

From: Graeme Montgomery

Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 1:16 PM

To: Stephen Naylor; Michael Prowse; Jeff Lehman; Tami Kitay; Carlissa McLaren; Office of the Mayor; Dawn McAlpine

Subject: Opposition to the Zoning Amendment at 401 Essa Road File #D12-420/D14-1601

To Whom It May Concern:

I remain opposed to the Planning Department's Submission of their report to the City of Barrie table June 20th, 2016 at Barrie City Council for approval of said report by council which was passed at that council meeting.

Further, I wish to speak against this File and Zoning Amendment on June 27th.

Thank you .

Graeme Montgomery



June 24, 2016

Director of Planning Services
City of Barrie
P. O. Box 400
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 4T5

Attention : Stephen Naylor

Re : Amendment to the Zoning By-Law and Plan of Subdivision – Sean Mason Homes
(Essa Rd) Inc. – 401 Essa Road, Barrie, File D14-1601 and D12-420

Dear Sir.

Further to our letter of May 9, 2016 and another on June 8, 2016, after reading and hearing some of the other concerns expressed by area residents, not just those on Cityview Circle, and the decision by city council to approve the above noted development, we wish to again express our opposition to the above development. This development and the associated development plan is not in keeping with the City of Barrie and does not belong in this city.

The process of democracy does not appear to have been followed in this case. We, the residents of the area along Essa Road, along Ferndale Drive South and the Cityview Circle subdivision are not fighting the permitted density, but the over densification of the property. We have elected a councilor who is to represent us as residents and although he has indicated that he is in opposition to the development, he has voted for the development. This was for political reasons only and not for his immediate constituents.

The mayor has also publicly stated that “Good design makes all the difference” “Badly designed intensification sticks out like a sore thumb”. I think everyone who has driven by this development would have to admit it sticks out like a sore thumb. I would conclude then that this is “bad design” and should be stopped before the rest of the city is polluted with this type of development.

The potential conflict of interest of some councilors and the mayor is also of concern. The mayor has stated publicly that he does not support these political donations but goes against his own principles by allowing voting on this matter by the councilors who are tainted. It was also noted that this conflict of interest was not disclosed at the meeting.

According to The City of Barrie Official Plan, the Intensification Study and the Intensification Guidelines, we again bring up the various discrepancies with the planned development of the lands along the intensification corridors. As stated in my earlier letters, the following are the significant variances from the Official Plan. If these various variances are allowed to proceed through the process without objection, there is nothing stopping a development of any kind within the City of Barrie. We understand the need for intensification and accept that this is going to happen, but there is no need to exceed the expectations of the province with regard to density and lose all sense of character in the community.

The Official Plan was developed for the City of Barrie at considerable expense, with input from the Province of Ontario, the County of Simcoe and city staff including the city's own planning department and then published in March of 2014. It appears to include the results of the city's own Intensification Study of 2009 and the Intensification Guidelines of 2012. Given the recent date of the Official Plan, why is it that the city appears to have disregarded this plan when making decisions on Phase 1 of this development only 5 months after its introduction? If the city is not going to abide by the Official Plan in its planning decisions, why waste the time and the tax payers' money in preparing a plan?

We have outlined many clauses from the Official Plan **highlighted** below with my concerns regarding these clauses in regular text immediately following in order to make it easier for you or your staff to see our concerns and address these issues. We realize in today's electronic culture, this would be considered screaming but it is only done for ease of interpretation, and not as a reflection of my tone.

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE PLAN, This document is a public statement by the Council of The Corporation of the City of Barrie (Council/City) of land use and development goals, objectives and policies for the guidance of public and private development decisions within the City of Barrie.

This Official Plan provides guidance for consideration of land use changes, the provision of public works, actions of local boards, municipal initiatives, and the actions of private enterprise. It gives direction for implementing by-laws, guidelines for more detailed planning and the means for controlling growth so that the City's capacity to provide a healthy community environment is not exceeded." Is this development considered to be healthy growth if it requires so many variances to the Official Plan which was developed to promote a healthy community environment and control growth?

1.2 STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES – "This document is founded on the following principles:"

"(a) That more effective, efficient and consistent decision making ... can be achieved through the development and implementation of a formally established set of goals, objectives and policies." If the Official Plan is the set of goals,

objectives and policies to be followed to develop a healthy community environment, why are so many variances being allowed and variances of such severity?

“(c) That municipal Planning has as its fundamental concern, the physical aspect of the community and in particular the use of land and land use relationships, in the context of the social and economic development of the community, the overall health and well being of its population, and the environment.” There appears to be little consideration given to the use of land and land use relationships to the surrounding areas and the environment in both this development and the earlier Phase 1. The selling of the Patterson Road road allowance to the developer does not seem to align with this principle as the environmentally protected area in behind the development will have restricted access and may at some time be totally closed to the public at the discretion of the development..

“(d) That public participation in the development of this Plan and its application is an essential component of the municipal planning process.” The decision to sell the Patterson Road road allowance to the developer does not appear to have had any input from the community as a whole.” Who was given notice of this decision prior to it happening? As the Patterson Road road allowance affects the entire community, the entire community should have been more informed of the potential for this decision.

2.1 BACKGROUND, in relation to TRANSPORTATION – “The city will continue to support the enhancement of Active Transportation infrastructure and facilities and through planning policies will strive to incorporate pedestrian/cycling connectivity through the community.” The selling and restriction of access to the Patterson Road road allowance is completely opposite to this desire and limits connectivity through the community. Although the development appears to allow access to this right of way, the massing and the very nature of the development will appear to limit or even totally restrict access. The developer in his own words has admitted that the aim of the development is to create an internal sense of community and residents will question persons about there being in “their” complex. This restricted access may at some time be completely closed off to the public at the development’s own discretion.

