

ISSUE DATE:

Aug. 02, 2011



PL091134

Ontario
Ontario Municipal Board
Commission des affaires municipales de l'Ontario

607074 Ontario Limited and Makow Associates Architect Inc. have appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board under subsection 34(11) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, from Council's refusal or neglect to enact a proposed amendment to Zoning By-law 0225-2007 of the City of Mississauga to rezone lands respecting 1969 and 1971 Lakeshore Road West from "C-4" (Mainstreet Commercial) to "RA4 Exception" (Residential Apartment) to permit a 15 storey, 124 unit condominium apartment building with ground level commercial uses
OMB File No. PL091134
OMB Case PL091134

607074 Ontario Limited and Makow Associates Architect Inc. have appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board under subsection 22(7) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, from Council's refusal or neglect to enact a proposed amendment to the Official Plan for the City of Mississauga to redesignate land at 1969 and 1971 Lakeshore Road West from (Mainstreet Commercial) to "Residential High Density II – Special Site" to permit a 15 storey, 124 unit condominium apartment building with ground level commercial uses
Approval Authority File No. OZ 05/043 W2
OMB File No. PL100045
OMB Case PL091134

APPEARANCES:

Parties

Counsel

607074 Ontario Limited

R. Jarvis

City of Mississauga

M. Minkowski

DECISION OF THE BOARD DELIVERED BY J. E. SНИЕZEK

Introduction

607074 Ontario Limited and Makow Associates Architect Inc. (the appellants) applied for an amendment to a Mississauga Zoning By-law and Mississauga Official Plan to permit a 15 storey, 124 unit apartment building with ground floor commercial at the intersection of Lakeshore Boulevard West and Walden Circle. The application was refused by Council of the City of Mississauga (the City) with reasons (Appendix 2) and appealed to this Board.

The Board heard eight days of testimony including a night session for the participants and two days of argument. The Board heard from John Hardcastle, planner for the City subpoenaed by the appellant, Ben Quan, consulting planner retained by the appellants, Stephen Pollock, consulting engineer retained by the appellants, Andrew Bigauskas, consulting architect retained by the City and Edward Davidson consulting planner retained by the City. The Board received 49 exhibits. The parties provided two volumes of cases.

The participants Gillian Blair, Anne Curran, Linda Donaldson and Boyd Upper, local residents of the area also testified.

The Proposal

The appellants filed a request to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law in order to construct a 124 unit mixed use building with a height of 15 storeys with 504 m² of commercial space on December 5, 2005. The application contained the following materials:

- Planning Justification Study;
- Sun/Shadowing/Wind Study;
- Heritage Property/Archaeological Site;
- Traffic Impact Study;
- Geotechnical Report;
- Soil Contamination/Decommissioning Study;
- Acoustical Feasibility Study;
- Grading Plan; and
- Environmental Impact Study

The filing of the application was preceded by a review by the Development Application Review Committee (DARC) that took place on July 20, 2005. The original

proposal was 18 storeys in height with a Floor Space Index (FSI) of 4.0. This compares to the 15 storey proposal with a FSI of 3.3.

On October 17, 2007, Lethbridge & Lawson Ltd. filed an Addendum Proposed Standards and Planning Justification.

The Municipal Urban Design Advisory Panel (MUDAP) reviewed the concept on May 13, 2008.

The MUDAP comments resulted in the following revisions to the design of the building:

- The building was shifted 1.5 metres west toward Walden Circle;
- Podium height was revised to three storeys;
- Removal of the circular driveway and relocate drop off area to Walden Circle;
- Site access has been reorganized;
- Outdoor landscaping area has been increased and outdoor patio has been added to both street frontages;
- The number of at grade parking spaces has been reduced and a walkway connection to Walden Circle has been added;
- Relocation of the children's play space; and
- Design changes to reflect the goals of the Clarkson Village Lakeshore West Corridor Study.

MUDAP met again with respect to the subject project on Sept 1, 2009 and made the following comments:

- There was unanimous support from the panel members in favour of the revised design concept which reflects most of the comments made in the previous panel meeting; and

- There was consensus that the revised concept enhances the streetscape; its relationship to the sidewalk is well handled and the concept of maintaining the shape of the Satellite Restaurant is brilliant and a good example of boutique development for a tight corner site.

