conducted to modify/simplify or add new Mixed Use zones in a future zoning by-law.</p> <p>Section 3.3 Response</p> <p>Parking rates for areas outside of the City were informed by the benchmarking exercise discussed in Discussion Paper #7 as well as an evaluation of site-specific exceptions for medium-density housing forms in the City. As this project is primarily a consolidation exercise, significant refinements may be considered in a subsequent Zoning By-law review stage. Further, there are opportunities for reduced parking rates within the Kingston Road Corridor intensification area. This area is excluded from the Consolidated Zoning By-law project and will be reviewed as part of a separate City initiated zoning by-law amendment.</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
MHBC Planning Urban Design & Landscape Architecture 2055 Brock Road	Request draft Consolidated Zoning By-law be revised to reflect an active development application.	The draft Zoning By-law is revised to reflect the July 8, 2024, Ontario Land Tribunal Decision OLT 23-000498.
Resident/Landowner 3290 Greenburn Place	Will Section 14.2.9 apply in RE zones, and is it part of the General Provisions? Other references are Home Occupation and Parking in Driveway.	Please note that Section 14.2.9 of the draft Zoning By-law applies to the Seaton Urban Area only. The subject site, 3290 Greenburn Place, is not located in this area and subject to Site Specific By-law 2044/85 (see Exception 312). Any Residential zone outside of the Seaton Urban Area will be subject to Section 5.12 - Restrictions on the Parking and Storage of Vehicles which regulates the parking and storage of vehicles. A Vehicle Sales or Rental Establishment is not a permitted use in the RE zone, nor permitted is a Home Industries (See Section 4.15 - Home Industries). The height of a garage is regulated through Section 4.2.3 of the draft By-law which limits the height to 3.5m except for a detached private garage with a pitched roof which permits a height of 4.5m. Please see Exception 312 for additional provisions that are applicable to the lands.

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
Resident/Landowner 1230 Sandbar Road	Zone in line with waterfront open space.	The zoning shown in the first draft was the existing zoning from By-law 2511 and carried forward. In response to specific comments from TRCA on the first draft, some zoning updates in this area have been made in response to TRCA's separate comments.
Resident/Landowner 734A Krosno Boulevard	This property contains a freehold townhome but is zoned RM4. Other RM zoning specify interior side yard setbacks, yet RM4 wording remains unchanged from current bylaw 2520. RM2 and RM5 zones for street townhomes have a 0.9m side setback for interior.	In the Final Draft Consolidated Zoning By-law, the Residential zones have been consolidated and streamlined to ease readability to respond to comments from the public and stakeholders. In the case of this property, the new zone, R3A, contains streamlined provisions for street townhouses, which apply a minimum interior side yard setback of 0.0 m where two street townhouses share a common wall.
Resident/Landowner 2215 Brock Road	This would be better utilized if zoned multi-use, community use like for a library, or community centre, or low- rise commercial / mixed residential. The adjacent neighbourhoods north of Finch would utilize it.	We note that this property is currently zoned Agriculture A and is the site of a former commercial greenhouse. The intent of the Consolidated Zoning By-law Review is to consolidate the existing zoning. This site is zoned Urban Reserve in the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law, to indicate that the site may be developed in the future, subject to a development application.

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

<p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority</p>	<p>Appreciate that the draft Zoning By-law highlights TRCA's roles and pleased to see TRCA's Regulated Area mapping is to be included as a schedule.</p> <p>Propose zoning for certain TRCA owned lands, or under a management agreement with the City, to ensure environmental protection.</p> <p>Clarification requested for zoning certain Environmental Protection – EP and Open Space – OS lands to Agricultural – A.</p> <p>Ensure the draft Zoning By-law reflects the requirements of source protection plans in accordance with the <i>Clean Water Act</i>.</p> <p>Request the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• carry over the definition of watercourse to the Seaton zoning regulations;</li> <li>• incorporate a setback from stable top of bank or shoreline hazard;</li> <li>• prohibit development including accessory and additional dwelling units; and accessory uses, building and structures in lands identified as hazardous lands or sites;</li> <li>• amend section 4.9.1 to outline that not all regulated areas may be captured in the draft Zoning By-law;</li> <li>• clarify rationale for a minimum 4 metre setback from the EP zone;</li> <li>• prohibit certain uses such as day care in hazardous lands and site;</li> </ul>	<p>We would be pleased to obtain and review any updated regulation area mapping to assess its incorporation into the final zoning by-law.</p> <p>Although this Zoning By-law Review is principally a consolidation exercise, and site-specific zone changes are not being addressed typically, we have reviewed and agreed with incorporating the requested site-specific changes. The reason is that TRCA is requesting modifications to an EP or OS zone over its landholdings, which would not require a site-specific evaluation to inform the modification. We note that the comment regarding the Rouge National Urban Park zoning is subject to further review.</p> <p>At this time, it is preferred that the Clean Water Act requirements be left to processes outside of zoning, but we welcome further discussion on the merits of incorporating them into zoning. Further review of the Highly Vulnerable Aquifer provisions will be considered in the third/final draft CZBL. We appreciate the suggestion to carry forward the definition of watercourse into the Seaton definitions. As the term is not used in the Seaton zone provisions, we do not feel it is necessary currently. In large part the intent of this chapter is to consolidate the existing Seaton zoning regulations.</p>
--	--	--



## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• define Significant Valleylands, Wetlands, Significant Woodlands, Fish Habitat and Seepage Areas and Springs;</li><li>• generally, prohibit new stormwater management facilities within EP zones;</li><li>• clarify that major (or active) recreational uses are not permitted within the EP zone and/or highlighting that only minor (or passive) recreational uses will be permitted within EP zones; and</li><li>• refine definition of structure to provide examples such as headwall, outlet pipes, etc, for clarity on permitted types of structures and no confusion for ponds, underground tanks, etc.</li></ul>	<p>We would prefer not to incorporate a setback from stable top of bank or shoreline hazard as it would be difficult for zoning administration to enforce this in many circumstances. Generally, any specifically hazardous lands identified through a development process would be incorporated into a protective zone such as EP.</p> <p>We have made the requested revision to the “checking the zoning” section as suggested. Regarding your comments on Section 4.1, Accessory Dwelling Units, we have added the requested provision to accessory dwelling units.</p> <p>Regarding your comments on 4.2.1, Accessory Uses, Buildings and Structures, it would not be appropriate to make this change, as the location of hazardous lands/sites will not be clear to zoning administration and this section will be applied very frequently to sheds and many other types of minor structures. There may also be exceptions to this given there is a wide variety of accessory structures. The Zoning By-law does not contain a fulsome map of these areas. A prohibition on a use in a particular area of land should be identified on a map or relate to the entirety of the lot.</p> <p>The suggested edit in Section 4.27.5 (former Section 4.9.1) has been</p>
--	---	---

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

		<p>integrated. Former Section 4.12 (Environmental Protection (EP) and City Centre Natural Heritage System (CCNHS) Zone Setback) has been deleted.</p> <p>The general provision requiring the minimum 4 metre setback has been deleted. Generally, the feature plus its required buffer/setback should be incorporated into the EP zone mapping through development application processes.</p> <p>The request to prohibit certain uses where there is a threat to the safe evacuation of vulnerable populations such as day care use is addressed through a proposed new provision which cross references with section 4.9.6. This focuses on day care uses. The medical use would not involve overnight care and would not be the same as the uses listed in Section 4.9.6</p> <p>The terms, Significant Valleylands, Wetlands, Significant Woodlands, Fish Habitat and Seepage Areas and Springs are defined to assist in the interpretation of the provisions of 4.22.5. As the terms are not used in the Seaton zoning chapter, there is not a need to define them in the Seaton chapter.</p> <p>Note that only existing stormwater management (SWM) facilities in the EP zoning are permitted. The City may have</p>
--	--	--

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>used the prior G zoning to permit SWM facilities, and since this G zone was replaced by the EP zone, there is a need to recognize these existing uses as they will continue to function as essential infrastructure. Moving forward, the City will utilize the specific SWM zone for new facilities.</p> <p>It is the City's intent not to allow for major recreational facilities in the EP zone. The allowance for buildings and structures would only be related to the established permitted uses listed in the table. As such only accessory structures associated with passive recreational uses would be allowed in the EP zone (e.g., for trails). We added the word "permitted" to clarify.</p> <p>A further revision of the definition of structure is not necessary. Structures would be limited to the permitted uses and the definition of accessory (i.e., related to the use) and the definition of structure.</p>
Resident/Landowner 570 Kingston Road	Zoning map does not indicate which zoning establishment this address falls under.	This property is located within the Kingston Road Corridor and Special Retailing Node Intensification Area, which is not subject to this proposed draft Consolidated Zoning By-Law, and thus it has not been assigned a proposed new parent zone. Policy and zoning