2.1 BACKGROUND, in relation to WATERFRONT – It is stated that “The city recognizes the value of public parkland as a community asset. Use of these lands for uses other than open space and recreational uses will be considered in the context of providing both public accessibility and benefit”. Where is the public accessibility and benefit in selling the road allowance to allow for more dense development and more profit to a developer?

2.1 BACKGROUND, in relation to THE ENVIRONMENT – It is stated “...that one of the competitive advantages that the City of Barrie has...is the lifestyle afforded by the City’s high quality natural environment... The importance of the conservation and preservation of the natural environment, including forested areas ... air quality and water resources is recognized as a major consideration in maintaining, and enhancing where possible, the health of the natural ecosystem and human health.” Restricting access to the green space behind the development and

increasing the density of the development affects both water resources and air quality by limiting the amount of percolation of ground water from rainfall and increasing traffic in the area, which will increase air and noise pollution..

2.1 BACKGROUND, in relation to THE ENVIRONMENT – It is also stated “In implementing the goals and policies of this Plan, the City will strive for “sustainable development”, defined as development that does not jeopardize opportunities for future generations. Development which is sensitive to the environment can be achieved through sound land use planning and transportation policies.” The selling of the Patterson Road road allowance has jeopardized opportunities for the future, regarding land use and active transportation. Is this not what the Official Plan is for – to plan sustainable development that does not jeopardize opportunities for future generations? Why throw the requirements of the Official Plan out the window for this development?

2.1 BACKGROUND, in relation to WATER RESOURCES – It is stated that “Long term protection of this valuable resource (water) from overuse, contamination and from land uses that could threaten or hinder existing and future drinking water supply is essential to maintaining human health, economic prosperity and quality of life.” The density of the development and the increase in impervious surfaces on the site will decrease water percolation into the soil and rain water collected from these surfaces will contain many contaminants and eventually find their way into the ground water. By allowing the water to runoff the site, precludes it from ever entering the ground and eventually will lower the water table.

2.2 COMMUNITY VISION – FOUNDATION OF OUR FUTURE – In order to ensure the City’s viability over the long term to promote and manage growth that sustains and builds a strong economy and community, and supports a healthy environment ...emphasized key elements to be included in a 20 Year Plan. This vision and key elements have been included in the City’s Official Plan to provide a foundation which will guide the City’s future.” If the official plan is the vision and contains the key elements for the foundation of the city’s development, why should we allow so many and such severe variances to the plan? What elements of the Official Plan are the developments actually conforming to?

2.3 ASSUMPTIONS – the Official Plan notes in subsection “(d) There will be a growing need to provide residential densities which are higher, more cost effective, energy efficient, and more environmentally sustainable than previous development in the City. It is expected that throughout the planning period, Barrie’s new housing stock will continue to include a large percentage of single detached units and a growing percentage of multiple family development at medium and high densities in order to provide a complete range of housing options for the City’s residents. Intensification represents an essential component of the City’s growth management strategy to minimize the infrastructure requirements of new development and to utilize existing services including transit, schools, and open space. (Mod C (g)).” The Official Plan already includes for densification, that recommended in the Intensification

Study of 2009 and the Intensification Guidelines of 2012, so why do we need higher densities than allowed for in the Official Plan. In relation to the higher energy efficiency and the environmental sustainability of the new development, is the developer required to have energy analyses done on the units to verify the energy efficiency of the construction? Is there a requirement for the developer to provide proof of environmental sustainability? Are Environmental Product Declarations required of the building products used? Is the developer required to build to LEED standards and register the units as LEED certified if he is promoting them to be “Near Net Zero”? Based on standards for Net Zero Construction, one of the primary considerations is building orientation. The proposed development has units that are perpendicular to others, so if building orientation is not part of the plan, how can they even start to be considered to be “Near Net Zero”. Are there any provisions for solar cell to achieve “Near Net Zero”. Without the generation potential, there is no possibility of “Near Net Zero”. What is the recourse of the city or the new owner if the energy efficiency of the new construction is not as promised? How does a new owner know if the unit is performing to the designer’s intent if no verification is performed?

2.3 ASSUMPTIONS, subsection “(e) There will be improved opportunities for efficiencies in public transit with the increased residential densities along or in close proximity to transit routes, transit stations and the GO Transit line. (Mod C (h))”, the reality of Barrie’s population is that we are commuters and most residents will have 2 cars, even if they use public transportation. Where are these vehicles to be parked? How will snow removal be managed in the winter? The congestion in the development because of the lack of parking will create a considerable health risk as access for emergency equipment will be severely restricted. Given that the likely owners of these units will be young families, where are bicycles stored in the summer – if in the garage, where do the cars get parked? Which comes first, the public transit system that encourages its use from the start or the densification and the habit of using a vehicle formed, then public transit will be improved after there is a possible user base but habits are already to use vehicles?

2.3 ASSUMPTIONS, subsection “(f) Emphasis will be placed on developing active transportation systems (pedestrian, cycling, etc.) that facilitate movement throughout the City and reduce dependence on the automobile, thus enhancing health and air quality.” The active transportation can only be utilized if there is employment along these active transportation corridors. The active transportation corridors will most likely be used for recreational activities and not employment. The selling of the Patterson Road road allowance has reduced the possibility of using that corridor for the general public..

3.1 GROWTH MANAGEMENT, 3.1.2 GENERAL OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES, 3.1.2.2 STAGING AND PHASING OF DEVELOPMENT, section (c), subsection “iv) phasing shall be done having regard for “the promotion of development in a contiguous and orderly fashion in order to achieve a compact, healthy and cost effective urban form.” This would ensure that the transition from existing density communities to the higher density communities would be gradual and not

abrupt as is proposed at this site. The orderly development of the city is not achieved by disregarding the Official Plan. What is the goal of the city for densification in infill lands? Are there specific densities allocated for all infill areas of the city to achieve the densification goals? How many units are required per year to achieve the set goals? Does the city know where it is now relative to its yearly target? Based on the Intensification Study of 2009, and using the reports numbers, the Intensification required along the corridors is minimal. This is based on a population in 2031 of 180,000. After consideration of the Annexed lands from Innisfil and a population in 2031 of 210,000, the need is negative, so why are we intensifying the intensification?

