

## Legislation Text

---

File #: 20-A-066, Version: 1

---

### DEPUTATIONS REGARDING MOTION 20-P-030, APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT - 481 YONGE DEVELOPMENTS INC. - 481 YONGE STREET (WARD 8)

1. **Mr. Greg Stephenson** appeared in to discuss his concerns associated with the proposed development at 481 Yonge Street. He noted that he has been a resident of Barrie over the last 20 years and why he enjoys being a resident. Mr. Stephenson noted that he can't support the development in his current form but supports measured intensification that is included in the Provincial and City plans. He noted his core issue is that the intensification being proposed is over twice to what is currently zoned and question why the current intensification is not appropriate and what the current level for this corridor is. Mr. Stephenson commented on what he felt is an appropriate density for the City to achieve targets identified in provincial and municipal policies. He discussed his concerns about parking implications and including parking numbers by Statistics Canada and the number of residents that rely on cars to drive to work. In closing he questioned challenging builders to take a measured development approach and the need to review parking as many residents depend on cars.

A member of Council asked questions of the deputation and received responses.

2. **Mr. Darren Vella of Innovative Planning Solutions** appeared on behalf of 481 Yonge Street Inc. in opposition of motion 20-P-30 concerning an Amendment to the Zoning By-law. Mr. Vella discussed that he had met with residents and Councillor Harris several times after the neighbourhood meeting and had spent a significant amount of time and money to redesign the development. He discussed that the stormwater details should not influence the zoning decision on this matter. Mr. Vella detailed how staff interpret the intensification within the provision of the Official Plan. He noted other substantial development projects under construction along Yonge Street noting that their size and density is much larger than what is being proposed and that some are closer to single family dwellings than this proposed development.

Mr. Vella noted that this application was re-submitted in February 20, 2020 that he felt addressed some of the public concerns including parking and a new shadow study. He discussed his concerns with the delays with processing the application resulting from COVID-19 and now with the Planning Committee recommendation to refer the application back to staff and the upcoming summer recess and having to wait until September for a report. Mr. Vella advised that his client is not willing to make changes to units and requested that a decision be made on the application either to approve or deny. He noted that staff would not be able to provide any further advice on density given that his client is not willing to change it as well as his observation concerning LPAT's decisions on applications supported by staff and not the municipal Council.

A member of Council asked questions of Mr. Vella and received responses.