(Exhibit 1B Tab 22, pg. 500)

MUDAP went on to make suggestions to make the design concept better and they included the following:

- Relocate the children's play area or outdoor amenity area to the northeast corner of the site beyond the hard surfaced area;
- The model views should include the view from the neighbourhood;
- The east wall of the tower is fairly solid and blank. Consider the use of spandrel glass to "lighten" up the massing;
- Extend the sidewalk pavement at Lakeshore Road across the driveway to give priority to pedestrians. Check the Clarkson Village Study to see what is possible in the boulevard area;
- With the curb cut on Walden and Lakeshore, can you eliminate the one on Lakeshore?
- Consider adding balconies on the west wall to serve shade device for west facing units;
- Consider placement of a landscape feature at the south end of the pedestrian walkway as a terminus;
- If the stair is moved consider moving the play area over to the northeast edge of the property;
- Provide a garden wall or greater setback for the restaurant patio to mitigate adverse noise impact at the intersection of Lakeshore Road and Southdown Roads.

- Expan(d)(sion)* of 3-level podium to the easterly property line to provide greater built form presence at Lakeshore Road frontage; and
- Provide more landscape detail to the site plan.

*(added by the Board)

(Exhibit 1B Tab 22 pg. 501)

A March 17, 2008 public meeting was held. The minutes of the meeting indicate that there was strong public reaction by the residents of Walden Spinney. Following the public meeting, the appellants met with a representative group of neighbours. The appellants had met with the community in May of 2007.

On November 30, 2009 a Supplementary Report was submitted to the Planning Committee that recommended the proposal. (Exhibit 1A Tab 13)

On December 9, 2009 the Application was refused with reasons (See Appendix 2).

The appellants provided four additional reports in support of the application; a Pedestrian Wind Study prepared by Theakston Environmental (September 2010), a Shadow Study prepared by Theakston Environmental (August 2010), a Landscape Plan prepared by Alexander Budrevics (September 8, 2010) and a Traffic Study by Sernas (September 8, 2010).

The Residents' Presentation

The residents made a Powerpoint presentation to the Board. The Walden Spinney residents make the point that the community is an award winning, compact and high density development already and that further high density development will have negative impacts and is not desirable or appropriate.

The Position of the City

The position of the City is that the density and height do not provide an appropriate transition in terms of density and height. The City's alternative is a six

storey residential and commercial building that would provide a better transition in terms of density and height and have fewer shadow impacts on the abutting townhouses.

Documentation

The following documents were referred to by the various witnesses:

- Region of Peel Official Plan approved July 11, 1996;
- Mississauga Plan approved May 5, 2003;
- Provincial Policy Statement issued March 1, 2005;
- Proposed Interim Residential Intensification Policies – June 6, 2006;
- Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe – June 16, 2006;
- Zoning By-law 0225-2007 passed June 20, 2007;
- Information Report – dated February 26, 2008;
- Clarkson Village Study Background and Public Engagement – April 2009;
- New Mississauga Plan – adopted June 10, 2009, approved by the Region of Peel on December 10, 2009;
- Vision for Clarkson – Peer Review - Urban Institute - November 2, 2009; and
- Phase 2 Analysis and Recommendations Report of the Lakeshore Road West - Clarkson Village Study - Planning and Development Committee - September 20, 2010

Surrounding Land Use and Physical Context

There are two existing restaurants (the Spoon and Fork and the Satellite) located on the subject property that is located at the intersection of Lakeshore Road West and Walden Circle. The site is flat and covered with asphalt.

There is an easement along the boundary abutting the Walden Spinney recreational area (to the north). There is a block of town homes that back onto the east side of the site.

Across the street (at 1271 Lakeshore/Walden Circle) a 15 storey condominium with a FSI of 3.0 presently shadows the existing site.

Across Lakeshore Road at 965 and 966 Inverhouse Drive there are two apartment buildings containing 125 and 197 units respectively with heights of 11 and 17 storeys with FSI's of 0.95 and 0.91. In the case of 965 Inverhouse the setback is 14.8 m to the property line and 21 m from the building face (apartments) to the building face (townhouses).

At the intersection of Southdown Road (to the west) there is a medium density townhouse project (89 units).

To the north of the townhouses on Southdown and Lakeshore Road West are two proposed 18 storey buildings with a total of 455 units and an FSI of 4.5 (one building is presently under construction). The additional FSI was mitigated by a dedication of land to expand the park abutting the site.