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>updates for this area are being undertaken through a separate process which will be incorporated into the CZBL at a future date.</p> <p>Currently, the property is subject to a site-specific exception zone, LCA-7, which was established through municipal by-laws 2599/87, 4121/92, and 4080/92.</p>
Durham Live	<p>The draft Consolidated By-law proposed to zone the Durham Live lands as C1 (General Commercial) and UR (Urban Reserve) which does not reflect the site-specific exceptions and MZO that exists on the site. The following is a summary of requests for changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area 1 (Pickering Casino Resort Lands): Objects to the proposed C1 zoning. Requests a C1 Exception; Objects to UR zone for the westerly lands of Area 1, requests for these lands to be added to the C1 Exception; No comments on the UR zone in northeastern corner</li> <li>• Area 2 (MZO Lands): Exclude these from the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law</li> <li>• Area 3 (Lands West of Squires Beach Road): Create a UR Exception zone</li> </ul>	<p>The Durham Live Lands are subject to site-specific By-laws 7404/15, 7661/18, and 7735/20, in addition to MZO 607/20.</p> <p>The Consolidated Zoning By-law Project is a consolidation of the various By-laws, including site-specific exceptions, into one City-wide By-law. Therefore, most site-specific zoning will not change, and simply be consolidated. This will maintain aspects of previous prevailing zoning by-laws.</p> <p>As such, existing site permissions for Durham Live Lands will be maintained through the existing exceptions and MZO. There is no need to create a new C1 or UR exception zone to reflect these existing permissions.</p> <p>The MZO is reflected in Schedule 2 of the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law. As noted in the Preamble of the draft By-law, in the event of a conflict between this draft Zoning By-law and an MZO, the MZO</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>prevails.</p> <p>Exception Zone 70 has since been created for Area 1 which aligns with the MZO wording.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 1862 Liverpool Road</p>	<p>What is the current zoning for this site? Has there been any studies for the future use of the properties abutting this site? What is the City's vision for this site?</p>	<p>Any information on plans for those properties, including any development applications or site-specific studies, can be obtained from the City's Development Planning department. We note that zoning in the second draft Consolidated Zoning By-law is updated to the Urban Reserve zone, to reflect the possibility that future development may occur, subject to an application.</p>
<p>Melymuk Consulting Limited 2215 Brock Road</p>	<p>It is requested that the second Draft of the City's Consolidated Zoning By-law (and all subsequent drafts) zone the developable portion of the property at 2215 Brock Road as "CN" (Community Node) with an exception to allow residential uses such as townhouses and apartments with heights up to 62 metres.</p>	<p>Currently, 2215 Brock Road is zoned A under Zoning By-law 3036. From our understanding, you are seeking to rezone your property to be consistent with the designations that exist on the site (Community Node and Natural Area). Under the draft Zoning By-law, the site is proposed to be rezoned to Urban Reserve. The Urban Reserve zone provides for and regulates existing uses on lands which are primarily undeveloped for urban uses. Generally, these uses have limited buildings or structures. The Urban Reserve zone is intended to protect land from premature subdivision and development to provide for future comprehensive</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>development on those lands.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Consolidated Zoning By-law Project is a consolidation of our various By-laws into one City-wide By-law. Therefore, most zoning has not changed, and simply has been consolidated. Some other elements of the project include updating outdated terminology and providing a more accessible Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Requests for pre-zoning are not being contemplated within this process. The current zoning reflects the existing use on the subject site. The process for rezoning includes an application, specific supporting studies, and a public meeting.</p>
Resident/Landowner 1675 Montgomery Park Road	Please advise for this property if we should follow the requirements of the parent by-law 2511, or the current draft by-law?	Until the new Consolidated Zoning By-law (CZBL) is enacted by Council, the requirements of the parent By-Laws apply to any change you may wish to make to your property. However, as the CZBL is principally a consolidation exercise, the intent is mainly to carry forward existing zoning standards into one document.
Resident/Landowner 490 Kingston Road	Zoning info for 478-490 Kingston Road does not appear on the map	This site is located within the Kingston Road Corridor. This area is excluded from the Consolidated Zoning By-law project and will be reviewed as part of a separate City initiated zoning by-law amendment. For

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>more information about this project, please visit:  <a href="https://www.pickering.ca/en/city-hall/kingston-road-corridor-intensification.aspx">https://www.pickering.ca/en/city-hall/kingston-road-corridor-intensification.aspx</a></p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 940 Brock Road</p>	<p>In your zoning GIS map, this property is classified as E3 (Employment Commercial). In other resources (MPAC) I see it is MC-18. My goal is to open an indoor Cricket facility (sportsplex). Would this use be permitted at this location?</p>	<p>Confirmed that a Cricket Facility is permitted as a "Commercial-Recreational Establishment" under By-law 6255/04.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 1289 Wharf Street</p>	<p>The proposed Zoning By-law will not permit restaurant use as a principal permitted use. Request for subject lands to be placed within a site-specific Open Space Waterfront Zone.</p>	<p>This property will be rezoned OSW which recognizes (permits) the restaurant.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 1230 Sandbar Road</p>	<p>Sandbar Road remains residential zoning, when in fact the land is not to be used as residential. A rezoning may be required.</p>	<p>There is no record of Sandbar Rd being zoned OS, zoned R4 under 2511. City confirmed this property is under TRCA ownership and therefore rezoned as EP.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner Saxton Glen Estate</p>	<p>Clarification of provisions concerning Accessory Structures; Permitted Uses and Antenna Towers as it relates to By-law 2044/85 and the Saxton Glen community.</p>	<p>We note that By-law 3044/85 has been incorporated as Exception 312, under Section 15.312. In consideration of the comments, we have proposed modifications to accessory structure requirements (see new Sections 15.312.2.b.xi.A and B).</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner Park Crescent</p>	<p>This land is owned by the TRCA and should be part of the open space system"</p>	<p>The TRCA has provided details comments regarding zoning for their lands, and the land has been rezoned according to</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		TRCA's request.
Resident/Landowner 520 Marksbury Crescent	This property should be zoned as open space as should properties to the east and west which are owned by the TRCA and cannot be built on due to ongoing erosion due to the shoreline hazard. The waterfront trail goes through this lot.	The TRCA has provided details comments regarding zoning for their lands, and the land has been rezoned according to TRCA's request.
Resident/Landowner 2550 Brock Road	The proposed Zoning is reflected as A, whereas a site-specific zoning by-law was passed in 2022 (7696/22) to permit the redevelopment of the lands. The draft By-law would appear to be reverting to the former zoning applicable to the lands, which should not occur.	The intent is to carry forward existing exceptions which have now been included in the second draft Consolidated Zoning By-law.
Resident/Landowner 1920 Bayly Street	Discrepancy between the listed exception and actual By-law	This site is zoned M-IC(DN) as per site-specific exception By-law 5829/01, amending Zoning By-law 2511. This is reflected on the interactive zoning by-law mapping.
Resident/Landowner 2460 Brock Road	This is not being built as mixed use. A mixed-use area has a mix of apartments, shops, and spaces for people to sit or hang out. This is a strip mall full of parking and some offices. Bring in extra legislation or design requirements about what "mixed use" is, and if you don't address surface parking, you're going to end up with some very ugly and inaccessible areas. Toss the parking underground, make a square, make it easy to	This site is subject to site-specific exception By-law 7642/18 from a previous zoning by-law amendment application. This exception permits both commercial and residential uses, including a drive-through facility. The draft Consolidated Zoning By-law provides the City with modernized standards to regulate above and below-grade parking structures, and a new Mixed Use Zone Chapter to use as a basis when



## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>access by foot or bike (it's for the people that live close by, right?). This isn't working. Also why is there a drive through here?</p>	<p>reviewing mixed-use development applications. Currently, the intent is to maintain existing zoning requirements for lands with an exception zone and to require the owner to submit a rezoning application for any proposed changes.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 1650 McBrady Crescent</p>	<p>Request to re-evaluate uses permitted in LN and other mixed use uses or commercial zones adjacent to residential zones (i.e., night clubs and loud restaurants in strip plaza behind houses) - Ward 3.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increases in water infrastructure capacity is not keeping pace with rate of condo development (low water pressure);</li> <li>• Increased bike safety connecting Brock Road to Kingston Road;</li> <li>• concerned about small businesses as intensification happens; and</li> <li>• include in future City-wide studies.</li> </ul>	<p>It is noted that the City will need to review the policies of the Official Plan for commercial areas to fulsomely respond to this comment. As such, this comment is flagged for consideration in future studies. The concerns about nightclubs are noted. Nightclubs can be impactful in terms of noise and there is a compatibility issue with respect to nearby residential uses. We have reviewed and updated the night club provisions.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner Bay Ridges Area</p>	<p>If rooming houses or short-term rentals open in Pickering there should be regulation.</p>	<p>The draft Zoning By-law includes rooming houses provisions in Section 4.32 and Short-term rental provisions in Section 4.38 to help better regulate these uses in the City.</p>
<p>Miller Thomson LLP representing GFL Environmental Services Inc.</p>	<p>GFL's is dissatisfied by how the site was split into different zones. GFL's view is that the entire Site should be zoned E1 in recognition of the existing Waste Transfer Station</p>	<p>To reflect the existing Waster Transfer Station in an industrial area and avoid legal non-conformity, 1034, 1048, 1060 and 1070 Toy Avenue will continue to be zoned</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
1034, 1048, 1060 and 1070 Toy Avenue	operations. Furthermore, the Waste Transfer Station use should be explicitly permitted on these lands given the long-standing use. GFL's intention is to continue that use in this location and the continued need for its services in Pickering and Durham Region.	as per the site-specific exceptions applicable to the sites. This will maintain aspects of previous prevailing zoning by-laws. Please see Exceptions 21, 48 and 73 as they apply to the sites.
Resident/Landowner General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How is the City of Pickering altering restrictive residential zones such as RS1 to address intergenerational living needs of families? Parking needs, for example.</li> <li>2. Does the city have any plans to further design or designate how parcels in MU1 are used? How can the City enforce the vision of the Official Plan?</li> <li>3. How can the City provide existing residents with a more diverse offering in local nodes?</li> <li>4. In the future, will the City consider zoning industrial as more mixed use?</li> </ol>	<p>The CZBL is a consolidation effort to bring existing By-laws into one By-law. Additional Dwelling Unit (ADUs) provisions have been incorporated in Section 4.3 of this draft. Parking needs for ADUs are considered. Additional driveway widening provisions are included in Section 5.11 of the draft Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Official Plan policies are primarily enforced through the provisions of the Zoning By-law. One of the tasks of the new CZBL project is to ensure that all zoning provisions reflect Official Plan policies.</p> <p>A diverse offering of neighbourhood-appropriate services (including retail uses such as food stores or restaurants and community uses such as libraries or day cares) are permitted in the Local Node (LN) zone. There may be other avenues for the City to support or encourage a broad mix of uses in Local Nodes, but zoning can only permit the uses, not facilitate the diversity of mix.</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>The CZBL includes three employment zones with a variety of uses, including a range of industrial uses. The overall vision and land use strategy for employment areas is set out in the Official Plan. Changes such as the suggestion of approaching employment areas as more mixed use in nature may be dealt with at the time of the next Official Plan Review. That process will provide several opportunities for public participation.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 345 Kingston Road</p>	<p>There's no zoning</p>	<p>This site is located within the Kingston Road Corridor. This area is excluded from the Consolidated Zoning By-law project and will be reviewed as part of a separate City initiated zoning by-law amendment. For more information about this project, please visit: <a href="https://www.pickering.ca/en/city-hall/kingston-road-corridor-intensification.aspx">https://www.pickering.ca/en/city-hall/kingston-road-corridor-intensification.aspx</a></p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 5229 Brock Road (also known as 'Old' Brock Road)</p>	<p>The front of the property is zoned ORM-R5 and the back approximately 3 acres is zoned ORM-A. The adjacent Ward Farm, on the south side, has recently been approved for housing development by the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) Plan Approval 18T-90016 (R). I would like to request that the zoning on my back property be changed to ORM-R6 consistent with the farm.</p>	<p>Currently, 5229 Old Brock Road is zoned "ORM-A" "ORM-R5" &amp; "ORM-EP" Under Zoning By-law 3037, as amended by By-law 6640/06. A residential dwelling is a permitted use.</p> <p>From my understanding, you are seeking to rezone your property to be consistent with the recent OLT approved development</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>adjacent to your lot.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Consolidated Zoning By-law Project is a consolidation of our various By-laws into one City-wide By-law. Therefore, most zoning has not changed, and simply has been consolidated. Some other elements of the project include updating outdated terminology and providing a more accessible Zoning By-law.</p> <p>The purpose of the Consolidated Zoning By-law Review project is not to rezone individual properties. The process for rezoning includes an application, specific supporting studies, and a public meeting. And, in the case of the adjacent neighbor, further resolution via the OLT. Furthermore, the lands south of your lot were formerly zoned for Agricultural uses (ORM-A). The applicant went through a formal process to rezone the lands including supporting studies and public consultation.</p>
Resident/Landowner General Provisions	Can there be consideration for driveway size relative to vehicle size? To provide you with some context, I live in zone R4 and my driveway can accommodate 8-10 cars and my home is 5600 square feet in size so one vehicle that measures 1.5 car lengths should be considered as permissible.	Oversized vehicles are regulated under Section 5.12 (Parking and Storage of Vehicles) of the second draft Consolidated Zoning By-law. Please refer to this section of the By-law which will regulate vehicles in residential zones.

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

<b>Resident or Organization / Address</b>	<b>Comment(s)</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) 2001 Clements Road</p>	<p>Requested that a portion of this lot be zoned Environmental Protection - EP to reflect its natural heritage features.</p>	<p>The Consolidated Zoning By-law Review is a consolidation effort to bring existing parent Zoning By-laws into one consolidated by-law. This site is zoned M2S and M1 by existing parent Zoning By-law 2511. Rezoning a portion of this property to the appropriate environmental protection zone will be further studied in a future comprehensive zoning review following the adoption of a new Official Plan.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 5269 Brock Road</p>	<p>Please advise whether properties in existence before the Consolidated Zoning By-Law is completed and enacted, be required to meet all Consolidated Zoning By-Law requirements, or will the Clergy Principle apply to those properties?</p>	<p>Properties and uses in existence prior to the Consolidated Zoning By-law coming into force that do not comply with the Consolidated By-law may be considered legal non-conforming and enjoy certain permissions as long as the properties and uses were in compliance with zoning that existed prior to the Consolidated Zoning By-law.</p>
<p>Kohn Architects 2055 Brock Road</p>	<p>Concerned that the following provision works for flat grade scenarios but not for sloping rows of townhouses: 7. Special Provisions ("RMI-7" Zone) (1)(b) A private garage shall have a minimum width of 3.0 metres and a minimum depth of 6.0 metres provided, however, the width may include one interior step and the depth may include two interior steps.</p>	<p>The subject site is zoned "RH/MU-3" and "OS-HL" under exception By-law 7085-10. There is no provision within this exception for By-law 3036, which amends, which regulates the interior space of the garage.</p> <p>As part of the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law, we have amended Section 5.6 (Size of Parking Spaces and Aisles) which regulates the size of parking spaces within private garages to remove discussion</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		regarding the number of steps and instead regulate by a maximum encroachment permitted for steps.
Resident/Landowner 375 Kingston Road	Within and around 100 buildings nearing different stages of approval in the City of Pickering, there should be thought on where applications are approved for height, trying to keep it near the Go Station and/or Kingston Road/Liverpool area, and maybe near Brock Road and Pickering Parkway. What doesn't make sense is to award considerable height in areas like Altona and Kingston Road, or specifically what is known as Bruno's Plaza at Rougemount and Kingston Road. Focus on development in and around the Pickering Town Centre and Brock/401 corridors, where we have the Go Station and other transit more readily available.	This site is located within the Kingston Road Corridor. This area is excluded from the Consolidated Zoning By-law project and will be reviewed as part of a separate City initiated zoning by-law amendment. For more information about this project, please visit: <a href="https://www.pickering.ca/en/city-hall/kingston-road-corridor-intensification.aspx">https://www.pickering.ca/en/city-hall/kingston-road-corridor-intensification.aspx</a>
Resident/Landowner Kingston Road Corridor	For property located inside Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retail Area Study, how will exceptions be addressed within this area while the CZBL leaves space for a new KRCSR by-law?	For the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retail Area Study (KRCSR) Area, until the new study area By-law is adopted and in force, City of Pickering parent zoning by-laws will apply. For developments in this area will go through the application process as usual. The study is complete but currently before the OLT. Existing exceptions are being carried forward (maintained) and will be reviewed as the KRCSR By-law is developed.
Resident/Landowner	On the project review website, it is noted that	For the Kingston Road Corridor and

