

-----Original Message-----

From: Barb Tansley
Sent: Monday, June 19, 2017 12:36 PM
To: CityClerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>
Cc: Barb Tansley
Subject: DEPUTATION

Honorable Mayor and Members of Council,

This submission is in opposition to motion 17-G-174 (PLN 019-17)

Regarding application for amendment to zoning bylaw and draft plan of subdivision By 24400511 Ontario Inc. re 521 and 527 Big Bay Pt Rd. and staff report.

I wish to speak in front of Council.

These currently zoned R1 properties lie east of the intersection of Yonge St and Big Bay Pt Rd. Only a small square footage of 521 (a double lot) appears to lie with the intensification node identified by the City Intensification Urban Design Study. 527 is not in or near the node boundary. The report seeks to merge these properties for draft plan of subdivision.

As a community we had a list of concerns which we presented through letters, and public meetings. These included privacy , desire to keep R1 zoning, concerns the properties were not in the node, drainage, garbage and snow storage , height and quantity of units, wish to see afternoon sun and sunsets plus others .We appreciate the change of draft plan concept in addressing our privacy concerns to orient the buildings so they don't look into our windows and back yards , there by giving us some relief from lack of privacy by main entrances and windows facing the street .

Could you please explain though how the Report can arbitrarily claim the subject properties are in the intensification node when clearly in the same report's diagram , they are not. Please see diagram in section 37 Bonusing below #31 . At the public meeting April 24,2017 , after residents expressed concerns about this, Council asked for clarification about nodes and distances from the intersection. The answer was 200m and it was intended the property to front the intersection. This does not. The presenter also made reference that a portion wasn't in the node.

The complete report is based on the premise that the properties are IN the node .The report may look markedly different if it said they were outside the node. Thereby affecting the intended Mixed Use Zoning standard comparisons to RM2 SP standards and Bonusing etc. It appears that somehow between Apr 24 ,2017 and June 9, 2017 the interpretation arbitrarily changes without notice. How can this be?

The properties when bought were not inside the node, when the application was received they were not inside the node and at the public meeting April 24 , 2017 , still , not inside the node.

Using the same logic ,that was suggested to market to potential condo buyers with only 1 parking spot. Don't buy a property with only 1 parking spot if you have 2 cars.

Don't expect to develop 2 properties that are outside an intensification node when only a fraction of one is inside the node.

We all want returns in our investments . As council you invest time to ensure the wellbeing of the community you represent .As residents ,we're concerned , the intensification nodes are contagious and spreading whichever way the wind is blowing. So imagine every intensification node would now have a potential increased radius of another 70 m as a result of this zoning bylaw amendment. I'm sure you are all busy as we are and if the opinions of the taxpayers mean very little there's no real need for us to come to council. If changes can be made to policy with out following due process then it's all just an illusion.

It's interesting that more time was spent on the discussion of whether to have a by election or appoint another member of council about 45 min vs 5 min discussing the zoning bylaw amendment which will potentially effect multitudes more.

A lot of time and energy has been invested on this . Before spending more time and energy, if you want this type of high density development to succeed ,place it in a more appropriate area . Where the people buying ,are expecting to live in an urban style residential area with only one parking spot. Don't drop it into a mature neighbourhood , where people have bought and lived for years expecting only single family homes .It would be like having King Kong in New York City. It that where it belongs?

Sincerely,

Barbara Tansley