



# City of Barrie

70 Collier Street  
P.O. Box 400  
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

## Minutes - Final Planning Committee

---

Monday, June 8, 2020

7:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

---

### PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT For consideration by Barrie City Council on June 29, 2020.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Lehman at 7:03 p.m. The following were in attendance for the meeting:

**Present:** 10 - Mayor, J. Lehman  
Deputy Mayor, B. Ward  
Councillor, C. Riepma  
Councillor, K. Aylwin  
Councillor, A. Kungl  
Councillor, R. Thomson  
Councillor, N. Harris  
Councillor, G. Harvey  
Councillor, J. Harris  
Councillor, S. Morales

**Absent:** 1 - Councillor, M. McCann

#### STAFF:

Chief Administrative Officer, M. Prowse  
City Clerk/Director of Legislative and Court Services, W. Cooke  
Director of Information Technology, R. Nolan  
Director of Development Services, M. Banfield  
Executive Director of Access Barrie, R. James-Reid  
General Manager of Community and Corporate Services, D. McAlpine  
General Manager of Infrastructure and Growth Management, A. Miller.

The Planning Committee met for the purpose of a Public Meeting at 7:04 p.m.

Mayor Lehman advised the public that any concerns or appeals dealing with the application that were the subject of the Public Meeting should be directed to the Legislative Services Branch. Any interested persons wishing further notification of the staff report should email the Legislative Services Branch at [cityclerks@barrie.ca](mailto:cityclerks@barrie.ca). Mayor Lehman confirmed with the Director of Development Services that notification was conducted in accordance with the Planning Act.

**20-P-020**

**APPLICATIONS FOR AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND A ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT - SUBMITTED BY SMART CENTRES ON BEHALF OF BARRIE LAKESHORE DEVELOPMENTS - 51 - 75 Bradford Street AND 20 Checkley Street (WARD 2) (FILE: D09-OPA078, D14-1692)**

Paula Bustard, Smart Centres Real Estate Investment Trust advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting is to review applications for an Official Plan Amendment and a Zoning By-law Amendment submitted by Smart Centres on behalf of Barrie Lakeshore Developments for lands known municipally as 51-75 Bradford Street and 20 Checkley Street, Barrie.

Ms. Bustard discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- The context of the subject site and surrounding uses;
- A map illustrating the building heights in the downtown area associated to existing towers, approved future developments and the proposed development;
- A rendering illustrating the view along the south side of Bradford Street associated to the proposed development and the approved Barrie Central development;
- A rendering illustrating the site and roof plan;
- A rendering illustrating the site plan and pedestrian access;
- A rendering of the ground floor plan;
- A rendering of the landscape plan, including photographs of examples of potential landscaping for the property;
- A summary of the proposed Barrie Lakeshore Development;
- Design renderings illustrating the site, roof, pedestrian access, ground floor, and landscape plans; and
- Renderings illustrating various perspective views of the proposed development.

Michelle Banfield, Director of Development Services provided an update concerning the status of the applications. She reviewed the public comments received during the neighbourhood meeting held on December 11, 2019. She advised that the primary planning and land use matters are currently being reviewed by the Technical Review Team. Ms. Banfield discussed the anticipated timelines for the staff report regarding the

applications.

**VERBAL COMMENTS:**

1. **Charlie Talbot, 6 Toronto Street** expressed that he felt that the waterfront is the jewel of the City limited the development. He noted that he is in support of the development, but that he felt the scale of the development would overwhelm and impact the availability to the waterfront and surrounding amenities to residents. Mr. Talbot discussed his concerns with the shadowing impacts on waterfront, the podium heights, building height the reduction in setback to the neighboring properties, the building height being out of scale with other buildings along the waterfront, the potential impacts on the waterfront parking and no provision for affordable housing. In closing, Mr. Talbot requested the City to consider maintaining the existing parking rations, provide adequate bicycle parking, reduction in podium height adjacent to the Toronto Street buildings, and provision of some affordable housing.
2. **Leslie Hart, 2 Toronto Street, Apt 408** advised that a group of the residents had submitted a petition speak with 150 signatures to date. She noted her concerns associated with the height of the podium encasing the view of 6 stories of 2 Toronto Street with concrete. Ms. Heart discussed her concerns associated with the emotional, mental health as most of the residents are seniors that the proposed structure would have. She reiterated that the height of the podium facing 2 Toronto Street be looked at.
3. **Bob Ebenstein, 6 Toronto Street**, advised that he agrees with everything that has been said by the other speakers. He noted that he felt that the proposed size of the development is more appropriate for the City of Toronto and not the City of Barrie due to the proposed size. He discussed the impacts on the quality of life of the area residents and surrounding environment. He advised that he was concerned about the units, being rental and commitment of ownership and noted that is why he moved to a condominium versus and apartment. Mr. Ebestein discussed safety concerns he has observed within the area. He noted he felt that the proposed scale of the building should be in keeping with the existing buildings in the area.
4. **Richard Handren, 2 Toronto Street, Apt 904** noted that he lives on the southside of the building and that he would be looking right at the patio. He discussed that his major concern was the shadowing. He commented on the various times and dates that reviews were completed as identified in the Shadow Impact Study and the impacts associated with the amount of sunlight that would reach his patio ranging from approximately 4 hours to being non-existent and how this would impact his mental and physical joy of using balcony. Mr.