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
1899 Brock Road	exceptions and on-going applications would be blank, but I am still unclear as to how these would be incorporated in the final CZBL. Can you clarify?	Specialty Retail Area Study (KRCSR) Area, until the new study area By-law is adopted and in force, City of Pickering parent zoning by-laws will apply. For developments in this area will go through the application process as usual. The study is complete but currently before the OLT. Existing exceptions are being kept and will be reviewed as the KRCSR By-law is developed.
Resident/Landowner 1734 Bayly Street	This zoning only applies to the lands with the municipal address 1750 Bayly Street. The correct amending By-law is 4989/97 and is zoned CA(A)-1 not CA(F)-1.	By-law 4989/97 was repealed by By-law 5971/02, which has been carried forward, and applies the CA(F)-1 zone to 1734 and 1742 Bayly. This is reflected on the interactive mapped.
McDermott & Associates Limited Lots 6 And 7. Registered Plan 424, 1930 Durham Road No.5, Part Lot 16, Concession 9, City of Pickering	Request that the site-specific provisions implemented by By-law No. 6640/06 be brought forward under the proposed comprehensive zoning by-law.	The Consolidated Zoning By-law Project is a consolidation of the various By-laws, including site-specific exceptions, into one City-wide By-law. Therefore, most site-specific zoning will not change, and simply be consolidated. This will maintain aspects of previous prevailing zoning by-laws. The exception zones have been consolidated and are available online.
Richard Vink, Consultant Seaton	The issue is with lane based product and the maximum front yard and minimum rear yard requirements. In regards to the Zone provision charts -Section 4, Table 4; The chart is somewhat confusing, as it notes the, Minimum Rear Yard as NR (no	Thank you for noting this potential conflict between the general provisions in 14.2.18 regarding attached private garages on lanes and the lot and building requirements in Section 14.4. As part of the development of the draft of the Consolidated Zoning By-

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>requirement). However, section 2.18, in regards to 'Standard for Attached Private Garages on Lots Accessed by Lanes' also applies and sets a minimum and maximum setback to the rear lot line. This confusion on this has led to a number of home builders to seek minor variances in regard to the maximum building setback to the rear yard lot line. Adding a note to the chart, to refer to section 2.18, would be helpful to avoid this confusion.</p> <p>The other concern in regard to applying both a maximum front yard setback and also a maximum rear yard setback to a dwelling. These maximum setbacks dictate the building depth, which directly affects the square footage of the dwellings and garage depths. The townhouse blocks on a plan of subdivision are often not the same depth and may vary from block to block, resulting in the dwellings being custom designed to suit the various block depths.</p>	<p>law the changes were considered. The requirement for the maximum rear yard setback has been removed to create more flexibility. We have not added the requested notation, as it may take away from the general intent that all provisions of the By-law will always apply and there are various aspects of Section 14.2 which will be applicable in most circumstances.</p>
<p>ASE+J Inc Architect 1605 Deerbrook Drive</p>	<p>Please advise regarding the zoning by-law requirement for a second dwelling unit in the basement.</p>	<p>The City has reviewed its policies and zoning provisions for Additional Dwelling Units (which would include a basement dwelling unit in a single-detached dwelling) based on recent Provincial policy changes through the More Homes Built Faster Act (Bill 23). This has been incorporated into the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law.</p>



## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
Resident/Landowner 1335 Kingston Road	A site-specific exception was approved for the City Centre.	The site-specific exception and related changes to the Schedules of By-law 7553/17 are integrated into the Draft Consolidated Zoning By-law (Noting that this is the Pickering City Centre site, for which an exception by-law was enacted by Council on January 23, 2023, for the easterly portion of the site.).
Resident/Landowner 1355 Kingston Road	The subject lands are zoned City Centre One Mixed Use 1 (CC1). However, the site-specific exceptions (A 15/21) have not been included in the text. We respectfully request that the approved site-specific zoning exceptions for the subject lands be included to ensure that the future development remains compliant when the By-law comes into full force and effect.	The second Draft of the Consolidated Zoning By-law has been updated to incorporate the exceptions from the City Centre Zoning By-law including amendments. The intent is to fulsomely consolidate the City Centre Zoning By-law so that it may be repealed.
Resident/Landowner Natural Heritage	Commented about the legislative changes in setbacks for Provincially Significant Wetlands, from 120 metres to 30 metres, and the potential for irreversible loss of wetland function within the city. Requests that a standard 120 m setback be adopted by the City of Pickering for all wetlands in the CZBL review.	<p>These setback provisions come from amendments to the City's existing Zoning By-laws to protect various natural heritage features the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan area. The AOI (or the Minimum Area of Influence, as described in Policies 16.42 and 16.51 of the City's Official Plan), should not be confused with setbacks.</p> <p>The change by the Province implies that the Minimum Area of Influence for wetlands in urban areas would now change from 120 metres to 30 metres. The scope of the area</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>to be studied re potential impacts has been reduced from 120 metres to 30 metres. However, the actual setback will be determined through the results of an environmental impact study.</p> <p>The Official Plan contains policies regarding distances from natural heritage features, which trigger additional required studies and/or protections, the outcomes of which are implemented through the development application process.</p> <p>As the Zoning By-law Review project is a consolidation exercise, these requirements have not been updated. The City will undertake a review of these provisions and the associated policies in the future.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 1875 Clements Road</p>	<p>1) The E1 - Employment General Zone no longer allows outdoor storage as a principal use, compared to M2S zone of By-law 2511. It is the intention of the property owner to develop the property for open storage use.</p> <p>2) Transition Provisions: in reference to staff report PLN-09- 23, the submission notes that there will be an extended period between the pre-submission stage and the time an application is formally submitted. Request for removal of "deemed complete" in section 1.9.2 transition provisions. Request also to add a provision to allow for the filing of an application for a minor variance from the</p>	<p>Within the draft E1 zone, outdoor storage will be permitted through the use of a Contractor's Yard or accessory Outdoor Storage. Outdoor storage as the principal permitted use is not contemplated in any new zones in the second Draft Consolidated Zoning By-law.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Consolidated Zoning By-law Project is a consolidation of the various By-laws, including site-specific exceptions, into one City-wide By-law. Therefore, most site-specific zoning will not change, and simply be consolidated. This</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	prevailing zoning by-law.	<p>will maintain aspects of previous prevailing zoning by-laws and any minor variances could continue to vary provisions of the site-specific regulations.</p> <p>In addition, transition provisions proposed are valid for 5 years from the effective date of this By-law which in our opinion is sufficient time to accommodate any extended period between the pre-submission stage and when an application is deemed complete by the City. Minor variances will be allowed by the City following the passing of the new Zoning By-law.</p>
Resident/Landowner Whitevale Road	Quarry land appears to be missing the Highly Vulnerability Aquifer layer as illustrated in OP Schedules. Please check.	The Highly Vulnerable Aquifer Areas have been updated in the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law, (see Schedule 8), to incorporate only those areas which are subject to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. The mapping of these areas and the associated provisions are required to implement the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. However, it is also noted that other source water policies from the City's Official Plan will apply and be considered through development review processes.
Resident/Landowner 711 Krosno Boulevard	Are the new proposed zoning changes affecting my property changes done in 2002	This property is zoned C2 in the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law and permits a range of uses related to automobile service

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	for the restaurant and severance.	stations, including a restaurant.
Resident/Landowner 615 Liverpool Road	Both sides of Liverpool, south of Wharf are Live-work freehold townhouses. It needs to be maintained as a mixed-use area.	This property and adjacent properties on Liverpool Road are subject to site-specific exceptions which permit a mix of uses. These exceptions are now included in the draft of the Consolidated Zoning By-law.
Resident/Landowner 640 Liverpool Road	Your building housing why?, this is the perfect spot for small park maybe even outdoor food truck court. built out this area as a destination.	<p>The Consolidated Zoning By-law Project is a consolidation of the various By-laws, including site-specific exceptions, into one City-wide By-law. Therefore, most site-specific zoning will not change, and simply be consolidated.</p> <p>This property is zoned Open Space Waterfront in the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law, which does not permit residential uses. Any change in these permitted uses will be subject to a zoning by-law amendment application.</p>
Resident/Landowner Staxton Glen Estate	When Draft #2 is released, it will contain revised and updated Exceptions?	To answer your exceptions question, we aim to post an exceptions table on Let's Talk Pickering so you will receive another email when it's posted. This will allow the public to review the exceptions prior to their addition to the third draft. Regarding applications that are before a committee or approval by Council, those are separate processes, and they will be added to the CZBL after approval.
Resident/Landowner	Concerned that the site's 40 percent lot	The site has an exception which will be

