

Appendix B: Official Plan Public Consultation and Engagement



Consultation on the Official Plan began in 2018 and has occurred and evolved over **three key phases**:

- **Phase 1** introduced the project to stakeholders and sought their vision regarding priorities and the overall approach for Barrie’s new Official Plan;
- **Phase 2** built off initial findings once key themes were established to provide policy direction; and,
- During **Phase 3**, City of Barrie staff worked with the internal and external stakeholders to refine sequential draft versions of the Official Plan.

This document provides a breakdown of key public consultation events and findings. At the same time, it should be noted that while the following provides a record of the main activities held as part of public engagement, City of Barrie staff have also worked behind-the-scenes to hold numerous one-on-one meetings with stakeholders to address comments, consult consistently both with City of Barrie staff and councillors, and correspond with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing representatives to conform with Provincial direction.

A review of the public consultation held is broken down by the following:

Timeline of Consultation and Engagement.....	p.2
Phase 1 Consultation: Summary and Key Findings.....	p.3
Phase 2 Consultation: Summary and Key Findings.....	p.8
Phase 3 Consultation: Summary and Key Findings.....	p.11
Indigenous Engagement: Summary and Key Findings.....	p.14
Comment Matrix: Responses to Comments Received.....	p.18
Statutory Public Meeting: Record of Comments Received.....	p.151

Official Plan: Timeline of Consultation and Engagement

Phase 1 Consultation: Launching/Identifying the Public's Official Plan Priorities

From November 2018 to March 2019

Date	Main Activities
November 2018 to January 2019	Building Barrie page launched with polling questions, surveys etc.
November 1, 2018	Booth at the Water Waste-Water Master Plan Public Information Centre (PIC)
November 13, 2018	Booth at the Multi-Modal Transportation Master Plan PIC
November 28, 2018	Project Workshop held to gather in-person feedback
January 16-17, 2018	OP Project Workshops held to refine and identify seven major Official Plan themes captured through early engagement
February 4, 2019	Special General Committee Meeting held on early Official Plan direction
February 17, 2019	Deadline for submitting youth workbooks

Phase 2 Consultation: Building on Key Priorities to Develop Proposed Policy Directions

From April 2019 to August 2019

Date	Main Activities
April 27, 2019	Waterfront City Walk
May 8 & 10	Stakeholder Focus Groups : on Community Area Lands & Employment Lands
May 16, 2019	Envision Barrie : interactive screening
May 17, 2019	Deadline: Places survey
August 2019	Summer booth sessions (e.g., pop up lemonade stand, public library sessions, hot summer night park sessions)

Phase 3 Consultation: Improving Drafts to Ensure an Official Plan that Works for Barrie

From September 2020 to December 2021

Date	Main Activities
September to December, 2020	Release of draft one of the Official Plan and 90-day consultation
September to December, 2020	Consultation with Indigenous peoples and vulnerable populations
May to July, 2021	Release of draft two of the Official Plan and consultation
September to October, 2021	Release of the working version of the Official Plan and consultation
December 2021	Release of the final draft of the Official Plan

Phase 1 Consultation: Summary and Key Findings

To ensure that the City of Barrie embarked in the proper direction for creating a new Official Plan, the public was engaged both online and in person between November 2018 and February 2019. The purpose of the public's feedback was to help determine the key priorities to serve as the backbone of the Official Plan. Seven themes were chosen, and seven key discussion papers related to these themes were then written.



The seven key themes, which arose from stakeholder feedback, are:

- Urban and complete city
- Attractive city
- Connected & mobile city
- Waterfront & green city
- Resilient city
- Prosperous city
- Cultural city

The following events and findings fed into the decision-making process for Barrie's Official Plan key themes:

1. "Priorities" quick poll on buildingbarrie.ca

- 196 people voted on Barrie's top priorities
- Highest priorities were deemed to be:
 - Sustainability (27%)
 - Urban design (19%)

- Growth & intensification (16%)
- Natural heritage (13%)
- Mobility (10%)
- Financial considerations (6%)
- Servicing (6%)
- Cultural heritage (3%)

2. “Our Big Questions” feedback tool through buildingbarrie.ca

- The feedback tool remained open until January 31, 2019
- Feedback revolved around the following pillars:
 - Creating a more complete community (20 comments received)
 - Integrating different aspects of city life (11 comments received)
 - Meeting provincial obligations and interests (53 comments received)
- Some key comment themes:
 - Creating more pedestrian-friendly and sustainable communities that protect parks and natural areas
 - Reducing homelessness, creating more housing affordability and housing solutions and supporting vulnerable populations
 - Making Barrie a major cultural, economic and urban centre and revitalizing the downtown
 - Fostering more inclusion and diversity
 - Protecting the waterfront
 - Better public transportation
 - Having a mix of services and building types in every neighbourhood
 - Balancing intensification and growing strategically

3. “Priorities for Barrie’s Future” survey through buildingbarrie.ca

- The survey remained open until January 31, 2019
- Based on the themes/images given, as well as follow up short-answer questions, priorities were ranked from most important (ranking of 1) to least important (ranking of 8). Results were:
 - Natural heritage (3.76)
 - Sustainability (3.94)
 - Servicing (4.47)
 - Urban design (4.47)
 - Mobility (4.53)
 - Intensification/growth (4.59)
 - Cultural heritage (4.94)
 - Cost of growth/taxes (5.29)

4. Information booths at Master Plan PICs (November 1 and 13, 2018)

- Staff on hand with a board, explaining the connectivity between all elements of the Official Plan

5. Official Plan Project Workshop held on November 28, 2018

- Held in the rotunda at City Hall; approximately 60 people attended
- Stations were set up, where people could interactively respond and give input into their priorities
- Information also provided on what an Official Plan is, why it matters, why the public should get involved, and how the public can get involved
- Key questions asked include:
 - What do we want to see in the transformation of our city
 - ✓ *Most popular answer: More investment/economic prosperity*
 - What are the most important elements of our identity that must still be strong 20 years into the future?
 - ✓ *Most popular answer: Our open spaces and parks, including the waterfront*
 - What are some community characteristics that need protection from development?
 - ✓ *Most popular answer: Historic buildings*
 - What does a well-connected community mean to you?
 - ✓ *Most popular answer: Having shops, services and community facilities near to where I live*
 - Who are the key players that need to work together?
 - ✓ *Most popular answer: Landowners & developers*
 - How do we balance and pay for growth expenses?
 - ✓ *Most popular answer: Make sure that "growth pays for growth"*
 - How can we embrace a variety of housing types, price ranges and options in our city?
 - ✓ *Most popular answer: Encourage intensification that includes a range of housing units, not just studio apartments*
 - Where should we put our tallest buildings and most dense/vibrant developments?
 - ✓ *Most popular answer: Along older arterial corridors (e.g., Bayfield Street) that need a stimulus for revitalization*
 - What can make our community more resilient to the impacts of climate change?
 - ✓ *Most popular answer: Promoting non-car transportation choices that reduce our per capita greenhouse gas emissions*

- Attendees also voted on their priorities for Barrie’s future. The tally of priorities were:
 - Intensification & growth (34 votes)
 - Sustainability (26 votes)
 - Urban design (19 votes)
 - Natural heritage (15 votes)
 - Mobility (13 votes)
 - Servicing (4 votes)
 - Cultural heritage (4 votes)
 - Cost of growth & taxes (2 votes)

6. Official Plan Project Workshops held on January 16 & 17, 2019

- The January 16 drop-in workshop was held at Allandale Recreation Centre
- The January 17 drop-in workshop was held at the Dorian Parker Centre at Sunnidale Park
- At these workshops, pillars were provided. These were:
 - Pillar 1: Custom Crafted by Barrie, for Barrie
 - ✓ Provided information about the timeline and the Official Plan process
 - ✓ At Pillar 1, attendees voted on their priorities for Barrie’s future. The tally of priorities were:
 - a. Urban design (21 votes)
 - b. Intensification & growth (18 votes)
 - c. Sustainability (16 votes)
 - d. Mobility (12 votes)
 - e. Natural heritage (11 votes)
 - f. Servicing (6 votes)
 - g. Cultural heritage (5 votes)
 - h. Cost of growth & taxes (5 votes)
 - Pillar 2: Integrated & Coordinated
 - ✓ At this pillar, people were asked why they chose the pillar they did, and more detailed feedback was collected
 - ✓ Information as to what prioritizing this pillar meant was also provided
 - Pillar 3: Meeting our Obligations
 - ✓ At this pillar, conformity with the *Growth Plan* and municipal policies was explained
 - ✓ Questions were answered about Official Plan obligations
- These workshops also included a “Youth Zone” (where youth could complete the youth workbooks) and a “Transit Zone” (which provided information about Vision Transit)

7. Special General Committee Meeting held on February 4, 2019

- As part of the general committee meeting, speakers provided comments. Comments were provided by the following participants:
 - Dr. Charles Gardner, on behalf of the Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit
 - Jennifer Van Gennip, Simcoe County Alliance to End Homelessness
 - Bill Scott, Chair of Allandale Neighbourhood Association
 - Cathy Colebatch, interested citizen and Allandale Neighbourhood Association member
 - Ron Richards, interested citizen
 - Eira Wachowiak, interested citizen

8. Youth Workbooks

- A youth workbook station was provided at the drop-in workshops
- Workbooks could also be downloaded from buildingbarrie.ca and returned to the following locations:
 - Allandale Recreation Centre
 - City Hall
 - Barrie Public Library – Downtown Branch
 - Barrie Public Library – Painswick Branch
 - Barrie Transit – Downtown Terminal
 - East Bayfield Community Centre
 - Holly Community Centre
- The workbooks gave youth a chance to think about their priorities for the future of Barrie including in relation to concepts such as climate change, transportation, the economy, built form, public spaces and more
- It was also an educational tool, providing fun facts about the city

Phase 2 Consultation: Summary and Key Findings

The seven key-theme discussion papers developed during Phase 1 Consultation formed the basis for Phase 2 Consultation. The purpose of Phase 2 was to gather feedback and input to inform Official Plan policy directions and identify key priorities, issues and opportunities.



During Phase 2, the following emerged as critical directions for Official Plan policies:

- **Balancing density needs**
 - Community members opted for a medium-level of density suitable to Barrie as a mid-sized city.
 - Being strategic about density was also a critical concern; density needs to fit into the local context and support stable neighbourhoods.
- **Protecting resources**
 - Pro-active policies need to be developed to protect Barrie’s heritage, environment and character.
- **Attracting diverse employment**
 - Ensuring policy encourages the diversification of Barrie’s economy and supports attracting jobs in new sectors, skilled works and well-paying jobs.
- **More housing options**
 - To address housing challenged, the City should provide more housing types to reflect Barrie’s demographic needs.
 - Policy that incentivizes and assists with the creation of more diverse and innovative housing types was also thought of as paramount.
- **More mixed-use**
 - Community members opted for more mixed-use development and policies that encourage the land use circumstances supporting mixed-use development (e.g., greater density, more walkable communities).
- **Shifting away from automobiles**
 - The public voted for more focus on cycling, walking and public transit in the new Official Plan.
 - Safe, well-connected and reliable alternatives to driving were prioritized.

The following events and findings fed into the establishment of Phase 2 critical directions:

1. Waterfront City Walk held on April 27, 2019

- Community members were invited to a facilitated and interactive walking tour of Barrie’s waterfront, focusing on identifying opportunities for planning a complete community
- More than 25 people attended
- Key priorities identified include:
 - i. Better use of waterfront, with less parking and more activities
 - ii. More active transportation options that ensure pedestrian safety
 - iii. Improving existing facilities along the waterfront
 - iv. Improving connections to the waterfront (e.g., through trails, transit)
 - v. Exploring variations in the intensification seen along the waterfront

2. Focus Groups held on May 8 & 10, 2019

- The two events were held to provide feedback on the city’s Community Area Lands and Employment Lands
- More than 50 stakeholders attended
- At the Community Area Lands focus group session, participants were asked:
 - i. What are the key elements of a completed community?
- At the Employment Lands focus group session, participants were asked:
 - i. What do we need more of to support a diverse and thriving employment sector?
 - ii. What do we need less of? (i.e., what is getting in the way?)
 - iii. What do we need to continue doing? (i.e., what’s working?)
- Key priorities identified:
 - i. Reduce restrictions on employment lands and be more flexible in OP and zoning
 - ii. Need incentives for employment uses/office downtown and for brownfield redevelopment
 - iii. Prioritize and improve multi-modal connections to employment areas
 - iv. Identify types of employment/industries Barrie wants to attract
 - v. Determine approximate areas for density/mixed uses, while protecting neighbourhoods
 - vi. Develop flexible and innovative parking standards and have less on-street parking
 - vii. More mixed-use areas
 - viii. More housing options for people of all ages

3. Envision Barrie Screening held on May 16, 2019

- A series of thematic Official Plan videos were shown, and participants used their smartphones to answer questions, vote and view group responses in real time
- More than 60 participants attended
- Key priorities identified:
 - i. More affordable housing and housing types that reflect Barrie's demographics
 - ii. Density is welcomed, but it should fit into its local context
 - iii. Barrie's economy needs to be diversified; making Barrie a more attractive place to live can help bring new jobs and skilled workers
 - iv. Walking, cycling and public transit should be prioritized over automobiles

4. "Places" survey through buildingbarrie.ca

- The survey ran between April to May 2019, and asked the public to vote on images of places to indicate what they wanted to see more or less of in Barrie
- 142 surveys were completed and 672 comments were collected
- Key findings included:
 - i. Low-rise, mixed-use buildings were the type of home the public most wanted to see (single-detached homes were the least popular)
 - ii. Urban offices were the type of work space the public most wanted more of (suburban offices were the least popular)
 - iii. A farmer's market was the type of shopping option the public was most interested in seeing (new big box retail was the least popular)
 - iv. The most popular publicly-offered recreational option was nature trails (the least popular was new public squares)
 - v. The most popular mobility option was walking (the least popular was highways)

5. Summer booth sessions held throughout August 2019

- A series of pop-up information tables were held in public places throughout the month of August. These included lemonade stands and more, and were held at:
 - i. Sunnidale Park, on August 2, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.
 - ii. Painswick Park, on August 8, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.
 - iii. Parkview 55+ Centre, on August 14, from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.
 - iv. Batteaux Park, on August 15, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.
 - v. Barrie Public Library Information Space (downtown library), on August 19, 20, 21, 22, 23
 - vi. Allandale Recreation Centre, on August 23, from 11 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
 - vii. Centennial Beach, on August 30, from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.

Phase 3 Consultation: Summary and Key Findings

Phase 3 can be further broken down into the following consultation phases:

90-Day Consultation on Draft One of the Official Plan

After the creation of draft one of the Official Plan, as well as draft one of the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines, a 90-day public review and comment period followed. Staff solicited feedback in a variety of ways, including through comment letter submissions and a variety of engagement tools on buildingbarrie.ca. A public notice was also published in the *Barrie Advance*, advising that written feedback on the draft new Official Plan and City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines would be accepted until December 22, 2020.

During the 90-Day Consultation, approximately 100 letters and emails were submitted from the public and stakeholders, commenting on the Official Plan. There were also approximately 2,400 visits to the buildingbarrie.ca webpage and nearly 900 downloads of documents. The engagement tools utilized on buildingbarrie.ca included:

1. Ask a Planner videos
 - A series of videos were posted, wherein planners from the City of Barrie answered questions from the public
2. Draft Official Plan Comment Form
3. Draft Urban Design Guidelines Comment Form
4. Quick Poll: Which of the Official Plan key themes is most important to you?
 - Waterfront & Green City was chosen as most important (44.4 per cent of votes), followed by Attractive City (22.2% of votes) and Resilient City (22.2% of votes)
5. Quick Poll: How should the Official Plan be used to enhance and protect our cultural heritage?
 - A tie between the establishment of conservation districts (50%) and the adaptation and re-use of buildings were possible (50%)
6. Quick Poll: What is most important to you in making your neighbourhood feel more complete?
 - A tie between more trees and green spaces (50%) and convenient access to grocery stores and other essential services (50%)

During this phase, there were several stakeholder presentations also given to both internal and external stakeholders. Presentations to external stakeholders included:

- The Salem and Hewitt's Landowners Groups: October 15
- The Town & Gown Subcommittee: October 28
- The Seniors Advisory Committee: November 23
- The Accessibility Advisory Committee: November 12
- Heritage Committee: November 11
- The Active Transportation and Sustainability Committee: November 24

A series of meetings were also held with individual stakeholders (upwards of a dozen), as well as with Councillors. A presentation was given to City Building Committee on November 3, 2020.

Consultation on Draft Two of the Official Plan

Release of Draft Two

On Thursday, May 6, 2021, draft two of the Official Plan was released to the public through buildingbarrie.ca. Draft two incorporated the changes and suggestions provided on draft one during the 90-day consultation period. There were more than 900 downloads of draft two.

As part of draft two consultation, the following occurred:

- Two open houses, held on Wednesday, May 19, 2021, with the first one starting at 4 p.m. and the second starting at 6 p.m.
- A statutory public meeting, held during Planning Committee on June 2, 2021 at 6 p.m.
- Updates and meetings on draft two with a variety of stakeholder groups including:
 - The Salem and Hewitt’s Landowners Groups on June 17, 2021
 - Accessibility Advisory Committee, on June 6
 - The Affordable Housing Task Force on June 23

Information sessions were also held with Councillors.

Further tools to help the public understand the Official Plan were also provided for through buildingbarrie.ca; these included a Community Structure Explainer, a document of key planning definitions, as well as “What We Heard During the 90-Day Consultation” summary.

A formal notice was also posted in the *Barrie Advance*, notifying both of the open houses and the statutory public meeting, and welcoming the people to make comment submissions both during the June 2nd meeting and through writing.

May 19 Open House

- 151 people registered for the Open House and 100 participants attended.
- Staff members from Development Services were available online from 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.
- Two presentations were given, at 4 p.m. and then at 6 p.m., introducing the public to:
 - How to best read, engage with and provide commentary on draft two; and,
 - Changes that had been made since the release of draft one.
- The rest of the time allotted was spent answering questions from the public.
- Any questions that were not addressed were followed up on through email.

June 2 Statutory Public Meeting

- The statutory meeting began with a presentation by Development Services Director Michelle Banfield on the new draft of the Official Plan, before Council opened up the meeting to public deputations.

- Comments by stakeholders who spoke during the statutory meeting were recorded by staff to ensure they were addressed at a later date.

Written Comment Submissions

- In accordance with the June 2 statutory public meeting, the deadline for submitting comments to the City of Barrie on draft two of the Official Plan was also June 2.
- Many letters and emails were received; a record of these submissions is included below.
- All comments were reviewed by staff and recorded in a comment matrix (included below). The comment matrix also included responses by Development Services staff, regarding how each comment was being addressed.
- Additionally, more than 20 hours of meetings were spent with individual stakeholders, to gather further clarification on comments.

Staff additionally addressed any comments received by Members of Council and City of Barrie staff members, however these were not included in the comment matrix, which focused on responses to external members of the public and stakeholders.

Engagement on the Working Version of the Official Plan

Following Development Services' staff's work to address comments on Draft Two of the Official Plan, a working version of the Official Plan was subsequently released on September 24, 2021. At the same time, an updated version of the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines was also released.

Subsequently, the Director of Development Services Michelle Banfield gave a presentation on October 19, 2021 to Planning Committee, to update Members of Council on progress. This committee meeting was followed by a public virtual town hall, also held on October 19.

Town Hall

- 85 people registered to attend the town hall
- 16 people registered to speak at the town hall.

Following the town hall, City staff prepared and emailed out responses to any unanswered questions asked during the event. Subsequent to the event, staff also received a number of comments from members of the public requesting additional changes to the official plan. Staff reviewed these comments and made additional changes where warranted.

Release of the Final Draft of the Official Plan

The final draft of the Official Plan was released to the public on December 14, 2021 via buildingbarrie.ca. Emails were sent out both to Building Barrie registrants and active participants in the Official Plan process.

Indigenous Engagement: Summary and Key Findings

As part of engagement on the City of Barrie's Official Plan, City of Barrie staff contacted those Indigenous Nations with current and traditional connects to the lands that make up Barrie.

In March 2021, letters were drafted to inform representatives from the following Indigenous nations and communities that a draft of Barrie's Official Plan had been created and inviting feedback and engagement.