There are two apartment buildings further up Walden Circle; a 21 storey, 203 unit building with an FSI of 1.89 next to the CN rail line and across from the GO Station at 1201 Walden Circle, and an 11 storey, 124 unit apartment building at 1110 Walden Circle with an FSI of 2.24.

A new senior citizen building is proposed further east on 1907 Lakeshore Road with a height of eight storeys and 129 units and has an FSI of 1.7 (It was reduced from 2.34).

The redevelopment of the RioCan site, located east of the rail overpass, proposes development that has an eight storey height limit, contains 144 units and has a residential FSI of 0.56 and a commercial/mixed use FSI of 0.77.

Further down Lakeshore Road at the east end of Clarkson Village the Moldenhaur site has a height limit of six storeys.

The majority of the apartment structures back onto the open space area along the Sheridan Creek that runs east of Southdown Road and parallel to it.

Issues List

1. Are the proposed setbacks, height, density access and servicing locations, massing, bulk, scale and building placement of the proposed development appropriate having regard to the site and the character of the surrounding lands?

The height of the proposed building is 15 storeys or 54 m. The density proposed is 3.3 FSI. The access would be from Lakeshore Road and Walden Circle. The building would be set at the intersection.

The question of height was addressed by Messrs. Hardcastle, Quan, Polluck, Bigauskas and Davidson.

Mr. Hardcastle's analysis of height focussed on the number of storeys. He acknowledged that the proposed building was some 9 metres taller than the 15 storey building across the street (54 m vs. 45 m). He didn't think that this was an observable difference. He admitted that the range of heights in the west gateway was 8 to 15 storeys and that a lower building of eight storeys was possible.

Mr. Quan produced Exhibit 5 that illustrated the height transition. Mr. Quan acknowledged that the proposed 15 storey building broke the plane of transition from the buildings on Southdown Road toward the proposed eight storey seniors housing building.

Mr. Polluck opined that the proposed building was not a tall narrow building but that such structures produced less shadow impact. The shadows move across the landscape more quickly because they are smaller and this results in less shadow impact.

Mr. Bigauskas indicated that a six storey building with a larger footprint taking up most of the Lakeshore Road frontage would be preferable and would satisfy the 45° angular plane from the existing townhouses.

Mr. Davidson found that a six to eight storey building would provide appropriate height.

The Board finds that a height of 15 storeys would not be an observable difference from the ground when compared to the building across the street; in addition, the new structure would function as a gateway feature and provide adequate protection for abutting uses and minimize shadow and overlook conditions.

The new building provides a good comparison to the 15 storey building across the street. Mr. Bigauskas's six storey structure ignores the abutting 15 storey structure concentrates only on the abutting townhouses. His frame of reference is the low to midrise mixed use commercial proposed for the centre of Clarkson Village and totally ignores the height transition to the eight storey seniors building recently approved to the east. The Board agrees with Mr. Hardcastle's description of the lands west of the rail line are fundamentally different from those east of the rail line.

The density of development is 3.3 FSI with 0.15 FSI being the ground floor commercial component.

Mr. Hardcastle indicated that the range of densities was 0.89 to 4.5 FSI with the average FSI of 2.24 FSI. The average will increase to 2.376 FSI.

Mr. Quan did not prepare a study of the density and admitted this in cross-examination.

Messrs. Bigauskas and Davidson indicated that the density of development should not exceed 2.5 FSI.

The Board finds that the density of development should not be limited as suggested by Messrs Biguaskas and Davidson.

In making this finding the Board has considered the policy regime in Mississauga Plan specifically the Clarkson-Lorne Park District Policy that sets the density range for the Residential High Density II at 1 – 2.5 FSI but provides no limit for mixed use commercial and Mr. Hardcastle said as much in his testimony to the Board.

The placement of the building is similar to that of the new senior's building down the street. The Board finds the setback from Lakeshore Road and Walden Circle appropriate.

The special parking regulations were not challenged by any of the witnesses. The limit on the restaurant space was not challenged. The expansion of the building along the Lakeshore Road frontage was only challenged by Mr. Quan who wanted the access to Lakeshore Road for a refuse vehicle. This was his opinion notwithstanding the fact that Lakeshore Road has a median and this will restrict the refuse vehicle to right hand turns.