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
1645 Pickering Pkwy	coverage is not recognized. Will this be included in the zoning by-law prior to it being finalized by Council?	carried over into the new CZBL.
Resident/Landowner 1246 Gloucester Square	This is currently zoned S3, not SD	Thank you for noting this. The correct zoning has been applied through the carrying forward of exception by-law 2864/88.
Resident/Landowner 485 Whitevale Road	This is currently zoned HMC8, this should become a CH zone.	This property is subject to exception by-law 2677/88, which applies the HMC8 zone, and will be carried forward in the draft of the Consolidated Zoning By-law.
Resident/Landowner 2130 Dixie Road	Zoning should be residential as all other areas surrounding the property are residential, this could make for a great place to add much-needed housing in the Liverpool area.	The Consolidated Zoning By-law Project is a consolidation of the various By-laws, including site-specific exceptions, into one City-wide By- law. Therefore, most site-specific zoning will not change, and simply be consolidated.
Resident/Landowner 2097 Liverpool Road	This should be higher density residential.	The Consolidated Zoning By-law Project is a consolidation of the various By-laws, including site-specific exceptions, into one City-wide By- law. Therefore, most site-specific zoning will not change, and simply be consolidated.
Resident/Landowner 911 Begley Street	This is currently Zoned PU - Public Utility. Why change it to RM?	Thank you for noting this. The correct zoning has been applied through the carrying forward of by-law 1299/81.
Resident/Landowner 1910 Altona Road	Should be zoned residential, increase housing in this area	The Consolidated Zoning By-law Project is a consolidation of the various By-laws, including site-specific exceptions, into one City-wide By- law. Therefore, most

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		site-specific zoning will not change, and simply be consolidated.
Resident/Landowner 1415 Major Oaks Road	These lots should be zoned S1 and not S2, refer to By-law 4183/93 schedule.	Thank you for noting this. The correct zoning has been applied through the carrying forward of by-law 4183/93
Resident/Landowner 825 Jomar Avenue	Please confirm the zone and advise the following: (1) Permitted use with conditions (2) The maximum building height	This property was zoned R1D in this draft of the Consolidated Zoning By-law, which permits a single-detached dwelling, a rooming home, and a home occupation, at a maximum building height of 9 metres.
Resident/Landowner 501 Marksbury Road	This property is owned by the TRCA, within a hazard zone and should be designated parkland.	The zoning of the property has been changed to Open Space, in accordance with TRCA's request.
Resident/Landowner 1855 Ninth Concession Road	Oddly shaped sliver overlapping.	Thank you for noting this. Overlaps and other legacy instances of data inaccuracies have been cleaned up..
Resident/Landowner 425 Whitevale Road	The Community Hamlet zone is not listed in the draft comprehensive by-law document. What is permitted in this zone?	This property is subject to an exception by-law as amended, which has been carried forward in the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law. The exception zone applicable to the property is HMC9, which permits the following uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•bed &amp; breakfast establishment;</li> <li>•day spa;</li> <li>•dwelling unit;</li> <li>•professional office;</li> <li>•restaurant – type A</li> <li>•retail store; and</li> <li>•small implement repair shop.</li> </ul>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
Resident/Landowner 431 Sheppard Avenue	A duplex zoning should be allowed in the area given it's close a proximity to highway 401 and big lots.	The subject property is zoned R1E and allows up to two additional dwelling units on the lot, subject to zoning regulations for Additional Dwelling Units.
Resident/Landowner 648 Foxwood Trail	I can find no reference to X225 (S SD-SA). What is it and what are the uses permitted.	Exception 225 can be found in the By-law 3036 Part 2 Document online. The S-SD-SA zone permits a single detached dwelling, semi- detached dwelling, and single attached dwelling residential uses. Please see Exception 225 for further details.
Resident/Landowner 5229 Brock Road	On the interactive map for my property, you show a pond in the middle of my land. This doesn't exist so please remove it. There is a cluster of trees and bushes but not a pond.	Noted.
Resident/Landowner 1851 Sandstone Manor	Properties, such as this should, permit private school use. There are limited opportunities for private schools, and the draft uses in this zone permit a daycare and commercial school, however not a private school. A location such as this should be considered, where the provincial D series guidelines can be met.	Noted. 1851 Sandstone Manor is subject to Exception 71 (by By-law 789/78) and permits the following uses: business offices; food preparation plants; light manufacturing plants; public uses; scientific or medical laboratories; and warehouses.
Resident/Landowner 857 Liverpool Road	More flexibility should be provided for commercial uses where properties abut major streets. This comment is not necessarily pertinent to this site, however properties along Liverpool Road should be encouraged to allow for future land use flexibility; no	Noted. Under Section 4.17 of the CZBL allows for Home Occupation uses including: Art Gallery, Personal Services Shop, Private Home Daycare, Office, Medical Office, and Instructional Business uses.

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	parking should be required.	
Resident/Landowner 1404 Rougemount Drive	Can the Zoning Maps include the character overlay zones?	The Infill Precinct Layer will be available in the Interactive Zone Mapping.
Resident/Landowner 395 Kingston Road	What are the allowable uses / zoning on the property.	This is located within the Kingston Road Corridor and is subject to a future By-law amendment (Official Plan Amendment 38, currently before the Ontario Land Tribunal).
Miller Thomson LLP representing GFL Environmental Services Inc. 1070 Toy Avenue	This site and sites surrounding reference the former zones as proposed zones. Is this not proposed to be an Employment zone (E1 - E3) in the future?	Please see Section 15 of the draft Zoning By-law for how to apply exceptions. Where the exception zone refers to the Former Zoning By- laws (e.g., 2511), the zone symbol shall refer to the corresponding zone, and the associated provisions as may be contained in the Former Zoning By- laws (e.g., 2511). The requirements of the exception zone, and all other applicable zone requirements under the Former Zoning By-law, shall apply except as may be otherwise stated in the exception zone. The site will remain zoned per the Exceptions, and not rezoned to E1 to E3 in the future.
Miller Thomson LLP representing GFL Environmental Services Inc. 1034 Toy Avenue	We have an exception but how are we supposed to know the underlying zone code?	Please see Section 15 of the draft Zoning By-law for how to apply exceptions. Where the exception zone refers to the Former Zoning By- laws (e.g., 2511), the zone symbol shall refer to the corresponding zone, and the associated provisions as may be contained in the Former Zoning By- laws (e.g., 2511). The requirements of the



## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		exception zone, and all other applicable zone requirements under the Former Zoning By-law shall apply except as may be otherwise stated in the exception zone.
Resident/Landowner 1675 Montgomery Park Road	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to By-law 6090/03 (Exception 6). Not all lands to the east form part of this Exception.</li> <li>2. These lands were initially zoned O1, they do not form part of Exception 6.</li> </ol>	This portion has been rezoned to Open Space (OS) and is not subject to Exception 6.
Resident/Landowner 1899 Brock Road and Seaton (SPEG and SPEHL - site specific)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarification requested regarding incorporation of 1899 Brock Rd., Kingston Road corridor and special retail node into CBL especially regarding OPA 20– 003/P, ZBAA07/20, SPA 06/20 through by law 7945/22 and 0720–22.</li> <li>2. Request to add additional uses to table 14.20 (SPEG Zone) for restaurant, bake shop, Café, convenience store.</li> <li>3. Request provisions of Table 14.6.2, for ancillary retail sales, be applied to the total area of the lot, versus the current per building policies.</li> <li>4. Request removal of retail stores from Section 14.6.3 prohibited uses.</li> </ol>	<p>The Kingston Road Corridor site is out of scope of the new ZBL as indicated in the submission. The Kingston Road Corridor OPA 38 is currently before the Ontario Land Tribunal. Provisions related to the Kingston Road Corridor will not be integrated into the city-wide Consolidation.</p> <p>With respect to the Seaton request, the Seaton zoning is carried forward and intended to implement the previously approved plans. The permission of new uses in the Prestige Employment zone would need to be evaluated against the policies. Generally, there is a limit to the types of non-employment uses allowed in employment lands. A Zoning By-law Amendment application is required to change the use.</p>
Resident/Landowner Duffins Rouge Agricultural	Regarding revoked Central Pickering Development Plan (CPDP) and O. Reg.	According to Bill 136, the Duffins Rouge Agricultural Preserve easements and

