

Good Evening,

My name is Andrea Attridge and along with my partner, Hugh Knowles, Patterson Road – 1 of the 4 properties included in this re-zoning application being made by Farrage Developments.

I am speaking to this application tonight as a result of my family's concerns with the proliferation of new and/or re-development in this area of the city. It is especially concerning to us as we are not one of the intensification areas on the city's official plan. Equally disconcerting is the lack of a long-range re-development plan for this area. Both the projects in process and those proposed continue to erode mature tree canopies by removing trees and imposing a density that is beyond the pale for this area.

While I understand that development and increased density is inevitable and, in some situations and locations, even desirable – this location and situation – in my opinion is neither inevitable nor desirable.

Reading the Planning Justification and Functional Servicing Reports prepared by Innovative Planning Solutions leads me to have very serious concerns. I present these concerns to you in no particular order.

- 1) The referencing of other developments as a means to support this application for re-zoning. For example – reference was made to both the Pratt Manhattan Development on Ferndale Drive and the Hedbern Townhomes on Alva Street as examples of multi residential projects that were given the go ahead. This seems to indicate that if it's already been done before, it should be done again. The townhomes on Alva Street are situated on a larger piece of land and there are only 35 in total compared to the proposal for 48 townhomes on Patterson Road on a much smaller tract of land. This is not an equal comparison. The Alva Street project has a barrier of mature trees separating the complex from the neighbouring single family homes. It sits on a lot that is bordered by city streets on three sides and the town homes that front onto Crawford Street have adequate parking in the driveways for residents and guests. Acknowledging that fact, there are still issues with on street parking at times and there is a notable lack of guest parking for the townhomes on Alva Street. On any given day you can find several cars parked on the street.
- 2) Another concern is related to the tree removals. I understand that in order to build there are times when trees need to be removed. In this proposal however, all one needs to do is look at the lots in question to know that the trees which would have to be removed are large, mature trees providing somewhat of a sound barrier to the noise that emanates from the Canplas plant and the 400 highway which are both less than 1000 meters from my backyard. These trees keep the sounds of industry and traffic to a livable level which allows me and many of my neighbours to use our backyards for social gatherings or relaxation after a busy day at work. When Pratt's Manhattan project was in its initial stages our neighbourhood went from being reasonably quiet to increased noise coming from Ferndale Drive. The removal of the trees reduced the pleasure we took in our backyards and allowed the noise of the traffic to drift into the neighbourhood – in particular when emergency vehicles travel on Ferndale Drive. This is something that was not heard prior to those trees being removed. The trees on the Patterson Road property also provide some measure of erosion control. Where 52 Patterson Road backs directly onto my backyard, 50 Patterson Road meets at the NE corner of my yard. Both 46 and 50 Patterson Road are at higher elevation and we already have water problems in the spring and during winter thaws. The back one-third to one-half of our yard is flooded every year from the snow melt. My sump pump is still going off occasionally due to the water in the ground. Building this proposed

development that will cover a large portion of these four properties with hard impermeable surfaces can only lead to increased water issues for my property. Water always finds its own level.

- 3) In the proposal, proximity to amenities is referenced as another justification for the plan. Within 2 km of this neighbourhood there are big box stores – Leon’s, Lowes and MEC, a grocery store in Zehr’s, a high end car dealership, gas stations, Tim Hortons, a corner store, dentist, optometrist, a couple of small restaurants and a pool hall. There are no major retailers or medical offices in the immediate vicinity. That would mean increased traffic flow as the residents of this proposed development would, of necessity, have to use their vehicles a majority of the time to arrive at a needed destination.
- 4) Transit accessibility and availability are also highlighted as a means for potential residents to access employment, creating the illusion that this development would not mean increased traffic as people would use transit to get around. This area is serviced by the 7A Bell Farm and 7B Bear Creek. City residents are well aware of the growing pains and issues with Barrie Transit as it stands today, and these two routes are no exception. I could take the bus to and from my employment in the south-end but it would add an extra 2 hours to my work day, as the current service is only every ½ hour during the day and changes to 1 hour service after 7 p.m. Transit, in this instance is not convenient. The first bus at the starting point for the 7A starts at 5:25 a.m. and on the 7B it is 6 a.m. so for people that start before or at 7 a.m. in the south end, using the 7B transit isn’t an option. Why would I (or anyone) want to add 2 hours to the day when my workplace is a short 10 minutes away, 15 minutes max on a heavy traffic day. There is no shelter from the elements at any of the bus stops that I could utilize on these routes and, in fact, there are very few shelters along the route at all. Issues with transit would mean that potential residents would be relying on their vehicles and adding to the busyness of the neighbourhood streets. As the proposed development has entrances/exits off both Patterson Road and Philips Street there will no doubt be increased traffic on Crawford Street as people aim to avoid trying to turn onto Patterson Rd from Philips St or trying to avoid turning from Patterson Rd into the complex altogether. This poses a concern as the north end of Crawford Street has no sidewalks and many residents, myself included, from the surrounding neighbourhood regularly walk our dogs on this street. Given the way many cars speed down Crawford Street, increased traffic could mean an increased risk of injury for someone.
- 5) The report alludes to this proposed development as providing housing to a diverse range of household sizes and incomes. The proposed size and layout of these units is predominantly 2 bedroom with a few possibly being 3 bedroom. It is also being presented as a “condo” style complex. I know that my family couldn’t be in a position to afford one of these units, as indicated by the selling price of the similar current townhome projects in this area. This leaves me uncertain as to how a wide range of incomes would be represented. This does not come across as the affordable housing that Barrie is in need of.

These are the arguments that stood out to me that were used in support of this re-zoning application. I find them rather specious and somewhat weak at best. They tick boxes on some checklist for intensification and development but they do not look at the reality of the situation for existing families in this neighbourhood. People moved into this mature existing neighbourhood because it is quiet, and well established. And being established there was no indication of any prospective construction and development happening. We chose to live in an area where our neighbours aren’t on top of us and to have the space to breath and enjoy our properties. If we wanted our neighbours so close we could hear their every move we would have chosen to live in that type of neighbourhood.

As stated earlier I understand the need for intensification and development but do not feel this is place for it. I do not feel that this application and this proposal are appropriate for these properties, particularly in view of

the fact there is no stated plan for re-development for this area. It is my hope that as you review and consider this application for approval you will acknowledge that the absence of a plan for re-development (should this be approved) will make all properties in this neighbourhood a target. Developers will keep watch with a view to purchasing homes as they go on the market or, worse, they will approach homeowners on a piecemeal basis, trying to buy the ones they want, and in no time at all there will be another proposal on the table. The potential of this happening over and over will mean the entire neighbourhood will change its basic shape and use and will, consequently, be devoid of character. I have no immediate intention to relocate at this time or in the immediate future. My family plans to live here as long as we possibly can. We love our home and property and we don't want to see this eroded by patchwork re-development.

Should this application be approved I wish it to be known that I strongly oppose the zoning by-law amendment application to lessen the setbacks and increase the density. If multi-family dwellings are going to be permitted in our neighbourhood then it needs to be done within the existing zoning by-laws out of respect for the existing homeowners in this neighbourhood.

Just because you CAN to something – does not mean you SHOULD

Thank you