

September 4, 2019

Mayor Lehman and Members of Council
City of Barrie,
70 Collier Street,
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 4T5

Mayor Lehman and Members of Council:

**RE: 481 Yonge Street - Rezoning request from RM2 to MU2 (SP)
Public Meeting to be held on September 9, 2019**

I am writing to express my concerns about the development proposed at 481 Yonge Street, as follows:

- 1. The property is already zoned for multi-residential use yet the applicant wishes to almost double the allowable number of units.**

The Committee of Adjustment granted an increase in the allowable number of units for this property from 27 units to 34 units. The applicant now wishes to rezone the property from RM2 to MU2 (SP) to almost double the density, to 67 units, with no planning rationale provided for the request for an additional 33 units.

- 2. Not all properties along Yonge Street are suitable for intensification.**

Notwithstanding the fact that intensification is already permitted as-of-right on this property, the rezoning to increase the number of units to 67 represents an over-use of the property. The subject property, according to City mapping, is 5 metres higher than the adjacent properties on Dixon Court thereby the impact of a 4 storey building is much greater in terms of scale and massing.

- 3. The City of Barrie is already meeting its intensification target.**

According to statistics provided to me by planning staff, the City of Barrie has been achieving 77 percent intensification for the last 8 years. The Province requires 50 percent. Within the built up area, City staff advise that between January and August of this year, there was 100 percent intensification.

- 4. The proposed rezoning does not conform to the Official Plan.**

The applicant has not demonstrated compatibility with the existing stable residential neighbourhood (Policies 3.3.2.1 and 4.2) nor is there a harmonious integration of new and existing development both functionally and visually (Policy 4.2.2.6).

5. The proposed density is more than twice the amount prescribed in the City's planning documents.

The City of Barrie encourages a density of 50 units per hectare along intensification corridors such as Yonge Street, yet the applicant seeks to develop the lands at a density of 122 units per hectare. This is higher than what the City anticipates for both intensification nodes and major transit nodes (50 to 120 units per hectare).

6. The Shadow Study has not been prepared in accordance with the City of Barrie Terms of Reference for Shadow/Shading Studies.

Because the Shadow Study prepared by the applicant does not meet the City of Barrie's terms of reference for such studies, the conclusions that have been reached severely understate the impact of shadows on the single detached dwellings, especially those located along Dixon Court.

For all of the above reasons, I respectfully request that Council deny the rezoning application.

Please ensure that my name remains on the list of those to be notified regarding further meetings of Council where this matter may be discussed.

Sincerely,



Celeste Phillips
celeste@cplan.ca

From: Les Racicot

Date: September 6, 2019 at 8:46:39 PM EDT

To: <carlissa.mclaren@barrie.ca>, <wendy.cooke@barrie.ca>

Subject: Fwd: Re-Zoning of 481 Yonge Street

Please add for public record regarding 481 Yonge St Zoning application.

Thanks

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Les Racicot

Subject: Re-Zoning of 481 Yonge Street

Mayor Lehman

I am writing this email to express my deep concern regarding the application to increase the zoning density to the vacant lot at 481 Yonge St. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] runs parallel to Yonge St. Approximately three years ago we were present at council meeting and spoke of how excessively large multi-use buildings would negatively impact our quality of life/home equity. It was also not in keeping with the presently established community. At that time you and your staff stated and assured us that any building through intensification must not have a major impact on existing homes or be out of character with the existing neighbourhoods.

The builder's application is for almost double the required density. There was an open house earlier this year, which the builder was present, and following the presentation a large number of concerns were expressed by residents on the negative impact this large a building would present. Some of these included parking, traffic congestion, and loss of personal enjoyment regarding the use of private home backyards. With our concerns ideas were presented, however the builder chose to ignore all of them, as the present application reflects none of them. In fact, 1 week prior to the council meeting regarding this application, they erected a very large 2 sided development sign picturing the exact building in the application for which he does not have approval for. I have been told by your staff that no permit was obtained for the construction of the sign and that by-law has passed the file to engineering.

