

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #:	17-A-079	Version:	1	Name:	
Type:	Deputation	Status:		To Be Introduced	
File created:	6/13/2017	In control:		City Council	
On agenda:	6/19/2017	Final action:		6/19/2017	
Title:	DEPUTATIONS REGARDING MOTION 17-G-174, APPLICATION FOR A ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT 2440511 ONTARIO INCORPORATED AND 2431805 ONTARIO INCORPORATED 521 AND 527 BIG BAY POINT ROAD (WARD 9).				

1. Mr. Dave Lawlor provided a deputation in opposition to motion 17-G-174 concerning an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment submitted by 2440511 Ontario Incorporated and 2431805 Ontario Incorporated for 521 and 527 Big Bay Point Road. Mr. Lawlor discussed his concerns associated with the proposed reduction in on-site parking for the development and that overflow parking could not be provided on Big Bay Point Road. He noted that the additional traffic will add to the high volume of traffic already being experienced along Big Bay Point Road.

Mr. Lawlor indicated that he had two points he wanted to make. The first point he discussed was that he felt that there is a discrepancy between the rezoning amendment identifying that 521 and 527 Big Bay Point Road are within an intensification nodes and the illustration accompanying the amendment shows they are not. He expressed concern in the City's planning policies that the City does not find this significant. The second point Mr. Lawlor noted was that whether or not a formal change in planning direction had been made, unrealistic housing intensification with reduced would be contrary to long term planning and practice. Mr. Lawlor stated that he believed that any plans for residential and traffic development in this area of Barrie should recognize the unique history and characteristics of the area.

Mr. Lawlor remarked that he believed that the residential and commercial development in the Big Bay Point Road/Yonge Street area has been accelerated due to the proximity to Toronto and the lower housing costs in Barrie making it attractive. He observed that there has been an increase in commuter traffic on Highway 400 and noted that it is worse in the summer due to cottage traffic. Mr. Lawlor discussed a number of traffic measures that have been implemented to support the residential traffic flow coming into Barrie. He discussed his concerns related to the additional traffic along Big Bay Point resulting from the Friday Harbour Development in Innisfil. He commented about his discomfort about the speed of traffic along Big Bay Point Road as part of the rationale for the full length parking ban.

Mr. Lawlor discussed future plans for expansion of the westerly portion of Big Bay Point Road and noted that he felt that because of the accumulated traffic impacts, that no further development should be undertaken without a traffic study. He discussed his concerns related to the traffic impacts from additional higher density development in the area, including illegal parking on Big Bay Point or in surrounding commercial plazas. He reiterated his perspectives that a change to allow intensification without an increase on on-site parking is contrary to planning practices.

Mr. Lawlor reiterated his comments associated with the proposed development not being within the intensification nodes, his concerns that responses received were that the nodes were more of a guideline, and the lack of clarity. He also reiterated his comments that he felt a traffic study was needed to forecast the effect of the accumulated changes in the area.

In conclusion, Mr. Lawlor commented that he felt that the intensification node identified at Big Bay Point Road and Yonge Street is a contradiction to the City's planning practice. He indicated that he felt that traffic infrastructure improvements are meant to service increased traffic flow in the City not to support higher density in the area. Mr. Lawlor discussed that without managed development in this

area the outcome would be excessive traffic congestion, accidents and similar traffic problems experienced in other areas of the City. He remarked that he felt that the City has chosen to add more traffic to an already over-trafficked area. Mr. Lawlor stated that bad planning is not town planning at all.

2. Ms. Barb Tansley provided a deputation in opposition to motion 17-G-174 concerning an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment submitted by 2440511 Ontario Incorporated and 2431805 Ontario Incorporated for 521 and 527 Big Bay Point Road. Ms. Tansley indicated that it didn't appear to her that both of the properties are located within an intensification node, as identified in City Intensification Urban Design Study.

Ms. Tansley discussed the concerns that the community had presented through letters and public meetings including the impact on privacy, they deserve to keep the current zoning, that the properties were not located within an intensification node, impacts on drainage, location of garbage and snow storage, height and quantity of units and shadowing impacts. She advised that she appreciated the change in the draft plan concept to re-orient the buildings to address some of the privacy issues. Ms. Tansley requested an explanation regarding why the staff report identifies the properties as being in the intensification nodes and the map referenced does not. She stated that at the Public Meeting on April 24, 2017 Council had requested clarification about the nodes and distances from the intersection. Ms. Tansley indicated that the answer received identified the nodes being 200 metres from the intersection and it was intended that any property front onto the intersection. She commented that the developer's representative remarked that a portion of the lands were not within the node.

Ms. Tansley commented that the staff report is based on the premise that the properties are within the intensification node and she felt that the report would be different if the properties were outside of the node. She remarked that she felt the interpretation surrounding the zoning standards associated with this property had changed without notice.

Ms. Tansley raised concerns associated with the proposed parking for the development. She noted that the residents are concerned that the intensification nodes seem spreading whichever way the wind is blowing. She commented that she felt there is no need to come to Council if changes can be made to policy without following due process.

Ms. Tansley remarked that she found it interesting that more time was spent by Council on the discussion of whether to have a by-election or appoint than discussing a zoning by-law amendment which could potentially have a larger impact. She noted that there has been a lot of time and energy invested in this application and suggested that the type of development needed to be placed in a more appropriate area to succeed. She indicated that this type of development should not be put in to a mature neighbourhood where people have lived for years expecting only single family homes to be built.