First Nations and Indigenous Communities:

- Huron-Wendat Nation/Nation Huronne-Wendat
- Métis Nation of Ontario
- Chippewas of Beausoleil
- Chippewas of Georgina Island
- Chippewas of Rama
- Mississaugas of Alderville
- Mississaugas of Curve Lake
- Mississaugas of Hiawatha
- Mississaugas of Scogog Island
- Chippewas of Nawash Unceded First Nation
- Saugeen Ojibway Nation
- Chippewas of Saugeen First Nation
- Mississaugas of the Credit
- Moose Deer Point First Nation
- Wahta Mohawks
- Chippewas of Sarnia
- Aundeck-Omni-Kaning
- Aamjiwnaang First Nation
- Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point
- Chippewas of the Thames First Nation
- M'Chigeeng First Nation
- Mohawks of Akwesasne
- Mohawks of Bay of Quinte
- Sheguiandah
- Six Nations of the Grand River
- Walpole Island
- Wiikwemkoong community
- Zhiibaahaasing First nation

Communication was then sent in May 2021, informing representatives of an upcoming open house and statutory public meeting being held on draft two of the Official Plan.

There was then further correspondence and/or meetings held with representatives from the following First Nations and Indigenous communities:

- The Huron-Wendat Nation/Nation Huronne-Wendat;
- The Chippewas of Rama;
- Aamjiwnaang First Nation;
- Mississaugas of the Alderville; and,
- Wiikwemkoong.

Additionally, the City of Barrie received and addressed the following comments:

Comment	Response
<p>I commend the City of Barrie for incorporating the Land Acknowledgement on page 2. If I may, a suggestion would be if a watermark of the Williams Treaty area/map could have been applied to the land acknowledgement. It allows a reference to the areas first peoples.</p>	<p>City staff appreciate the suggestion to include a mapping reference to the treaties that apply to Barrie. Included in the “Maps and Appendices” section of the Official Plan is Map 8, which highlights the cultural features of the city. City staff have revised Map 8 to include treaty territory. The Official Plan also now includes a policy that acknowledges that “Barrie is covered by the Williams Treaty, Treaty 16 and Treaty 18, and that we are all treaty people.”</p>
<p>Second comment would apply to the Archaeological section. 8.4.2. [Please consider adding] wording that incorporates the use of an Indigenous Elder to conduct a ceremony if ancestral remains are found within a developmental site.</p>	<p>City staff have added a policy that states the “Where ancestral remains of interest to an Indigenous community are identified, the City supports the right for that Indigenous community to hold a ceremony with an Indigenous Elder on the development site.”</p>
<p>[Please consider] the possible repatriation of any cultural items found to local FN communities. Numerous times our cultural items are forwarded to the Province but never returned to our communities. Numerous times as well, items like our ceremonial pipes, artifacts are found online for sale.</p>	<p>The language in the archaeological section of the Official Plan has been strengthened to reflect this request, and the City will encourage the depositing of artifacts at no charge in an appropriate public or Indigenous institution, in alignment with Section 66(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act.</p>
<p>First and foremost ... the Land Acknowledgement should be changed without delay. Here is a revised version that we suggest:</p> <p>“City of Barrie acknowledges that we are situated on the traditional and treaty land of the Anishinaabeg people. The Anishinaabeg include the Ojibwe, Odawa, and Pottawatomi nations, collectively known as the Three Fires Confederacy. The city of Barrie also acknowledge that this sacred land has been a site of Ancestral activity for millennia. We acknowledge the ancestral and traditional territories of the Huron-Wendat Nation. The City of Barrie is dedicated to honouring</p>	<p>A placeholder has now been provided in lieu of a land acknowledgement in the draft official plan. The City’s current land acknowledgement is in the process of being updated and consulted on. As part of this process, the suggestion provided will be reviewed and adaptations made. Once the updated version of the land acknowledgement is ready, it will be incorporated into the official plan.</p>

<p>Indigenous history and culture and committed to moving forward in the spirit of reconciliation and respect with all First Nation, Metis and Inuit people.”</p>	
<p>As a general comment, any mention of indigenous community should be replaced by Indigenous Nations.</p>	<p>References to Indigenous communities in the Official Plan have been changed to references to Indigenous Nations.</p>
<p>In section 8.4.2 all of the texts should be revised to reflect a willingness to involve Indigenous Nations rather than simple notification.</p>	<p>The policies in the archaeological resources section (formerly section 8.4.2 but now section 8.4.4) have been revised with this suggestion in mind.</p>
<p>Policy e should be revised to read:</p> <p>“Should archaeological resources or burial sites associated with Indigenous communities be found through assessment or during the development process, then the City shall prioritize and engage with indigenous Nations for all matters regarding their historical heritage.”</p>	<p>Policy 8.4.4(e) has been revised accordingly.</p>
<p>Policy f should be revised to read:</p> <p>“Where archaeological resources are documented and found to be Indigenous in origin, a copy of the Archaeological Assessment report shall be provided by the consultant to the appropriate Indigenous Nations.”</p>	<p>Policy 8.4.4(f) has been revised accordingly.</p>
<p>Policy h should be revised to read:</p> <p>“Where the preservation of a site containing indigenous archeological resources not possible, the City, the development proponent, and the consultant archaeologist (in an advising role) shall engage at the earliest possible moment with the appropriate Indigenous Nations to identify interpretive and commemorative opportunities to ensure the long-term protection of any archeological resources.”</p>	<p>Policy 8.4.4(h) has been revised accordingly.</p>

<p>Regarding Public Art, a section should be added to underline a priority to engage First Nations, Métis and Barrie residents directly to ensure that the City of Barrie honours its past and also its current residents through art commissioning.</p>	<p>A new policy has been added to Section 8.3.3, Public Art, which states:</p> <p>“b) the City of Barrie will prioritize engaging with First Nations, Métis, and Barrie residents to ensure that the City of Barrie appropriately honours past and current residents through art commissioning.”</p>
--	--

Comment Matrix: Responses to Comments Received

The following section provides a record of the comment matrix, which tracks the City's response to each comment received on draft two of the Official Plan.

Comment Matrix



Please refer to the Working Version of the Official Plan to track the changes made based on responses.

Contributor	Consultant	OP Chapter	OP Policy	Comment	Response
Gary Bell		1	1.2	The Community Vision Statement includes a reference to “focussed” development for downtown vibrancy. The meaning of “focussed” is not clear here or elsewhere in the Plan.	"Focussed" will be changed to "planned."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	1	1.2	This policy states a “Cultural richness amongst a backdrop of flourishing natural areas” We are not sure what this actually means	Current line is "new and old blend harmoniously, creating a cultural richness amongst a backdrop of flourishing natural areas." Recommended change for clarification: "New and old blend harmoniously, creating an attractive and dynamic city amid a backdrop of flourishing natural areas."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	1	1.3	This policy states “hard and soft infrastructure (e.g., stormwater management and affordable housing respectively) Also, “creating stronger synergies across the City” What does this mean and what is the objective in which it is trying to achieve?	First part will be changed to: "To address global and climatic volatility, this Plan also includes policies guiding infrastructure maintenance and development to accommodate unpredictable change, so that Barrie can quickly recover after major storm events and other shocks to the system." Additionally, reference to "synergies" will be changed to: "a strong economic ecosystem."
LSRCA		1	1.3	Please replace the photo for the “Green and Resilient” section to show something more reflective of the natural heritage system. The current photo shows an unnatural landscape with hardened edges and non-native annual plantings. A photo from Ardagh Bluffs or the Bear Creek Eco Park would be much more appropriate. We’d be happy to provide the one below of the Bear Creek Eco Park, if needed.	The Green and Resilient section is not only about the city’s Natural Heritage Systems, but about the city’s urban infrastructure and built form. Therefore, we feel the photo is appropriate. At the same time, the Communications team will be reviewing the finalized draft before the Official Plan goes to Council for adoption and may be replacing/adding in more photos.

Hi-Way Pentecostal Church	Darren Vella / IPS	2	2.8	<p>The subject lands possess a site specific special policy area in the approved Official Plan which reads as follows: New Section 4.8.X – Defined Policy Area (XX) is added as follows: The following policies shall apply to the lands show on Schedule C, municipally known as 40, 42, 44 & 50 Anne Street North and 124, 128 & 130 Henry Street. a) In addition to the uses permitted in the Environmental Protection Area designation the following uses shall be permitted; i) A Bioretention Cell and associated stormwater management controls. b) In addition to the Site Plan Control Policies in Section 6.3 of this Plan, the lands which are designated Environmental Protection Area are subject to the following policy; i) A scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) (restoration plan for watercourse corridor, SAR, ELC) is required to be completed, to LSRCA satisfaction, prior to site plan approval.</p> <p>This policy is extremely important given the permitted uses within the Natural Heritage System do not permit the uses outlined in the approved OPA. We would request that this defined policy area be inserted into the Official Plan to ensure that this development can proceed as proposed.</p>	Defined Policy Area included as 2.8.7, and policy area is delineated on Map 2.
LSRCA		2	2.3.1	<p>The importance of the Natural Heritage System to the community should be better captured in this section. Suggested wording: “Natural heritage features and areas are essential to the landscape and the community – they contribute to the overall environmental and social...” “...policies to ensure the features and functions are protected to so that they can continue to perform their ecological functions, providing ecosystem services to the City, such as flood attenuation, carbon sequestration, pollination, infiltration, recreational opportunities, and so much more. These services are all vital to the health and well-being of the community.”</p> <p>The terms “Water Systems” and “Tablelands” are used in this section, are they defined? Perhaps “Fluvial System” would be more appropriate than “Water Systems”.</p>	<p>The definition for tablelands and water systems used is the common definition, therefore clarification isn’t needed.</p> <p>The section has been revised slightly to address the suggested wording. Further information on specific ecosystem services is provided in other sections with the Plan.</p>
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.3.2	The policies begin at “b” as opposed to “a”.	Policies in this section to begin with policy “a”

LSRCA		2	2.3.2	The UGC is an area of focused growth... it is also an area with constraint associated with identified flood and erosion hazard areas. It would be helpful to have direction in this section speaking to opportunities for flood attenuation and also the protection/improvement and restoration of the watercourses within the UGC. Additionally, the UGC is adjacent to the shoreline of Lake Simcoe – recognizing the need to protect the shoreline through policy in this section would be helpful.	Other sections of the plan speak to flood and erosion hazards, as well as the waterfront.
SCATEH / Jennifer van Gennip		2	2.3.2 and 2.3.4 and 2.5.j	In Draft One, we saw a target of 10% affordable housing city-wide, and 35% requirements in the Urban Growth Centres (UGC). Our recommendation was to maintain the UGC target at 35% and increase the citywide target to 30%. Instead, in Draft Two we see the city-wide target stay at 10%, with a drop to a 20% target in the UGCs and the addition of a 20% target in the two Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA). We recognize that much of the development will happen in the MTSAs and UGCs so this may be a net gain, but we question the reduction from 35% to 20%. Surely it was not in response to an outcry from the public. We strongly recommend reinstating the 35% target for UGCs. The reason for our recommendation to increase to 35% is based on the fact that affordable housing is defined by the province as what is affordable for those with a household income at or below the 60th percentile. A target of 10-20% of new builds citywide as “affordable” for approximately 60% of the population of Barrie will always be a problem.	We understand the need for greater affordable housing in Barrie, and are committed to seeing greater affordable housing options available to meet the needs across our diverse population. After further discussions between Drafts 1 and 2, based on stakeholder conversations as well as research, the target of 20% was chosen, as it will help us to work towards building a significantly greater amount of affordable housing, while hopefully still not disincentivizing developers from building residential units in Barrie and having negative impacts on affordable housing in other ways. We will continue to monitor progress and adapt accordingly.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.3.2.e.ii	Requires at least 20% of housing units in the UGC to be affordable. This target continues to be too high which will discourage growth from occurring in the UGC.	The target of having 20% of housing units as affordable in the Urban Growth Centre was introduced in draft two of the new Official Plan; in draft one, the original target was 35%. Staff made this deliberation after careful consultation with a variety of stakeholders as well as after further research and feel this target is appropriate. It should be noted that the City of Barrie has already met its existing Official Plan target of 10% of housing in Barrie being affordable. We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie.

Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.a.iii	<p>The Official Plan contains numerous policies outlining the new requirements for provision of affordable housing. These policies include but are not limited to Policies 2.3.2(e)(ii) & 2.3.4 (a)(iii) & 6.4.2(e). As we have commented to staff in meetings and prior submissions, policies that mandate provision of affordable housing are in effect inclusionary zoning. It is our understanding that Provincial Policy (Bill 108) for inclusionary zoning mandates that it can only be applied in areas that have a Development Permit System in place or within a Major Transit Station Areas, and only once the pre-requisite studies have been completed. We are not aware that these requirements are in place and thus the Official Plan Policies requiring affordable housing are not enforceable. Staff have advised that the inclusion of these policies in the Official Plan is a first step towards meeting the Provincial requirements outlined above. In our view, the policies for affordable housing should be amended or removed. Amendments could include addition of policy language to clarify that the affordable housing requirements of the Official Plan are not in force until such time as the pre-requisite studies and polices have been put in place. Or alternatively, remove the requirements entirely until a comprehensive Official Plan Amendment based on the required studies can be brought forwards.</p>	<p>We appreciate that inclusionary zoning mandates are not yet in place in the City of Barrie, and aware that enforcement cannot take place in areas such as the Major Transit Station Areas until requirements have been met. We should note that the use of the noun "the urban growth centre" in relation the future tense "will be planned to" identifies that these targets will come into effect in the future.</p>
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii	<p>As such, we are recommending that this policy be modified to include language acknowledging that a DPS or PMTSA must be in place prior to the requirement being enforced or revise the proposed policy as voluntary.</p>	<p>We appreciate that inclusionary zoning mandates are not yet in place in the City of Barrie, and aware that enforcement cannot take place in areas such as the Major Transit Station Areas until requirements have been met. We should note that the use of the noun "the urban growth centre" in relation the future tense "will be planned to" identifies that these targets will come into effect in the future.</p>
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii	<p>Lastly, if the municipality is looking for 20% affordable housing, then incentives should be created to make this requirement more palatable for the development industry. The City of Barrie has traditionally not supported these initiatives at the development level, and hence costs to implement can be unachievable. This is the opportune time to revisit this important issue.</p>	<p>We are open to working with the development industry to encourage greater affordable housing and will consider options in addition to those existing incentives provided through the affordable housing strategy. The Official Plan sets out the broader vision for this, and, to highlight our commitment, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: ""b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing."</p>

BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii and 2.5.j	<p>BILD remains concerned that by embedding the requirement for affordable housing (10% city average and 20% in the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Areas) without understanding the specific policies, structure or framework on how this is to be achieved, can become very problematic and can lead to many appeals. In particular, we believe that the definition of Affordable is wide open to interpretation as it relates to low and moderate household incomes.</p> <p>As such, we are kindly requesting clarification on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kindly confirm how a developer is going to be able to fulfill the requirement or be able to assess the financial burden at the front end of the planning approval? • Has the City contemplated any tools that would be able to provide for more affordable housing such as a Community Benefits Charge, City incentives of zoning and infrastructure, as well as partnerships with all levels of government? If not, when and how will this be considered? • How is the stewardship of these affordable units going to be maintained into the future? How will the City ensure these units remain in neighbourhoods for their intended purpose rather than being flipped in short order at market prices? 	<p>As the existing Official Plan maintains a 10% target for affordable housing, which has been achieved, we believe that we can -- through partnerships with developers -- work to improve the affordability of housing in Barrie. The City is contemplating further tools to achieve and incentivize more affordable housing through its Affordable Housing Strategy, and is also considering the challenge of stewardship. To affirm our commitment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: "b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing." While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means.</p>
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii and 2.5.j	<p>Affordability has simply been prescribed in this draft as a percentage of new builds, but how this will be supported through appropriate housing mix, incentives, strategic location of housing, maintenance, time and terms of affordability, affordable ownership versus rental structures and supports, and building management has not been included.</p>	<p>While the City is contemplating further tools to achieve and incentivize more affordable housing through its Affordable Housing Strategy, the commentator's concerns about how affordable housing targets might be implemented and achieved is noted. While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means. Additionally, to affirm our commitment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: ""b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing."</p>

800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii and 2.5.j	<p>We note that the New OP generally requires 10% of new units to meet affordability criteria; 20% in Major Transit Station Areas (“MTSAs”). We caution the City against unintended consequences of such a policy. For example, it may mean that while one unit in a building becomes more affordable, every other unit becomes less affordable. Instead, we would like to see the City incentivise construction of affordable housing by using the other planning tools at its disposal. For example, units could be made more affordable by providing exemptions from development charges or property tax breaks for units meeting certain conditions.</p>	<p>While having targets for affordable housing is critical for developing greater affordable housing options across the City, we agree that incentivization tools and working with a variety of partners (such as developers and non-profits) is also crucial. As part of the City of Barrie's Affordable Housing Strategy, we will continue to monitor the effectiveness of current tools and strategies and we will adjust to ensure that our affordable housing strategy is successful and aligned with the perspectives of our partners.</p>
10-24 Grove Street West	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii and 2.5.j	<p>There is no question that the provision of affordable housing is a basic human right/requirement and a critical component of inclusive community. However, the mandatory provision for affordable housing in all new developments is not practical or achievable and is of concern to our Client.</p> <p>All developments are not conducive to the provision of truly affordable housing due to building type, location, proximity to supportive amenities, and financial feasibility. Additionally by mandating each development includes a prescribed amount of affordable units will likely at the same time increase the cost of the remaining market units which would be working against this objective.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the City of Barrie has already met its existing Official Plan target of 10% of housing in Barrie being affordable. We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie.</p>
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii and 2.5.j	<p>Additional details are needed on how the City's affordable housing policies will be implemented and interpreted, for example, how targets will be monitored and evaluated through the development process.</p>	<p>While the City is contemplating further tools to achieve and incentivize more affordable housing through its Affordable Housing Strategy, the commentator's concerns about how affordable housing targets might be implemented and achieved is noted. While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means. Additionally, to affirm our commitment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: ""b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing."</p>

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.3.2.f.ii	Speak to winter city design elements? What is this and this would be better served to be included in the urban design guidelines rather than the Official Plan.	As stated in the Growth Plan, "municipalities will develop and implement urban design and site design official plan policies ... that direct the development of a high quality public realm and compact built form" (5.2.5.6). The definition of winter city design elements is implied in the final clause within the policy: in other words, those elements that support "a safe attractive, and inviting pedestrian realm that supports year-round use." Further elaboration on this will be provided in the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines. As this serves City Council's strategic priority of "ensuring a vibrant, safe and welcoming downtown," and as it builds off of responses we have heard from the public, the policy will remain. Moreover, it should also be noted that this policy is not development specific, but speaks to the Urban Growth Centre more broadly, allowing for flexibility in interpretation.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.3.2e)ii)	Requires "at least" 20% of housing units in the UGC to be affordable. The Landowners are concerned that this target is much too high and will discourage growth in the UGC, which in turn could restrict growth in the designated greenfield areas.	The target of having 20% of housing units as affordable in the Urban Growth Centre was introduced in draft two of the new Official Plan; in draft one, the original target was 35%. Staff made this deliberation after careful consultation with a variety of stakeholders as well as after further research and feel this target is appropriate. It should be noted that the City of Barrie has already met its existing Official Plan target of 10% of housing in Barrie being affordable. We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.3.3	Draft subsection c) acknowledges that redevelopment of the Strategic Growth Areas will be planned over the long term, and the evolution of the area will not be immediate, however Policy 2.3.3 is silent with respect to interim development permissions that would allow moderate infill or expansion to existing functions that would not otherwise conform with the intensification policies of the draft Official Plan, prior to comprehensive redevelopment. We continue to suggest that interim development policies be incorporated into the draft Official Plan in order to ensure the continued viability of existing land uses is maintained in advance of redevelopment.	After a review of the Official Plan, the only section where there may be confusion about the permissiveness of interim or infill development is in section 2.6.9 Employment Area -- Non-Industrial. Therefore, a policy will be added to make this explicit. Otherwise, none of the other land use policies contain any language that would suggest this type of use would be restricted.