This builder has proven that he has no intention of trying to connect nor work with the established residents of our area. The negative impact the overbuild of this property will have on our neighbourhood is no concern to them as they don't live here and possibly not even from our city. These types of increase applications are nothing more than "Greed" by those who will not have to live the negative impact it will bring to established neighbourhoods.

In closing, intensification along Yonge will happen but does it have to happen at double the rate that even the province has established. You and the council have the power to stop the "Greed" while maintaining the requirements placed on our city. Neighbours have been told that the city is well ahead of its intensification goals, and I hope that was not done at the degradation of other neighbourhoods. Our neighbourhood is hoping that your/councils past assurance that these

building should not grossly impact the established area, will guide your decision regarding this application.

Thanks for your support,
Les and Terry Racicot



Sent from my iPad

From:

Date: September 6, 2019 at 9:58:44 PM EDT

To: <Jeff.Lehman@barrie.ca>

Subject: Concerns for development at 481 Yonge St

Dear Mayor Lehman,

[REDACTED], within the notification area for the upcoming public meeting related to 481 Yonge Street. You may recall that over 3 years ago, residents in this neighbourhood expressed concerns about the City's Intensification Strategy. At that time, we indicated that it is not appropriate to permit tall buildings along the east side of Yonge Street as the impact would be significant given that our single detached dwellings are located topographically lower (5 metres). We were assured at that time by both you, and by Planning staff, that there would be careful consideration given to any rezoning applications in this area. At the recent Open House, area residents suggested that the City conduct a special study for this neighbourhood as referenced in the Official Plan (4.2.2.6 h) but we have not heard back from staff about this request.

We now have a situation where a landowner wishes to up-zone a property from 34 permitted units to 67 units in a 4 storey structure. No planning rationale has been given for a proposed development that, if approved, would have a density of 122 units per hectare. We have serious concerns about compatibility and the impact that this rezoning would have on our stable residential neighbourhood and we look to you for your support in denying the application that Council will consider on September 9th.

Unfortunately I will not be able to attend the public meeting on Monday to discuss this issue. However, I would be happy to discuss this further with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Greg & Robyn Stephenson

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Shawn Filson [<mailto:S.Filson@lsrca.on.ca>]
Sent: Thursday, September 05, 2019 3:04 PM
To: Carlissa McLaren <Carlissa.McLaren@barrie.ca>
Cc: aedwards@ipsconsultinginc.com
Subject: 481 Yonge Street Hydrogeology Comments

Please see the attached LSRCA comments for the Zoning Amendment for 481 Yonge. These are the Hydrogeology comments (Engineering comments were sent on August 23) and have been prepared by Caroline Hawson. Should you have any questions concerning these comments, please contact Caroline (c.hawson@lsrca.on.ca)

The Applicant is required to provide a completed copy of the attached matrix as part of their next technical submission.

Shawn Filson, MSc.

Planner 1

Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority

120 Bayview Parkway,

Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 3W3

905-895-1281, ext. 229 | 1-800-465-0437 |

s.filson@LSRCA.on.ca | www.LSRCA.on.ca

Please note: the LSRCA Board of Directors approved a change to our Fee Policy. The new fees will take effect on January 1, 2019. Please click [here](#) for the new fee schedule.

Twitter: @LSRCA

Facebook: LakeSimcoeConservation

The information in this message (including attachments) is directed in confidence solely to the person(s) named above and may not be otherwise distributed, copied or disclosed. The message may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and by the Personal Information Protection Electronic Documents Act. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message without making a copy. Thank you.

