

Mr. & Mrs. W. Church

May 22, 2012

To Ms. Dawn McAlpine; city clerk
City of Barrie,
P.O. Box 400
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 4T5



Re: Official Plan Amendments
Amendment to the zoning By-Law, and Plan of Subdivision 2131059 Ontario Limited (Baywood Homes) - 700-725 Maplevue Drive East

To Whom It May Concern:

We reside at _____, Barrie, On. _____ It borders at the back on the retention pond and there is open space to hike and walk on the south side of the retention pond which abuts on the northern boundary of the subject property. We have the following concerns about the proposed development which is an intensive residential development on the south portion of the subject property and submit the following comments for your consideration.

1. We realize that the Province of Ontario, in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth) Plan (GGH), wants intensive development within 500 metres of a Go Station. This plan also provides that it is not intended to replace existing municipal plans, but, to work within the existing planning framework to provide growth management policy direction for the GGH. It further provides that, in preparing for the future, planning for the GGH take into account natural heritage features and areas (we interpret this to include wetlands) and the government's commitment to protecting them.

It seems reasonable to us that intensive development be confined to lands that have direct access to Go Stations and can and should be developed for residential use.

There is no direct access from these lands to the Go Station, they are so wet and swampy that they should never be developed, and a large portion of them are more than 500 meters from the Go Station. Also there is a large parcel of land to the west of the Go Station that is undeveloped and is suitable for dense residential development.

2. The only access for most of this development is one street onto Maplevue Drive East near the railway tracks. Maplevue Drive East is a former country gravel road (2 lanes) with pavement on top of the gravel and was never designed to accomodate traffic from 3500-5500 people. In addition the subdivisions to the east and north use Maplevue Drive East to get to the Go Station

and the Shopping Centers to the west. We anticipate long lineups of vehicles trying to get to the Go Station and other points west of this area.

3. We understand that Barrie has insufficient fire, police, transportation and school services to service this area properly and insufficient money, at the present time, to provide these services. In fact there are many residents of the southend who think that the services for the present residents are inadequate.

Because a municipality loses money on each residence it permits we don't believe that Barrie should incur any more debt to finance further residential development. We have lived in Barrie for almost 11 years and during that time there has been substantial residential development which has resulted in municipal taxes and other municipal charges rising at more than twice the annual rate of inflation.

4. The developer proposes to build 1849-1905 units with 1 parking space for each 300 square metres (about 1000 square feet). Even if each unit were only 1000 square feet, which we doubt, the parking spaces would be inadequate because most units produce 2 vehicles and some with teenage residents produce more than 2 vehicles.

5. The proposed development will place 3500-4500 people on less land than is found in settlements such as Baxter, Churchill, Thornton and Stroud to name a few in Simcoe County. Each of these municipalities has more land than 40 ha. And fewer people than 3500-4500. Considering the surrounding development this is much too intensive (most of the proposed development is not within 500 metres of the Go Station).

6. The only park shown on the developer's plan is less than 1 acre. This is an extremely small park for 3500-4500 people and again, in our opinion, is much too small.

7. Hewitt's creek is a small creek which barely handles the present runoff. It won't begin to handle the runoff from another retention pond, particularly a pond which is the sole runoff for a residential development of 3500-4500 people. The only solution that will work is a storm sewer attached to the Barrie storm sewer system that empties into something big enough to handle the runoff without flooding anybody.

8. Does either the Environmental Protection Act or the Environmental Assessment Act apply? The nature of this property is such (our oldest son and one of us traversed the northern part of the property, with difficulty because it is very swampy) that it should be studied by the experts usually found in Environmental Assessment hearings. The southern part of the property in the middle portion is even worse than the northern portion. We agree that part of the land bordering Maplevue Drive East can be developed but we don't know why anybody would try to develop the remainder of the property. We concluded that the developer probably bought the property without fully examining it and now hopes to talk the City into allowing it to develop sufficient land to earn a profit even though the original zoning would not have permitted it to make a profit.

9. This development is, at the very least, premature because adequate services don't exist and Barrie can't afford, at the present time, to provide the necessary services. In addition no plans have been made for the recently incorporated lands from Innisfil although we understand that the planning department is working on this.

We suggest that:

1. No residential development be permitted until some official has traversed the entire property and determined what building sites exist and what type of development is suitable.
2. An Environmental Assessment be conducted before any development is approved.
3. No development be approved until the necessary services are available.
4. This application not be considered until the previous application is resolved.

We wish to be notified of any decision of the Council regarding this application.

Yours very truly,

William Church

Ann Church

William Church
Ann Church