520-526 Big Bay Point Road	James Hunter/IPS	2	2.3.3.e	<p>Policy 2.3.3.c. states that the Strategic Growth Areas shall accommodate higher levels of intensification, tall buildings and higher densities. Further, policy 2.3.3.g. states that development in Strategic Growth Areas will be planned to be transit-oriented, shall maximize the use of existing and planned transit infrastructure with appropriate transit supportive densities and mix of uses, and be pedestrian-friendly to support active transportation. Additionally, policy 2.3.3.i. states that higher densities and taller built form will be encouraged within Strategic Growth Areas and particularly at major intersections of intensification corridors.</p> <p>In order to achieve the goals of the SGA's and develop the built form intended, significant densities will be required. Similar to the policies within sections 2.3.2 (UGC) and 2.3.4 (MTSA's), the SGA policies should provide density provisions or minimum targets for SGA's that separate them from other areas of the City, as these areas are directed for high levels of development and intensification.</p>	<p>Strategic Growth Areas are guided by the densities set in the Land Use Designations. Each Land Use Designation either sets a minimum density target/range, or encourages greater intensification along Intensification Corridors or other higher-order streets. Further clarification regarding the application of density provisions for a Land Use Designation is being provided for in the General Land Use Policies section and within the Land Use Designation sections themselves.</p>
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.3.3.e	<p>2.3.3e) states "The City will establish a minimum density target for the Strategic Growth Areas to support intensification and the development of complete communities", however it is unclear what the density target is, and through what means that density target will be established (i.e. Secondary Plan or future OPA). We suggest revised language to clarify the minimum density targets applicable.</p>	<p>This policy has been removed to avoid confusion. However, Strategic Growth Areas are guided by the densities set in the Land Use Designations. Each Land Use Designation either sets a minimum density target or a range, and encourages greater intensification along Intensification Corridors or other higher-order streets. Further clarification regarding the application of density provisions for a Land Use Designation is being provided for in the General Land Use Policies section and within the Land Use Designation sections themselves.</p>
Artenosi Developments Group: 284 + 286 Dunlop & 119 + 121 Henry St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.3.3.f	<p>Confirm SGA at Dunlop and Anne St still enables a tall building built form with ground floor non-residential use that will achieve the planned economic function. This is not clear based on the SEED policies as they state the primary use must be non-residential, whereas by the nature of a mixed use building if all the upper floors are residential the residential component will have far more floor area than that of the non-residential ground floor component.</p>	<p>Suggested revision to 2.3.3.f.: "...will be planned to fulfill non-industrial economic and employment growth." A mixed-use building with non-residential on the ground floor, focused on appropriate employment uses, and with residential on upper floors, should be permitted in SEED found within an SGA.</p>

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	2	2.3.3.f. and 2.6.8	<p>In summary, it is submitted that refinement of the policy framework applicable to those lands forming part of the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Employment and Economic District, which are also classified as a Strategic Growth Area, is required to avoid speculation and uncertainty with respect to the future use and development of the area in question. Initially, the policies speak to intensification of the built form to create complete communities inclusive of high density residential development and regional shopping destinations. In contrast, the SEED policies place significant emphasis upon offices and mixed use industry clusters as the predominant forms of land use. The need to provide for spatial separation between the differing forms of land use may be effective to compromise the ability of the City to realize the significance of the area as a Strategic Growth Area.</p>	<p>The primary intent of those lands designated SEED within a Strategic Growth Area is to support employment-focused growth. At the same time, the other policies under section 2.3.3 Strategic Growth Areas still apply. As clarified further in section 2.3.3 and 2.6.8 collectively, a mixed-use building with non-residential on the ground floor, focused on appropriate employment uses, and with residential on upper floors, should be permitted in SEED found within an SGA.</p>
17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.3.4	<p>Allandale MTSA: Although the density target of 70 units per hectare is a minimum value, it is well below the minimum 150 residents and jobs combined per hectare for Transit corridors and station areas listed in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. It is also unclear why the Allandale Station possesses a minimum density target of 70 units per hectare while the Barrie South Major Transit Station Area has a minimum density target of 150 units per hectare. The Allandale station is located adjacent to the Urban Growth Centre and not only contains the Go Station but also the future Barrie Transit Hub. This collection of transit supportive activities deserves policies to support densities at the high levels within the City. It is recommended that the minimum density target be revised to be more aligned with the Growth Plan to achieve the goal of becoming a medium-sized city.</p>	<p>We have reviewed and analyzed the Allandale MTSA in relation to density potential. While there are some restrictions due to the historic fabric within the neighbourhood, we have revised the minimum density target to 130 persons and jobs per hectare. We will additionally support higher densities in the MSTA, where appropriate.</p>
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.3.4.a)	<p>Lands in Hewitt's are designated within the Barrie South MTSA which is required to provide 20% affordable housing units. The Landowners wish to point out that the vast majority of the MTSA area has approved draft plans and site plans ranging from singles to higher built forms, none of which provide 20% affordable housing. Based on those approvals, the Landowners feel that 20% is an unrealistic target that is unattainable during the planning horizon.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the City of Barrie has already met its existing Official Plan target of 10% of housing in Barrie being affordable. And that the requirement of 20% in the MTSA is for new developments (those that have already been approved will not be subject to the draft Official Plan policies). We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate on and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie and meeting a 20% target for the MTSA.</p>

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.3.4.a).iii)	Requires at least 20% of the housing units within the MTSA be affordable. This policy was not included in the first draft and in our opinion, given a significant amount of land is already draft plan approved or under construction, this policy is not achievable.	It should be noted that the City of Barrie has already met its existing Official Plan target of 10% of housing in Barrie being affordable. And that the requirement of 20% in the MTSA is for new developments (those that have already been approved will not be subject to the draft Official Plan policies). We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate on and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie and meeting a 20% target for the MTSA.
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	2	2.3.4.a).iii	The boundary of the Barrie South GO MTSA includes lands that are identified on the Land Use Schedule as Neighbourhood Area. It is unclear how the 20% affordable housing target (policy 2.3.4.a).iii) will be applied in this area, which has been identified for low-rise development and unit types where the definition of an affordable unit may be more challenging to accommodate.	We have revised the Barrie South GO MTSA boundary in light of the Neighbourhood Area that was included. We have also revised the minimum density target to 145 persons and jobs per hectare. We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate on and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie and meeting a 20% target for the MTSA.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.3.4.d	Requires development in the Barrie South MTSA to achieve an average minimum density target of 150 uph. This policy needs to be clarified for the following reasons: i. I have reviewed all of the properties within that MTSA and I can confidently state that there is no likelihood that 150 uph will be achieved. Most of that area is planned and approved for densities vastly lower than 150 uph. ii. There are Neighbourhood Area lands designated MTSA in Barrie South. Are those lands to be planned to achieve 150 uph, or the 50/60 uph noted in point B2a) above. I do not see how Neighbourhood Areas can help achieve 150 uph.	We have done a review of the Barrie South MTSA, and have determined that a density target of 145 persons and jobs per hectare is feasible and have revised accordingly. At the same time, please note that the wording is "average minimum density target." We have also revised the MTSA boundary in light of the Neighbourhood Area lands.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.3.4.d)	The central portion of Hewitt's is within the Barrie South MTSA, that requires a minimum of 150 uph. The Landowners recommend that lands designated Neighbourhood Area be removed from the MTSA.	We have done a review of the Barrie South MTSA, and have determined that a density target of 145 persons and jobs per hectare is feasible and have revised accordingly. At the same time, please note that the wording is "average minimum density target." We have also revised the MTSA boundary in light of the Neighbourhood Area lands.

PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.3.5	Section 2.3.5 Employment Areas - The range of uses permitted in the new employment area designations are more restrictive than those currently permitted by Barrie's existing OP and Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Please refer to the Appendix for a comparison in permitted uses (in letter). These use restrictions appear contrary to the draft OP goals for economic prosperity which are expressed throughout the Plan.	We revised the Employment Areas in this draft new Official Plan to afford greater flexibility through both the Employment Area - Non-Industrial designation and the Employment Area - Industrial designation. We are also upholding existing approvals and permissions through a new policy; moreover, as part of the development of the new Zoning By-law, we will be holding consultations to ensure that the zoning corresponding with each land use designation is appropriate.
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.3.5.h	2.3.5.h) related to Employment Areas, noting that "a limited range of small-scale retail and commercial uses may be permitted". Large scale commercial/retail uses, including Major Retail are permitted by certain Employment Areas designations, and therefore it would be appropriate to identify these as permitted under Section 2.3.5.	Section 2.3.5 "Employment Areas" has been updated to better reflect the Employment Area -- Non-Industrial land use designation and maintain that flexibility.
624 Yonge Street / Heritage Square	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	2	2.3.6 (as well as 3.3.6)	The Site is fully serviced but is not yet fully built out. We are concerned that design policies of s. 2.3.6 and s. 3.3.6 use strong language intended to force development to occur closer to the street, which is incompatible with the existing servicing scheme for the Site. Rebuilding existing services would be inefficient and contradictory to provincial policy. Accordingly, we request that a policy be added to the New OP to permit intensification of existing sites, such as this one, based on designs that are compatible with existing servicing.	For policy 2.3.6.d.ii, the language will be softened; e.g., "Development and redevelopment, <u>where possible, must</u> be oriented towards those street segments."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.3.6.a.ii	2.3.6.a)ii) related to intensification corridors, states "development or redevelopment must be oriented towards those street segments". In our submission, flexibility should be incorporated and we suggest "must" be replaced with "should."	For policy 2.3.6.d.ii, the language will be softened; e.g., "Development and redevelopment, <u>where possible, must</u> be oriented towards those street segments."
Artenosi Developments Group: 284 + 286 Dunlop & 119 + 121 Henry St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.3.6.c	What if conflict with underlying land use designation?	The purpose of policy 2.3.6.b is to ensure there is not a conflict between land use designation and intensification corridors. Recommended revision to further clarify: "It is expected that the level of intensification will vary along the length of an Intensification Corridor to reflect different contexts. The scale of built form along Intensification Corridors must conform with the applicable land use designation and Section 3 policies."

79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.3.6.d	Public transit infrastructure should not be the onus of the developer as this is operated by the City. Suggest this should be removed, an OPA should not be required if City does not have public transit or active transit infrastructure in place.	Suggested revised wording to place less onus on individual developers: "Intensification Corridors will be planned so that all new development and redevelopment within these corridors are supported by public transit infrastructure and active transportation infrastructure. This infrastructure will also incorporate winter city design elements, as detailed in the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.4.2.1.b	Policy 2.4.2.1 states that "all new development shall be planned to contribute to a housing mix ...". In our submission, this policy does not appropriately contemplate non-residential development, and would suggest that all new development incorporate a form of housing. We suggest revised language be considered to clarify that the housing mix target is applicable to new development that includes residential uses.	Suggested revision: "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..."
LSRCA		2	2.4.2.1.f	Please include a policy that recognizes the importance of protecting natural heritage features when settlement area boundaries are being adjusted. Suggested wording: v) the protection of natural heritage features is addressed.	Sections 2.3.1, as well as Chapters 5 and 6 are what govern the City's natural heritage features. Moreover, the maps provide further direction. Furthermore, there are no plans for any further settlement area boundary changes.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	2	2.4.2.1.k	Policy 2.4.2.1 (k) The planning process provides many opportunities for engagement and often landowners consult above and beyond the minimum requirements to better engage with local interests, neighbours, and community organizations. In some instances, such as with Indigenous interests, which are commonly engaged in relation to the archaeological study of a property, there are Provincial guidelines and regulations that must be followed to ensure appropriate engagement. We seek clarification on how the policy for additional engagement will be practically applied by staff during the planning process of site-specific development applications, in order to ensure that the appropriate Indigenous communities are consulted with.	Suggested revision to first sentence of policy: "Within the context of Provincial guidelines, the City shall work with Indigenous communities who have connection to the lands within the City to ensure consultation and engagement is appropriate to the type of planning application or planning process being undertaken."
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.4.2.3.c	As specified in Section 2.4.2.3 (c), City is proposing that 52% of housing is to be high/medium density. Being that this is a very intense built form, is this percentage realistic in a Greenfields setting, particularly since significant sections of the Greenfield areas have already been planned and finalized?	This policy will be removed; it does not need to guide land use development, as that can be done through other policies and density targets.

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.4.2.3.c	Policy 2.4.2.3 c) identifies that the housing mix for the Designated Greenfield Area shall target a higher-than-historical proportion of medium and high density housing with at least 52% of housing being high density development. It is understood that the 52% figure emanated from the City's Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). The MCR identifies a second suite in a residential unit as a form of high density development. It is requested that the OP recognize the intent of the MCR by acknowledging that second suites meet the 52% policy criteria.	This policy will be removed; it does not need to guide land use development, as that can be done through other policies and density targets. Additionally, we can verify that second suites do provide a form of intensification.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.4.2.3.c	Section 2.4.2.3.c) – requires 52% of the housing mix to be high density within designated greenfield areas. What is the rationale behind this? Is the City working to no longer offer single detached, semi-detached and street townhouse dwelling units as a housing option within the Salem Secondary Plan area?	This policy will be removed; it does not need to guide land use development, as that can be done through other policies and density targets.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.4.2.3.c	Requires at least 52% of new housing being high density with the DGA. This housing mix target does not seem reasonable, especially for the Salem Secondary Plan area that was designed to have a greater mix than what is being proposed. Again, we request the current Salem Secondary Plan target mix remain.	This policy will be removed; it does not need to guide land use development, as that can be done through other policies and density targets.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.4.2.3.c	States that DGA will be planned to achieve 52% high density, and all new development will be evaluated to determine how it contributes to achieving this target. I recommend that you clarify the intent of this policy for the following reasons: i. The City's MCR defines High Density differently from the High Density Designation which requires a minimum of 300 uph. For example, the MCR included second suites in the calculation of High Density. ii. In the case where staff is recommending that 52% of the DGA develop in accordance with the High Density designation (300 uph), then this density is inappropriate, particularly given that many of the DGA sites are already draft plan approved at densities closer to 35 uph. That would put an incredible and unrealistic burden of developing the balance of the unapproved DGA lands at unsupportable densities to average out to 300uph.	This policy will be removed; it does not need to guide land use development, as that can be done through other policies and density targets.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.4.2.3.e.v	Policy 2.4.2.3 e) v) discusses the creation of neighbourhoods with parks and schools as their focal points within a five-minute walk of most residents. It is requested that "open space or natural heritage system" be one of the listed focal points. These naturalized areas can provide for appropriate focal points within a community.	Recommendation: We will add "natural heritage system" to the policy.

LSRCA		2	2.4.2.3.e.vi	Provide examples of measures that will be utilized to maintain the natural hydrologic cycle, etc.	Further direction will be provided in supplementary materials; the Official Plan provides a broader overview of our land use vision.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.4.2.3.f	As noted in Section 2.4.2.3 (f), the City is proposing that the minimum density with be 79 persons/jobs/hectare. Can the City kindly elaborate on how this is this number was finalized as a minimum requirement for Greenfield development?	This number was finalized as a minimum density target in the Land Needs Assessment completed by Dillon Consulting, which was circulated as part of a memorandum in advance of the Public Meeting held on June 2nd. Essentially, the assessment addressed the targets set by the Province to achieve 150,000 jobs by 2051 and 298,000 people by 2051; it reviewed current and projected employment and population across both the Built-Up and Designated Greenfield Areas and strategically addressed how that target could be met through a realistic approach to employment and population distribution. The analysis follows City Council's decision in October 2019 that 50% intensification would be in the Built Up Area and 50% intensification would be in the DGA in order to achieve the Province's growth targets. Additionally, in line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.4.2.3.f	Policy 2.4.2.3 f) identifies that the planned density is 79 people and jobs per hectare to the year 2051. It is understood that this was intended to identify 62 people and jobs per hectare to 2041 and 79 from 2041 to 2051; please confirm. Also, it is requested that the policy be amended to identify that the development is to be measured across the entire Designated Greenfield Area and not on a site-by-site basis.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.4.2.3.f	The Official Plan has now been changed to require 79 persons and jobs per hectare whereas it was 62 persons and jobs in the previous version. We noted previously that 62 was much too high and now it has been increased. In our opinion, the density should continue to mirror that as set out in the Growth Plan.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
Trans Canada Pole: 7735 County Rd 27	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.4.2.3.f	We understand that the City will be inserting additional wording into the Draft Official Plan that will identify density staging provisions for different phases within Designated Greenfield Areas. The current draft increases density from 62 to 79 persons and jobs per hectare without a graduated scale. We would respectfully request further clarification in order to under implications to our site.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.4.2.3.f	The draft Official Plan seeks to achieve a minimum of 79 persons and jobs per hectare whereas the Growth Plan sets out a minimum of 50 persons and jobs per hectare and lastly the current Salem Secondary Plan sets out a minimum of 52 persons and jobs per hectare. The Salem Landowners wish to maintain this minimum moving forward.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.4.2.3.f)	Designated Greenfield Areas require a minimum density of 79 persons and jobs per hectare. We understand this is an error. As noted previously, the persons and jobs per hectare calculation should conform to the Growth Plan.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.4.2.3.h	For policy 2.4.2.3 h), new applications should not be evaluated against previous approvals which conformed under previous policies. Also, the density target "test" is to be applied across the entirety of the Designated Greenfield Area, not on a site-by-site basis. It is requested that this policy be removed.	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process. At the same time, if a developer that has already received approval is interested in increasing density, we are open to this conversation. Additionally, in line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
McCowan Ardagh Road Property (Ardagh Rd and County Rd 27)	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.4.2.3.i	Designated Greenfield Area and tenure - Policy 2.4.2.3 i) identifies that to meet the DGA density target, among other matters, new development is to provide for a range of unit types, tenures, and built form; "tenure" is not related to density and this should be removed.	Policy will be revised to read: "To meet the Designated Greenfield Area density target and to help meet housing needs, development across the Designated Greenfield Area shall provide a range and mix of housing options, unit types and built form."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.4.2.3f)	Requires 79 persons and jobs per hectare throughout the DGA. We understand that staff had intended to identify 62 people and jobs per hectare to 2041 and 79 persons and jobs per hectare from 2041 to 2051. Please confirm. Also, this policy should clearly state that the persons and jobs per hectare target is measured across the entire DGA area (as required by the Growth Plan), and not on a site-by-site basis.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.4.2.3h)	Requires an evaluation whether existing approved development can meet the new density target on vacant blocks, future development blocks, or future phases of the subdivision. The Landowners would like existing draft plan and zoning approvals, based on the existing Secondary Plan densities, to be recognized.	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process. At the same time, if a developer that has already received approval is interested in increasing density, we are open to this conversation.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.4.2.3j)	Requires all neighbourhoods in the DGA to be designed to support resource conservation and environmental stewardship "to the greatest extent feasible" and to include be practices in the use of district energy. The Landowners do not feel that the words 'to the greatest extent feasible' are appropriate and ask how this would be evaluated at the application stage. The Landowners also question why this policy refers to district energy where the City is not proposing the development of a district energy plant.	Suggested revision: "All new neighbourhoods and employment areas in the Designated Greenfield Area will be designed to support resource conservation and environmental preservation, protection and enhancement, and should include the best practices in the use of energy, water conservation/recycling and sustainable community planning."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.5.3.b	Requiring consistency with the City's Urban Design Guidelines should be removed; Council can provide direction to staff on this matter. The Guidelines have not been completed and should not be elevated to the level of policy without the Planning Act direction related to policy.	Recommended revision: "All development shall conform with the relevant Urban Design Policies in Section 3 of this Plan, and should be consistent with the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines to the greatest extent possible."
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	2	2.5.5.a)	Instead of how it is currently written, s. 2.5.5 of the New OP should read: <i>Any change in land use or introduction of a new land use not otherwise already permitted by the underlying land use designation or existing zoning will require an amendment to the Plan...</i> This change simply recognizes the Zoning By-law is best suited to regulate the use of land.	This change will be made accordingly.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	2	2.5.a	Policy 2.5(a) allows for slight variation from development standards, except for variation to height and density. Allowing minor variation to provisions without requiring an amendment to the plan is a reasonable approach. Unique site circumstances can also impact height and density calculations and in our view the policy allowing slight variation should be inclusive of height and density. The City could also consider formalizing the permitted variance to height and density by specifying a limit to the permitted variation, for example, allowing for a maximum variation of up to 5% or 10%, subject to the site circumstances.	As the City focuses on meeting the significant growth targets set by the Province, we are encouraging greater heights and density and we hope you agree that this is reflected in the Plan. At the same time, the changes proposed do require careful oversight. For this reason, we will not be changing Policy 2.5(a). However, we have revised language elsewhere across the OP to allow for greater flexibility, especially as we realize the importance of context for determining appropriate heights and density.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.5.d	It is questioned why a condominium street is not permitted to connect to a condominium street as per policy	A network of private condominium streets may be permitted, as long as there are appropriate access points to public streets. The policy will be revised to clarify further: "The creation of new lots fronting onto private streets is only allowed where access to a public street is provided."

