

From: Cristen Carson >
Sent: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 9:00 PM
To: cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>
Cc: John Kelly
Subject: Planning Committee Meeting February 8, 2002

My name is Cristen Carson. I live with my husband John Kelly and two young children who attend

I am concerned about the development proposal on Duckworth and Mountbatten.

1. The development is not in line with the area.
2. The design is not suitable for families or students as it is not accessible because of the stairs.
3. The proposed number of bedrooms indicate that the proposal is designed for rooms to be rented out to absentee landlords.
4. I am concerned for the number of students to walk to Codrington Public school and those that attend Oakley Park from the area who will be walking with an increase to the amount of traffic in the area.
5. I am concerned about the increase in cars and traffic in the area. The number of parking spaces proposed indicates the need for cars for those that reside in the large residence.
6. The area lacks access to busing for those that live in the development as most shops are more than a kilometre away from the development.
7. I worry about the change in safety of the area.
8. I worry about the privacy for my family in our backyard that we have worked hard to create a private space for us to enjoy and feel safe where we now may be impacted by the height of the proposed development and could lose our privacy and comfort in our neighbourhood.
9. I worry about the neighbourhood aesthetic related to the removal of trees and needs for an increase in garbage disposal, recycling.
10. I am concerned about the noise levels that could occur given the number of individuals living in the proposed development.
11. I am concerned that one of the councilor's owns the properties in question for development and is working towards his own gains while on council.

I am opposed to the proposed development on Duckworth and Mountbatten.

Thank you,

Cristen Carson

POINTS FOR COUNCIL PRESENTATION
FROM MARSHALL GREEN

have no personal axe to grind in this application

- I currently live far enough away from the site that I won't be personally impacted
- Susan and I will be moving to the condominium development in due course so again, no personal impact.
- However – I have been a near 40 year resident of the East End, now at . (when we decided to downsize) and have a deep personal, sentimental attachment to the area – and can well understand the concern of those who live and will continue to live in this area
- And this IS a very special part of the City:
 - Largely older and very well-maintained housing stock on well treed and landscaped lots.
 - It has a history of its own as witnessed by the several storyboards at the beginning of the north shore trail
 - An existing mix of both higher end, more affordable subdivision and post-war housing, and some well-spaced, small-scale multi-residential development that is sympathetic to their surroundings.
- The east end is not untouched by or unavailable to intensification. The example of my own home, located on a block of land east of , south of and north of
 - This was, some 10 years ago, developed with two homes – a large heritage home and a small storey and a half family home. Now, after several applications to the C of A – there are seven on the same piece of land. See pages 4 and 5 of the Draft Preliminary Report filed by the East End residences. Our block (and our home) are pictured there
 - But the implementation of this increased intensification was done with some appreciation for the surrounding larger treed lots. Single family homes have been added (like our own) and, for the most part, the existing older tree stock has

been maintained. The materials and style of the homes, while varied, still does respect the surroundings

- The Official Plan provisions:
 - There is a new OP which we realize will not be in place for perhaps quite a while, and under that plan, the developer will have to face the fact that the portion of Duckworth on which their land is placed is no longer an intensification corridor. It is interesting that the City has decided to recommend removing that designation from Duckworth. There are sure to be very good reasons for that – reasons that perhaps could be the basis of an interim control bylaw as some of the objectors have suggested.
 - However, the developer is allowed to be measured, in large part, on the existing in force OP. However, the existing OP contains some very stringent policies which I would argue, the developer cannot meet.
 - I have included as an appendix to this presentation, some (certainly not all) of the applicable provisions from the existing and proposed new Official Plans. There are 9 from the existing and 6 from the proposed new. They stress the importance of making sure that intensification doesn't destroy existing neighbourhoods.
 - I have also provided in my appendix quotes from two cases where intensification vs neighbourhood compatibility was the central issue before the Ontario Land Tribunal – where this development may very well be destined. The words of the Members who decided those cases are very instructive.
- There should be little concern for the City meeting its intensification targets without this development.:
 - There are multiple high-rise projects now underway or under consideration in the City and in particular in the downtown and on arterial streets in the existing built boundary of the City.
 - Although the City is very lucky to have no real “slum” area or brownfield areas on the border of residential areas that need to be rebuilt, there is no need to knock down a few houses on the literal doorsteps of a well-designed, well maintained residential neighbourhood to create what is without doubt a totally incompatible development.
- I'm not a planner or a surveyor, but based on the example of what took place around my own home, I would suspect that the developer of the block of land that is under

consideration and that used to contain 4 homes could likely get twice that number on the same parcel, still make a nice, if not tremendous profit, and would be able to make those new homes much more valuable than the ones he purchased. The east end is a much sought after neighbourhood. He could build up-to-date modern homes there, each of which could have a second suite. He could thus end up with 16 units instead of his 28, make nearly as much money, and protect the integrity of the properties that belong to his neighbours on Mountbatten and on Duckworth. He may also avoid the cost and delay of a lengthy Ontario Land Tribunal hearing.