#	Report / Drawing	Section	Pg#	LSRCA COMMENT (5 September 2019)	APPLICANT RESPONSE (DATE)
Documents Reviewed:					
Functional Servicing and SWM report; Pinestone Engineering Ltd; May 6, 2019.					
H1				The proposed development is subject to the LSPP Water Balance Offsetting Policy; details can be found here: https://www.lsrca.on.ca/Shared%20Documents/lssp-water-budget-policy.pdf	
H2				A pre-and post-development climate based water balance is required details for the preparation of a Thornthwaite-Mather Water balance assessment can be found here: https://www.lsrca.on.ca/Shared%20Documents/permits/hydrogeological%20_guidelines.pdf?pdf=Hydrogeological-Guidelines	
H3		1.3		Please add the above documents to the reference list	
H4		4.3		LSRCA requires that the water balance assessment demonstrate how such changes will be minimized in the post-development scenario.	
H5				The proposed density of the development appears to exceed the density of high density residential in the City of Barrie Official Plan, it is possible that by reducing the density of the development that it may be feasible to build above the groundwater table. Please re-evaluate the proposal.	
H6	Figure 3			A 1 m separation is required between the invert of the LID facility and the seasonal high groundwater level. Seasonal high groundwater level is required to be established in the area of the proposed infiltration tank as per comment H7 below.	

#	Report / Drawing	Section	Pg#	LSRCA COMMENT (5 September 2019)	APPLICANT RESPONSE (DATE)
Appendix B: Geotechnical Report; Haddad Engineering					
H7				A groundwater monitoring program is to be established such that the seasonal high groundwater levels for this site can be assessed. Data is to be acquired monthly between 1 March and 30 June, a minimum of 12 months data is required. Monitoring should be ongoing.	
H8				<i>In-situ</i> percolation testing is required to establish the local percolation rate of the native soils in the vicinity of any proposed LID facilities.	
H9				The City of Barrie Engineering Standards requires that a 0.50 m separation be established between the seasonal high groundwater level and the invert of the lowest floor slab. Please provide cross-sections demonstrating that this requirement has been met. The cross-sections are to include bore holes, seasonal high groundwater level, current and proposed grading profiles, and building profiles.	
H10				An assessment as to the volume of dewatering that is required is to be carried out, together with a dewatering plan. It is to be established whether an ESAR or PTTW is required.	
H11				It is noted that under the current design permanent dewatering will be required for this site with under floor drainage, including sump pumps, and emergency generators to avoid build-up of hydrostatic pressure during a power outage. The volume of groundwater to be extracted by this method is to be calculated and added to the post development infiltration deficit. This entire annual volume is to be mitigated.	

#	Report / Drawing	Section	Pg#	LSRCA COMMENT (5 September 2019)	APPLICANT RESPONSE (DATE)
H12				Provide detailed drawings of all LID facilities include all dimensions and materials used.	
H13				Provide cross-sections of all LID facilities, include the seasonal high groundwater level and all dimensions. A 1 m separation is required between the invert of the Lid facility and the seasonal high groundwater level for infiltration credit to be provided.	
H14				Provide detailed calculations demonstrating that the footprint of the LID facility is sufficiently large for complete drawdown to occur within a 24-48 hour time frame.	
H15				Provide detailed calculations demonstrating that the volume of the LID facility is sufficient to mitigate the infiltration deficit.	
Resubmission Requirements:					
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A response matrix which includes a detailed response outlining how each of the comments above have been addressed with reference to applicable reports/drawings (i.e. specific sections/pages/details or tab identifiers). 2. A summary of any additional changes to the design (i.e. in addition to those not identified in the detailed response to comments, and includes changes to reports, drawings, details, facility design, etc.). 3. All drawings are to be folded (8.5 x 11). 4. Reports and engineering drawings/details are to be signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer or Professional geoscientist as appropriate. 	

#	Report / Drawing	Section	Pg#	LSRCA COMMENT (5 September 2019)	APPLICANT RESPONSE (DATE)
				All submissions/reports are to include applicable technical components which achieve the minimum requirements outlined in the LSRCA Technical Guidelines for Stormwater Management Submissions, September 2016.	