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
Preserve	154/03 (Agricultural Preserve MZO) - put back the agricultural preserve MZO protective easements.	covenants are valid and held by the province. The City does not have the authority to remove them, and this is not a municipal matter. Further, a lapsing contract on previous agreements or removals is regarded as null and void at this point. An administrative consideration for Council is to direct Staff to update AMANDA to reflect the properties where Bill 136 continues to hold the easements.
Resident/Landowner 1470 Finch Ave	<p>Concerns with permitted uses such as conservation use, park, and passive recreation use in the Urban Reserve zone.</p> <p>Concerns were raised as conflicting with identifying the land for future development.</p> <p>Requests that lands be designated 'residential' subject to the required studies as may be required by staff within a formal planning application.</p>	<p>The Pickering Official Plan designates 1470 Finch Avenue as Urban Residential Area – Low Density Area and the existing parent Zoning By-law 3036 zones the property Agriculture – A. The property is in the urban area of the City in a mixed area that has been developed for low density residential uses through plans of subdivision and larger lots having a potential for future low density residential redevelopment. The current A zoning is out of date for an urban area and does not reflect the potential for future residential development.</p> <p>The draft consolidated Zoning By-law proposes to zone 1470 Finch Avenue as Urban Reserve – UR recognize the potential for future urban redevelopment, and that agriculture zoning is no longer appropriate. Permitted uses in the Urban</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>Reserve zone include conservation use, park, and passive recreation use. Staff reviewed definitions and permitted uses of Urban Reserve and Future Development at the municipalities of London, Guelph, Ottawa, Vaughan, Stratford, and Clarington. Except for Stratford and Clarington, all municipalities included uses such as passive recreation, conservation, recreation, and park. Respectively, London and Ottawa include a preamble and a purpose for the UR zone clarifying the intention to protect land from premature development, and recognize the land for future development, while recognizing the existing uses.</p> <p>Regarding the request to designate the lands 'residential' subject to a formal planning application, it is noted that the lands are designated by the Pickering Official Plan as Urban Residential Area – Low Density Area. There is no intention through the Consolidated Zoning By-law Review to change the residential designation of the property. This is to confirm that the existing Urban Residential Area – Low Density Area designation, and both the existing Agriculture – A and proposed Urban Reserve -UR zoning would permit the submission of a Zoning By-law Amendment Application for</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		Council's consideration. The purpose of the Consolidated Zoning By-law Review is Not to bring properties into compliance with the existing Official Plan designations. That will be a subsequent exercise, following the completion of a new Pickering Official Plan.
Resident/Landowner 2465 Sixth Concession Road	RC5 is from the First Draft and was consolidated for the Second Draft CZBL. Please correct this zone category.	These lands have been rezoned to R1B.
Resident/Landowner 2505 Brock Road North	<p>Exception to recognize the permitted uses including the proposed funeral centre, parking along one side of internal cemetery roads, as accepted by the City, either as associated uses to the operation of the cemetery or explicitly identified as permitted uses on the cemetery</p> <p>Clarify S. 1.9.2 to specifically recognize what has been interpreted as a permitted use - for clear, transparent, and unambiguous expression of the permission on the property.</p> <p>3) X303 (CEM-1, 1927/84 F) amended to permit continuous use of the funeral centre and allowance of existing internal roads for parking purposes (provided min. width of 6 m)</p> <p>4) X303 should not preclude the expansion of the cemetery in the future.</p>	Permissions of X303 and Pre-Consultation SPA S 03/92 (R22) were reviewed. The City is satisfied that the requested funeral home was previously permitted. SPA S03/92 (R22) has also been circulated and is therefore complete according to prior requirements for circulation. X303 has been modified to clarify that a cemetery and funeral home are permitted uses to not preclude expansion in the future. However, if parking amendments are required, the property owner can proceed with a minor variance.
Resident/Landowner 1875 Clements Road	1) S. 1.9.2 requiring applications to be deemed complete by the City be removed and that this transition policy apply to any	Transition provisions (Section 1.9.2.2) are clarified with the addition of a provision to specify that where pre-submission

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>application for which a Pre-Consultation meeting request has been submitted and held with the City prior to the enactment of the CZBL or</p> <p>2) That either a site-specific exception be implemented for the subject property in order to maintain existing land use permissions for outdoor storage or that the property not be subject to the proposed By-law such that By-law 2511 continue to apply to the subject property;</p> <p>3) that minor variances be subject to the prevailing by-law (reference to 2511 in March 2023) to allow variances from provisions of the previous zoning by-law in the event of a minor variance, where the permission sought by the minor variance is more desirable than the condition required by the new zoning by-law from the perspective of safety, urban design, or efficient use of lands. - please explain, does this mean whichever provision best meets these criteria should prevail?</p>	<p>consultation was held and recorded by the City, and meets the required revisions as recorded, the application would be deemed a complete application, provided it is in accordance with all prior zoning by-laws.</p> <p>Section 1.9.2 is clarified to list types of planning applications, including minor variances. In combination with Section 1.9.2.2. provisions are further clarified to include minor variances related to transitioned planning applications, to be considered under transition provisions.</p> <p>Staff reviewed the pre-consultation minutes, met with the landowner, and agreed that prior to the adoption of the CZBL, the landowner would submit a rezoning application based on the pre-consultation minutes.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 1400 Church St (proposed E1 and E2); 1792 Liverpool Rd (proposed CC1 - H, X382, X404; 020017302000000); 1900 Dixie Rd (proposed LCA-2, 3036 X223; Former by-</p>	<p>1. The existing site-specific exception (E1) for 1792 Liverpool Road permits Outdoor Storage associated with a Garden Centre Use as an additional use, and further, it is suggested that the site-specific exception X382 be modified to specify that Outdoor Storage is not subject to the provisions of</p>	<p>With respect to Outdoor storage/display (1792 Liverpool), it appears the Exception contains a specific set of requirements for the outdoor storage (seasonal garden centre). Exception X382 has been modified to specify that Outdoor Storage is not subject to the provisions of S 4.26 as every year they receive a site plan approval (see</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
<p>laws 1494/82, 6104/03 and under first Draft "LN"); 1725 Kingston Rd (proposed LCA- 1, 3036 X275; Former by- laws 1895/84, 4468/94)</p>	<p>Section 4.27.</p> <p>2. The site-specific exception (E1) for 1792 Liverpool Road appears to generally be accurately carried through by site specific exception X382, except for subsection 3d):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subsection 3d) states: Section 9.3.1, related to Floor Space Index and related to Building Height, shall not apply to any additions or expansions to existing buildings and structures as legally existed on the effective date of this By-law.</li> <li>• The existing site-specific provision directs the exemption to both the parent by-law section, and other provisions of the site-specific exception related to height and FSI.</li> <li>• We suggest the following revision: Sections 9.3.1 and 15.382.2a), related to Floor Space Index and related to Building Height, shall not apply to any additions or expansions to existing buildings and structures as legally existed on the effective date of this By-law;</li> </ul> <p>According to the Interactive C-ZBL Map, 1900 Dixie Road and 1725 Kingston Road are proposed to be rezoned to LCA-2 and LCA-1 respectively, and subject to site-specific provisions. The draft C-ZBL does not establish the LCA zone as a zone (Section 2), and there are no other references to the LCA</p>	<p>Section 15.382.3f). The Exception addresses the use already. For clarity, in the parent zoning by-law, the new Outdoor Storage provisions are intended to relate to industrial storage, and the Outdoor Display Area/Seasonal Display Provisions are more relevant.</p> <p>Minor modification was made to Section 3d) as indicated in the letter.</p> <p>With respect to 1900 Dixie and 1725 Kingston, the Exception would apply with respect to permitted uses and standards, in addition to the general provisions of the parent zoning by-law. It is correct the parent by-law does not otherwise address LCA zones. By-law 6104/03 permits an Outdoor Garden Centre. The LCA-1 and LCA-2 zones are only referenced in the Exception. Some properties in the Parent By- laws have unique site-specific zone codes and this may be one such case. Moving forward, the LCA-1 and LCA-2 will be maintained until further consolidation allows these specific provisions to be amalgamated into an overarching zone code.</p> <p>The Second Draft by-law required a 1.5 m minimum height for any landscape strip requirement, but this is not always desirable (e.g., where the landscape strip is</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>zone. It is noted that in the initial draft of the Consolidated Zoning By-law, these sites were proposed to be zoned Mixed Use Local Node (LN).</p> <p>We seek clarification as to the implementation of this new zoning.</p> <p>The M1 and M2S zones applicable to 1400 Church Street S under By-law 2511 are proposed to be replaced by the E1 and E2 zones. The E1 and E2 zones contain numerous performance standards, which are not currently applicable to the M1 and M2S zones, and which may create instances of legal non-conformity. We are concerned with the proposed new landscape strip requirements for the E1 and E2 zones found in Table 10.3 of the draft CZBL, which require a minimum width to any street line and any other lot line of 3.0 metres and 4.5 metres.</p>	<p>required abutting a street). In the Third Draft, this height is removed from the definition and moved into the general provisions to apply to certain circumstances. Further modifications include Section 5.9.1 b) A minimum 3.0 m wide landscape strip shall be required and permanently maintained between any street line, daylight triangle or existing residential development and the parking spaces or aisles. Where a landscape strip is provided between existing residential development and the parking spaces or aisles, the landscape strip shall also have a minimum height of 1.5 m to provide visual screening. The minimum landscaped strip abutting any other lot line is also changed to 1.5 m from 4.5 m in Table 10.3: Lot and Building Requirements for the Employment Zones.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 1355 Kingston Road</p>	<p>Transition policies should be expanded to include lands that are subject to a complete application for ZBA or Draft Plan of Subdivision applications OR subject lands be exempt from the CZBL and existing ZBL provisions continue to apply. Concern is regarding a change in the amenity space requirements for future SPA applications despite being part of a broader master plan. CZBL Shared Amenity Space minimum increased rate from 4 sq m to 8 sq m for</p>	<p>Amenity area requirements are updated and reverted to the prior requirements, consistent with the Integrated Sustainable Design Standards. If there is an application with the City that meets the transition requirements, the new General Provisions will not apply to disrupt the process. Transition provisions are clarified and discussed in the Report to the Planning and Development Committee.</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>developments of more than 20 units. Questioning the minimum rate for indoor amenities. Request to maintain existing provisions of min 2.0 sq m per unit for indoor and outdoor amenity areas (4 sq m combined).</p> <p>Clarification is requested on Section 15 (Exception Zones) and Section 16 (Enactment) of the Second Draft of the Consolidated Zoning Bylaw. Our interpretation of Section 15(c) is that for exception zones that reference former zoning bylaws, the requirements of the exception zone and former zoning bylaw still apply to those lands. However, 15(b) defines former zoning by-laws to exclude those by-laws that have been repealed and not superseded. This would mean for 1355 Kingston Road (Exception zone 400) the zone exception and the former by-law permissions may not apply, given that zone exception amended By-law 7553/17, which is now repealed.</p>	<p>The provisions of the two zoning by-laws that have been repealed (Seaton By-law 7364/14 and City Centre By-law 7553/17) have been carried forward in the new Consolidated Zoning By-law. Thus, any exception zone referring to By-law 7553/17 now relates to the City Centre zoning provisions in Chapter 9 of the new CZBL. Section 15.c) has been revised in the Final Draft to clarify this.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 1786-1790 Liverpool Road (S08/23 - Makimono); 1460 &amp; 1430 Celebration Drive (S02/22 - UC 4-5); 1475 Celebration Drive (S06/22 - UC 7)</p>	<p>Clarification about scenarios where previously approved site-specific zoning by-laws conformed with applicable ZBL at the time of approval and omitted development standards in the CZBL.</p> <p>Confirmation that the existing 4.0 sq m per dwelling unit rate continues to apply.</p>	<p>The transition provisions have been updated in Section 1.9 of the draft Zoning By-law. If there is an application with the City that meets the transition requirements, the new General Provisions will not apply to disrupt the process. Transition provisions are clarified and discussed in the Report to</p>



## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>Confirmation of the proposed transition clauses and their effect on the previously secured rezoning approvals and that no regulations of the CZBL will prevent the implementation and SPA of the existing active applications (that nothing shall prevent the SPA or building permits of the mentioned applications so long as they comply with the regulations of their site-specific ZBL and CC By-law 7553/17 in effect at the time of their approval.)</p> <p>Proposed shared amenity areas are unreasonable. Request the requirement remain as regulated in By-law 7553/17 2.0 sq m per dwelling for indoor and outdoor amenity areas (4.0 sq m combined total). Suggest differentiating rates between locations i.e. CC vs. areas of lower intensity/lower land cost.</p>	<p>the Planning and Development Committee.</p> <p>Amenity area requirements have been updated and have reverted to the prior requirements, consistent with the Integrated Sustainable Design Standards.</p>
<p>Malone Given Parsons on behalf of North-East Pickering Landowners Group (NEPLOG)</p>	<p>NEPLOG Area-Specific Zoning: Agree with the proposed approach to the zoning of the NEPLOG lands concurrent with the secondary plan process. However, continue to re-iterate comments that the preferred zoning approach to creating complete residential communities is to permit a range of built forms and typologies (from single detached dwellings to higher density townhouse units such as stacked and back-to-back units) within the same general</p>	<p>This CZBL initiative consolidates parent by-laws and modernization is in the form of language, added provisions that reflect standard practice and adds a limited range of updated standards such as parking. Additional work will be considered under the Official Plan Review that started May 27, 2024. Form-based zoning, significantly increased permissions, and MZO requests to the province are not within the scope of this initiative.</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>residential zone.</p> <p>Pickering Airport MZO: Urge the City to consider applying to the Province to remove the portion of the existing Pickering Airport MZO (O.Reg 102/72) applicable to the NEPLOG lands to facilitate urban development as part of the zoning by-law review and consolidation process.</p> <p>Mixed Use Zones: Concerns that only the MU1 zone permits residential uses out of the 3 mixed use zones. Request that the City consider increased maximum building height in the MU1 zone, and more flexibility with the FSI.</p> <p>Parking Space Requirements: Concerns that the parking requirements for residential uses are overly restrictive in the Draft ZBL at a minimum of 2 parking spaces for all residential building types except stacked townhouses and apartment dwellings. These should require a lower parking rate of 1 parking space per unit.</p> <p>Parking Space and Driveway Dimensions and Landscaped Open Space: Request that Table 5.3 be amended so that the categories are 'Lot Frontage Less than 11.0 m' and 'Lot Frontage Greater than 11.0 m'. Request clarification if the calculation of the minimum 30/45 percent required landscaped open space in each yard is inclusive of the</p>	<p>There have been no changes to the Mixed-Use Zones. In large part zones for future intensification should be driven by other processes such as the Kingston Road Corridor and will also be informed by the OP Review. The proposed MU1 zone is more of a stopgap until that work takes place and is intended to function as a starting point to introduce some terminology and an approach to mixed- use zones.</p> <p>The CZBL maintains 2 parking spaces per dwelling as proposed in the draft, as this is driven by the consolidation and continues to be a practice similar to other municipalities for ground-related housing.</p> <p>The City is supportive of using 11 m as the threshold and has updated Table 5.3. The new zoning by-law does not currently restrict number of garage doors. Further, the intent of the language, used for a driveway or parking, is to state which yards are subject to the requirements (i.e., since a driveway could be located in the front or the exterior side yard). The requirements would not apply to any yard where there is no part of a driveway. We do not support reduction in the percentages as they appear to work well. A townhouse will have a front yard of 6x6 m in the R3A zone for</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>minimum driveway width on the lot required by the first row of Table 5.3 or if it is calculated separately. Clarification on intention of provision. Concerned with new provision introduced under Section 14.3.12 Residential Building Standards: recommendations on more modern and flexible building standards in the Residential Second and Third Density zones (e.g., reduced minimum rear yard setback, increased maximum.</p>	<p>example, and the driveway would be limited to 50 percent of this area as it is limited to a 3 m width. If any existing lots do not comply, they would be considered legal non-complying.</p> <p>With respect to requested revisions to the residential zones, this may be considered in a next phase of zoning review. The current proposed standards represent a consolidation at this time. It is anticipated that any new development that deviates from these standards apply for a zoning by law amendment. No lands have been pre-zoned with the proposed zones.</p> <p>With respect to modifying the temporary sales office, the City uses a Standard Operating Procedure to exempt sales offices from the Site Plan approval so the process has already been expedited on behalf of applicants.</p>
<p>Fairport Beach Neighbourhood Association Seaton, City-wide</p>	<p>Request that natural heritage lands within the Seaton Area (By-law 7364/14) be rezoned to recognize their existing natural heritage designation.</p>	<p>City Staff contacted the landowner, Infrastructure Ontario. This review process does not have the authority to rezone property without landowner approval. City-wide, TRCA regulatory lands will be recognized in an attachment to the consolidated Zoning By-law. These maps are updated annually by the TRCA.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner Duffins Rouge Agricultural</p>	<p>Request to reinstate agricultural easements that were removed by the Duffins Rouge</p>	<p>In 2023, the Duffins Rouge Agricultural Preserve Act (Bill 136) repealed the Duffins</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
Preserve	Agricultural Preserve Repeal Act of 2022.	Rouge Agricultural Preserve Repeal Act of 2022, thereby reinstating the easements and covenants. This is not a municipal matter. Further, a lapsing contract on previous agreements or removals are regarded as null and void at this point.
Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd representing Seaton Landowners Group	Identified minor administrative corrections in the Second Draft CZBL.	The minor corrections have been made in response to the comments.
Resident/Landowner Taunton/Brock Road Seaton Neighbourhood	Please review the deck/balcony zoning restrictions for this property/SLD1. Due to the lot sizes, these backyards are already very small and quite close to the neighbouring houses. Due to the grading elevation, there is a chance that owners with a walk-out basement will build a balcony/raised deck from the second floor into their backyards. This will reduce privacy for adjacent neighbours even further.	Section 14.2.5 Yard Encroachments of Seaton By-law integrated into the CZBL allows a porch or deck to encroach 2.0 metres into the required rear yard. There are no height limits.
Resident/Landowner 2080 Lynn Heights Drive	Is a public speaking and a tutoring service, as part of a professional office permitted.	This site is zoned S1 under X301. A Home Based Business would allow a tutoring business subject to the Home Occupation Zoning regulations under 4.17 of the CZBL.
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) 501, 503 and 520 Marksbury Crescent, and	Requested that all or a portion of these properties be zoned Open Space – OS to facilitate the completion of the Waterfront Trail.	As requested by TRCA, 501, 503 and 520 Marksbury Crescent, and 509 Park Crescent are zoned Open Space - OS in the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law.

