

Planning Dept<Planning@nvca.on.ca>  
Melissa McCabe  
Good morning,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. The properties are located outside of our watershed and are under the jurisdiction of Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority. I would direct you to contact their office.

Please let our staff know if we can assist with anything further.

Kindly,

**Pearl Gill**  
**Planning Technician**

**Planning Department**  
**Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority**  
8195 8th Line, Utopia, ON L0M 1T0  
T 705-424-1479  
[planning@nvca.on.ca](mailto:planning@nvca.on.ca) | [www.nvca.on.ca](http://www.nvca.on.ca)

**WE'RE GOING DIGITAL!** Email your complete permit application submission directly to [permits@nvca.on.ca](mailto:permits@nvca.on.ca). Note: Files larger than 10MB are not received. In this case, submit the documents individually.

To see if your property is regulated by the NVCA, use our [INTERACTIVE MAPPING](#).

To find out if your property may be affected by NVCA policies and regulations, complete our online property inquiry form at <http://www.nvca.on.ca/planning-permits/property-inquiries>

For more information about the permit process, visit our website at [https://www.nvca.on.ca/Pages/Permit\\_FAQs.aspx](https://www.nvca.on.ca/Pages/Permit_FAQs.aspx)

This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the original message.

**From:** Greg Stephenson <  
**Sent on:** Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:55:14 PM  
**To:** Jim Harris <Jim.Harris@barrie.ca>  
**CC:** Melissa McCabe <Melissa.McCabe@barrie.ca>; Daniel Frangione <Daniel.Frangione@barrie.ca>; Logan Juffermans <Logan.Juffermans@barrie.ca>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Notice of Complete Application & Public Meeting (D30-006-2025 - 461-473 Yonge Street)  
**Attachments:** EMAIL - Notice of Complete & Public Meeting - D30-006-2025 - 461-473 Yonge St.pdf (728.92 KB)

Hi Jim.

Hope all is well. I noticed this plan has 0.67 residential parking spots per unit, and it is not clear how many commercial parking spaces for both employees and customers, also factoring seasonal issues like snow storage/removal.

As I see it, at full capacity there will not be enough parking to satisfy the cars people will need for residential and commercial units, based on the facts for average car per household in Barrie (~1.5). The streets should not be leveraged by developers for parking lots which causes congestion, makes it difficult for safety vehicles, and clutters the neighbourhood.

I know the narrative: need to reduce reliance on cars, planning for intensification corridor etc. but in my opinion, it is clear the intent here is for fewer parking spots for the sake of more units and more profit. I believe we can get the intensification we need in this specific area (intensification corridor) while accommodating the parking demand properly, and supporting the existing residential neighbourhood.

In the past I've noticed developers rely on traffic studies to support their story, including suggesting there will be less parking demand. A traffic study does not specifically address the # of cars owned by the residents purchasing the units nor parking needs for shoppers & employees visiting the commercial units. As you know, there are credible statistics on cars/drivers per household that can be utilized for Barrie region by Statistics Canada. I suggest they refer to these statistics in their proposal and redesign #units to accommodate the true parking needs. If they can't fit enough parking spots to satisfy the demand for 233 residential and 6 commercial units, I see this as a proxy for overdevelopment, esp. in an intensification corridor next to an existing residential neighbourhood (not a node).

Could you or your planners confirm what is the anticipated number of cars per household for this development, and what data is being used to support this?

Also, does the city agree the builders should not rely on the city streets to support parking overflow due to insufficient number of residential and commercial parking spots for this particular area?

Thanks,  
Greg

**From:** Celeste Phillips <

**Sent:** Saturday, August 23, 2025 10:12 PM

**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>; Daniel Frangione <Daniel.Frangione@barrie.ca>

**Cc:** Jim Harris <Jim.Harris@barrie.ca>; Melissa McCabe <Melissa.McCabe@barrie.ca>

**Subject:** D30-006-2025 - 461-473 Yonge Street

We are homeowners at 461-473 Yonge Street and are writing to express our opposition to the rezoning proposed at 461-473 Yonge Street.

In our opinion there are clear indicators that what is being proposed represents overbuilding of the site.

**1. The density of the development is obviously too high because the minimum parking requirement of 1 space per unit cannot be met.**

While it is a laudable goal that more people should use transit and not automobiles, that is in fact not current reality.

The Traffic Report submitted with the planning application indicates that the required parking spaces cannot be provided and the project will be short by 72 parking spaces. The Report goes on to say that only 23 units of the 233 units will be occupied by people that don't have a vehicle.

The resultant impact of such a significant parking shortage is overspill parking onto local residential streets in stable residential neighbourhoods. The lack of available on-site parking spaces is further exacerbated when the very few surface parking spaces are used for snow storage in winter months.

If the minimum parking requirement cannot be met, that means that there are too many units proposed on the site. The total number of units should be reduced.

**2. The height of the building exceeds what is permitted in intensification corridors.**

The applicant intends to take advantage of additional height permissions when ground floor commercial is provided. In this case however, the proposed development does not achieve the minimum amount of ground floor commercial that is required in order to be granted any additional height (30.9 % vs. 50% required ground floor commercial). The height of the building should be reduced because of this deficiency.

Further, in consideration of the single detached residential lots located to the immediate east along Tomlin Court, I'd ask that you carefully review the shadow impact analysis completed by the applicant's architect (Lima Architects). These drawings show significant shadowing of homes and yards for those nearby residents living on both sides of Tomlin Court and Dixon Court.

**3. Overcrowding of the site is evident as the minimum parking aisle width of 6.4 metres cannot be met.**

If something as simple as aisle widths between parking spaces cannot be met, that indicates that the size of the building is too large. A parking aisle width of 6.4 metres is the current zoning standard in most municipalities in central Ontario and in some municipalities, a larger aisle width is required.

A reduction in the building footprint would allow for conformity with the 6.4 metre aisle width requirement.

**4. Access to and egress from the building is proposed to be located on Macmillan Crescent, a local roadway.**

The proposed access to and egress from the building is located on Macmillan Crescent, very close to the Yonge Street intersection. Macmillan Crescent is a local roadway. Was consideration given to access to

and from the building from Yonge Street, to lessen the impact on Macmillan Crescent and the Yonge Street intersection?

For all of the above reasons, we request that the proposed rezoning not be approved.

Kindly confirm receipt of this email.

Celeste Phillips  
Dale MacKenzie