Handren suggested to move the building as far south as possible and lowering the building. He noted he understands the need to support the tax base and investment. Mr. Handren requested that the developer consider the surrounding landscaping of the area before going forward.

5. **Mr. Robertson, 37 Elm Street** advised that they live south of the proposed development. Mr. Robertson quoted population data statistics and identified a number of proposed high density projects slated for the City of Barrie. He noted that he felt that the developers were asking for four towers and would take and two. He commented on the beautiful accessible greenspace and how this used to be the case when he lived in Oakville and the impacts development had on greenspace there. Mr. Robertson spoke to the natural habitat of Bunkers Creek and its value to the eco system. He mentioned the City's Climate Mitigation Plan and the declaration of a climate emergency and he noted that he believes that the proposed development will have an impact on Bunker's Creek. Mr. Robertson discussed his concerns with the proposed building heights and indicated he felt they should be in keeping with the height of the existing buildings. He spoke to the drawbacks of working in Toronto and living in Barrie, due GoTrain time limitations. Mr. Robertson noted the need for greenspace for health and wellbeing, especially during the pandemic and noted his objection towards the proposed development.
6. **Mr. Dave Wismer - 2 Toronto Street Apt 704**, advised that he lived on the south side of 2 Toronto Street and would likely experience the brunt of the shadowing impact from the proposed development. He suggested that the developer try and move the buildings to the south to alleviate some of these impacts. Mr. Wismer commented on other developments on Simcoe Street and Bayfield Street where the impacts of additional development was not as impactful. He noted his concerns associated with the 6 m setback between the development and 2 Toronto Street. Mr. Wismer noted he felt that hotel complex could be moved to south even another metre to achieve more open space. He noted that with the three towers he feels that the density is way too high and that the height of the towers should be reduced especially the ones closest to 2 and 6 Toronto Street, which will also alleviate some of the shadowing concerns. He noted that shadowing should be reviewed on the proposal presented by the developer. Mr. Wismer noted that he has to remind himself that new taxes will be charged when the development is built and helps seniors to not have any additional taxes added.
7. **Bonnie Gill, 2 Toronto Street , Apt 1502** noted that she has been a resident of Barrie for 50 years in Barrie. Ms. Gill advised that she had provided written comments. She noted her concerns associated with the maximum building of Tower 1 as it would be well above the 16 storeys of adjacent buildings and suggested that it be reduced. She

also noted her concerns associated with the maximum building heights of Towers 2-4 noting that they are far too great and that the difference between the current and existing building is unreasonably high and excessive.

Ms. Gill noted her concerns associated with the side and rear yard setback would significantly impact the owners of 2 Toronto Street as they would be looking out the window at a 6-level parking garage and requested that the setbacks not be reduced.

Ms. Gill also noted her concerns associated with the Shadow Studies and impacts on 2 Toronto Street highlighted the number of diagrams within the study that displayed impact to 2 Toronto Street, especially the south side. Ms. Gill noted that in order to mitigate the shadowing the tower heights would need to be reduced and increase the rear yard setback along Lakeshore Drive.

Ms. Gill noted that she is not opposed to development or revitalization, but that the density proposed is far too much and that increasing the density of the downtown does not have to occur on one development. She indicated that the lakeshore and parks are used by Barrie residents, but with the proposed development she is concerned that the public spaces along the waterfront are not sufficient to sustain current and future residents. In closing, Ms. Gill noted she was proud to express her views in opposition to the proposed development.

7. **Mr. Rod Burns, 6 Toronto Street** advised that he has lived in at this location for almost 20 years. He noted that the Tall Buildings Report was considered by Council approximately 6 years ago and noted that the maximum building height to meet the Places to Grow density were 12 storeys and that most projects have been approved with higher storeys than 12. He indicated that this project is trying to put a lot of density in a small area. Mr. Burns noted that the developer's other project in other areas are lower density and 20 storeys and are on transit hubs and that they are asking for 40 storeys in Barrie.

Mr. Burns noted the sense of community felt by residents in condominiums along the waterfront, similar to that of neighbourhoods throughout the City. He noted that the pedestal of the proposed development could be lower if there weren't as many storeys. He provided comparisons to developments in residential areas to this proposed development if a large fence or a monster home was built next to them. He also commented the potential view from the marina looking onto the development being a concrete wall.

Mr. Burns noted that he felt that each developer seems to increase the amount of density being asked for based on other applications. He noted that he felt that there should be consistency in planning. He discussed the Transportation Study that looked at Transit

transportation in Barrie up until 2021. He noted that bike lanes, transit and sidewalks should be looked at in concert with the proposed development and not after the fact.

Mr. Burns discussed his concerns associated with the parking garage, including the large pedestal and the potential safety concerns for residents base on his observations of other parking lots in the City, especially the proximity of the garage at the potential alley way 19 m set back parking garage wall and wall between the proposed development and 6 and 2 Toronto Street.