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. 170619 DEP D Lawlor 521 and 527 Big Bay Pt Rd.pdf, 2. 170619 DEP B Tansley 521 and 527 Big Bay Pt Rd.pdf, 3. 170619 ADDITIONS Deputation B. Tansley.pdf

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

DEPUTATIONS REGARDING MOTION 17-G-174, APPLICATION FOR A ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT 2440511 ONTARIO INCORPORATED AND 2431805 ONTARIO INCORPORATED 521 AND 527 BIG BAY POINT ROAD (WARD 9).

1. **Mr. Dave Lawlor** provided a deputation in opposition to motion 17-G-174 concerning an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment submitted by 2440511 Ontario Incorporated and 2431805 Ontario Incorporated for 521 and 527 Big Bay Point Road. Mr. Lawlor discussed his concerns associated with

the proposed reduction in on-site parking for the development and that overflow parking could not be provided on Big Bay Point Road. He noted that the additional traffic will add to the high volume of traffic already being experienced along Big Bay Point Road.

Mr. Lawlor indicated that he had two points he wanted to make. The first point he discussed was that he felt that there is a discrepancy between the rezoning amendment identifying that 521 and 527 Big Bay Point Road are within an intensification nodes and the illustration accompanying the amendment shows they are not. He expressed concern in the City's planning policies that the City does not find this significant. The second point Mr. Lawlor noted was that whether or not a formal change in planning direction had been made, unrealistic housing intensification with reduced parking would be contrary to long term planning and practice. Mr. Lawlor stated that he believed that any plans for residential and traffic development in this area of Barrie should recognize the unique history and characteristics of the area.

Mr. Lawlor remarked that he believed that the residential and commercial development in the Big Bay Point Road/Yonge Street area has been accelerated due to the proximity to Toronto and the lower housing costs in Barrie making it attractive. He observed that there has been an increase in commuter traffic on Highway 400 and noted that it is worse in the summer due to cottage traffic. Mr. Lawlor discussed a number of traffic measures that have been implemented to support the residential traffic flow coming into Barrie. He discussed his concerns related to the additional traffic along Big Bay Point resulting from the Friday Harbour Development in Innisfil. He commented about his discomfort about the speed of traffic along Big Bay Point Road as part of the rationale for the full length parking ban.

Mr. Lawlor discussed future plans for expansion of the westerly portion of Big Bay Point Road and noted that he felt that because of the accumulated traffic impacts, that no further development should be undertaken without a traffic study. He discussed his concerns related to the traffic impacts from additional higher density development in the area, including illegal parking on Big Bay Point or in surrounding commercial plazas. He reiterated his perspectives that a change to allow intensification without an increase on on-site parking is contrary to planning practices.

Mr. Lawlor reiterated his comments associated with the proposed development not being within the intensification nodes, his concerns that responses received were that the nodes were more of a guideline, and the lack of clarity. He also reiterated his comments that he felt a traffic study was needed to forecast the effect of the accumulated changes in the area.

In conclusion, Mr. Lawlor commented that he felt that the intensification node identified at Big Bay Point Road and Yonge Street is a contradiction to the City's planning practice. He indicated that he felt that traffic infrastructure improvements are meant to service increased traffic flow in the City not to support higher density in the area. Mr. Lawlor discussed that without managed development in this area the outcome would be excessive traffic congestion, accidents and similar traffic problems experienced in other areas of the City. He remarked that he felt that the City has chosen to add more traffic to an already over-trafficked area. Mr. Lawlor stated that bad planning is not town planning at all.

2. **Ms. Barb Tansley** provided a deputation in opposition to motion 17-G-174 concerning an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment submitted by 2440511 Ontario Incorporated and 2431805 Ontario Incorporated for 521 and 527 Big Bay Point Road. Ms. Tansley indicated that it didn't appear to her that both of the properties are located within an intensification node, as identified in City Intensification Urban Design Study.

Ms. Tansley discussed the concerns that the community had presented through letters and public meetings including the impact on privacy, they desire to keep the current zoning, that the properties

were not located within an intensification node, impacts on drainage, the location of garbage and snow storage, height and quantity of units and shadowing impacts. She advised that she appreciated the change in the draft plan concept to re-orient the buildings to address some of the privacy issues. Ms. Tansley requested an explanation regarding why the Staff Report identifies the properties as being in the intensification nodes and the map referenced does not. She stated that at the Public Meeting on April 24, 2017 Council had requested clarification about the nodes and distances from the intersection. Ms. Tansley indicated that the answer received identified the nodes being 200 metres from the intersection and it was intended that any property front onto the intersection. She commented that the developer's representative remarked that a portion of the lands were not within the node.

Ms. Tansley commented that the staff report is based on the premise that the properties are within the intensification node and she felt that the report would be different if the properties were outside of the node. She remarked that she felt the interpretation surrounding the zoning standards associated with this property had changed without notice.

Ms. Tansley raised concerns associated with the proposed parking for the development. She noted that the residents are concerned that the intensification nodes seem spreading whichever way the wind is blowing. She commented that she felt there is no need to come to Council if changes can be made to policy without following due process.

Ms. Tansley remarked that she found it interesting that more time was spent by Council on the discussion of whether to have a by-election or appoint than discussing a zoning by-law amendment which could potentially have a larger impact. She noted that there has been a lot of time and energy invested in this application and suggested that the type of development needed to be placed in a more appropriate area to succeed. She indicated that this type of development should not be put in to a mature neighbourhood where people have lived for years expecting only single family homes to be built.