

**DEPUTATION:** City of Barrie Council Meeting  
Wednesday November 20, 2024: 7:00 pm  
Council Chambers

**BY:** Michael T. Larkin, MCIP, RPP, M.,Pl.  
LARK Plan Land Use Planners

**ITEM:** Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application DEV047-24  
19 Dundonald Street, Barrie  
Staff Report DEV047-24 (November 13, 2024)  
Council Motion 24-G-244

I am appearing before Council on behalf of Ms. Nadine Carr [REDACTED] and her neighbours that live in the vicinity of the proposed development at 19 Dundonald Street for a residential tower condominium.

The application submitted in late December 2021 proposed to amend the City's Zoning Bylaw to permit the proposed development originally envisioned a 9 Storey Multi-Residential Condominium building containing 59 Units with two storeys of underground parking. The proposal advocated for an overall coverage of 19.6% of the property and required a Zoning Amendment from Residential Single Detached Dwelling Second Density (R2) to Residential Apartment Dwelling First Density-3 (RA1-3) - with "Special Provisions".

In a Staff Report dated June 7, 2022, in advance of a formal Public Hearing for the Project it was noted that there may be a need to rezone a portion of the property to an Environmental Protection (EP) Zone. If so, an Official Plan Amendment would be required for the project.

To be clear, while the application was to amend the Zoning Bylaw to permit the proposed development, no Site Plan Approval (SPA) application was submitted supporting the proposed Amendment. A Site Plan Application typically provides municipalities with a recognized planning tool to ensure the development would reflect the proposal Council approved. As well, there was, and has been, no Official Plan Amendment application submitted.

It is important to note that Staff also noted that "*The proposed development at a density of 148 units per hectare is considered a high-density development*". Furthermore, they noted that in accordance with the then operative Official Plan, "*high density residential development shall be encouraged to locate in the Intensification Nodes and Corridors*". For clarity, Dundonald Street is neither an "Intensification Node", nor a "Corridor". And, with the submission of a modified Plan the status of Dundonald Street has not changed. It simply does not meet the parameters for one as set out in the Official Plan, nor for that matter would it meet the criteria in the City's new Official Plan. In Staff's own words they concluded that "*The subject property is not located within a designated intensification area.*"

Following the Public Hearing of June 7, 2022 I was approached by Ms. Carr to undertake an analysis of the proposed development to determine in my capacity as a Registered Professional Planner if the proposal was supportable in the context the applicable land use policy. My report was presented to my Client on September 19<sup>th</sup> 2022. It included both an analysis of the Land Use Policy framework and a Technical Assessment of the proposal.

It has been my position that the consideration of the merits of the application must be based on the locational application of development densities and its compatibility with the surrounding residential community as is articulated in the City's Official Plan. It was concluded that the proposed development does not meet the density policies and compatibility considerations set by the OP Policies. In this regard, the Applicant's Planning Justification Report was fundamentally flawed being based on the incorrect interpretation of the Plan by the Proponent regarding the location of the proposed development in an intensification node and the proposed density of the development. Thus, it was determined that OP conformity had not been demonstrated.

My analysis also included a review of the supporting documents submitted by the Applicant. While the studies were mostly supportive of the proposal, it was surprising and telling to note that Historical Neighbourhood Character Impact Evaluation undertaken by the Applicant's consultant identified a number of potential negative impacts to the surrounding neighbourhood should the development proceed.

...continued

**DEPUTATION:** City of Barrie Council Meeting, Wednesday November 20, 2024: 7:00 pm, Council Chambers  
**BY:** Michael T. Larkin, MCIP, RPP, M., PI.  
**ITEM:** Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application DEV047-24 RE: 19 Dundonald Street, Barrie (Applicant: IPS for Pat and John Hargreaves)

### Revised Proposal:

The Proponent submitted a revised development proposal in the fall of 2023 which proposed a reduction in building height from nine to six storeys, a reduction in the number of units from 58 to 50 (-8 Units), a reduction in the number of parking spaces provided from 99 to 61 (-38 spaces) and a slight increase in landscape area from 50.3% to 54.7%. Once again, my Client requested a review of the proposed modifications to the project.

Several of the supporting studies were updated to reflect the revised proposal, but interestingly the Planning Justification Report was not updated or submitted when I undertook my review in the Spring of 2024. I do acknowledge, however, that a memo dated September 30, 2024, addressing some of the Land Use Policy requirements of the Official Plan has since been submitted. Upon my subsequent review of the memo I note that the analysis by the Applicant's consultant continues to rely, in my opinion, on an incorrect interpretation of the Official Plan, and in particular the intensification policies contained therein.

While I acknowledge that the proposed modifications to the project are an improvement, there are still significant issues associated with it from both a land use policy and technical perspective which should preclude the approval of the application. Issues persist related to the proposed density of the development, the coverage (which increased by 3.9% from the original), the setbacks required to implement the project, and the list of potential impacts which the Applicant's own consultant reiterated in their revised Historical Neighbourhood Character Impact Evaluation submission, which includes:

- *The Project is not in keeping with the existing character of the neighborhood.*
- *It does not reflect the predominant building typology found in the neighborhood.*
- *It requires the removal of some existing mature trees and has the potential to rise above the current tree canopy.*
- *It is not in keeping with the predominant building heights and massing found within the neighborhood.*
- *It is not in keeping with the contemporary materials and finishes found in the neighborhood.*
- *It is not in keeping with the predominant low-density, low-rise residential character of the neighborhood.*

Although not mentioned by the Consultant, I note that there are potential concerns associated with the grade on this portion of Dundonald, which I understand to be between an overall 14% to 17% slope at its steepest point. This potentially represents technical challenges when one considers the City's standards typically only permit a 6% grade for new development. I leave this to the Engineers to sort out.

These are matters for consideration typically expressed in Official Plan policy, of which compatibility is a common refrain. It does not mean that development must be the same as what is already there, but it must respect and reflect existing neighbourhood structure and be sensitive to positive changes to support a logical evolution in built form that respects and addresses environmental considerations at the same time. The proposed development, in my opinion, does none of this. Thus, there are a number of land use planning reasons supporting the refusal of the application.

### Conclusion:

It is my opinion and respectful submission, that the proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the property and is inconsistent with the character of the neighbourhood and the environmental attributes of the subject lands.

I recognise that the motion before Council is to deny the application, and I support this motion noting that there are a number of reasons for this action supported by good land use planning principles. If, however, the Zoning Bylaw Amendment were to be approved, I would recommend to Council that a "Holding" designation be adopted pending the approval of a Site Plan application to ensure that the technical requirements associated with the site development be reflected in any Site Plan Agreement that would ensue.

Thank you, these are my submissions.