Mr. Burns advised of his concerns associated with the traffic study as it was conducted on October 19 and not during peak time or period. Mr. Burns noted that he doesn't have concerns with development just that the building is to large for the proposed site.

8. **Jersene Bellavance, 6 Toronto Street** noted that she agreed with comments made by the other speakers. She noted that she would love to see changes made encourage those accessing the development to use Bradford Street and not the waterfront as she finds it like a racetrack and noisy. She noted she felt that some use Lakeshore Drive has a by-pass route and that deterrents need to be put in. Ms. Bellavance noted that the building setback setback out of character for what is existing.
9. **Gary Bell - Ward 1**, provided slides that discussed his concerns associated with the scale, height and massing and appearance of the proposed development. Mr. Bell provided photographs of the waterfront and he described the potential impacts on the view from each area. He noted his concerns with the proposed height of the building as they are to be much higher than what is existing. He discussed the proposed development in context with the Urban Growth Centre. Mr. Bell highlighted the density of previous applications for the subject lands. He highlighted the potential number of residents at the proposed development, and noted his concerns that the number of units significantly exceed those in the Urban Growth Centre.
10. **Ms. Dorthy Goddard, 2 Toronto Street**, noted that many issues touched upon were made in her. Ms Goddard discussed that she felt that hotels should be located closer to restaurants and entertainment or a big shopping centre. She commented that this is a residential and that she has lived in the area for 19 years. Ms. Goddard noted that the proposed development should be residential, as there could be a lot of issues with cars in the evening right next 2 Toronto Street and people lingering around the hotel. She noted her concerns associated with the parking and possible encroachments due to the garage on underground streams large development. Ms. Goddard felt that they were cramming all kinds of building into a small parcel. She also raised concerns with the walls blocking sunlight. Ms. Goddard

also raised concerns associated with the infrastructure on Bradford Street as it may be very old and need to be replaced due to this development. She noted that she is not sure that she can agree with all of the amendments, and that consideration be given to those who live in the area prior to making decision\.

11. **Cathy Colebatch, 97 Cumberland Street** noted that most of her items had been covered off in terms of the density, height and scale of development, that the podium for parking, should be lower and not 6 storeys. She questioned why the developer is proposing to construct 4 tall towers and not mixed uses including townhouses. Ms. Colebatch noted that she felt that the potential population at the towers could reach up to 8000 not including employees at hotel units. She noted that she felt that this is far too much for the site and that 24-25 storeys would be more suitable and look like rest of neighbourhood. Ms. Colebatch noted a few questions for the staff report, including concerns with the lower retail lower portion of building as it would be in direct competition with businesses in the downtown that are struggling and where the hotel and residents of the towers would shop or dine.
12. **Sebastian Vastof, 2 Koslov Street**, discussed the shadow studies, the façade of the building and the parking garage, the building being balanced with the downtown, the space between the proposed development and existing condominiums, park and greenspace, parking lots, retail and the impacts to retail due to covid-19, community and capitalizing on how to bring community together, engagement with the arts community, the need for outdoor washrooms and how the development fits into a bigger picture.

Members of Planning Committee asked several questions and received responses.

#### WRITTEN COMMENTS

1. Correspondence from D. McLaren, dated June 3, 2020
2. Correspondence from G. Pitts, dated June 3, 2020
3. Correspondence from D. Clemens, dated June 1, 2020
4. Correspondence from S. Bracken, dated May 27, 2020
5. Correspondence from R. and A. Eveleigh, undated
6. Correspondence from C.D. McKenzie, undated
7. Correspondence from D. Phillips, undated
8. Correspondence from J. Arn, dated June 4, 2020
9. Correspondence from L. Brumwell, dated June 4, 2020
10. Correspondence from E. Menard, dated May 22, 2020
11. Correspondence from V. Handren, dated June 7, 2020
12. Petition signed by 151 residents
13. Correspondence from P. and J. Landry, dated June 5, 2020
14. Correspondence from W. Holst, dated June 7, 2020
15. Correspondence from L. Evans, dated June 7, 2020

16. Correspondence from B. Gill, dated June 7, 2020
17. Correspondence from J. and R. Wisocky, dated June 7, 2020
18. Correspondence from W. McElroy, dated June 8, 2020
19. Correspondence from Nautica, dated June 2, 2020
20. Correspondence from P. Armstrong, dated June 3, 2020
21. Correspondence from R. McLawson, dated June 1, 2020
22. Correspondence from R. Blair, dated June 6, 2020
23. Correspondence from M. Holmes dated June 8, 2020
24. Correspondence from J. Chinn, dated June 8, 2020
25. Correspondence from G. and A. Cornick, undated
26. Correspondence from K. Forsyth, dated June 8, 2020
27. Correspondence from P. Hedges, dated June 8, 2020
28. Presentation from G. Bell, provided on June 8, 2020

This matter was recommended for consideration (Section "A") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 2020-06-29.

### **ENQUIRIES**

Members of Planning Committee did not address any enquires to City staff.

The meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

CHAIRMAN