3.1 GROWTH MANAGEMENT, 3.1.2 GENERAL OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES, 3.1.2.3 DENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT AND INTENSIFICATION subsection (a) Development of the City's designated greenfield area shall be planned to achieve a minimum density target that is not less than 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare as measured by the Growth Plan. (Mod D (j))" The densities proposed for new Greenfield projects are 50 residents per hectare in green fields (subsection (a)) to 150 residents per hectare for Downtown Barrie Urban Growth Centre (subsection (c)). Based on the stated household density of 2.71 persons per household, the current proposed development would have a density of more than 157 residents per hectare, higher than required in the Urban Growth Centre. Why are we looking for higher densities in the intensification areas than in the Urban Growth Centre?

3.3 HOUSING, 3.3.1 GOALS, subsection (c) states that the "building designs and densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities, and support and contribute to safe, vibrant, pedestrian and cyclist-friendly streetscapes." The massing and the overbearing nature of the design does little to promote a vibrant and pedestrian and cyclist friendly streetscape. The proximity of the development to the street and the dark colouring of the first phase is not vibrant and is intimidating to anyone passing by.

3.3 HOUSING, 3.3.2 POLICIES, 3.3.2.1 GENERAL POLICIES, subsection (c) states that "The review process for intensification applications will include consideration of the existing and planned character and lot fabric of the area as well as the intensification and density targets of this plan." This should indicate that the existing neighbourhoods need to be looked at and considered to determine the degree of densification acceptable and does not state anywhere about the need for over intensification of these areas.

3.5 NATURAL HERITAGE, NATURAL HAZARDS AND RESOURCES, 3.5.1 GOALS, subsection "(a) To identify, protect and enhance natural heritage features and areas and their connecting linkages including land, air, water and the life they support for the benefit of future generations by encouraging and, where necessary, only allow land uses which protect the natural heritage features and functions of the E P Areas." By incorporating the Patterson Road road allowance, the natural flow of wildlife will be restricted and very likely totally cut off.

3.5 NATURAL HERITAGE, NATURAL HAZARDS AND RESOURCES, 3.5.2 POLICIES, 3.5.2.1 GENERAL POLICIES, subsection (b), “In the review of plans, programs and development applications, the city shall protect the natural environment and its ecological functions for conservation, recreation, scientific and educational value, and its benefits to human health,” The selling of the road allowance is completely opposite to this policy.

3.5 NATURAL HERITAGE, NATURAL HAZARDS AND RESOURCES, 3.5.2 POLICIES, 3.5.2.2 LAND MANAGEMENT, subsection (b) “New development shall be directed to maintain natural landscape that shapes and defines the City’s land form features, natural watershed drainage patterns and vista.” With the intensification, the natural drainage and the watershed drainage patterns will be disrupted significantly.

3.5 NATURAL HERITAGE, NATURAL HAZARDS AND RESOURCES, 3.5.2 POLICIES, 3.5.2.3 WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, subsection (a) “In reviewing development proposals, the City shall protect, maintain and enhance water and water related resources on an integrated watershed management basis.” This development doesn’t protect, maintain or enhance the water resources of the area. It significantly negatively affects these valuable resources.

3.5 NATURAL HERITAGE, NATURAL HAZARDS AND RESOURCES, 3.5.2 POLICIES, 3.5.2.3 WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, subsection (b) “The city will maintain and where possible, protect, improve or restore the quality and sustainability of surface and groundwater resources.” By permitting the over intensification of this property, groundwater will be affected and the sustainability of the water table will be brought into questions.

3.6 COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PLANNING, 3.6.2 POLICIES, 3.6.2.3 DESIGNATION OF COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AREAS, subsection (b) items “xi) Deteriorated or insufficient parking facilities” and “xii) Poor overall visual appearance including streetscape, and urban design.” Will the city have to provide additional parking in this area because of the lack of parking provided in this development at a later date? Who will pay for this? It should not be the City of Barrie but the original developer and should have been provided from the onset. When the development starts to decline, the dark appearance and the limited setbacks will reduce the area to being foreboding and uninviting, even more than it currently is. Who pays for the upgrading of these structures.

3.7 ENERGY CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE ENERGY SYSTEMS, 3.7.2 POLICIES, 3.7.2.1 GENERAL POLICIES, subsection “(c) In the review of development applications, consideration shall be given to energy conservation measures such as the solar orientation of streets and buildings, increased densities, and the use of landscaping and building materials;” With the reduced setbacks and the dark brick, there is minimal room for landscaping and tree planting, contributing to higher energy use in the summer months. The orientations are at 90 degrees to one

another so how can they be using orientation for energy efficiency. This is one of the requirements of “Near Net Zero” Homes.

4.1 URBAN DESIGN, 4.1.2 POLICIES, 4.1.2.3 RESIDENTIAL PLANNING AREAS, subsection (a) “The integration of new development with existing residential areas must be accomplished in a compatible manner. Land uses, ... pedestrian linkages, architecture, landscaping and streetscaping ... shall be compatible with adjacent uses. (Mod E (d))” The new development is not compatible with the existing neighbourhoods. The pedestrian linkages are severely restricted, the architecture does not match the surrounding architecture, there is little space for landscaping and the streetscaping will be the black brick with little room for anything else along Essa Road.

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.1 GOALS, subsection “(a) To guide the formation of residential planning areas which foster a sense of neighbourhood and belonging for their residents.” The development may foster a sense of neighbourhood within the new development but totally alienate the existing neighbourhoods.