The Board finds the zoning regulations acceptable and in addition supports the extension of the commercial use along the Lakeshore Road frontage and the elimination of the driveway.

- 2) Does the subject proposal function appropriately and efficiently and provide for an adequate transition in built form having regard to the site, the pedestrian realm, existing, future or other proposed developments, current and planned character of the immediate area and surrounding lands?

The Mississauga Plan clearly provides for a transition in terms of height and density. Transition means:

- 1 (a) a passing or change from one place, condition etc., to another or
(b) passage from one subject to another.
- 2 Music - a momentary modulation. (Exhibit 30)

The height of the proposed building is 9 m but that distance is imperceptible from the street as it is taller but not overly tall and the break in the trend of heights is not fixed but conceptual in nature. Official Plans are policy documents setting a general direction, not by-laws providing strict regulation and the general direction is from higher to lower. The higher density is mitigated by the mixed use of the building as it transitions from the tower in the park residential structures to a high density mixed use building that is

different but not incompatible. The subject building is 30% denser with an FSI of 3.3 compared to an FSI of 3.0 across the street.

The Board finds that the appellant in providing a mixed use concept incorporating the satellite restaurant building form that was reviewed by the MUDAP represents the kind of intensification contemplated in the PPS and brought forward with the Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The commercial podium that extends across the Lakeshore Road frontage provided a pedestrian friendly band of continuous commercial development that fits within the planning objectives for the Clarkson Village. The only person objecting to the extension of the commercial podium was Mr. Quan who wanted the access for refuse vehicles. The Board finds the reason for the access questionable given the position of the traffic median on Lakeshore Road.

If one looks at Exhibit 5 and the plane of heights including the 15 storey building across the street, the proposed building is similar in terms of the number of storeys and slightly higher (9 metres) would provide an appropriate height transition. If the building were a narrower, tower like structure without a step in height it would create less shadow and fewer privacy concerns and would provide a gateway feature identified in the Clarkson Visioning Study but the proposed building is not incompatible. The height and building separation was reviewed in some detail by Mr. Hardcastle. The building at 1110 Walden Circle is 11 storeys in height a setback of 11.2 m to the property line and a building to building separation of 19.2 m. The property at 1201 Walden Circle is 21 storeys in height and has a setback of 22 m to the property line and a building to building relationship of 32 m. 1035 Walden Circle is 18 storeys and has a building face to building face separation of 73 m. The Board finds that an appropriate height is 15 storeys

Given the scale and density of development it is appropriate to amend the Official Plan to designate the site mixed commercial special exception allowing for ground floor commercial in recognition of the existing commercial use given the density policies in the Clarkson-Lorne Park District Plan. The Board, like the MUDAP appreciates the attempt to replicate the form of the satellite restaurant that should be incorporated into the new tower design.

- 3) Is it appropriate for Mixed Use development to front on Lakeshore Boulevard West at this location and, if so, does the existing parent Zoning By-law and proposed Amending Zoning By-law put in place appropriate zoning controls?

All the witnesses indicated that the mixed use for the site was appropriate. The witnesses for the Applicant supported the 15 storey 3.3 FSI development while the City's witnesses supported a six to eight storey building with a lesser density with FSI in the range of 2.2 – 2.3. The only deficiencies identified by the City witnesses were height and density. The Board finds that the direction in the Growth Plan and existing context compelling. The proposed building with its ground floor commercial area is not inconsistent or incompatible given the existing uses and the context.

- 4) Does the proposal before the Board meet the objectives and address the overall intent and policies of the Mississauga Official Plan?

Mr. Hardcastle indicated that objectives 2.2.2.3 – 2.2.2.6 define the character of relationships that exist in the area the range of heights 8 to 21 storeys defines the character of the area. The proposed building meets the objectives of the plan according to the evidence of Mr. Hardcastle.

- 5) Does the proposal before the Board have regard to the matters of Provincial Interest, Section (2), and is it consistent with the provisions of Section (3) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13 as amended

The Board heard no evidence on this question.

- 6) If the Board is to favourably consider the subject proposal, does the proposed official plan amendment and zoning by-law sufficiently encompass the necessary urban design and other planning elements in order to ensure that setbacks, height, built form, massing and design features of the proposed development are secured and impacts on surrounding lands minimized?

The proposed building design with the height, density and setback from the existing townhouses will in the Board view provide protection for abutting uses and minimize impacts.