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.5.d	Requires development on condominium roads only if access to a public street is provided. Please clarify the assumed intent, is that a network of connected condominium streets can be developed provided that at acceptable points, direct access to a public street is provided.	A network of private condominium streets may be permitted, as long as there are appropriate access points to public streets. The policy will be revised to clarify further: "The creation of new lots fronting onto private streets is only allowed where access to a public street is provided."
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.5.j	Section 2.5.j) – requires a minimum of 10% of all new housing units to be affordable. In our view, this continues to be too high to achieve. A more achievable approach would be 5% of the total units across the city as a whole.	This is a City-wide target that is also provided for in the existing Official Plan; based on recent data, we are currently meeting this target.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.5.j)	Requires a minimum 10% of all new housing units in each year to be affordable. Again, this target is much too high and is not sustainable. In our view, the requirement should be 5% across the city as a whole.	The existing City of Barrie Official Plan upholds this minimum target and the target has been met. We feel confident, with the support for affordable housing provided through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, that we can continue to work with partners to continue the progress made in providing more affordable housing in Barrie.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.5.j; 2.3.2.e; 2.3.4.iii	Specifically, we are also seeking clarification on how the 10% City-wide affordable housing requirement as set out in Section 2.5 (j) relates to the minimum 20% requirement for Urban Growth Centres (UGCs) and Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) set out in Section 2.3.2 (e) (ii) and Section 2.3.4 (iii) respectively. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When building in MTSAs or UGCs, will the development industry have to include the 10% city-wide requirement on top of the 20% area-specific requirement? 	The 10% city-wide requirement would not be additional to the 20% area-specific requirement in the UGC and the MTSAs.
Al McNair		2	2.6.1	Apparently the street designations flow from the 2010 Transportation Master Plan, which staff now acknowledge is seriously out of date and is intended to be updated in the 2022 to 2025 time period. Due to this long time line, I suggest that the new Official Plan policies should NOT permit greater intensification on properties based on the road classification as arterial or collector versus local streets. My earlier submission asked the City to consider reviewing these classifications based on how they actually serve their local neighbourhoods rather than just on how much vehicle traffic they do or can carry. In the interim, intensification should only be directed to those major streets which will be designated as intensification corridors in the new Official Plan. Let us always remember that we are planning for a city that works for people and their neighbourhoods at a human scale, including natural heritage areas.	The City's focus is on strategic growth, therefore greater intensification makes sense on arterials or major collectors over local roads; at the same time, the City will be incorporating a transition policy to emphasize the need for a new development to complement the existing context of the surrounding area.

Al McNair		2	2.6.1	Mid-Rise and High-Rise buildings should not be permitted in the designated Neighbourhood Areas	Buildings in the Neighbourhood Area are allowed different heights according to street typology; local and minor collector streets can see up to three storeys, major collector and arterials up to four, and intensification corridors higher. At the same time, we have incorporated additional transition policies to emphasize the need for a new development to complement the existing context of the surrounding area.
Al McNair		2	2.6.1	There should not be a required minimum density for redevelopment in Historic Neighbourhood Areas. This would only encourage grossly out-of-scale proposals for redevelopment.	There will be no minimum density for development along local roads in Historic Neighbourhood Areas.
Al McNair		2	2.6.1	<p>In the face of our present existential challenges of both Climate Change and the COVID-19 Pandemic, the nature of our urban residential areas may need to be rethought. There will be much more likelihood of residents working-from-home and telecommuting in the longer term. This could be hugely beneficial for our individual health as an alternative to long hours spent, physically inactive, sitting in traffic behind the wheel of a car. It will allow more time each day for our personal lives and for community involvement. It also has the potential to substantially reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by reducing commuting, as was illustrated during the first wave pandemic lockdown in the spring and summer of 2020.</p> <p>The long-term success of such life/work changes will also require many of us to create room in our homes for pleasant, functional work and learning spaces for all family members. This will likely increase the demand for our present housing stock at its' existing scale, rather than trying to work on laptops on the kitchen table of a small condo or rental apartment. It will likely cause us to rethink constant growth and the idea of work/life balance. That is all the more reason why we need to ensure protection of our residential neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>We agree that communities need to be developed as "complete" in a way that services the diverse needs of our residents. At the same time, as we plan for growth, we need to acknowledge that many people can no longer afford single-family homes, and we need to ensure that we can provide a diversity of housing types so that all our residents have a place to call home.</p>
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	2	2.6.1.1	The property at 99/110 Anne Street South functions as a commercial plaza. The current land use designation is General Commercial and the existing zoning is General Commercial Special Provision C4-SP9 (no residential uses permitted). Because this property is already zoned for commercial uses, the owner is seeking assurances that the range of commercial uses currently permitted will be taken into consideration when the new zoning bylaw is reviewed. Further discussion and clarification on allowing commercial permissions without primary uses is requested, or broadening the range of primary uses.	The draft new Official Plan designates this property Non-Industrial Employment, and existing uses for this site will continue to be permitted. We are going to be further clarifying/allowing for this through a special provision for existing retail and commercial sites that are now designated Non-Industrial Employment. We will take care to ensure that the appropriate range of commercial uses are permitted in the new Zoning By-law.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.1.3.a)	Generally, restricts development to 3 storeys on a local road. Recommend that the words "only" before "onto" because several mixed use/medium density blocks in the DGA have multiple frontages on both arterial/collector and local roads.	Recommended revision: "Development on a lot which fronts only onto a Local Street shall be generally kept to three storeys or less."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.1.3.b) & c)	This policy restricts development to a maximum of 4 storeys if oriented towards the collector road/arterial street. Heights exceeding 4 storeys are not permitted unless on an intensification corridor. In order to achieve the higher density targets there may be instances in newly planned DGA subdivisions, where higher density blocks on a collector road would be appropriate. Recommend additional text and the end of 1.6.1.3c)i) which reads "or in an appropriate block in a DGA subdivision fronting onto a Collector Road or Arterial Street.	For a neighbourhood area designation, we believe that a maximum of 4 storeys along a collector road or arterial street is appropriate. We will consider land use designation changes, where appropriate, ahead of the approval of this plan for certain sites.
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.1.3.c	This is really the only policy within this designation that applies to Intensification Corridors. The existing Official Plan policy framework for intensification corridors is working well with the transformation of these areas into more densely populated mixed-use communities. Buildings currently under construction or approved for development along Yonge Street and Essa Road range from 4 to 8 storeys in height with ground related commercial or stand alone residential. What is the rationale for deviating from this policy approach? This policy set is accomplishing the intended function that these corridors are planned to achieve.	Some of the Intensification Corridors still abut low-rise residential, and therefore six storeys allows for intensification while recognizing the existing fabric of these areas within the Neighbourhood Area land use designation. At the same time, we will be incorporating a transition policy that enables growth in a strategic and transitional manner and may allow for up to 8 storeys. Additionally, certain sites along these Intensification Corridors have received a different land use designation, to encourage growth and higher heights in a strategic manner.
Smart Centres / 15 Harvie Rd	Mark Resnick	2	2.6.1.3.c and 2.6.1.3.d	we have made clear our intent to develop Low-Rise Residential Buildings (up to 6-storeys) along the west side of the future Bryne Drive extension (an Arterial Road) for which staff have indicated their support. Policy 2.6.1.3(c) as written would not permit development over 4-Storeys on the property as Bryne Drive is not an "Intensification Corridor". Development to a height of 6-storeys, as stated in Policy 2.6.1.3(c) is only permitted on Intensification corridors. We request the Policies be amended to permit development to 6-storey along Bryne Drive on the property.	We have no indication that permission was given for up to six storeys. We believe that up to a maximum of four storeys is appropriate for an Arterial road. Please note that we have added a new policy highlighting that existing approvals given, before implementation of the Plan following approval from MMAH, will be upheld.
Marshall Landholdings - 15,13,11,9,5 Peel Street & 118, 98 Mulcaster St	Greg Barker / IPS	2	2.6.1.3.c.i	In the alternative of the requested medium density designation, we would request the City consider including lands adjacent the UGC under Section 2.6.1.3 (c) (i) Development Standards. This would permit lands directly abutting the UGC to develop in a transitional manner to the UGC and in a similar fashion as lands along an intensification corridor.	We have a density target to meet in the Urban Growth Centre, and we want to make sure that growth is directed into this core; therefore, with this Official Plan, as the UGC continues to build up, we prefer not to permit high density on the fringe of the UGC, especially if it would begin to conflict with the context and fabric of the existing neighbourhood.

505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street	Jack Krubnik / IPS	2	2.6.1.3.c.i	There should be more policy attention towards reducing impact rather than limiting heights, as many land uses and developments benefit from economies of scale or building efficiencies that may be greater than six storeys. Furthermore, the goal of transit-oriented development will be limited and hampered by a six storey height limit adjacent to Intensification Corridors. Some parcels are sufficiently sized to accommodate more height and density along Intensification Corridors, while also appropriately considering impact to the established Neighbourhood Area communities. Development along Intensification Corridors should also promote grade related commercial uses. However, it can be difficult to attract commercial tenants in this economic environment, without providing for more density within a development to support the commercial grade related use. High density developments best support commercial uses in developments, which in turn will support a complete community and growth along an Intensification Corridor.	Some of the Intensification Corridors still abut low-rise residential, and therefore six storeys allows for intensification while recognizing the existing fabric of these areas within the Neighbourhood Area land use designation. At the same time, we will be incorporating a transition policy that enables growth in a strategic and transitional manner and may allow for up to 8 storeys. Additionally, certain sites along these Intensification Corridors have received a different land use designation, to encourage growth and higher heights in a strategic manner.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.6.1.3.d	In Section 2.6.1.3 (d) Development Standards - mentions that the minimum requirement is 50% non-residential use for the ground floor of a low and mid-rise unit fronting a collector and or arterial road, if there is no other commercial use within 450 metres. We kindly ask that the City review this policy as this rigid provision could be problematic and hinder the development of affordable housing units.	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
969, 979, 989 Maplevue Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.6.1.3.d	Requires retail and commercial uses within a five minute walk of other retail and commercial uses (450 metres) within Neighbourhood Areas on Collector or Arterial Streets or Intensification Corridors. This will have the effect of dispersing commercial uses along a road. Commercial uses rely on synergies which include adjacency to each other. It is requested that this policy be removed or, at a minimum, be changed to 800 metres (approximately a 10 minute walk).	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.1.3.d	On what basis was mandatory ("shall") 50% ground floor retail and commercial uses determined to be required of low and mid-rise buildings fronting onto Collector and Arterial Streets and Intensification Corridors? This policy should be revised to allow greater flexibility as not every property fronting onto Collector or Arterial Streets or Intensification Corridors for a variety of reasons may not be appropriate to provide non-residential uses	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."

Smart Centres / 15 Harvie Rd	Mark Resnick	2	2.6.1.3.d	<p>Additionally, we do not believe that, incorporating 50% non-residential uses at grade in the proposed Low-Rise Buildings on the property is necessary or viable. Depending on the final layout of the development it is possible that placement of Low Rise Buildings on the property would be further than 450 meters triggering this requirement as set out in Policy 2.6.1.3 (d).</p> <p>The min 50% non-residential gfa at grade does not make sense for the property given the proximity to the extensive retail and commercial offerings along Bryne Drive and Mapleview Drive in the Strategic Growth Area.</p> <p>We understand the basis of Policy 2.6.1.3 (d) is contribute to building complete communities, where residents can access their most basic, day-to-day needs within a short walk from home, however, this policy is very restrictive as non-residential uses at grade may not be suitable or viable for all sites. In our view, the 450 meters requirement alone may not be the best criteria on which to determine the need for non-residential uses at grade.</p>	<p>We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."</p>
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	2	2.6.1.3.d	<p>Section 2.6.1.3.d identifies mid-rise buildings as a permitted use within the Neighbourhood Area; however, this conflicts with the definition of mid-rise buildings (7- 12 storeys, per Section 3.3.3) and the maximum 6 storey height restriction within the Neighbourhood Area.</p>	<p>The reference to mid-rise buildings will be removed.</p>
Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.1.3.d	<p>Section 2.6.1.3.d) continues to require a min of 50% ground floor in low rise buildings to be non-res. The Watersand Draft Approved plan accommodates an 11 acre commercial block that will more than satisfy the commercial needs within the area. This should not apply to the Salem area.</p>	<p>We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."</p>
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.1.3.d	<p>Requires a min of 50% ground floor in low rise buildings to be non-residential where there is no existing commercial within 450 metres. As noted previously, this would continue to include singles with the way it is currently written and interpreted, which is not logical.</p>	<p>We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."</p>

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.1.3.d)	<p>Requires commercial uses on ground floor of low and mid-rise buildings where there are no existing commercial and retail uses within 450 metres. According to Section 3.3.2, low rise includes singles, semi's and townhouses. We request that this policy be revised to exclude ground related housing from the commercial requirement. IN our opinion, it is inappropriate to require singles/townhouses to have commercial uses along interior Collector Roads.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Hewitt's Secondary Plan was designed, draft plan approvals granted, and construction commenced on the basis that Yonge Street would provide the primary commercial uses, and that 5 interspersed arterial road neighbourhood mixed use areas would provide the balance. Those areas exceed 450 metres in distance to every house. We request that the distance be increased to 800 metres.</p>	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	2	2.6.1.3.e	The calculation of minimum density in the Neighbourhood Area (2.6.1.3.e, i.e. density based on the type of street frontage) seems overly complex at the OP level. Instead, minimum density targets for the Neighbourhood Area should be paired with policies that encourage a denser built form/lot fabric along higher-order roads.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.1.3.e	<p>States that new development should be planned to a minimum of 50 uph on local streets and 60 uph for collector roads. These densities would preclude singles, semi's and some street townhouse development.</p> <p>While I appreciate that the change to 'should' from 'shall' from the 1st draft, I'm not clear what criteria would be used to evaluate when it is appropriate to develop at a lower density. The language should be clarified, because there will be many sites in the Neighbourhood Area that will not be suitable for that density.</p>	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.6.1.3.e.i and 2.6.1.3.e.ii	The residential density on local roads is identified as a minimum of 50 uph, and on Collector and above streets, the minimum is 60 uph. The densities provided are too high and preclude many types of development other than stacked townhouses or mid-rise buildings. On Collector and higher order roads, densities would be reached that are similar to those for the UGC and are well above the Designated Greenfield Density of 62 and 79 people and jobs per hectare [2.4.2.3 f)]. At 62 people and jobs per hectare, this results in a uph in the range of 25, not 50. The inclusion of the word "should" in the policy does not provide sufficient policy direction. The uph should be appropriately lowered to reflect the policy intent and the people and jobs per hectare.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.

Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.1.3.e.i and 2.6.1.3.e.ii	Section 2.6.1.3.e) i) and ii) – as noted previously, the minimum densities of 50 and 60 units per hectare are very high, especially compared to the current density ranges in the Salem and Hewitt’s Secondary Plans. The densities within the respective Secondary Plans should continue to be respected.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.1.3.e.i and 2.6.1.3.e.ii	The Neighbourhood Area designation and policies sets out a minimum of 50 and 60 units per hectare depending on the fronting situation of the development which is much too high. The current Salem Secondary Plan sets out the range of low density residential from 20 to 40 units per hectare, which is a reasonable range of density. The Salem Landowners wish to continue using this density range.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.1.3.e.i) and ii)	Requires minimum densities of 50 and 60 units per hectare depending on the frontage of either a local or collector road. As noted above, these minimum densities are very high, especially compared to the current density ranges in the Salem Secondary Plan. The densities within the respective Secondary Plans should continue to be respected. Also, how is the density calculated given the density applying to local and collector roads? This is a very confusing and convoluted way to calculate density.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.
164 Innisfil Street	MHBC / James Newlands	2	2.6.1.3.f	While we do not support a cap number in the Official Plan; if one is used, it is our recommendation that it be increased to 3,500 square metres.	This policy is for lands in a Neighbourhood Area. We believe the 2,000 square metre cap is appropriate and based on our modelling, you can still fit approximately 10 commercial units within a building this size. Anything larger should ideally be in a Commercial District designation. At the same time, the policy now reads "should" to incorporate some flexibility.
Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.1.3.f	Policy 2.6.1.3f) applies to Neighbourhood Areas and states that “Commercial, retail, and office (excluding Major Office) uses shall be located on and oriented towards Intensification Corridors, Arterial or Collector streets, and shall be limited to a maximum of 2,000.0 square metres on the ground floor...” In our submission, flexibility should be introduced, and we suggest “shall” be replaced with “should”, in particular so that there is clarity that not every site along a Corridor, Arterial, or Collector street is required to provide commercial, retail and office uses, and to account for site specific circumstances.	This policy is for lands in a Neighbourhood Area. We believe the 2,000 square metre cap is appropriate and based on our modelling, you can still fit approximately 10 commercial units within a building this size. Anything larger should ideally be in a Commercial District designation. We have also clarified the policy and incorporated greater flexibility by using "should" over "shall."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.1.3.f)	Limits commercial GFA to 2,000m2 and states that ‘additional floor area is permitted up to the applicable maximum building height’. Please explain the basis for the 2,000m2 size threshold because this is not consistent with the City’s current comments on large mixed-use sites. Please also add the word “commercial” after “Additional” and in front of “floor area” to clarify the intent of the policy.	This policy is for lands in a Neighbourhood Area. We believe the 2,000 square metre cap is appropriate and based on our modelling, you can still fit approximately 10 commercial units within a building this size. We have also clarified the policy and incorporated greater flexibility by using "should" over "shall."

Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.1.3.g	Policy 2.6.1.3g) states that "If a low-rise commercial plaza is being redeveloped as mixed use, then the new mixed use building shall have at least 75% of the original plaza's commercial gross floor area on the ground floor." As outlined in our December 16, 2020 letter, in our submission, revised wording should be considered that would require redevelopment to "strive to achieve, where possible, at least 75% of the original plaza's gross floor area..." so as to allow for consideration of site-specific context and to provide flexibility and avoid the need for an Official Plan Amendment if the policy cannot be met. In particular, as in redevelopment scenarios of large commercial plazas, the existing GFA can be quite substantial to reproduce in consideration of modern built form objectives.	Policy will be revised to read: "If a low-rise commercial plaza is being redeveloped as mixed use, then the new mixed use building shall have, <u>where possible</u> , at least 75% of the original plaza's commercial gross floor area on the ground floor." Additionally, minor variations to this would be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.10	Employment Area - Industrial: We have concerns with the restricted range of permitted uses and development standards. We request that existing use permissions be carried forward.	We will be introducing a new transition policy to confirm that existing approvals given during the development application process will be upheld. The intent of changes to the Employment Areas, including the introduction of the Employment Area - Non-Industrial designation, was meant to expand uses, while also protecting core industrial areas.
Transcanada Pipelines Ltd.	MHBC / Darlene Quilty	2	2.6.12.2	A multi-use trail is shown over the pipeline right-of-way on Map 4a. A policy should be included in Section 2.6.12.2 to reference the need to consult with TCPL in relation to any trail locations or trail development.	we will add the following policy to section 2.6.12.2(b): For any multi-use trail addition that would intersect with the Transcanada Pipelines Limited (TCPL) gas pipeline right-of-way, consultation with TCPL must be completed.
Transcanada Pipelines Ltd.	MHBC / Darlene Quilty	2	2.6.12.2.b	TransCanada should be referenced as: 'TransCanada PipeLines Limited (TCPL)' and all items in the section as TCPL	Changes will be made accordingly.