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.1 GOALS, subsection “(d) To develop high quality, well linked public open spaces in residential areas.” There is minimal open space in the development, meaning other open spaces will be more used and due to the density, there is very poor linkage to any open spaces in the area.

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.1 GOALS, subsection “(f) To plan the location and design of residential development to enhance compatibility between dwelling types at different densities and to minimize potential conflict between incompatible land uses.” There is limited compatibility between the dwelling types and the densities of the neighbouring communities. The density of the new development is so high that the Environmentally Protected Areas in behind will be destroyed by the anticipated heavy use.

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.1 GOALS, subsection “(g) To plan for new development in the medium and high density categories which encourage mixed use and high quality urban design for medium and high density development within the Intensification Areas as identified on Schedule I – Intensification Areas while continuing to support the integrity of stable neighbourhoods. (Mod E (g)(ii))” This type of development does not support the integrity of the stable neighbourhoods of Wildwood, Cityview Circle, Stroud and Looker Avenues or those along Essa Road. The development is big, black and does not fit in at all.

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.2 POLICIES, 4.2.2.2, RESIDENTIAL DENSITIES, subsection “(d), iv) Cluster and /or block townhousing shall be no more than 53 units per net hectare. (Mod E (l))” If this is the maximum, why was Phase 1 allowed to exceed this requirement. The target density for Intensification Corridors is 50 units per hectare which is below the proposed density as well.

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.2 POLICIES, 4.2.2.4, DESIGN POLICIES, subsection “(a) Residential development shall provide necessary on-site parking (as prescribed in the implementing zoning by-law) and a functional open space amenity area including landscaping, screening, buffering and accessibility considerations.” There needs to be more buffering and landscaping along Essa Road and the other developments in behind. With the reduced setbacks, there is little opportunity for landscaping along Essa Road to soften the development and lighten up the mass and character of the development. Phase 1 has limited opportunity for landscaping along Essa Road and the set back for Phase 1 is almost twice the proposed setback for Phase 2.

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.2 POLICIES, 4.2.2.4, DESIGN POLICIES, subsection “(b) Densities shall be graduated where possible in order to provide for integration between adjoining residential land uses. Where medium or high density uses abut development of a low density nature, buffering protection will be provided to minimize the impact to the lower density uses.” There is no transition at present between the existing neighbouring developments and this one. How will buffering protection be provided as the proposed setbacks are so small that there is little opportunity to incorporate buffering protection? Who will be providing these buffering measures, in what form will these buffering measures take and who maintains the buffering protection once in place?

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.2 POLICIES, 4.2.2.5, GENERAL POLICIES, subsection “(a) Development that generates large amounts of traffic, noise, odours, dust and other nuisances which could have a negative impact on adjoining residential land uses shall be discouraged in order to maintain healthy, safe and liveable communities and a high degree of residential area amenity. Spot rezoning of residential lands should not be approved when they would have a negative impact on an existing neighbourhood. (Mod E (p))” This development is a rezoning and the traffic, noise and other nuisances will have a negative impact on the neighbourhood. Phase 1 was also a rezoning and will also have a negative impact on the existing neighbourhood. Why was Phase 1 approved or why was this clause waived?

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.2 POLICIES, 4.2.2.5 GENERAL POLICIES, subsection “(c) The City will require the incorporation of larger lot sizes in wooded areas or the protection of woodlands (in whole or in part), and/or additional planting as determined by the City prior to approval of any development proposals in areas adjacent to or including woodlands.” This development is adjacent to an EPA and the density is above the maximum. Phase 1 is similar. Why was this clause waived for Phase 1?

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.2 POLICIES, 4.2.2.6, INTENSIFICATION POLICIES, subsection “(e) The City may, in the process of reviewing development applications for residential intensification, require studies related to the improvement of older residential areas, as deemed appropriate. Such studies shall consider and evaluate measures to improve the condition of housing and neighbourhood amenities including: item vi) Promoting high quality urban design and harmonious

integration of the new and existing development functionally and visually;” This is one of the major issues for the neighbourhood. The visual impact of the existing Phase 1 and the proposed Phase 2 is significantly negative, and does not harmoniously integrate into the neighbourhood. What was proposed by the developer to the city planning department for Phase 1 and does it match what is being constructed? The perspective on page 37 of the Intensification Study does not look anything like the proposed development or that of Phase 1. Neither of these developments represents high quality urban design in appearance.

4.2 RESIDENTIAL, 4.2.2 POLICIES, 4.2.2.6, INTENSIFICATION POLICIES, subsection “(g) To achieve the goals of this section of the Plan, the following target densities shall be applied to the Urban Growth Centre, Intensification Nodes and Corridors and Major Transit Node identified on Schedule I of this Plan; item iii) Intensification Corridor – 50 units per hectare.” The intensification is being intensified above what is required. Why do we need it if the City will meet its intensification targets? According to the Official Plan numbers, there is no need for intensification on the intensification corridors or at the intensification nodes.

4.3 COMMERCIAL, 4.3.2 POLICIES, 4.3.2.2, THE CITY CENTRE, subsection “(e) Existing front yards are encouraged to be preserved as landscaped open space rather than parking spaces in those areas being redeveloped or converted through a change of use.” If the city is encouraging the retention of front yards in the Urban Growth Centre, why is it not requiring them in residential areas? This requirement appears to be totally opposite to the approved development for Phase 1. If landscaped front yards are desirable in the UGC, why are they not desirable in residential neighbourhoods?