QUOTES FOR EXISTING AND NEW OPs AND CASELAW

FROM THE CURRENT OFFICIAL PLAN

2.3(g) Intensification, *mixed land uses* and increased density represent an opportunity to develop complete communities, as intended by the *Growth Plan*, and in order to ensure success, **urban design will be a key consideration in all developments. (Mod C (i))**

3.3.2.1 GENERAL POLICIES

(a) The City will encourage the maintenance of reasonable housing costs by encouraging a varied selection with regard to size, density and tenure. The Zoning By-law will be amended to allow for **innovative housing where it is recognized to be in accordance with good land use planning principles. (Mod D (p))**

(b) The City shall support programs and policies encouraging a wide range of housing opportunities including rental housing in order to **meet identified housing needs in accordance with good land use planning principles.**

(c) The City shall encourage residential revitalization and intensification throughout the built-up area in order to support the viability of healthy neighbourhoods and to provide opportunities for a variety of housing types. Residential intensification includes secondary suites, Housing City of Barrie Official Plan 3-9 Section 3.0 General Policies conversion of existing housing into multiple unit forms, infill, redevelopment of clean and brownfield sites, and other innovative strategies. **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.** The City may specify standards in the implementing Zoning By-law for matters such as minimum densities, built form, height and setbacks to regulate the physical character of residential intensification and revitalization. **Area specific Urban Design Guidelines will be developed to address built form including exterior design features. (Mod D (q))**

3.4.2.1

(a) **All new development in older established areas** of historic, architectural or landscape value, **shall be encouraged to be in keeping with the overall character of these areas.**

(d) **Proposed development** and site alteration permitted in accordance with subsection (c) above **shall be encouraged to be in keeping with the immediate physical context and streetscape by being generally of the same height, width, massing and orientation as adjacent buildings, being of similar setback, of like or compatible materials, and using similarly proportioned windows, doors and roof shapes in order to maintain a sense of visual continuity and compatible building design.**

4.2.2.4

(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.

(d) The City will continue to encourage the maintenance and improvement of the character, and appearance of existing residential areas.

4.2.2.5

(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.

0

FROM THE PROPOSED NEW OFFICIAL PLAN:

2.4.2.1

Strategy and shall be used as a tool in its interpretation and implementation.

City-Wide Growth Management Policies

a) The City shall plan to accommodate a population of 298,000 people and 150,000 jobs by the year 2051, as per Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan.

b) All new development will be evaluated by the City in the context of housing, so that the City can plan for an appropriate housing mix to ensure a gradual transition towards more compact forms of development, support intensification and Designated Greenfield Area density targets, and meet future housing needs.

####

2.6.2.1

Permit appropriate levels of intensification in accordance with Sections 2.3.6 and 2.3.7 of this Plan. Any proposed development must be sensitive to and compatible with the character, form, and planned function of the surrounding context, as per the policies in Section 3 of this Plan.

f) Promote intensification by permitting additional residential units, including detached ancillary dwelling units, second suites, shared accommodations, and other forms of low impact intensification, which can provide affordable housing options.

#####

3.1.1

Design for human scale by:

- i) Creating compact, complete, and connected neighbourhoods;
- ii) Scaling built form appropriately to its context and providing appropriate transitions between different types of built form; and,

3.2.1

i Attention must be paid to appropriate transition between existing and planned land uses and built form. While still conforming with the development standards of the appropriate land use designation, this may result in lower heights and densities than proposed based on or responding to site characteristics, building and site performance, and neighbourhood context.

FROM THE CASES:

London Case: 2186121 Ontario Inc. v London (City), 2019 CanLII 5529 (ON LPAT), <<https://canlii.ca/t/hx8pw>> ,

[11] When considering a ZBA, the Tribunal must determine whether it is consistent with the *Provincial Policy Statement, 2014* (the “PPS”) and conforms with the OP. In this case, the planning witnesses agree that the proposed development generally accords with the intensification policies in the PPS, and that the main issue relates to conformity with the City’s OP. In particular, while several OP policies are engaged, the core issue is one of compatibility with and character of the neighbourhood.

[13] While the OP generally encourages residential intensification, it is subject to a number of policies and criteria to ensure compatibility with the neighbourhood context in terms of general impact, and also from an urban design perspective. Accordingly, the Tribunal will first discuss the policies relating to residential intensification and compatibility, and will then determine the appropriate neighbourhood area against which these policies must be assessed. The Tribunal will then consider the OP’s urban design policies as they relate to the proposed development.

[36]The Tribunal also finds that the proposed development in no way reflects the character of the surrounding, primarily single-detached residential neighbourhood, and cannot be considered to maintain that character or to be compatible with this context.

Burlington Case: First Urban Inc. v Burlington (City), 2018 CanLII 65246 (ON LPAT), <<https://canlii.ca/t/ht1nn>>

[53] The Tribunal accepts and prefers the evidence of that the development, in its current form, fails to satisfy the OP requirements for compatibility and transition. The Tribunal agrees with that townhouses are permitted within low density neighbourhoods subject to the requirements of the OP, but that this proposal does not sufficiently balance intensification with integration in the existing neighbourhood. The features of the community include separations between dwelling emphasis on trees and fencing as buffers, the Tribunal finds insufficient transition is provided between the individual dwellings on large lots and 26 townhouses in their proposed form. Other than a building height inventory, Mr. Quarcoopome did not conduct a quantitative analysis of the neighbourhood for lot area, density, coverage, and setbacks to support his opinion.