Transcanada Pipelines Ltd.	MHBC / Darlene Quilty	2	2.6.12.2.b	<p>v. TCPL operates two high-pressure natural gas pipelines within its right-of-way crossing the City and is identified on Map 2 of this Plan. TCPL Limited is regulated by the Canada Energy Regulator (CER), which has a number of requirements regulating development in proximity to its pipelines, including approval for activities within 30 metres of the pipeline centreline.</p> <p>vi. New development can result in increasing the population density in the area that may result in TCPL being required to replace its pipeline(s) to comply with CSA Code Z662. Therefore, the City shall require early consultation with TCPL or its designated representative for any development proposals within 200 metres of its pipelines.</p> <p>vii. Trails on the pipeline right-of-way require approval from TCPL. Early consultation during the design process is encouraged to ensure TCPL's design requirements are met.</p> <p>i. In addition to the requirement for setbacks for principle buildings, structures and accessory structures, the following should be setback a minimum of 7 metres from the limit of the pipeline right-of-way:</p> <p>a. Private roads, driveways, parking spaces and parking areas.</p>	These additions will be included.
52, 56, 58 Lakeside Terrace	JD Development Group / Sally Campbell	2	2.6.2	<p>All three buildings will have a total of 479 units with two of the buildings a height of 12 storeys and one a height of 10 storeys. The designation proposed on the lands in the current draft Official Plan is 'Medium Density'. Regarding building height, this designation identifies a minimum height of 6 storeys with no indication of a maximum height provision. This is contrary to the first Official Plan draft, which noted that building height should be between 6 and 12 storeys. The proposed 'High Density' designation suggests a minimum height requirement of 12 storeys. As such, there seems to be no consideration given to which designation provides for heights between 6 and 12 storeys. Our preference is that the language from the first draft be reinstated in the second draft with respect to height permissions in the 'Medium Density' designation.</p>	For clarity, we have added a height range to the medium density designation policies.
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.2.1 and 2.6.3.1	<p>Is seniors' housing, assisted living and long term care homes included in the Residential category? We recommend that the various forms of seniors and assisted living/care homes be included as a permitted use in both the Medium and High Density designations.</p>	We will add assisted living and long-term care homes to the Neighbourhood Area as well as the Medium Density land use designation.

McCowan Ardagh Road Property (Ardagh Rd and County Rd 27)	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.2.2	<p>In the Medium Density designation, a development, as long as it is not on an intensification corridor and is within 70 metres of an NA designation (among other matters) may be permitted to have townhouses (2.6.2.2 i) and those townhouses are required to have ground floor commercial or retail if the building is on a Collector or Arterial road (2.6.2.2 e) and a mix of residential and non-residential uses is required (2.6.2.2 c) in all circumstances. However the development can be exempt from requiring commercial if it meets one of a handful of tests; mostly related to whether there is commercial close by and the site is not on an Arterial road (2.6.2.2 g) and notwithstanding policy (g) the commercial exemption policies don't apply in some areas. It is not known what the "townhouse" built form therefore is if it is required to have a mix of uses and might require ground floor commercial or retail depending on what type of street it is on; it is assumed that it is a live/work unit. It is suggested that if townhouses (without commercial) are permitted, that this be stated and it is also suggested that the commercial policies be simplified.</p>	<p>There are currently no policies pertaining to townhouses in the medium density land use designation. However, we will be incorporating a policy to highlight that lower heights may be permitted in this designation if the minimum density target can be met and/or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan. Additionally, regarding commercial concerns, in certain cases, minor variations may be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."</p>
17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.2.2	<p>We herein request a subtle modification to this policy to address the need for high density development on the subject property: a) Lands within the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area (shown on Map 1) that are designated Medium Density may be considered for development in accordance with the policies of the High Density designation in Section 2.6.3 of this Plan and without requiring an amendment to this Plan, but only if the lands designated Medium Density abut (i.e., share a common lot line with) lands designated High Density.</p>	<p>Lands within an MTSA would require a land use designation change from Medium Density to High Density.</p>
52, 56, 58 Lakeside Terrace	JD Development Group / Sally Campbell	2	2.6.2.3	<p>The three buildings result in a density of approximately 266 units per hectare. Regarding density, the 'Medium Density' designation provides for a maximum density of 125 units per hectare, whereas the first draft proposed a density of 300 units per hectare. The 'High Density' designation provides for a minimum density of 300 units per hectare. Again, there seems to be no consideration given for densities between 125 and 300 units per hectare. If the intent is for the 'Medium Density' designation to allow densities between 125-300 units per hectare then in our opinion this should be clearly indicated.</p>	<p>The commentator is correct in making the assumption that the Medium Density designation allows for between 125-300 units per hectare. The missing range is an oversight and it will be corrected.</p>

17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.2.3	Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, there appears to be a significant gap in the density permitted between Medium and High Density and we encourage the City to review the maximum density permitted for the Medium Density designation, as this will greatly limit development and restrict the provision of residential units in the City.	The density range for Medium Density development shall be 125 units per hectare to 300 units per hectare.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.2.3.b)	Criteria for non-residential. Most of the land proposed to be designated Medium Density in Hewitt's, was previously designated in the Secondary Plan as Mixed Use that permitted stand-alone residential or stand-alone commercial. The Landowners request that stand-alone residential or commercial be permitted in all Medium Density sites in Hewitt's. At a minimum, the Landowners request that the criteria in b) apply to any Medium Density site regardless whether it fronts onto an Arterial Street or Intensification Corridor. The Landowners also request that planned and existing commercial uses be recognized in evaluating compliance with the criteria. At present, the policy in b) is limited to 'existing'.	The relevant policy in the Medium Density land use section will be revised to incorporate more flexibility; rather than outright focusing on when single-use is permitted, we have focused more simply on when mixed-use is required. In addition to the revisions of the relevant policy, in certain cases, minor variations may be permitted to the policy in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.6.2.3.b.i	provides criteria where single use residential is permitted where there is "...existing commercial or retail lands within...". It is requested that this be amended to allow for planned commercial or retail (not just existing). Many developments are master planned and, as such, planned commercial or retail could be provided for which would satisfy the policy context of having such uses in proximity to planned residential.	We will revise this policy to incorporate more flexibility and be more context driven, while maintaining intent.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.6.2.3.c	As identified, the lands between Mapleview Drive East (an Arterial Road) and the NHS area to the south on the site are proposed to be designated "Medium Density". The property is near the furthest extent of the eastern edge of the City and has limited area for development due to the need to accommodate a "regional" stormwater management facility. It is suggested that a large built form in this section is not appropriate, does not provide a destination aspect to it, nor will it be serviced by a large nearby population as the intended realignment of the Sandy Cove Creek channel abutting the property will reduce the population that would have utilized Terry Fox Drive to get to Mapleview Drive East. The planned function of Terry Fox Drive as a Collector Road has effectively been moved further east due to the upcoming creek realignment. It is requested therefore that the building height policies of 2.6.2.3 c) be amended to provide for a minimum height of three stories along Arterial streets for this location.	We will be clarifying that lower heights may be permitted in the Medium Density designation if the minimum density target can be met and/or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan.

Sean Mason / 570-586 Yonge	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.2.3.c	Section 2.6.2.3 c) Buildings shall have a minimum height of six storeys along the Arterial Street or Intensification Corridor frontage except on lands designated Medium Density within the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area, or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan. Comment: Based on this provision, it is interpreted that the built form along the frontage of the intensification corridor will have a minimum height of six storeys and that as the property moves to the rear of the site, adjacent to the natural heritage system, the height of the built form can be reduced. Currently, as noted above, three-storey townhouses are proposed along the rear of the site which would be permitted under this proposed designation. We are requesting a meeting with staff to better understand the implementation of these policies.	We will be clarifying that lower heights may be permitted in the Medium Density designation if the minimum density target can be met and/or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.2.3.c	Only permits buildings with a minimum height of six storeys. As noted previously, we continue to request that townhouse dwelling units in various forms be permitted as of right within the Medium Density designation, in accordance with the Salem Secondary Plan.	We will be clarifying that lower heights may be permitted in the Medium Density designation if the minimum density target can be met and/or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.2.3.c)	Minimum height of 6 storey's along arterial streets or Intensification Corridor and MTSA. The MTSA includes areas designated Neighbourhood Area where 6 storey's may be inappropriate. The Landowners also request that the minimum height be reduced to 3 storeys.	This policy only refers to Medium Density designations. Within an area designated Neighbourhood Area, developments fronting arterial streets can be up to four storeys, while developments fronting Intensification Corridors can be up to six storeys. Lower heights would be permitted.
Sean Mason / 570-586 Yonge	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.2.3.d	Section 2.6.2.3 (d) notes the maximum residential density for a development shall be 125 units per net hectare. Comment: The 'Medium Density' land use designation is intended to facilitate an increase of densities and built form in the City (2.6.2). The designation permits a maximum density of 125 units per net hectare (2.6.2.3.d). Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, there appears to be a significant gap in the density permitted and we encourage the City to review the maximum density permitted for the Medium Density designation, as this will greatly limit development and restrict the provision of residential units in the City, which are severely needed at this time due to an affordability crisis.	The residential density range for Medium Density development shall be 125 units per hectare to 300 units per hectare.
520-526 Big Bay Point Road / 19 Dundonald Street	James Hunter/IPS	2	2.6.2.3.d	Given the direction from the Province to meet the growth and intensification targets, and to accommodate attainable housing for an increasing population, a density of 125 uph is viewed as a restricted amount of permitted density. To achieve the built form directed by the City, the permitted density should be increased for the Medium density designation.	The residential density range for Medium Density development shall be 125 units per hectare to 300 units per hectare.

70&76 Edgehill Drive	Darren Vella / IPS	2	2.6.2.3.d	<p>The subject lands are designated Medium Density (76 Edgehill) and Neighborhood Area (70 Edgehill). Within the existing Official Plan, and the approval of OPA No. 32, the subject lands have development permissions for a maximum density of 255 units per hectare. Section 2.6.2.3(d) of the proposed Official Plan permits a maximum density of 125 units per hectare which is not consistent with this previous approval. An excerpt from the existing Official Plan is noted below: 4.8.23 DEFINED POLICY AREA (HH) (OPA NO. 32, By-law 2014-143) Lands shown on Schedule C known municipally as 76 Edgehill Drive and is located on the north side of Edgehill Drive, east of Anne Street North, within the Sunnidale Planning Area, shall permit a twelve-storey residential apartment building with a maximum density of 255 units per hectare, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.2.2.3 (c) of the Official Plan. Option 2 could include a revision to Section 2.6.2.3(d) of the draft Official Plan to permit a maximum density equal to or greater than 255 units per hectare within the proposed Medium density designation. My client is also not opposed to the high density residential designation in this location and would be happy to discuss this in more detail with staff.</p>	The residential density range for Medium Density development shall be 125 units per hectare to 300 units per hectare. At the same time, existing approved development permissions will also be upheld.
390 Essa Road	Darren Vella / IPS	2	2.6.2.3.d	<p>the subject lands possess a site specific special policy area in the approved Official Plan which reads as follows: A) Defined Policy Area (LL) – lands shown on Schedule ‘C’ – Defined Policy Areas legally described as Part Lot 6, Concession 13, Part Park Lot 19, Registered Plan 67, known municipally as 390 Essa Road, shall be permitted a maximum density of 220 units per net hectare, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.2.2.3(d) of the Official Plan. B) Schedule “C” – Defined Policy Areas is hereby amended by designating the lands legally described as Part Lot 6, Concession 13, Part Park Lot 19, Registered Plan 67 in the City of Barrie, known municipally as 390 Essa Road, as “Defined Policy Area LL”, as shown on Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this amendment. We herein request that this recognition for 390 Essa Road be added to Section 2.8 – Defined Policy Areas or alternatively the maximum density permissions in the Medium Density designation be increased to accommodate the approval granted for this site.</p>	The residential density range for Medium Density development shall be 125 units per hectare to 300 units per hectare

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.2.3.d)	Maximum density is 125 uph. What category do projects ranging in density from 126-299 uph fall under? They are neither medium nor high density.	The Medium Density land use designation section will be updated to include the following residential density target: 125 to 300 units per hectare.
505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street	Jack Krubnik / IPS	2	2.6.2.3.d, 2.6.3.3.d	If Medium Density is a maximum of 125 units per net hectare and High Density has a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare, in which category does a development fit which has a density of 126-299 units per hectare? More clarification on how Medium Density works within the mid-rise building section of the OP is necessary.	The Medium Density land use designation section will be updated to include the following residential density target: 125 to 300 units per hectare.
Karen Buck		2	2.6.3	Getting Building Height Right for the Climate – A study by two UK Architectural Firms show results that height is a significant predictor of energy use, even accounting for other variables. According to their current analysis of 9 different building types – the four-storey courtyard had the lowest overall emissions after 40 years of operation. I would caution Barrie to explore this further and I am recommending that, at this time, buildings higher than 10 – 12 stories might not be the right choice for the future.	While environmental concerns are a priority for Barrie, we must balance these considerations among others, including the targets for population growth set by the Province of Ontario, which will see Barrie's population double in the next 30 years. While the study has been noted, intensification beyond 12 storeys can have a greater net benefit for the environment than many other forms of development; particularly, as building upwards means that there is less pressure to build outwards and to encroach on environmentally sensitive lands. There are a number of green building policies tied to the development of high-rise buildings (as well as other development types), which can be found in section 3.2.3 "sustainable and resilient design" and particularly in section 3.2.3.1 "green development standards."
Sean Mason / 474 & 490 Essa Road and 235 Harvie Rd	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.3.2.d	The 'Medium Density' land use designation is intended to facilitate an increase of densities and built form in the City (2.6.2). The designation permits a maximum density of 125 units per net hectare (2.6.2.3.d). Given the direction from the Province to meet the growth and intensification targets, and to accommodate attainable housing for an increasing population, a density of 125 uph is viewed as a restricted amount of permitted density and will leave sites such as this underutilized. We encourage the City to review the maximum density permitted for the Medium Density designation based on recent staff approvals (390 and 440 Essa Road), to propose a density that is consistent with the planned function particularly along intensification corridors.	The Medium Density land use designation section will be updated to include the following residential density target: 125 to 300 units per hectare.

<p>PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10- 24 Grove St</p>	<p>MHBC / Andrew Edwards</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2.6.3.3.d</p>	<p>Prescriptive nature of the Official Plan - Many policies throughout the 2nd Draft are written in an absolute and prescriptive manner with no flexibility, very much like a Zoning By-law. An Official Plan is meant to provide broad long term policy direction and provide room for flexible interpretation of policies and goals. As written most development applications moving forward would likely require an Official Plan Amendment to proceed. For example Section 2.6.3.3 d) requires High Density development with a residential component shall have a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare. Many sites will not be able to achieve this density on a site by site basis while others will be able to far exceed it. This should be written as a general target and not an absolute requirement. This also would remove flexibility for mixed-use buildings that are primarily commercial/office to incorporate a small residential component. Many properties within this designation may be challenged to achieve a density this high based on constraints and should not require an Official Plan Amendment if the general intent of the policy to intensify with taller built form is being maintained.</p>	<p>The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop “official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design” (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. At the same time, we are reviewing the Official Plan to determine whether some policies are better suited for the Zoning By-law or Urban Design Guidelines.</p>
<p>Cameron Sellers/IPS Consulting</p>		<p>2</p>	<p>2.6.4</p>	<p>Currently, the new OP requires a minimum density of 125.0 units per hectare within Community Hub lands (2.6.4.3 A) with a maximum of 300.0 units per hectare.</p> <p>Given that Community Hub lands are dispersed throughout the City in varying locations / settings / neighbourhoods, we believe the density requirements (at least the minimum requirement) should be tiered, based on their position within the City, in similar fashion to the Neighbourhood Area designation under 2.6.1.3 e) i).</p> <p>We recommend having a minimum density requirement for Community Hub lands adjacent to Local roads vs. those adjacent to Collector / Arterial roads, and possibly a third tier for Community Hub lands fronting Intensification Corridors.</p>	<p>Given the variability across Community Hub lands, we will be revising the t minimum residential density target to respond more to local context.</p>

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.4.1	<p>Residential is only permitted as part of a mixed-use development. Within the DGA, the Community Hub designation applies to recreation centre lands, fire station lands, and school sites. The inclusion of these land use blocks within subdivisions were made as a result of requests from the City or Agencies and accordingly, if the City or Agency chooses not to purchase those sites, then the landowner should be able to develop according to the surrounding land use designations.</p> <p>We question the planning merits of requiring mixed use development on interior sites, which may abut a local road. The Hewitt's Secondary Plan requires that the site be planned and zoned to permit residential use in the event the school boards choose not to purchase the land. The new OP should be amended accordingly.</p>	Recommended policy addition for 2.6.4.2. c) "Should a public service facility or institutional-type use no longer be required or no longer exist on the land designated as Community Hub, then development in accordance with the majority surrounding land use designation may be considered without an amendment to this plan."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.4.1.	<p>Residential uses are only permitted as part of a mixed-use development. The Salem Landowners request that standalone residential uses also be permitted within elementary and secondary schools along with recreation centres. This was a fundamental item within the Salem Secondary Plan that not only permits residential uses but these blocks are also dual zoned in order to provide residents that will live beside these uses a clear understanding what would be permitted should those uses not ultimately be constructed and included as permitted uses.</p>	The intent is that the residential development itself should be mixed use. At the same time, we will be incorporating a policy stating that if there are other non-residential uses within 450 m of the site, then we may consider a single-use residential development.
Park Place	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.5	<p>Commercial District: We request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. that permitted uses in this designation be expanded to include hotels and motels. (The only reference to hotels and motels right now appears to be in Section 8.3.1 – Celebration Spaces.) b. discussion/definition of "Commercial" c. clarification of whether gas bars/car washes fall under retail or commercial? 	The designation of "hospitality and tourism" will be added to Commercial District, as well as to Employment Area - Non-Industrial. This will allow for hotels and motels. A gas bar/car wash would be permitted in the Employment Area - Non-Industrial land use designation.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.5.1	<p>Policy 2.6.5.1 permits a range of uses in the Commercial District land use designation, however does not permit "Major Retail", which is a defined term under the Official Plan. In our submission, the intended function of the Commercial District designation would suggest that it is appropriate for large scale commercial/retail uses to be permitted, including Major Retail, and we suggest Major Retail be added as a permitted use. Policy 2.6.5.2b) does permit "large format retail (i.e. big box) as well as shopping malls". Understanding that Major Retail is a defined term, we suggest consistency with this defined term throughout the Official Plan for clarity;</p>	We will do a review to ensure that "Major Retail" is the consistent term used for the permitted use.

Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.5.2.b	Draft Policy 2.6.5.2b) permits “large format retail (i.e. big box) as well as shopping malls”. Understanding that Major Retail is a defined term, we suggest consistency with this defined term throughout the Official Plan for clarity, including updating Policy 2.6.5.2b) to reference Major Retail;	We will do a review to ensure that "Major Retail" is the consistent term used for the permitted use.
LSRCA		2	2.6.6.1	Consider updating this section to describe more clearly the uses permitted in the natural heritage system. Suggested wording: a)Environmental conservation and preservation; b)Environmental stewardship, restoration and enhancement; c)Flood or erosion control mechanisms, if demonstrated to be in the public interest; d)Hazard management, if demonstrated to be in the public interest; e)Naturalized trails, boardwalks and interpretive/wayfinding signage installed by a public authority; and, "Low intensity" active transportation infrastructure installed by a public authority.	The section has been reviewed and updated.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.6.1 e)	Permits boardwalks or trails ‘installed’ by government or public authority. As per current draft approvals in Hewitt’s, the City requires the developers (not the City) to install the trails and receive DC credits. This policy should be revised to state “installed by or on behalf of...”.	Revised wording: "Naturalized trails, boardwalks and interpretive/wayfinding signage installed, or as permitted, by a public authority"
LSRCA		2	2.6.6.2.b.	Several features that also make up the natural heritage system are currently excluded from the list, such as natural areas abutting Lake Simcoe, watercourses, woodlands, cultural thickets, cultural meadows, corridors and linkages, and natural areas of local significance. Also, note that coastal wetlands are specific to the Great Lakes and their connecting channels (as per PPS definition) and should not be referenced in the City’s OP since there are none in the area. Suggested wording: b) The natural heritage system includes: provincially significant wetlands, other wetlands, significant woodlands, other woodlands, significant valleylands, significant wildlife habitat, habitat of endangered and threatened species, watercourses, fish habitat, natural areas abutting Lake Simcoe, areas of natural and significant interest, cultural thickets, cultural meadows, natural areas of local significance and natural corridors and linkages as well as natural hazard lands, which include floodplains, erosion hazard areas, steep slopes and unstable soils.	This section has been revised.