4.3 COMMERCIAL, 4.3.2.2, THE CITY CENTRE, subsection “(i) All new development in the City Centre shall respect the physical scale and characteristics of the existing structures. Any redevelopment of properties shall be in keeping with the existing character of the area and, where possible, the existing heritage structures shall be retained.” Again, if it is required in the UGC, why is it not required or at least enforced along the intensification corridors? The current Phase 1 is not in keeping with the existing character of the area and Phase 2 will not be either unless you refer to what is built for Phase 1

4.6 OPEN SPACE, S 4.6.1, GOALS, subsection “(c) To provide recreational and educational opportunities and opportunities for appreciation and enjoyment of nature in the form of a linked open space network which incorporates environmental lands and locally significant natural heritage resources.” The selling of the Patterson Road road allowance is a complete violation of this Goal. “The Ardagh Bluffs is the largest contiguous municipally owned wooded/natural area within the City of Barrie limits. It provides both an ecologically and socially significant feature within the City, and should be available for the entire community to enjoy.”(Ardagh Bluff Park Plan). The loss of this access point may also create dangerous conditions in the event of personal injury to persons on the trails or even worse, in the event of a forest fire in this

area. With this new development being so close to the wooded area of the EPA, and with the anticipated increase in use of the EPA, what measures were required of the developer to mitigate such an occurrence?

4.6 OPEN SPACE, 4.6.2.4, LINKED OPEN SPACE NETWORK, subsection “(a) The City shall develop a long term plan to create an inter-connected system of open space throughout the City that will utilize wherever feasible, open space areas including natural resource areas, parks, watercourses, cemeteries, landfill sites, gas line corridors, hydro corridors and transportation corridors, unopened road allowances, and abandoned railways as effective recreational corridors.” Why would the city decide to sell the unopened road allowance if this is part of the long term plan? When a linkage already exists to interconnect areas, why sell it and at some time in the future, have to purchase it back or acquire other access points.

4.6 OPEN SPACE, 4.6.2.6, PRIVATE OPEN SPACE AREAS, subsection “(a) Where lands are designated Open Space and are under private ownership, this Plan does not indicate that the lands will necessarily remain as open space indefinitely, nor shall it be construed as implying that open space areas are free and open to the general public or will be purchased by the municipality.” Now that the Road Allowance is privately owned, what are the assurances that it will remain open to the public? By the developers own admission, this may be an issue once the development is complete.

4.6 OPEN SPACE, 4.6.2.6, PRIVATE OPEN SPACE AREAS, subsection “(b) Council may require an Environmental Study prior to the approval of utilities, golf courses, or other uses in an open space designation where environmentally sensitive lands may be affected.” Has an Environmental Study been carried out for both Phase 1 and Phase 2? If it has, why was the road allowance allowed to be sold given the presence of endangered species. The environmental impact study is incomplete given that the species inventory is incomplete.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.1, GOALS, subsection “(e) To identify significant natural features and their associated ecological functions in the City as part of an overall Natural Heritage Strategy and identify natural connections between the features which shall be maintained and improved as environmental corridors and ecological linkages where possible.” The natural connection and ecological linkage between other natural features in the area will be lost with the selling of the Patterson Road Allowance to the Phase 2 development and the inclusion of development on this portion of the property. There will be little chance of deer using this corridor once the development is completed as it is extremely dense and there will be no protection for larger wildlife.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.2, POLICIES, 4.7.2.1 DEFINITIONS, defines environmentally protected area “Lands Designated as Environmental Protection Areas on Schedule A include, but are not limited to: (a) Provincially or locally significant features or functions such as those areas

containing the following: item v) significant habitat of threatened and endangered species;” The Patterson Road Allowance contained 2 Butternut Trees. Although they are to be protected, why was the land even considered for sale when these endangered species were on this parcel of land? With the intensification in the area, these trees will eventually die due to the stress of the development. This area was dedicated to the city as part of the development process for the subdivisions surrounding the Ardagh Bluffs. As such, all of the developments surrounding the Ardagh Bluffs should have been notified of the proposed sale.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.2, POLICIES, 4.7.2.2, PERMITTED USES “(a) Environmental Protection Areas are intended primarily for preservation and conservation in their natural state. Such uses as passive outdoor recreation, forestry, and wildlife management may be permitted where appropriate.

(b) No buildings or structures shall be permitted in Environmental Protection Areas other than those necessary for flood or erosion control or for conservation purposes as approved by the City in consultation with the applicable agencies. (Mod E (iii)) Ancillary or accessory uses to permitted uses shall be located on adjacent lands outside of Environmental Protection Areas, unless their location within the Environmental Protection designation is efficient, cost effective and in the public interest, and consistent with protection of the environment; in all cases ancillary and accessory uses shall be developed in accordance with Provincial Policy.” How does this development and the selling of the Patterson Road road allowance fit within these uses? The sale is not in the interest of the general public, not consistent with the protection of the environment and not in accordance with Provincial Policy.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.2, POLICIES, 4.7.2.3, GENERAL POLICIES, subsection “(a) Development and site alteration in Provincially Significant Wetlands and the significant habitat of threatened and endangered species is contrary to the Provincial Policy Statement and will not be considered with the exception of public works/utilities subject to Section 5.1.2.1 of this Plan. (Mod E (jjj))” Why is development of the road allowance permitted given the presence of endangered species? How are these endangered species protected during construction and what are the consequences of their destruction.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.2, POLICIES, 4.7.2.3, GENERAL POLICIES, subsection “(b) The redesignation of Environmental Protection Areas to a designation that permits development and site alteration shall be discouraged. (Mod E (kkk))” If the city is supposed to discourage this type of development, why was it done in this case? The intensification is not needed if we look at the numbers in the Official Plan.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.2, POLICIES, 4.7.2.3, GENERAL POLICIES, subsection “(d) An amendment to the Environmental Protection Area designation shall only be considered where the results of an environmental study clearly demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts on