- 7) If the Board is to favourably consider the subject proposal, does the proposed height and/or density require a contribution pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act? What are the nature and extent of appropriate facilities, services and other matters to be secured through section 37 of the *Planning Act* for the subject proposal?

There was unanimous consent from the planning witnesses that section 37 benefits should be applied. The question was what benefits because the Clarkson Village Study was not yet completed. Mr. Davidson mentioned the possibility of improvements to the Sheridan Creek but no specific proposals were proposed at this stage. The lack of proposed public benefit was a negative in Mr. Davidson's mind.

The Board finds that Section 37 benefits are appropriate and should be applied and that the appellant has no objection to their application.

- 8) Are the Applications before the Board premature?

The Board has considered the status of the Clarkson Village Study and the fact the Moldaur, RioCan and the Seniors building were all recently approved prior to or during the Clarkson Village Study and finds that the prematurity argument is not authentic.

- 9) Do the Applications before the Board constitute Good Planning and are they in the Public Interest?

The Board finds that the proposal represents "good planning and is in the public interest". The proposed building provides an adequate transition and does not offend the policies in the Mississauga Plan and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and the Growth Plan. The proposal will provide transit supportive development densities in a node with excellent transit service connections and access.

Other Issues

The Board finds that the issue of the need for an urban design study was decided when the staff accepted the application and deemed it to be “complete”. Once DARC declared the application complete the need for an “urban design study” was decided notwithstanding the clause in the Mississauga Plan that required it. It would be unfair to subject applicants to a never-ending series of requests for studies. Once an application is deemed complete further studies must be mutually agreed upon. The Board notes that lack of an urban design study was not a reason given by Council in its rejection of the application.

The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe defines Major Transit Station Area as follows:

Major Transit Station Area means the area including and around any existing or planned higher order transit station within a settlement area or the area including and around a major bus depot in an urban core. Station areas are generally defined as the area within an approximate 500m radius of a transit station, representing a 10-minute walk. (Exhibit 1A Tab 4)

Mr. Hardcastle testified that the Clarkson Go Station was 388 m from the Clarkson Go Station and a three to seven minute walk. Mr. Quan stated that it was a five minute walk to the Go Station. Mr. Quan indicated that the proposed intensification prevented sprawl, optimized infrastructure and provides transit supportive development.

It is clear that the area is an area of intensification under the provisions of the Growth Plan and the proposed development at 3.3 times lot area and a height of 15 storeys represents the kind of intensification contemplated by the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

The Board finds that the revised proposal is intensification within a Major Transit Station Area that is envisioned and encouraged by the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

The Board has carefully reviewed the reasons that Council gave and the materials that were before it and concludes that the justification is insufficient given the physical and policy context.

The Board will withhold its final order pending receipt of the by-laws adopting the Official Plan Amendment and amending the zoning by-law. The Board gives the Parties four months from the issuance of this decision to finalize the planning instruments.

The Board expects that Section 37 benefits will be applied to the site.

If there are difficulties with respect to the OPA, Amending Zoning By-law or the Site Plan the Board may be spoken to.

“J. E. Sniezek”

J. E. SNIEZEK
MEMBER

APPENDIX 1

Issues List

1. Are the proposed setbacks, height, density access and servicing locations, massing, bulk, scale and building placement of the proposed development appropriate having regard to the site and the character of the surrounding lands?
2. Does the subject proposal function appropriately and efficiently and provide for an adequate transition in built form having regard to the site, the pedestrian realm, existing, future or other proposed developments, current and planned character of the immediate area and surrounding lands?
3. Is it appropriate for Mixed Use development to front on Lakeshore Boulevard West at this location and, if so, does the existing parent Zoning By-law and proposed Amending Zoning By-law put in place appropriate zoning controls?
4. Does the proposal before the Board meet the objectives and address the overall intent and policies of the Mississauga Official Plan?
5. Does the proposal before the Board have regard to the matters of Provincial Interest, Section (2), and is it consistent with the provisions of Section (3) of the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13 as amended?
6. If the Board is to favourably consider the subject proposal, does the proposed official plan amendment and zoning by-law sufficiently encompass the necessary urban design and other planning elements in order to ensure that setbacks, height, built form, massing and design features of the proposed development are secured and impacts on surrounding lands minimized?
7. If the Board is to favourably consider the subject proposal, does the proposed height and/or density require a contribution pursuant to Section 37 of the *Planning Act*? What are the nature and extent of appropriate facilities, services and other matters to be secured through section 37 of the *Planning Act* for the subject proposal?
8. Are the Applications before the Board premature?
9. Do the Applications before the Board constitute Good Planning and are they in the Public Interest?