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
509 Park Crescent		
Resident/Landowner 1855 Ninth Concession Road	Oddly shaped sliver overlapping	Mapping correction completed
Resident/Landowner 3430 Seventh Concession Road	Mapping correction needed	Mapping correction completed
<p>Miller Thomson LLP representing GFL Environmental Services Inc. 1034 Toy Avenue: Exception X48(M2-2) 1048 Toy Avenue: Exception X73 (MC-16) 1060 and 1070 Toy Avenue: Exception X21 (MC-6)</p>	<p>In principle, we asked that all of these properties be zoned to an Employment Industrial zone in recognition of the long established use and that the continuation of that use be clearly recognized.</p> <p>Rezone to E1 all lots (now under one ownership) to permit as-of-right existing operations - All the Exceptions for these properties are carried forward and permit the current waste management uses.</p> <p>The second draft of the text of the by-law and interactive zoning map would zone the GFL properties as follows: 1034 Toy Avenue: Exception X48(M2-2) 1048 Toy Avenue: Exception X73 (MC-16) 1060 and 1070 Toy Avenue: Exception X21 (MC-6)</p> <p>In each case, an old Zone (MC06, MC-16 and M2-2) established by older by-laws would be the underlying zone for these properties. The draft by-law text does not appear to re-establish these zones going forward.</p>	<p>All the Exceptions for these properties are carried forward and permit the current waste management uses. As long as the Exceptions exist, GFLs' existing uses are maintained.</p> <p>These zone codes are from the Parent By-laws and provisions in the Exceptions are to be interpreted alongside provisions in the Parent By-laws. In reference to prior concerns that 1070 Toy is not underutilized land and not a "high exposure location" for redevelopment purposes (refers to Durham Region OP). Documentation exists noting that Durham Region refers to the City of Pickering for implementation. City Staff also confirm there is no intention to encourage redevelopment of these properties. The municipality cannot rezone property without the owners' consent to do so.</p> <p>The consolidated Zoning By-law review does not include confirming the legality of existing uses. To be explicitly recognized</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>Would you review the interactive zoning map and Schedule 1 in accordance with our request that the new zoning by-law zone these properties within a heavy industry zone (is this the current use of each lot and how does each lot differentiate from each other in their use, i.e. level of environmental regulation)?</p> <p>Furthermore, given the Waste Processing Station and Waste Transfer Station uses are being carried out on all of these properties, that those uses are permitted only in the E1 zone and even in that E1 zone are subject to a footnote which provides “Only legally existing uses shall be permitted”, we would ask that the site specific provisions for each of these properties explicitly permit both the Waste Processing Station and Waste Transfer Station uses without that limitation. That would recognize the reality of the well-established use of these lands, which are crucial for the continued economic well-being and safety of the City and the Region.</p>	<p>requires Zoning By-law Amendment Application where all the required studies are undertaken.</p> <p>The new outdoor storage provisions in the consolidated By-law would apply, save and except for any specific statements in the exception zones. If GFL finds the new provisions unreasonable, more specific input is needed. City Staff believe another meeting with GFL to explain how Exceptions relate to superseded Parent By-laws may be helpful, and have reached out to set up that meeting.</p>
<p>TransCanada Pipelines, Enbridge, TransNorthern Pipelines, CN Rail City-wide</p>	<p>Utility corporations 1) TransCanada Pipelines; 2) Enbridge 3) TransNorthern Pipelines, and 4) CN Rail requested mapping and/or provisions to be added to the consolidated Zoning By-law.</p> <p>TransCanada Pipelines a) General Regulations of the CZBL a) A minimum</p>	<p>The City chose a consistent approach for utility regulation in the Consolidated Zoning By-law, based on the following.</p> <p>The Federal CER Act requires utility companies to monitor and regulate development for public safety. Both the Provincial Planning Statement, and the</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
	<p>setback of 7.0 m shall be required from any part of a principal building or structure from the edge of the TransCanada pipeline right-of-way. b) A minimum setback of 3.0 m shall be required from any part of an accessory structure from the edge of the TransCanada pipeline right-of-way. c) A minimum setback of 7.0 m from the nearest portion of a TransCanada pipeline right-of-way shall also apply to any parking area or loading area, including any parking spaces, loading spaces, stacking spaces, bicycle parking spaces, and any associated aisle or driveway.</p> <p>Enbridge requested their pipelines and facilities be indicated on one or more maps of the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>TransNorthern Pipelines requested a meeting to discuss their regulatory framework.</p> <p>CN Rail Requested a) to add definitions from the PPS into the CZBL. (Sensitive Land Uses definition included in the 2nd draft CZBL) b) to add areas of influence for sensitive land uses (300 m to railway, 1km to rail yard) identified in a Schedule.</p>	<p>Official Plan support protecting infrastructure corridors. However, Section 92(10) of the <i>Constitution Act</i> speaks to “heads of power”. Provinces and municipalities do not have jurisdiction over areas of Federal regulation. Within Pickering, there are areas where utilities overlap, and conditions for approval may need flexibility to negotiate between utilities, i.e., CN rail and TransCanada Pipelines. Detailed provisions would be too prescriptive. Further, operationally, Pickering's' capacity to support and enforce provisions (such as setbacks) for Federally regulated utilities is limited.</p> <p>In light of these constraints, the City of Pickering will meet the core interests of utilities by flagging applications in the planning process. Further, the CZBL includes sections 4.29 Public Uses Permitted in All Zones and 14.2.5 Permitted Public uses in All zones.</p>
<p>Resident/Landowner 2130 Dixie Road</p>	<p>Zoning should be residential as all other areas surrounding the property are residential.</p>	<p>This property is located in the urban area of Pickering, It was previously zoned agriculture, yet has a small size, generally unsuited to accommodate long term</p>

## Responses to Public and Agency Comments

Resident or Organization / Address	Comment(s)	Response
		<p>agricultural use. The consolidation review rezones remnant agricultural parcels not anticipated to remain as agricultural to an Urban Reserve zone. This property has been rezoned to Urban Reserve.</p>
<p>Lehman Plan on behalf of the Archdiocese of Toronto</p> <p>Holy Redeemer Parish 796 Eyer Drive</p> <p>St. Isaac Jogues Parish 1148 Finch Avenue</p>	<p>Requesting that exceptions be created for these properties to recognize existing place of worship uses held as-of-right under parent Zoning By-laws 2511 and 2520. The current by-law permits both the church and school to the south of the property in all residential zones. The proposed R3 zone does not permit either the church or school.</p> <p>Also please confirm the place of worship minimum parking requirement of 10 spaces per 100 square metres proposed in the draft Consolidated Zoning By-law is correct.</p>	<p>Holy Redeemer Parish located at 796 Eyer Drive is zoned R3 by Zoning By-law 2511, as amended by By-law 7610/18. A site-specific exception will be created for this property to permit a place of worship in the proposed draft Consolidated By-law to be presented to Council in December for adoption.</p> <p>St. Isaac Jogues Parish located at 1148 Finch Avenue is zoned I(C)-ES by Zoning By-law 3036, as amended by By-law 4091/92. Exception X196 carries forward By-law 4091/92 for 1148 Finch Avenue.</p>