the natural features or ecological functions for which the Environmental Protection Area has been identified with the exception of provincially significant wetlands and habitat of threatened and endangered species. (Mod E (mmm)).” The Patterson Road road allowance should never have been sold according to the Official Plan due to the presence of the Butternut Trees. This clause should have precluded the sale of the road allowance in all cases.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.2, POLICIES, 4.7.2.4, ADJACENT LANDS, subsection (a) Development and/or site alteration may be permitted on lands adjacent to Environmental Protection Areas if it has been demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) that it will not negatively impact the natural features or ecological functions for which the area is identified. The diversity of natural features in the area and the natural connections between them should be maintained and improved where possible.” The natural connections are being destroyed in this case, not maintained and definitely not improved. Adjacent Lands are defined as **“(b) Adjacent lands are defined by the MNR Natural Heritage Reference Manual as being located 120 metres from a provincially significant wetland and endangered and threatened species habitat, 50 metres from significant woodlands, significant valleylands, significant wildlife habitat, and areas of natural and scientific interest and 30 metres from fish habitat. (Mod E (nnn)).**” The 120 metres requirement would remove the development in its entirety from this property, require the road allowance to remain under city ownership and should have limited the development of the Cityview Circle subdivision 25 years ago if this requirement was applicable then.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.2, POLICIES, 4.7.2.4, ADJACENT LANDS, subsection “(d) The City may consider the reduction or re-allocation of development densities in order to preserve existing woodlots, mature trees and other natural areas and features which are not identified within the Environmental Protection Area designation.” Given the presence of the endangered species, the development should not have gone forward at all, but if allowed, it should have been restricted to something less intense. Even if the area is not designated Environmentally Protected Area, the density can be reduced, so why do we need to allow a variance to over densify?

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.2, POLICIES, 4.7.2.4, ADJACENT LANDS, subsection “(e) Where additional buffer areas or connecting links required to maintain ecological function outside of lands designated Environmental Protection are recommended to protect the natural features and functions within lands designated Environmental Protection, these lands shall be designated and zoned Environmental Protection.” According to this statement, the Patterson Road road allowance should have been designated as Environmental Protection Area.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.2, POLICIES, 4.7.2.6, WOODLANDS AND HEDGEROWS, subsection “(c) Where an Environmental Protection Area consists of a woodland, the City will control development adjacent to this area to prevent destruction of trees.” The city has to look at this property and should have looked at Phase 1 as well in light of this clause. The initial Arborists report indicated removal of almost all trees. This has since been changed to something somewhat less but we have not seen what is currently proposed. Even with the reduction in the removal of trees, the density of the development should be reduced to less the destruction and the impact on the trees.

4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AREAS, 4.7.2, POLICIES, 4.7.2.7, WILDLIFE HABITAT, subsection “(a) Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in significant wildlife habitat unless it has been demonstrated by the proponent, to the satisfaction of the City, that there will be no negative impacts on their natural features and ecological functions. (Mod E (rrr))” The Wildlife Report has not identified all of the wildlife in the area and therefore is incomplete. It should be noted that there are a number of deer that use this area for feeding during the winter and spring and the report does not even mention the presence of white tailed deer in the area.

5.0 SERVICING AND TRANSPORTATION, 5.2 WATER AND WASTEWATER, 5.2.1 GOALS, subsection “(b) To maintain a high standard of water quality in Kempenfelt Bay and in the numerous watercourses within the City.” With the intensity of development on this site, there is little area remaining for the storm water to be directed and contained, with all of the pollution it will contain, other than to the current storm water retention pond. This will increase the pollution load on the stormwater retention pond and affect water quality downstream.

5.3 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT 5.3.1 GOALS subsection “(b) To encourage effective stormwater management in order to control flooding, erosion, sedimentation and maintain and enhance water quality in the receiving watercourses and water bodies. (c) To promote the incorporation of natural waterways, valleys, and ponds into continuous green corridors for wildlife habitat, open space, and parkland. (d) To ensure stormwater management practices minimize stormwater peak flows, contaminant loads including phosphorous, and maintain or increase the extent of vegetative and pervious surfaces.” This development increases the amount of impervious surfaces, reducing rainwater percolation, thereby increasing runoff and potentially erosion, sedimentation and degrading the water quality in the receiving watercourses. The sale of the Paterson Road road allowance is no longer an option for incorporation in the drainage plan as it is no longer a corridor. The increased density will increase runoff, increase peak flows, increase contaminant load and decrease the extent of vegetative and pervious surfaces. The increased density leaves little room for directing the stormwater to other areas or containment to prevent the contamination of the water downstream.

5.3 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, 5.3.2.2 GENERAL POLICIES, subsection “(i) Where, deemed necessary, existing stormwater ponds shall be retrofitted for

quality and quantity controls in order to meet City standards and the requirements of provincial and watershed policy. (Mod F (o)). Has the city looked at the stormwater created from this development and will they be making any upgrades to the Existing Stormwater Retention Pond? Who will be paying for these upgrades if they are required? What will the affect be on the neighbouring developments due to these upgrades and when will these upgrades occur?

5.3 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, 5.3.2.3 DESIGN CRITERIA, “the second subsection (c) Development upon aquifers or lands having capacity for groundwater recharge will incorporate best management practices and be designed to: i) minimize the reduction of groundwater recharge; ii) maintain groundwater quality; and iii) promote aquifer recharge by among other things means of runoff retention or detention ponds.” Is the land in question capable of ground water recharge and if so, what measures have been taken to minimize reduction of groundwater recharge, maintain groundwater quality and promote aquifer recharge?