APPENDIX 2

Reasons for Council's denial of the Application

- a) The proposed development is out of scale with the adjacent Walden Spinney residential community;
- b) The proposed development will create a walled-in effect for the adjacent Walden Spinney residential community, and a 15 storey building will cause unacceptable shadow impacts on the Walden Spinney community's recreational facilities and grove of trees;
- c) The size and scale of the proposed development is not consistent with the City's Strategic Plan for the City's historic villages, of which Clarkson Village is one;
- d) The proposed development is too intense and will overwhelm the site as well as adjacent lands;
- e) The proposed fails to provide an appropriate transition in building height in relationship to adjoining lands and lands within the vicinity of the subject property;
- f) The proposed development creates an inappropriate precedent for future redevelopment of the Clarkson Village Community;
- g) The proposed development fails to offer or provide community or public benefits in exchange for the proposed amount of density;
- h) The proposed development is not compatible with the adjacent Walden Spinney residential community; and
- i) The proposed development fails to respect the Development Concept policies in Mississauga Plan for the Clarkson-Lorne Park planning district.

(Exhibit 34D, Tab 18, pg. 1-2)

APPENDIX 3

Item	Exhibit Reference	Comments
Peel Official Plan Mississauga Plan Clarkson Lorne Park District Plan	Ex#1A Tab 5 Ex#	Office Consolidation dated Novemb 2008
Mississauga Plan PPS issued	Ex#1B Tab 7 pg 146 - 164 Ex1A Tab 6 pg 120 - 145 Ex#1A Tab 3 pg 15 - 55	Office Consolidation December 200
Development Application Review Committee (DARC) reviewed the initial proposal Rezoning and Official Plan Amendment filed	Testimony of John Hardcastle Ex#1B Tab 9 pg 213 - 263 Ex#1A Tab 11 pg 278 - 293	
Vision for Clarkson - Terms of Reference Proposed Interim Residential Intensification Policies Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe Zoning By-law 0225-2007 MUDAP Terms of Reference	Ex#1A Tab 10 pg 264 - 277 Ex#1A Tab 4 pg 56 - 106	
Addendum Proposed Standards and Planning Justification report prepared by Lethbridge and Lawson Inc.	Ex 1A Tab12 pg 294 - 309	
Mississauga Urpan Design Advisory Panel formed Information Report	Ex#1B Tab 16 pg 380-410 Ex#1B Tab 20 pg 462-489 Ex#1B Tab 14 pg 364 - 372	
Statutory Public Meeting held received opposition noted MUDAP Comments on the design of the building Clarkson Village Study Background and Public engagement		
New Mississauga Plan adopted by Council Planning Application Status Report Parking Issues Report-Lethbridge and Lawson Inc.	Ex#1B Tab 20 pg 462-489 Ex#1B Tab 21 pg 491 - 494 Ex#1B Tab 22 pg 495 - 503	
MUDAP Comments on the revisions to the design Vision for Clarkson - Peer Review Urban Insitute Supplementary Report dated November 10, 2009	Ex1A Tab 13 pg 310 - 363 Ex#1B Tab 24 pg 505- 510	
Planning and Development Committee Meeting	Ex#1B Tab 25 pg 511 - 520	
Council Meeting Minutes New Mississauga Plan approved by Region of Peel		Under Appeal
First PHC Amended decision issued	Ex1A Tab 1 pg 1 - 2 Ex1A Tab 1 pg 3 - 4 Ex#1B Tab 28 pg 667 - 720	
Shadow Study - Theakston Enivironmental Procedural Order issued	Ex#1B Tab 1 pg 5 - 10	

Pedestrian Wind Study Theakston Environmental
Landscaping Plan prepared by Alexander
Budrevics

Ex#1B Tab 29 pg 724 -
776

EX#1B pg 777 - 787

Phase 2 Analysis and Recommendations Report
of Lakeshore Road W - Clarkson Village Study
Planning and Development Committee

Ex#1B pg 521 - 636