5.4 TRANSPORTATION, 5.4.2 POLICIES, 5.4.2.2 ROAD CLASSIFICATION, subsection “(c) Arterial Roads are primarily traffic carrying facilities, providing through routes across and within the City. Development of property adjacent to Arterial Roads should be encouraged to design access onto the site which would minimize the impact on the adjacent Arterial Road. Such designs may include shared access points, controlled directional access and the use of access points onto Collector or Local Roads. Where driveways are provided on Arterial Roads six lanes or greater, access shall be restricted to right in and right out.” Does this imply that when Phase 3 is developed, the developer will be encouraged to access Cityview Circle as a collector or a local road? If this is the case, Paterson Road road allowance should have been utilized as the collector road, which would have also allowed full public access to the Ardagh Bluff Park or a local service road should have been required along Essa Road to accommodate the high traffic volumes

6.0 IMPLEMENTATION, 6.1 GENERAL POLICIES, 6.1.1, INTRODUCTION, subsection (b) Following the adoption of this Plan, a new Zoning By-law shall be enacted to establish land use zones and development standards that are consistent with the intent of this Plan.” Have these Zoning By-laws been established. Are they being enforced?

6.0 IMPLEMENTATION, 6.1 GENERAL POLICIES, 6.1.3 DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS, subsection (a) The City and or the Committee of Adjustment may require, as a condition of approval, that applicants enter into agreements as considered appropriate. Such agreements may be registered against the title of the subject lands and may take the form of a subdivision agreement, a site plan agreement or a development agreement. Items in an Agreement could include but are not limited to the following:; Item iv) the placement, massing and conceptual design and scale of buildings, site facilities, landscaping, storm drainage;” What were the conceptualized design submissions for Phase 1 and does the current construction

of Phase 1 match the conceptualization designs submitted? Is what is being built as Phase 1 what the city envisions for new developments? If that is the case, why include development perspectives like page 37 of the Intensification Study.

6.3, SITE PLAN CONTROL, 6.3.1, GOALS, Site Plan Control shall be employed to achieve the following objectives: (a) to ensure that the massing, location, and exterior design of development is of high quality and generally compatible with adjacent uses and the natural environment; The massing, location and the exterior design is not generally compatible with adjacent uses and the natural environment.

6.3, SITE PLAN CONTROL, 6.3.1, GOALS, (f) to ensure the appropriate use of lighting, walls, fences, hedges, trees, shrubs or other ground cover or facilities for the landscaping of areas to enhance land use compatibility and facilitate a safe and visually pleasing environment; With the reduced setbacks, there is little opportunity to enhance land use compatibility and facilitate a safe and visually pleasing environment. The increased height makes it even more difficult to make the environment visually pleasing.

6.3, SITE PLAN CONTROL, 6.3.1, GOALS, (i) to achieve an aesthetically pleasing urban environment through the implementation of Urban Design Guidelines; The development is not visually pleasing to the neighbourhood.

6.3, SITE PLAN CONTROL, 6.3.1, GOALS, to address exterior design elements of buildings including, but not limited to character, scale, appearance, massing, design features, roof pitch, materials and screening of rooftop mechanical and electrical equipment, sustainable exterior design of buildings, sustainable design elements on any adjoining boulevards /municipal right-of-ways; The addressing of these features has not been to the satisfaction of the neighbourhood.

6.3, SITE PLAN CONTROL, 6.3.2, POLICIES, 6.3.2.2 GENERAL POLICIES, subsection (e) The City shall ensure that the following measures are incorporated into site plan agreements: i) keep the removal of vegetation, grading and soil compaction to the minimum necessary to carry out development activity; The arborists report indicated that most of the trees will be removed. The developer has proposed the maintenance of some of the trees but nothing has been formally proposed that the neighbouring residents have seen. We would like to see what is currently being proposed.

6.4 PARKLAND DEDICATION REQUIREMENTS, (a) As a condition of development of land for residential or institutional purposes, the City may require the conveyance of land for park purposes or the equivalent cash-in-lieu in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act and the following criteria or combination thereof ii) development of densities greater than fifteen units per net hectare will require a dedication of up to one hectare per 300 units. How much land has been dedicated to parkland, if any?

6.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES, 6.5.1 GOALS, (a) To provide, through urban design policies and guidelines, a framework for the development and maintenance of a healthy, safe, convenient, efficient and aesthetically pleasing urban environment. Does Phase 1 fit within the aesthetically pleasing urban environment? Does Phase 2 as proposed fit within the aesthetically pleasing urban environment? What will the actual development look like?

6.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES, 6.5.1 GOALS, (b) To initiate an overall visual improvement program for the Planning Areas with emphasis on the Defined Policy Areas and major entrances to the City through public works programs incorporating such matters as boulevard landscaping, street furniture, lighting, signage, sidewalks and park/plaza development. (Mod G (m)). There is so little additional lands around the front of the development that there is minimal opportunity to make visual improvements.

6.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES, 6.5.2 POLICIES, 6.5.2.2 GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES (a) BUILDING AND SITING i) Buildings should be designed to complement and contribute to a desirable community character in terms of massing and conceptual design. The neighbouring communities do not feel the buildings contribute to a desirable community character.

6.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES, 6.5.2 POLICIES, 6.5.2.2 GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES (a) BUILDING AND SITING, vii) Corner locations should emphasize the building, not the car, as the dominant feature of the site. Setbacks at these corner locations should accommodate space for landscaping, pedestrian amenities and interesting architectural features. There is nothing proposed in this regard that is shown on the drawings.

6.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES, 6.5.2 POLICIES, 6.5.2.2 GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES, (c) LANDSCAPING i) Minimum planting strips in accordance with the Urban Design Manual shall be provided along the street frontage and should contain planting materials and street furniture (lighting, seating and bus shelters) consistent with any themes established by the municipality. Are there any themes established for the intensification corridors and if so, what are they?

6.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES, 6.5.2 POLICIES, 6.5.2.2 GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES, (d) ENVIRONMENTAL FEATURES, ii) All contiguous woodlands greater than 0.2 hectares are protected by the City's Tree Preservation By-law, irrespective of ownership, maturity, composition and density. The City will control development adjacent to woodlands to prevent destruction of trees.

6.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES, 6.5.2 POLICIES, 6.5.2.2 GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES, (d) ENVIRONMENTAL FEATURES, v) Development adjacent to an Environmental Protection Area should be designed to incorporate the Area's natural features and provide for their long term protection, subject to the results of an Environmental Impact Study that may be required. Environmentally significant

features such as those listed in Section 4.7.2.1 (a) and mature vegetation should be incorporated as integral components to proposed development. (Mod G (r)(ii)). The original plan as proposed called for the removal of a large percentage of the trees. This should not be allowed given this clause.

6.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES, 6.5.2 POLICIES, 6.5.2.2 GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES, (d) ENVIRONMENTAL FEATURES, vi) The City may consider the reduction or re-allocation of development densities in order to preserve existing woodlands, mature trees, and other natural areas and features which are not identified within the Environmental Protection Area designation of this Plan. Given the development's location, is there not a good reason to reduce the density, not intensify the density?

6.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES, 6.5.2 POLICIES, 6.5.2.2 GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES, (g) ENERGY EFFICIENT URBAN DESIGN, i) Energy efficiency shall be encouraged through community, site, and building design measures that use energy efficient building materials, energy conserving landscaping, building orientation that uses shade and sunlight to advantage, panels for solar energy, appropriate lighting, "green" roofs, and other methods. Although the developer claims that the development is near net zero, many of the design features of near net zero are absent.

6.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES, 6.5.2 POLICIES, 6.5.2.2 GENERAL DESIGN GUIDELINES, (g) ENERGY EFFICIENT URBAN DESIGN, ii) In reviewing development applications, the City may request a report on energy efficiency with the objective of achieving a high level of energy conservation in a sustainable manner. Has the city requested a report on the energy efficiency of the proposed development? Has the city received such a report?

6.11 REQUIRED STUDIES IN SUPPORT OF DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS In order for a development application to be considered complete in accordance with Sections 22, 34, 41, 51 or 53 of the Planning Act, the City of Barrie may require the following reports or studies be prepared to the City's satisfaction:

- (a) Needs/planning justification report except for applications for new aggregate operations**
- (b) Functional servicing report**
- (c) Stormwater management report**
- (d) Environmental evaluation study**
- (e) Environmental impact study**
- (f) Environmental assessment study**
- (g) Traffic impact study**
- (h) Hydrogeological/hydrology study**
- (i) Agricultural assessment**
- (j) Fisheries impact study**
- (k) Archaeological study**
- (l) Architectural/cultural heritage report**

- (m) Affordable housing report**
- (n) Urban design report**
- (o) Aggregate potential assessment and/or Aggregate license compatibility assessment**
- (p) Wellhead protection area – risk assessment report**
- (q) Hazards lands/slope and soil stability report**
- (r) Tree preservation plan/inventory**
- (s) Noise/vibration impact analysis**
- (t) Odour/dust/nuisance impact analysis**
- (u) Illumination study**
- (v) Shadow/shading study**
- (w) Wind study**
- (x) Market study**
- (y) Fiscal evaluation and staging of development, including analysis of municipal revenues and expenditures**
- (z) Digital plan according to City specifications**
- (aa) Energy conservation and efficiency evaluation**
- (bb) Coastal engineering studies along the Lake Simcoe shoreline**
- (cc) Heritage impact assessment**
- (dd) Marine archaeological assessment**
- (ee) Source Water Information Form**
- (ff) Threats and Issues Assessment – Water Quality Study**

The need for any or all of the studies listed from (a) to (ff) shall be determined by the City of Barrie following consultation between the City and the applicant. (Mod G (y)) Studies, reports, and plans in support of an application are to be submitted in digital and paper formats in quantities determined by the City.

What studies have been prepared for this development and are they available for public review? If so, where and when are they available?

Given the significant number of variances to the Zoning By-laws for Phase 1, and a similar number and an even greater degree of variance from the By-laws for Phase 2 and given the local response to the Phase 1 development currently under construction, We would like to request that Phase 2 of the proposed development be at the very least, put on hold until Phase 1 is complete and the exact appearance, nature and character of the development can be seen and experienced by the entire community.

If this development is the vision for the City of Barrie going forward, We think it is reasonable to get the full picture prior to proceeding down this development path with little or limited chance of return. This type of development represents a major assault on the character of the city and will impact the residents and the quality of life for them in the future.

We would like a response to this letter and the opportunity to sit down with the planning department to discuss the overall development and the process required to oppose the development if it is approved by council.

Sincerely
Malcolm Hachborn, P. Eng.

Concerned Local Resident representing many of my neighbours on Bloom Crescent, Brown Street, Cityview Circle, Cummings Drive, Essa Road, Fawn Crescent, Grouse Glen, Looker Drive, Stroud Place, Wildwood Trail and many other areas of the city that are seeing intensification developments that do not fit into their community.

The Intensification Report of 2009

The Vision Statement “The City of Barrie will encourage new development in the higher density categories in appropriate areas throughout the municipality while continuing to support the integrity of stable neighbourhoods”. We are a stable neighbourhood and council does not appear to be supporting our neighbourhood with the allowance of Phase 1 to proceed.

Statement of Principles

Appropriately located
High standard of urban design

Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 3:43 PM

To: Stephen Naylor; Michael.Prouse@barrie.ca; Jeff Lehman; Tami Kitay; Carlissa McLaren; Office of the Mayor; Dawn McAlpine

Subject: Opposition to the Zoning Amendment at 401 Essa Road File #D12-420/D14-1601

Please be advised that we are opposed to the Planning Department's decision and of their report submission to the City of Barrie June 20,2016 at Barrie City Council for approval of noted report by council which was passed at that council meeting.

Further,we wish to speak against this File and Zoning Amendment on June 27th.

Respectfully submitted,
Alice and Garth Sweetnam