LSRCA		2	2.6.6.2.d	Please add "flood control in the public interest" to iii) Erosion control	We will add flood, in addition to erosion
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.7.1b)	Permits low impact development stormwater management facilities. Stormwater ponds across Hewitt's are proposed to be designated Greenspace. Accordingly, the permitted uses should read "Low Impact development Facilities" and "Stormwater Management Ponds/Facilities".	We have incorporated the terminology proposed, but please note that these uses are overall restricted across the City and that language is also incorporated. (Also note that restricted is not the same as prohibited.)
LSRCA		2	2.6.7.2.c	Trees are a more sustainable, cost efficient and environmentally friendly way to generate shade in public spaces. It's recommended that this policy be revised to include the provision of trees as well. Suggested wording: c) The City shall install trees and shade structures along the waterfront to provide relief from the sun.	Urban forest policies are provided for in section 6.3.2; the City encourages the planting of trees across Barrie.
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.8	It is requested that all existing land use permissions be carried forward in the New OP. For example two of PBMR's landholdings located within the proposed SEED designation currently have and are used for industrial purposes and the SEED designation proposed to remove all industrial use permissions.	The SEED boundaries found on Map 2 will be revised and the properties in question will be designated appropriately to uphold existing land use permissions.
Artenosi Developments Group: 284 + 286 Dunlop & 119 + 121 Henry St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.8	Strategic Employment and Economic District (SEED) - Our Client submitted a ZBA application for a mixed use building in May 2021. We request confirmation the proposed built form would be deemed to conform with the proposed SEED policy framework. We would request a meeting with City staff to review this further.	Existing approvals will be carried forward and we will be introducing a transition policy that states this. The mixed-used building, should the ZBA be approved, will be deemed to conform with the Official Plan.
PBM Realty Holdings / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.8.1	Can City staff confirm the permitted uses presented are in addition to the existing designation and not exclusive. PBMR's properties at 364 St. Vincent Street and 30 Alliance Boulevard have existing industrial use permissions and have tenants using the properties for industrial purposes and it is critical these existing permissions be carried forward.	The SEED boundaries found on Map 2 will be revised and the properties in question will be designated appropriately to uphold existing land use permissions.
Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.8.1.m	Policy 2.6.8.1m) indicates that "Convenience Retail as part of a mixed-use development" is permitted. "Convenience Retail" uses are not referenced under any other land use designation, whereby Convenience Retail is only permitted on lands designated Strategic Employment and Economic District. We suggest removing the word "convenience" so that the use permitted is "Retail", and also that "as part of a mixed-use development" be removed;	2.6.8.1.m will be changed to "Retail (excluding Major Retail."
PBM Realty Holdings / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.8.2.h	Land Use Policies - Can City staff confirm the intent of this policy? It does not appear any SEED designated lands are also designated Employment Areas.	SEED designated lands are permitted in Employment Areas. The latest Map 2 now demonstrates this.

Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.8.3.b	<p>Policy 2.6.8.3b) notes that “the height of buildings should generally be limited to 6 storeys”, whereas the corresponding policy in the September 2020 draft OP indicated a maximum of 16 storeys would be permitted. The proposed building heights are a significant reduction from what was previously contemplated, and we seek clarity as to the appropriateness of such a substantial reduction. In particular, considering the SEED designation is part of a Strategic Growth Area, where significant redevelopment and growth is to be directed. Development beyond a 6 storey maximum may be appropriate to facilitate appropriate levels of growth within this node, and we suggest that revised policy be considered that would be reflective of the intent of the Strategic Growth Areas, such as directed by draft Policy 2.3.3c), which states: “Strategic Growth Areas shall accommodate higher levels of intensification, tall buildings, higher densities...” The policy does not currently permit tall buildings within the SEED designation.</p>	<p>The primary intent for the SEED designation is for strategic growth of employment. At the same time, we have reviewed your sites in relation to the SEED designation, and intend to change 201-211 Cundles to Commercial District. This would still allow for a wide mix of uses, would protect commercial and retail uses, and would allow the site to achieve greater intensification and height.</p>
PBM Realty Holdings / Arsenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.8.3.b	<p>Development Standards - Can City staff confirm the intent of generally requiring buildings to be limited to 6 storeys in height is meant to be flexible and if lands are located in other areas (along intensification corridors or higher order streets) that consideration for increased heights will be considered without the need for an Official Plan Amendment?</p>	<p>Generally, height is intended to be limited to six storeys in SEED designations as the primary focus of growth for these areas is employment.</p>
Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.8.3.c	<p>Policy 2.6.8.3c) requires that at least 25% of ground floor uses for buildings with frontage along an arterial or collector street contain retail, commercial or other active uses. As outlined in our December 16, 2020 letter, flexibility should be afforded to this policy to account for site specific circumstances, and we suggest revised wording be considered as follows: “The ground floor of buildings with street frontage onto arterial or collector streets should consist of...”</p>	<p>The requirement has been changed from ground floor area to building frontage to incorporate greater flexibility.</p>

341 Mapleview Drive West	TALUS / Peter Obradovich	2	2.6.9.1	<p>As such, we are pleased to see that the proposed designation is now Employment Area: Non-Industrial, however, a self-storage facility continues to not be a permitted use. We purchased these lands to build a self-storage facility. In our opinion, Employment Area: Non-Industrial is a perfect designation for a self-storage facility being that this type of use does not function fully as an industrial use. A self-storage facility does not require manufacturing or processing, it is not harmful to people or the environment or have noxious effects, and typically there are commercial uses included such as an office and the sale of packing and moving supplies as is the case in our proposed facility. Our request is that the City reconsider permitting self-storage facilities within the Employment Area: Non-Industrial designation on our subject site.</p>	<p>Generally, we consider self-storage to be a commercial use. We will be providing further guidance on where self-storage facilities are permitted in the new Zoning By-law.</p>
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.9.2	<p>Policy 2.6.9.2 indicates that Major Retail uses are to be "subject to the policies in Sections 2.6.10.2, 2.6.10.3, and 2.6.9.3". Based on a review of those sections, it is unclear the applicability of the "Employment Area – Industrial" standards to the Major Retail permitted use, as sections 2.6.10.2 and 2.6.10.3 relate mainly to industrial employment type uses.</p>	<p>Policy 2.6.9.2.a) is meant to apply to what is now policy 2.6.9.1.j); those land uses now permitted in the Employment Area - Industrial section. This has been changed.</p>
164 Innisfil Street	MHBC / James Newlands	2	2.6.9.2	<p>we have concerns with the principle of using the percentages and maximum size limits - it is our opinion that these are regulatory approaches that should not be included in the policy document and are better applied through the implementing Zoning Bylaw. The reasons and solutions follow: Despite the language in Section 10.1 d), which enables flexibility in the interpretation of numbers, the use of the word "shall" in the subsections of section 2.6.9.2, instead of "should" or "generally" places hard limits on the numbers and would precipitate an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) for any deviation from the maximums. The Zoning By-law is the better location for the numbers and the Zoning By-law process requires the same public notice procedures as an OPA. It remains our recommendation that the 25% cap be removed from Section 2.6.9.2 d. ii) and iii). It is recommended that "secondary to the principle use" is a sufficient requirement and that the section should be modified to state, "The implementing zoning by-law will establish provisions to ensure that secondary uses are secondary to the principle use." The recommended approach would have administrative benefit of taking an application having 26% of floor area being dedicated to a secondary use from an OPA and ZBA application before Council to a Committee of Adjustment application.</p>	<p>The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. We have maintained caps for site design elements that we believe to be critical for growth management, and have allowed for more expansive retail development under the Commercial District designation. At the same time, greater flexibility has been added to the section on major retail.</p>

164 Innisfil Street	MHBC	2	2.6.9.2.c	In Section 2.6.9.2 c) the second sentence should be deleted. This sentence selectively recites some of the permitted uses of Section 2.6.9.2 and then applies an added "criteria" of "compliment". It is recommended that this sentence be removed and that Section 2.6.9.1 stand on its own in establishing the list of permitted uses in the designation. If this sentence is to remain, it would appear to be more appropriate in the preamble to section 2.6.9.	Agree that the second sentence can be deleted. The need to preserve Employment Area lands for industrial employment uses is made clear in the preamble of section 2.6.10; whereas the supportive capacity of Employment Area -- Non-Industrial (to Employment -- Industrial) is made clear in the preamble of section 2.6.9.
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.9.2.d	Policy 2.6.9.2d) would restrict any new retail uses as standalone, and new retail would be required to be in association with another use in the same building. In our submission, the requirements for new retail to be associated with another use is an inappropriate standard. We suggest revised policy be considered to allow for small scale retail uses, including infill type development, within the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation;	We will be revising the retail policy section to increase clarity and flexibility. New standalone retail may be permitted on a site, but with conditions.
Park Place	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.9.2.d.ii and 2.6.9.2.d.iii	Employment Area – Non-Industrial ii) A new retail use may be permitted as an accessory use to a primary permitted use listed in Section 2.6.9.1 of this Plan, but it shall be within the same building or structure as the primary use, and it shall be no larger than 25% of the gross floor area of the building/structure within which it exists; and, iii) A new retail use may be permitted as a secondary use in a multi-tenanted building, but it shall only be permitted once the primary use has been established, and it shall be no larger than 25% of the gross floor area of the building/structure within which it exists Based upon our recent experience, including current discussions with large scale users for our north lands we believe that the maximum accessory retail component should be set out as “generally in the order of 30%” so as not to preclude minor variances in appropriate circumstances.	We will be rephrasing these policies for greater clarity and flexibility.
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.9.2.e.i	Policy 2.6.9.2e)i) provides criteria for the development of Major Retail uses in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, and proposes a cap to ‘contiguous clusters’ of Major Retail Uses. As the term ‘contiguous cluster’ is undefined and unclear, we are concerned of how this policy will be applied, interpreted and implemented, including under the Zoning By-law. In our experience, a combined cap that is applicable to multiple developments under separate ownership is difficult to track and implement consistently. We suggest that Policy 2.6.9.2e)i) be removed.	We agree that this term is confusing. The recommendation is to revise as follows: "New major retail will only be permitted: i) Within a kilometre of Community Area lands, and fronting onto an Arterial Road; ii) When less than 25% of existing uses within 500 metres are major retail; "

Canadian Tire Real Estate	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.9.2.e.ii	Policy 2.6.9.2e)ii) provides criteria for the development of Major Retail uses in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, and proposes to cap individual major retail uses at 5,000 sq.m. In addition to our concerns with the appropriateness of the proposed “Employment Area – Non Industrial” designation for 75 Mapleview Drive West as noted above, the existing Canadian Tire store at 75 Mapleview Drive West has approximately 7,258 sq.m of retail space within the existing building, which exceeds the proposed maximum. In our submission, it would be appropriate to contemplate a revised maximum that is reflective of the needs of a Major Retail type use, or that policy be introduced to recognize existing Major Retail uses regardless of existing GFA, and which would permit expansion to such a Major Retail use, without need for amendment to the Official Plan;	Revised policy recommendation: "Each new major retail building must be a minimum of 3,500 of square metres and should generally not exceed 5,000 square metres. A mix of major retail and retail may be permitted, though together all uses on a site should generally not exceed a maximum of 5,000 square metres."
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.9.2.h)	Policy 2.6.9.2h) provides direction for the provision of sensitive land uses within the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, however it is unclear what (if any) sensitive land uses are permitted within this designation. Clarification regarding the applicability of this policy would be welcomed;	A definition of Sensitive Land Uses, which provides examples of sensitive land uses, is provided in the definitions section within Chapter 10.
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.7.1	Historic Neighbourhoods: There should be acknowledgement than a significant amount of intensification is expected within the Historic Neighbourhoods along identified Intensification Corridors, Strategic Growth Areas and lands with higher density permissions.	The expectation of some intensification is clarified in Policy 8.4.3.f, which states: "The policies of this section apply to lands designated Medium Density within the Urban Growth Centre as shown on Map 2, but are not intended to be used to prohibit redevelopment or limit intensification. The integration of new development within intensification areas that are part of historical neighbourhoods will be achieved by applying the direction provided in the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines."
LSRCA		2	2.7.5.e.v	Please include reference to the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan “where applicable”.	Reference to LSPP has been added.
Gary Bell		2	2.8.6 and 2.7.5	The defined policy area 2.8.6 would be better and more explicitly expressed as: “The Extractive Industrial overlay policies apply to this area until such time as the mineral aggregate operation on the subject lands is no longer licensed under the Aggregate Resources Act. Then the Natural Heritage System designation and polices apply.” Similarly, the reference to the underlying Natural Heritage System should be included in policy 2.7.5.	Policy 2.8.6 needs to be clarified to align with policy 2.7.5.a; additionally, as the land use designation as per Map 2 is Natural Heritage System, this can be incorporated in both 2.7.5.a and 2.8.6 to omit any interpretation that the land use designation can ultimately be changed when the Extractive Industrial overlay no longer applies.

Park Place	IPS / Darren Vella	2		For the lands adjacent to the north side of Lover's Creek we would like to explore with you whether some further flexibility in uses could be considered. For example could a hotel/motel become a permitted use in the Non Industrial and Industrial Employment areas?	We will be adding "Tourism and Hospitality" to the permitted uses in Employment Area - Non-Industrial. This would permit a hotel/motel.
Karen Buck		3	3	All New buildings should have to be Net Zero buildings. This is where the Province and Municipalities may have to work together to require this. BC requires high performance windows in new buildings and I think Barrie should, too.	In section 3.2.3.1, the following guidelines are given in relation to new developments: that they shall "provide a high level of efficiency in energy consumption" (i) and that they "promote Energy Star qualified development" (xii). The requirement of high-performance windows is more appropriate for the Urban Design Guidelines (as the Official Plan is intended to provide broader land use guidelines), and this is a consideration that we will keep in mind for the future. More language in relation to net-zero initiatives have additionally been added into the plan.
Karen Buck		3	3	The management of "runoff" is very important for mitigation during "climate disruptive events" and the City must prepare for resiliency in the face of Climate Change. Protecting the sewer system is important and resiliency might also mean that downspouts should be disconnected and connected to rain gardens. Maybe we should be also looking at Green Roof solutions.	The City encourages green roofs as part of section 3.2.3.1.x; 3.2.3.1.iv encourages rainwater harvesting. Rain gardens are also listed as a permitted use under the Greenspace land use designation. These suggestions for the use of rain gardens and Green Roof solutions may also be something we can consider as draft two of the City-wide Urban Design Guidelines is developed.
Michelle Lackey		3	3.3	In regards to the built form of new development - I think greater landscape buffers and set backs need to be provided when developing or re-developing land that has existing residential properties adjacent to them. The current minimum setbacks and buffers described in the OP are not sufficient in my opinion. I also think densities need to be adhered to more strictly and stop allowing special provisions for density and height increases with new development. The community is noticing more and more development of townhomes, back to back stacks and low rise buildings being shoehorned into existing mature neighbourhoods.	To ensure appropriate transitions to neighbourhood sites, low-rise and mid-rise developments must be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from the property line, while high-rise buildings must be setback a minimum of 70 metres. Additional transition regulations also apply -- for instance a mid-rise building must include a 45 degree angular plane from the property line. At the same time, setbacks will be determined on a case-by-case basis for a development through the application process to ensure that an appropriate transition to a neighbouring site is maintained. This new draft Official Plan also sets out specific densities for different land uses in order for there to be greater confirmity and understanding of what is acceptable, which should result in fewer special provisions in the future.

17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3	<p>As part of the Draft Official Plan, the City has included built form types and development criteria for each type (Section 3.3). It provides a level of detail not commonly found within an Official Plan and would be more appropriately located in an Urban Design Guideline document. This level of detail will result in significant barriers to development and ultimately unnecessary amendments to the Official Plan to resolve. This has the effect the slowing down the development approval process and slowing intensification efforts. It also restricts the artistic aspects of architects, urban designers, and landscape architects to create engaging and unique spaces that may not fit into the "box" that is being created by these Official Plan Policies.</p>	<p>The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. The criteria incorporated into Section 3.3 of the Official Plan have continued to be included due to their importance in achieving the type of city that stakeholders have expressed they would like Barrie to become; at the same time, we have incorporated some more flexibility into the policies. The City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines will provide greater built form guidance and will be designed to work in collaboration with the Official Plan.</p>
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	3	3.1.2.d	<p>Speaks to Urban Design Standards and Guidelines, both of which being mandatory. The Salem Landowners request urban design guidelines not being a mandatory policy but changed to being an encouraged policy as is typical with municipal Official Plans.</p>	<p>We support the requirement of a Planning Justification Report and/or Urban Design Brief. At the same time, staff do recommend changing the policy to read: "Require development applications to demonstrate how <u>relevant</u> Attractive City objectives and Urban Design policies are being achieved through any requisite Planning Justification Report and/or Urban Design Brief."</p>
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.1.3.1	<p>Policy 3.1.3.1 provides direction for application of the Urban Design Standards, stating "The Urban Design Standards are phrased with the terms "will" or "shall", or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies." Elsewhere, the draft Official Plan recognizes the importance of flexibility in design standards for successful and appropriate implementation, including Policy 2.5a), which states: "Slight variations from the development standards, with the exception of variations to height and density, may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City." We suggest Policy 3.1.3.1 be revised to incorporate an appropriate level of flexibility;</p>	<p>The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Urban Design Policies are provided for in Sections 3.2., 3.3 and 3.4. For clarity, it is suggested that 3.1.3.1a) be changed to read: "<u>Many</u> of the Urban Design Policies are phrased with the terms "will" or "shall," or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies provided in Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4." We have incorporated some more flexibility into the Urban Design Policies, overall.</p>

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.1.3.2	<p>Urban Design Guidelines. 1) This Section refers to a City-Wide Urban Design document but then states in a policy how the guidelines are to be read. Please consider that a policy referring to a guideline which then speaks to mandatory conformity lacks clarity and flexibility.</p> <p>2) The Landowners recommend that the OP refer to the UDG document and the policies could provide high level guidance as to the goals of that document. 3) The text of a)-c) is confusing. a) requires mandatory conformity if any guideline can be achieved; however, b) states that if a guideline can be achieved with minor adjustments, then it 'must' be achieved. Finally, c) states that if it cannot be achieved then an Urban Design Brief is required. A 'policy' cannot be mandatory if the subsequent polices allow for variations.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is not clear what 'can be achieved' means. What is the test for which 'can be achieved' is being measured against that automatically requires mandatory compliance?</p>	We will simplify section 3.1.3.2 in reference to the Urban Design Guidelines. At the same time, we will still emphasize that the Urban Design Guidelines shall be followed to the greatest extent possible; moreover, while the Urban Design Guidelines will maintain flexibility, if any relevant guidelines cannot be followed, then an Urban Design Brief must be completed demonstrating how the spirit and intent is maintained. Otherwise, further direction will be given in the guidelines themselves.
PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.1.3.2	Must be clear that there is flexibility in not achieving every specific guideline due to site specific circumstance but the intent of the guideline can be demonstrated through other means and that should a relevant guidelines not be achieved that it does not trigger an Official Plan Amendment.	If the relevant Urban Design Guidelines cannot be followed, then an Urban Design Brief would need to be completed demonstrating how the spirit or intent is maintained. If the relevant OP Urban Design policies cannot be met, we may consider, if justified, as slight variation -- as per policy 2.5.a. If the variation cannot be justified, an OPA would be required. Please note, we have also incorporated further flexibility into the Urban Design Policies, overall.
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	3	3.1.3.2	The Urban Design Standards in Section 3 should be removed from the OP and consolidated with the future City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines document. The standards/guidelines seem duplicative and per policy 3.1.3.2, the difference in their status is nuanced – essentially still requiring applications to evaluate and apply all guidelines subject to City approval.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. The criteria incorporated into Section 3.3 of the Official Plan have continued to be included due to their importance in achieving the type of city that stakeholders have expressed they would like Barrie to become. Please note, we have also incorporated further flexibility into the Urban Design Policies, overall. The City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines will provide greater built form guidance and is designed to work in collaboration with the Official Plan. We will also be changing the reference to "Urban Design Standards" to "Urban Design Policies" for greater clarification.

PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.1.3.2.c	Can the City confirm the interpretation of 3.1.3.2 c) is that should an applicant not be able to meet any of the specific urban design criteria presented in the City OP, through a sufficient Urban Design Brief providing rationale for why the guideline cannot be met, the development can then proceed without the need for an Official Plan Amendment? (ex, 3.3.4 a) ii) g) 70m separation from towers to low rise built form).	Section 3.1.3.2.c applies to Urban Design Guidelines, but not to the Urban Design Policies in the Official Plan. An OPA would be required for those relevant Urban Design policies in the OP that cannot be met, if proper justification is not provided (as per policy 2.5.a). We will also be changing the reference to "Urban Design Standards" to "Urban Design Policies" for greater clarification. Please note, we have also incorporated further flexibility into the Urban Design Policies, overall.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.1	Policy 3.2.1 provides general urban design standards to evaluate development applications, and will require development applications demonstrate a number of aspects, including (but not limited to): improving the City's legibility, navigability and sense of place; improving the existing urban fabric; and increasing overall connectivity. In our submission, it is not appropriate for all development applications to demonstrate the provision of certain city building elements, which may not be feasible to implement in a number of potential instances. We suggest revised wording as follows: "development applications, where appropriate, should demonstrate the following..."	Policy 3.2.1.a) will begin: "To create human scale neighbourhoods that accommodate the City's anticipated intensification and growth, development applications, <u>where appropriate, shall</u> demonstrate the following:" We have maintained the use of shall, as this is intended to be a mandatory measure; at the same time, we agree that the same approach may not be appropriate for every development and this has been addressed through the inclusion of "where appropriate."
Gary Bell		3	3.2.1	The issue of compatibility of redevelopment in established neighbourhoods is a major and re-occurring question at Council. The term compatibility in The Plan is mostly in reference between different land uses not between low density and greater intensity residential buildings. 9.5.6 Context Sensitive Intensification provides a useful policy e). City Council thru The Plan can articulate what it means to be compatible forms of new development in existing neighbourhoods. It is worthwhile for The Plan to provide as much certainty as possible to existing single detached residential owners and to development interests, as to what is and what is not acceptable height, massing, and appearance. Although it is recognized that you cannot regulate good taste.	Believe the policies do this and we will be making further revisions to reflect existing height of existing buildings as a determinant of a maximum height.

Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	3	3.2.1	<p>Policy 3.2.1., as we understand from staff has been included to provide specific guidance in the Official Plan as a reference point for what staff view as the characteristics of over-development when evaluating development proposals. While the policy is intended for this purpose, we caution against its inclusion as the policy can also serve as a basis for appeals and objections to development that while appropriate pushes many of these boundaries as Barrie grows into a mid-size City. If the policy is to remain, we suggest Policy 3.2.1 (b) be revised as detailed below. In the 1st paragraph of 3.2.1 (b), the last sentence states, "Over-development is characterized, but not limited to the following...". We suggest the following in its place, "Over-development may be characterized, but not limited to the following...".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current wording of Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) reads as a definitive statement against any Official Plan Amendments for height and density, which we do not believe is staff's intent. We believe staff are merely raising a caution over excessive height or density, a small but important distinction. The Policy states, "Development that exceeds the maximum permitted height or density". An example alternative wording is, "Development that proposes excessive height or density". 	This policy has been clarified as to the intent of over-development as a definition and to introduce more flexibility. Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. has been changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density."
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		3	3.2.1 b (iii)	we kindly recommend that Section 3.2.1 (b) (iii) be revised as the current language suggests that there should never be Official Plan Amendments (OPAs) for height or density.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. is recommended to be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	3	3.2.1.a	It is not understood how a development proposal "shall" demonstrate "improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place"	Revision to Policy 3.2.1.a.i.c : "Contribute to the city's legibility (meaning the coherent organization of the built environment), navigability and sense of place." Moreover, it is also suggested that 3.2.1.a begin with: "To create human scale neighbourhoods that accommodate the City's anticipated intensification and growth, development applications shall demonstrate, <u>where appropriate</u> , the following:"
PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.1.a.i.c	It is not understood how a development proposal "shall" "improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place".	Revision to Policy 3.2.1.a.i.c : "Contribute to the city's legibility (meaning the coherent organization of the built environment), navigability and sense of place."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.1.b	Policy 3.2.1b) specifies that the City will not support "over development", which further goes on to define what may be considered as over-development including "development that exceeds the maximum permitted height or density", or "unwarranted variances" where an alternative built form is appropriate.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iv) will be rewritten as "Variances to the City's development standards resulting in inappropriate built form, especially where an alternative built form solution is more appropriate;" Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. is recommended to be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"

Melchior Management	Janet Foster	3	3.2.1.b	The policies identify that minor revisions to the Plan may be considered without an Official Plan amendment; however, increases to height and density will not be considered. Will an Official Plan amendment be required in instances where increases are contemplated? Also, will an Official Plan amendment be required if minimum requirements cannot be satisfied, for example minimum densities or building storeys?	Cases preventing underdevelopment are incorporated across the Official Plan, through tools such as minimum density targets. In certain cases, minor variations may be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	3	3.2.1.b	relates to, among others, exceedances in maximum permitted height or density, "inappropriate built form", "unwarranted variances" and shadow impacts. A hard approach to these matters as criteria for over development will, it is submitted, reduce design and functional flexibility and potentially usurps someone's right to have variances considered if the Planning Act tests can be met. For example, a height exceedance for a desired design element, or higher density for the provision of more affordable or attainable built housing form. It is questioned how the City will evaluate "inappropriate built form" and it is likely that every multi-story building will have some amount of shadow impact. Also, it is not understood what the City means by identifying that development that "impacts local amenity" will not be supported.	Policy 3.2.1.c has been clarified as to the intent of over-development as a definition and to introduce more flexibility. As for "local amenity," recommendation is to change policy 3.2.1.c.ii to "Development that negatively impacts the public realm and local character."
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.2.1.b	We agree that over development does not result in good planning; however, with the current density permissions, particularly the maximum within the Medium Density designation, developers will be required to submit Official Plan Amendment applications to increase densities in order to meet the other objectives of this plan. It is recommended that subsection (iii) be deleted as good planning relates to the overall functionality of the site highlighted in (vi), not the developments proposed height and density given all the policies in this Plan related to transition and neighborhood impact.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. will be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"
PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.1.b.iii	this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. will be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"
Artenosi Developments Group: 284 + 286 Dunlop & 119 + 121 Henry St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.1.b.iii	this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. will be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"

PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10- 24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.1.i.c	Additionally the 2nd Draft contains a lot of challenging urban design verbiage/terminology that is unclear and undefined which leaves a lot of room for varying interpretation of these policies. For example Section 3.2.1 (i)(c) requires all development applications to demonstrate it will improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place.	Revision to Policy 3.2.1.a.i.c : "Contribute to city's legibility (meaning the coherent organization of the built environment), navigability and sense of place."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.1a)i)c)	Legibility. How are development applications to demonstrate that they 'improve the city's legibility'? What does this even mean?	Revision to Policy 3.2.1.a.i.c : "Contribute to the city's legibility (meaning the coherent organization of the built environment), navigability and sense of place."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.1b)iii)	Over-development – height/density. Request adding the words 'in the Official Plan' otherwise applications for rezoning to increase height would be automatically considered over-development.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. will be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.2	Policy 3.2.2 provides standards to evaluate development applications, including that "all development applications shall demonstrate how the proposal contributes to...", and goes on to outline a number of criteria that includes how an application "contributes to the diversity of housing types and tenures in the neighbourhood", amongst several other aspects. In our submission, not all development applications would be appropriate to contribute towards a housing mix, or other specific criteria that this policy would require contribution towards. Flexibility should be incorporated, and we suggest revised language as follows: "Development applications, where appropriate, should demonstrate how the proposal contributes..."	Policy 3.2.2.a will be changed to: "To ensure the creation of complete neighbourhoods, developments outside of Employment Areas, <u>where appropriate</u> , shall generally be designed to contribute to:"
LSRCA		3	3.2.2	Part of designing for excellence requires consideration for an inclusion of natural elements. It's recommended that an additional sub-objective be included that speaks to this. Suggested wording: f) Respect the environment: incorporate natural elements and features to promote a sustainable and robust natural environment.	This is covered in policy 3.1.1.a (references to sustainability and resilience), as well as in policy 3.1.1.d
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	3	3.2.2.a	Policy 3.2.2(a) requires that "all development applications shall demonstrate how the proposal contributes..." to a list of 9 criteria set-out in the policy. The policy as written suggests that all applications need to meet all the criteria. We encourage staff to build more flexibility into this policy to reflect the reality that new development will contribute to complete communities by meeting "some or all of the criteria as applicable".	Policy 3.2.2.a will be changed to: "To ensure the creation of complete neighbourhoods, developments outside of Employment Areas, <u>where appropriate</u> , shall generally be designed to contribute to:"

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	3	3.2.2.a)	Requires all development applications “shall demonstrate” a number of criteria. Again, a policy that is much too prescriptive and is not achievable for each and every application. Suggest this policy be revised to be more general in nature.	Policy 3.2.2.a will be changed to: "To ensure the creation of complete neighbourhoods, developments outside of Employment Areas, <u>where appropriate</u> , shall generally be designed to contribute to:"
John Bartosik		3	3.2.3	<p>Barrie will protect and improve air quality and promote energy efficiency through enhancement of the City’s tree canopy cover and vegetation to provide shade, reduce the urban heat island effect, trap pollution, and control run-off. This will be implemented through green urban design standards.</p> <p>In regards to your above statement why is it that development of new subdivisions continues in the manner it does by stripping away all trees, brush, wetlands and soil usually to the clay and water table?</p> <p>With a little research I discovered that a newlyman made creek in the annexed lands just south 100 metres from the Madelaine and Maplevue East intersection is actually drainage from a shallow subterranean lake my home and many others are sitting on top of. Tapped and excavated to surface just a short distance downhill from my home at 585 Maplevue Dr. East. My 25 foot dug well has been providing us with an abundance of clean pure water since the 1960's. The amount and quality in this aquifer is now being jeopardized. The surface of the earth has been removed as much as 20 feet in places. This twenty five hectare plot behind my home once owned by Lockmaple? developments will soon be covered with concrete and pavement. The creek will become part of a man made tunneling system running under many homes and streets slated for development as so called storm water management.</p>	The draft new Official Plan cannot be implemented until after approval is given by City Council and then by the Province. At this point, policies in the draft new Official Plan do not apply to current developments; however, they will apply to new developments into the future.
969, 979, 989 Maplevue Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	3	3.2.3	It is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document. For example, all development (including applications for minor variances) shall demonstrate i) passive energy design strategies, iii) use of environmentally preferable products, iv) enhancement of environmental quality, and vii) resource conservation through operational and maintenance practices, among others. It is requested that these policies be removed.	Revision to 3.2.3.a): "To support the City's sustainable design priorities, all development applications shall demonstrate how the City's sustainable design priorities are being <u>addressed</u> , including through:"
PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.3	it is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document for example, all development (which would include, for example, minor variances shall demonstrate passive design strategies, use of environmentally preferable products, enhancement of environmental quality, and optimization of operational and maintenance practices, among others.	Revision to 3.2.3.a): "To support the City's sustainable design priorities, all development applications shall demonstrate how the City's sustainable design priorities are being <u>addressed</u> , including through:"

PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.3.1	A Sustainable Development Report is a new requirement for specific development applications. For a development application to demonstrate conformity to the Official Plan, it is unknown how these policies are to be addressed and their appropriateness in a land use planning document is questioned.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) will be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	3	3.2.3.1	It is requested that policy 3.2.3.1 be removed. Several of the criteria are not land use related (e.g. demonstrating enhanced indoor air quality and use of various building products) and some can be provided for in the Urban Design Guidelines, such as the provision of permeable pavers and drought resistant landscaping.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) should be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.
Kelly Patterson McGrath		3	3.2.3.1	GREEN CITY needs to be the overall driving force behind this plan, Barrie needs to be seen as the leader in sustainable development, caring for it's community in a healthy way that takes care of our beautiful Lake Simcoe, greenspace and attracts businesses and development that embrace that focus. Green Development Standards need to be developed quickly using best practices that already exist. We need to be very clear and firm with new developments that the City will not entertain your development unless basic criteria are met. Look to Passive House Canada. In fact, GREEN STANDARDS need to be the driving force in all areas/departments of the City. Each department could have a very specific and clear matrix that guides purchases, practices (Parks maintenance, transportation usage, idling, roads maintenance, fleet, greenhouse, native species etc.) and these GREEN standards need to be clear and shared with the residents to encourage similar behaviors that enhance and care for our City's greenspace, lands and water.	We agree that Green Standards are very important for new developments, and the green standards within the draft new Official Plan can be found in section 3.2.3.1. We will also be carrying forward green standard recommendations in the City-wide Urban Design Guidelines as well as in other City documents. One of City Council's strategic priorities is to "build a greener Barrie while mitigating and adapting to climate change."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	3	3.2.3.1	Requires a sustainable development report, including an ability to enhance indoor air quality. As noted previously, what is this and why is it required? How is a sustainable report or development for that matter able to enhance indoor air quality? Again, the use of "required" and "shall" make this policy nearly impossible to achieve and again, more flexible language should be utilized.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) should be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.

Karen Buck		3	3.2.3.1	Roofs, on all buildings should be utilized for renewable solar electricity used, first, by the building and any excess energy going to the electricity grid as a new metering contract.	In section 3.2.2.1, the following guidelines are given in relation to new developments: that they shall "incorporate green roofs into building design" (xi) and that they "maximize solar gains and be constructed in a manner that facilitates future solar energy installations" (ii)
LSRCA		3	3.2.3.1	Green Development Standards should also include the requirement for Low Impact Development as well as maximizing the use of native plants for landscaping, to the greatest extent possible. Suggested wording: m) Incorporate low impact development; and, n) Maximize the use native plant material in landscape design.	Policy 3.2.3.1.viii) already references the use of native plants in landscaping The following change will be made to Policy 3.2.3.1.x: "incorporate low-impact development and maximize permeable surfaces, including the provision of permeable driveways"
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.2.3.1.a	This comment was not addressed in our previous submission. What qualifications would the reviewers of the Sustainability Development Report hold and how much influence will they have to alter proposals? The green standards being developed should focus on those already successfully implemented by the industry rather than a Council or staff directive with no expertise. Is the City willing to have flat roofs facing south onto main roads to maximize solar? Passive housing designs can be encouraged with advanced building technologies have unintended consequences. For example, do staff have a level of knowledge to ensure that increased sunlight will not overheat residents, as this approach has been shown to be erroneous in many jurisdictions across Canada, despite good intentions of Passive Haus certifications. Rapidly changing technology and building science should not be captured in an Official Plan document.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) will be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.3.1a)	<p>Green Development Standards. It is not appropriate to require a review of many of the items listed (i.e., air quality) when dealing with applications for OPA and ZBLA. Accordingly, the Sustainable Development Report, if it must be provided, should only be provided for Site Plan applications.</p> <p>Please consider the objective of this policy. The Landowners feel that it is inappropriate to require every new development to provide a Sustainable Development Report and instead, ask that you consider changing the policy to state that the Planning or Urban Design Report in support of an application will contain a section detailing sustainability in consideration of the items stated in i-ix), where appropriate and applicable. Please consider that the word 'shall' does not provide suitable Official Plan flexibility to deal with the range and scale of development applications. Not every application will achieve policies i)-xii).</p> <p>We fail to understand how you expect these features to be considered as part of most OPA/ZBLA applications or how providing/not these measures will be evaluated by staff.</p>	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) will be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.3.a	Policy 3.2.3.a) states that "All development applications received by the City shall demonstrate how the City's sustainable design priorities are achieved" and provides a range of priorities. In our submission flexibility should be provided, since demonstrating the achievement of the priorities may not be applicable or appropriate for all development applications.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) will be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.
LSRCA		3	3.2.3.v	It's not clear what is meant by "enhancement environmental quality". Enhancement of the natural environment?	3.2.3.v can be changed to "enhancement of the natural environment"
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.3a)	This policy states that all development application must demonstrate how the City will achieve sustainable design priorities. Request that the prescriptive language "shall" be replaced with "area encouraged". There is no practical way that most typical development applications can demonstrate the use of environmentally sensitive products or adapting to Barrie's seasonal changes. Please explain how every development application is supposed to respond to this policy?	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) will be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.

LSRCA		3	3.2.4.1	Part of creating a connected and vibrant public realm involves building community appreciation for these spaces. The City should consider committing to providing educational resources, such as nature interpretation. Suggested wording: To design and develop a connected and vibrant public realm, the City will: i) create resources, such as interpretive signage, to better connect residents with natural spaces and build communal appreciation for these natural assets.	The Official Plan offers a broader land-use vision for the city; however, the City would be open to considering through other means.
LSRCA		3	3.2.4.1.viii	Consider revising this statement to be more in-line with ecological terms and language. Suggested wording: h) Encourage sustainable development practices and enhancement or restoration of degraded natural heritage features (e.g. sustainable forest management, etc.)	Policy 3.2.4.1.viii will be changed to address this.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.4.5.b)	Private streets shall be designed similar to public streets. The Landowners request that this policy be revised to maintain the intent (i.e. allow for pedestrian circulation, etc.). This OP policy should not prescribe curb types (inappropriate OP level detail) and it needs to recognize that are narrower and are designed to a different, not similar, design standard.	We have removed the policy asking for private streets designed similarly to public streets. We will provide guidelines/standards for private streets through other means.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.4.5.c	Policy 3.2.4.5c) states that "Internal private streets will be used to divide large sites into a grid of blocks and roadways to facilitate safe pedestrian and vehicular movement and that frame appropriately sized development parcels. Internal private streets will be designed to interconnect with adjacent properties to create an overall cohesive and integrated circulation network wherever possible." In our submission it is not clear as to the applicability of this policy, if the intention is for comprehensive redevelopment, and what may be considered "large sites".	The City of Barrie has guidelines for a maximum block size. Generally, this would apply to any site larger than the maximum block size. We will also be revising the policy to read as follows: " <u>Where appropriate</u> , internal private streets will be used to divide large sites into a grid of blocks and roadways to facilitate safe pedestrian and vehicular movement and that frame appropriately sized development parcels. Internal private streets will be designed to interconnect with adjacent properties to create an overall cohesive and integrated circulation network wherever possible."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.4.6	Requires consolidation of amenity areas. Significant progress and flexibility has been made in Hewitt's/Salem and in Mixed Policy areas in Barrie to recognize that consolidating amenity spaces can negatively impact site design, particularly on smaller parcels. At a minimum, please change the prescriptive text 'shall be' to 'encouraged to be'.	We will be revising the policy as follows: "Amenity areas <u>are strongly encouraged to be</u> consolidated and centrally located, and indoor/outdoor amenity areas should be co-located wherever possible."

Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.4.6.a	Policy 3.3.4.6a) states that "Amenity areas shall be consolidated and centrally located". In our submission, flexibility should be afforded to the policy, such that it may be more appropriate for unconsolidated amenity space, or in a less centralized location due to specific circumstances. We suggest "shall" be replaced with "should".	We will be revising the policy as follows: "Amenity areas <u>are strongly encouraged to be</u> consolidated and centrally located, and indoor/outdoor amenity areas should be co-located wherever possible."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.3.1.b	Policy 3.3.1c) states "Blank facades facing a street, open space or park shall not be permitted". In our submission, flexibility should be afforded to this policy to consider site specific circumstances, and we suggest revised language as follows: "Blank facades facing a street, open space or park shall be discouraged".	Recommended change to Policy 3.3.1.b: "Blank walls facing a street, open space or park <u>shall be strongly discouraged.</u> "
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	3	3.3.1.d	Section 3.3.1.d is in direct conflict with the City's Engineering Standards. In particular, Transportation Planning requires that setbacks to driveways on corner lots be so far away from the intersection that it is not possible to put a ground-related building in close proximity to the intersection. While we support this policy (as-is) in the OP, this needs to be fully communicated and updated in the Engineering Standards.	We support this poicy. Following the approval of the new Official Plan, some City standards will need to be updated.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.1d)	Intersections of major streets shall be emphasized by placing buildings in close proximity to intersections and building entrances are visible from that intersection. This is a notable and agreeable policy; however, in our experience, the City's Transportation Design Manual standards are continually changing, particularly relating to intersections. The most recent example being the requirement for very large setbacks for driveways to ground oriented housing. Discussions with City Engineering are needed to ensure this policy will be properly implemented.	We support this poicy. Following the approval of the new Official Plan, some City standards will need to be updated.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.2.c)	Requires new development to respect and reinforce the scale, massing and setback and orientation in the immediate area. Request the policy be revised to add the words "in older established neighbourhoods in the built-up area". This policy would be inappropriately applied in DGA, MTSA, Intensification Corridors etc.	This policy is for low-residential everywhere. However, we will replace the word "reinforce" with "complement" to allow for greater flexibility. The revised policy 3.3.2.c. should then read: "In Neighbourhood Areas where new Detached Houses, Semi-Detached Houses, and Townhouses are proposed, they shall respect and <u>complement</u> the scale, massing, setback and orientation of other built and approved houses of the same type in the immediate area and shall be consistent with the other policies in this Plan."

Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3.2.d.	<p>d) Where a Townhouse end unit does not front a public street but flanks a public street, the flanking unit(s) shall provide a front-yard and front-door pedestrian entrance facing the public street.</p> <p>Comment: We do not agree that this should be a mandatory requirement. Enhanced architectural elements can be recommended along flanking units. Front Door Entrances for townhouse units that are 4.5 metres in width is impossible to achieve on the flanking frontage.</p>	Revised policy wording: "Where a Townhouse end unit does not front a public street but flanks a public street, the flanking unit(s) <u>should</u> provide a front-yard and front-door pedestrian entrance facing the public street."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	3	3.3.2.e)	Requires stacked townhouses to be designed to resemble a traditional street townhouse. The Salem Landowners request this policy be amended as stacked townhouses by their very nature of completely different than a traditional townhouse dwelling.	The policy is that stacked townhouses shall "generally resemble" a traditional street townhouse. We believe that this allows a significant amount of flexibility, while reinforcing that there should be some resemblance in design, whether one considers a modern or traditional looking townhouse.
377 Big Bay Point Rd	Brandi Clement / Jones Consulting	3	3.3.2.f	<p>Our client, Big Bay 4 Inc., is in the process of developing the lands known municipally as 377 Big Bay Point Road with upwards of 29 Townhouses. Formal applications for a Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Condominium have not been submitted as of yet but are expected to be submitted to the City in the summer of 2021. The 2nd Draft of the Official Plan designates the subject lands as Neighbourhood Area. Based on these policies, the proposed use is permitted; however, the density of the proposed townhouse development does not meet the minimum density standard of 60.0 units per hectare considering the lands front onto Big Bay Point Road, an arterial road. The proposed development does not propose a rear yard setback of 7.5 metres as the infill site is constrained by the shape and topography of the lot. We agree with the softened language in the 2nd Official Plan Draft which notes 'should be' rather than 'shall be' as long as this is considered to be less restrictive language meaning that if for various reasons a property cannot achieve this density then an Official Plan Amendment is not required. Further, in our opinion the Official Plan should not have prescriptive language requiring a particular setback distance. We would request that the City have language suggesting how to provide appropriate buffers between new and existing development but that language identifying exact distances be excluded.</p>	Policy 3.3.2(f) will be changed to: "To provide appropriate privacy and daylight/sunlight conditions for any adjacent lower scale housing forms, Low-Rise Buildings on a lot that abuts the rear yards of a lot with a Detached House, Semi-Detached house or Townhouse <u>should generally</u> be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from the property line and shall be designed with the appropriate transitions to consider a high quality of urban design per the policies of Section 3.2 of this Plan and the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines." It should also be noted that existing approvals will be upheld and that a new transition policy explicitly states this.

Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3.2.f	Low-Rise Buildings on a lot that abuts the rear yards of a lot with a Detached House, Semi-Detached House or Townhouse shall generally be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from the property line and shall be designed with the appropriate transitions to consider a high quality of urban design per the policies of Section 3.2 of this Plan and the City-wide Urban Design Guidelines. Comment: While this policy provides a specific setback requirement, which is often more suited for a Zoning By-law, we interpret this policy to have flexibility with the minimum setback as the word “generally” has been used and the policy reinforces design that provides for an appropriate transition with high quality urban design. Based this, if appropriate the rear yard setback could be less than 7.5m.	This is correct.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.2.l)	Generally, incorporate rear lanes along arterial and mixed use areas. Request that this policy be removed as there are numerous design treatments/options for development, with rear lanes being only one suitable option.	Suggested revised policy 3.3.2.i, to incorporate further flexibility: "Rear lane development is generally encouraged. On narrow lots and particularly along arterials and within intensification and mixed-use areas, rear lanes can help create attractive streetscapes and minimize the impact of driveways on pedestrian circulation and the public realm."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.2f)	Requires development be setback 7.5m from a property line. The Landowners request that the setback be removed from the OP. This is another example of overly prescriptive policy. Barrie's Zoning By-law has not required a 7m (not 7.5m) rear yard setback going back at least to 1985, and more current standards in place in Hewitt's permit a 5m rear yard setback. Policy 1.1.3.4 of the PPS states that appropriate development standards should be promoted which facilitate intensification and redevelopment and compact form.	Policy 3.3.2(f) will be changed to: "To provide appropriate privacy and daylight/sunlight conditions for any adjacent lower scale housing forms, Low-Rise Buildings on a lot that abuts the rear yards of a lot with a Detached House, Semi-Detached house or Townhouse should generally be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from the property line and shall be designed with the appropriate transitions to consider a high quality of urban design per the policies of Section 3.2 of this Plan and the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines."
Gary Bell		3	3.3.3	The question that needs attention is “Where are Mid-Rise Buildings and High- Rise Buildings expected or permitted?” Are there locational criteria in The Plan for these forms of development or re-development?	The heights of buildings correspond with and are dictated by the Land Use Designations. Permissions and expectations aligns with Map 2.
LSRCA		3	3.3.3	It's recommended that a policy be included that requires development of all greenfield areas be designed in a way that provides residents access to parks, open spaces or natural areas within a reasonable walking distance. i.e. 500 m. The City should also strive to meet this objective in already built areas or areas proposed for redevelopment.	Section 3.3.3. is now about Mid-Rise Buildings; however, the Parks Master Plan governs the greenfield areas in relation to parks. Moreover, section 3.2.2 “Complete Neighbourhood Design” speaks to the importance of connectivity to parks and open spaces.

800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	3	3.3.3.c	We request that the 45 degree angular plane requirement of "Medium Density" transitional policies be removed from the New OP as it too is overly prescriptive for an official plan. There may be instances where a good design can be achieved, but slavish adherence to an abstract angular plane cannot. In such instances, amendment to the OP would be required to allow a design to proceed. As with tower setback provisions, angular plane provisions are better suited to urban design guideline documents which permit a reasonable degree of flexibility.	The intent behind this policy is to uphold an industry standard; it is mostly applicable to infill situations, where having proper transitions is of the utmost importance, to ensure that the development functions well in the context of adjacent properties.
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3.3.h	The rooftop of Mid-Rise Buildings should include landscaped green space, private outdoor amenity space, or environmental sustainability features such as solar panels. Comment: This level of commitment for a developer to achieve is too restrictive and must include some flexibility in building design and construction.	Flexibility in the policy is maintained through the use of the verb "should include" over "shall include."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.3.h)	States that the rooftop of mid-rise building should include landscape green space, private outdoor amenity, or environmental sustainability features. The Landowners request that this policy be revised to state that the City encourages these design features.	The use of "should" over "shall" in this policy maintains flexibility, should there be a reason for not incorporating these elements.
Al McNair		3	3.3.3; 3.3.4	These definitions of building forms should be included in the definitions section of the OP, if they are to be used in this document.	These buildings are delimited by height; therefore, the preface for each section provides a definition.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.3b)i)	Requires the podium on mid-rise buildings to be 3-6 storeys in height. Please explain why a 1 or 2 storey podium is inappropriate?	The base is required to be 3 to 6 storeys in height, while elements above the base would be setback. The ratio of the base height to what's above the base is intended to reduce shadow and wind impacts and to complement the streetscape. At the same time, 3.3.b.i. suggests the base "shall <u>generally</u> be between three and six storeys"; the incorporation of the qualifier "generally" means that, given the appropriate context, an application of a building with a one-to-two storey base could be considered.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.3c)	Buildings should generally be setback 7.5m from the property line. Please provide the rationale for this detailed policy. In many examples in Barrie mid-rise buildings have been constructed 5 metres from the property line.	The use of the word "generally" incorporates flexibility. Policy 3.3.3.c. is: "In order to provide appropriate transitions between buildings of varying heights and privacy and daylight/sunlight conditions for any adjacent lower scale buildings, Mid-Rise Buildings on a lot that abuts the rear yards of a lot with a Low-Rise Residential building shall generally be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres..." This is a common Official Plan policy, and appears, for instance, in Vaughan's Official Plan.

PBM Realty Holdings / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4	High Rise Buildings, we have concerns with the prescriptive nature of many of the specific urban design criteria presented and proposed to be enshrined as OP policy rather than incorporated within the City's forthcoming Draft Urban Design Guidelines and Zoning By-law.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. The criteria incorporated into Section 3.3.4 of the Official Plan have continued to be included due to their importance in achieving the type of city that stakeholders have expressed they would like Barrie to become. The new City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines will provide greater built form guidance and is designed to work in collaboration with the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law.
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4	Section 3.3.4 - High Rise buildings (change to read) (a)(ii)(d) Any tower, including its balconies, should be setback from the podium by a minimum of 3.0 metres along all public street frontages to ensure an appropriate human-scaled pedestrian environment and mitigate wind impacts at street level; (a)(ii)(f) Where more than one High-Rise Building is located on the same lot, the distance between the towers at the twelfth storey and above shall be at least 25.0 metres, (a)(ii)(c) The tower of a High-Rise Building should be setback a minimum of 12.5 metres from: (1) the side property line; (2) the rear property line, and; (3) the centre line of an abutting right-of-way.	As highlighted in policy 3.1.3.1.a: "Many of the Urban Design Standards are phrased with the terms "will" or "shall," or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies provided in Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4." These policies will remain "shall" and "will" for a variety of reasons and are consistent or compare with many other Official Plans. However, we will be expanding policy 3.3.4.a.ii.c. to allow for the reduction of setbacks when a lot of adjacent to a natural area, a highway or another use where it may be appropriate to have the building closer to the rear lot line.
LSRCA		3	3.3.4.5	The City should commit to providing educational resources to the community in the form of interpretive signage. Consider including an additional policy in this section that speaks to this. Suggested wording: b) The City is committed to providing residents with opportunities for meaningful connections to public spaces and will provide interpretive signage along trails and in parks with information on the cultural and natural heritage in the area.	The Official Plan offers a broader land-use vision for the city; however, the City would be open to considering this through other means.
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4.a.ii.c	This should be written to generally apply, some sites may be appropriate for a reduced rear yard setback such as if a site backs onto a natural area, highway or other use where it is appropriate to site the building closer to the rear lot line. this should be a general policy and if it cannot be achieved other provisions to apply a buffer/transition can be applied.	Recommended change: expand policy 3.3.4.a.ii.c. to allow for the reduction of setbacks when a lot of adjacent to a natural area, a highway or another use where it may be appropriate to have the building closer to the rear lot line.

10-24 Grove Street	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4.a.ii.g	In order to provide appropriate transitions, towers <u>should generally</u> be setback at least 70.0 metres from low rise residential built form on lands designated Neighbourhood Areas on Map 2; however, this does not apply to those towers located within the Urban Growth Centre which will be instead be setback at least 30.0 metres.	A policy definitively regulating setbacks from residential built form is appropriate, and in part responds to resident concerns heard during the engagement phase.
Artenosi Developments Group: 284 + 286 Dunlop & 119 + 121 Henry St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4.a.ii.g	this should be a general policy and if it cannot be achieved other provisions to apply a buffer/transition can be applied.	A policy definitively regulating setbacks from residential built form is appropriate, and in part responds to resident concerns heard during the engagement phase.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.3.4.a.ii.i	Policy 3.3.4.a)ii) states that “where multiple towers are proposed on the same site, tower heights shall be staggered by a minimum of five storeys...” In our submission, this policy is overly prescriptive and may result in limitations to appropriate levels of intensification, or not permit good design. We suggest revised language as follows: “Development should be designed in a manner so as to provide variation in building mass, including but not limited to staggering of building heights where appropriate”.	Recommended policy change for 3.3.4.a.ii.i: “where multiple towers are proposed on the same site, tower heights <u>should generally</u> be staggered by a minimum of five storeys...”
10-24 Grove Street West	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4.a.ii.i	this should be removed or be a general policy, no need to provide a minimum of 5 storeys of separation between every tower. Visual interest can be provided for in other ways.	Recommended policy change for 3.3.4.a.ii.i: “where multiple towers are proposed on the same site, tower heights <u>should generally</u> be staggered by a minimum of five storeys...”
17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3.4.ii.c	For example, Policy 3.3.4.ii.c. states that “The tower will be setback a minimum of 15.0 metres from: (1) the side property line; (2) the rear property line, and; (3) the centre line of an abutting right-of-way;”. This policy will restrict potential development opportunities within the City where a site may be appropriate for tower placement however the site constraints are such that a tower does not meet one of the setback criteria triggering an OPA. It is reasonable for a development to proceed with a tower that is sited closer to a property line without an OPA where it is demonstratable that the impacts of a reduced tower setback are mitigated (such as along a rail corridor or highway).	As highlighted in policy 3.1.3.1.a: “Many of the Urban Design Standards are phrased with the terms “will” or “shall,” or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies provided in Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4.” These policies will remain “shall” and “will” for a variety of reasons and are consistent or compare with many other Official Plans. However, we will be expanding policy 3.3.4.a.ii.c. to allow for the reduction of setbacks when a lot of adjacent to a natural area, a highway or another use where it may be appropriate to have the building closer to the lot line.

Park Place	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3.4.ii.f	<p>High-Rise Buildings</p> <p>Where more than one High-Rise Building is located on the same lot, the distance between the towers at the twelfth storey and above shall be at least 30.0 metres...</p> <p>From our recent experience in designing and developing multi tower sites we suggest that the minimum distance between towers should be 25m. This requirement is in place within several large urban centres throughout the Golden Greater Horseshoe and creates a desirable built form. We would also request consideration within the Plan that any deviation from these requirements could be supported by an in depth Urban Design Study.</p>	We feel that 30 metres distance is appropriate; for instance, the distance between towers in Toronto is required to be 25 metres ... as our urban scale is more moderate, we feel that having 5 metres more between towers is appropriate.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	3	3.3.4.ii.g	<p>It is requested that High-Rise Building policy 3.3.4(ii)(g) dealing with minimum setbacks of towers from "Neighbourhood Areas" be removed as this design parameter is not appropriate for an official plan. Rather, this type of language is best incorporated into urban design guidelines. We recommend that any required setback for towers in MTSA's, SGA's or Intensification Corridors be the same as apply to towers in the Urban Growth Centres, being suggested 30 metres or less dependent on other design parameters as may be specified in the urban design guidelines and in context with local site conditions.</p>	The policy has been changed to: "In order to provide appropriate transitions, towers will be setback at least 70.0 metres from low rise residential built form on lands designated Neighbourhood Areas on Map 2; however, for towers located within the Urban Growth Centre or a Major Transit Station Area, an appropriate reduction to the minimum setback from low rise residential may be considered." As high-rises are essentially only permitted in MTSA's, SGAs and the UGC, allowing lower permissions for everything would stray to far from intent. This will be further regulated through the Zoning By-law.
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.3.5	<p>Policy 3.3.5 states "The following urban design standards apply to Single Storey Employment Buildings: a) Single Storey Employment Buildings are those buildings exclusively located within Employment Areas and are generally low-rise in form, including but not limited to warehouses, distribution centres, and manufacturing or assembly facilities." With the permissions for major retail in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, clarity should be provided that the Policies are not applicable to Major Retail uses.</p>	Policy will be revised to read: "While Employment Areas may see a range of building types, single storey Employment Buildings are those buildings exclusively located within Employment Areas and are generally low-rise in form, including but not limited to warehouses, distribution centres, and manufacturing or assembly facilities."
LSRCA		3	3.3.5.2.1.b.vii	<p>Please consider the inclusion of direction pertaining to SWM storage facilities beneath park space (i.e. tanks under soccer fields)</p>	The Official Plan offers a broader land-use vision for the city; however, the City would be open to considering this through other means.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.3.6.b	<p>Policy 3.3.6b) would require retail uses to provide a variety of building heights as part of the same building. In our submission, this policy provides an inappropriate standard for building design that would promote inefficient standards for development. We suggest that this draft policy be better suited as an urban design guidelines, or that revised wording be considered which allows for flexibility.</p>	Suggested revised wording for 3.3.6.b.ii: "For major retail development as a grouping of multiple stores, the individual stores shall create visual interest and avoid monotony through variation in built form. For instance, individual stores should vary in height and roofline, and different stores should have exterior materials indicative of the store/merchant/tenant."

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.4h)	Pervious surfaces in surface parking lots to the "greatest extent possible. Please replace the word "shall" with "encouraged to". Also, the words 'greatest extent possible' are inappropriate. Who decides what is possible and using what criteria?	Suggested revised wording: "Where possible, surface parking lots shall incorporate the use of pervious surfaces."
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	4	4.7	The Parking solutions identified in Section 4.7 identify that as a minimum, request for a reduction in parking spaces will be in accordance with the City's Cash-in-lieu of Parking Bylaw. It is difficult to find this Bylaw on the City Website. The policies regarding parking should explain the Cash-in-Lieu of Parking Bylaw or identify a link that can be used to view the Bylaw.	The Official Plan, at this time, is not a document designed to hyperlink to other documents. At the same time, we will review the location of the Cash-in-Lieu Parking By-law on the City website to make sure that it is easily accessible.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	4	4.0 and throughout	The Polices of Section 4 and other polices throughout the plan establish a clear direction to implement Complete Streets. The achievement of complete streets, in our view, must be balanced and flexible to respond the local and planned urban contexts. To that end, we encourage the City to make use of positive city-building policies, particularly the policies in section 4.0, which aim to "transform how people move around and through Barrie". Further, we strongly encourage the City to explore integrating the numerous policies that promote Complete Streets, resulting in new language that allows for right-of-way widths to be reduced in urban contexts. For example, Policy 4.2 (b) requires streets in Barrie to be designed as "Complete Streets" to provide for all modes of travel including pedestrian zones, cycling zones, and vehicular zones. For sites located within an Urban Growth Centre, we strongly feel we can meet these objectives within reduced right-of-ways, as demonstrated in other municipalities.	Policy 4.2.b. states that "streetscapes shall be designed to <u>generally</u> consider the following complete street zones as per Figure 3 below." The word "generally" maintains flexibility, allowing for some variance according to urban context when justified. Please also note policy 4.2.3.1.I: "Consider, in certain cases, a reduced setback width, or reduced street pavement where a reduced setback width is not possible, for streets that are part of the complete street network, in order to facilitate wider sidewalks, the addition of cycling lanes, transit priority lanes and/or other geographic needs."

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	4	4.1.1.e	In general terms, the underlying principle of the Mobility policies is to promote a reduced dependency upon automobiles through the establishment of a comprehensive mobility network which places emphasis upon both public transit and active modes of transportation, namely walking and cycling. Section 4.1.1 (d) states that the intent is to achieve a modal split of 12 percent as of 2041 . Clarification is sought as to how this metric is to be measured relative to other modes of transportation. Is it the intent of the Plan that other modes of transportation, namely transit and active modes, will represent the balance, some 88 percent, of movements within the City of Barrie?	This policy will be taken out as it is confusing and also implicit in policies prioritizing active transportation. Further direction will come from the Transportation Master Plan.
Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	4	4.1.1.i	Throughout Part Four of the draft Plan, reference is made to development of an ACES mobility network. It is respectfully submitted that, to afford readers an improved understanding of the intent of the policy statement in question, the initial reference, specifically in Section 4.1.1 (i), should be to the creation of an Automated Connected Electronic Shared mobility network if, in fact, that is what is intended by the policy statement in question. It would also be of benefit to the reader if some form of guidance could be provided as to the means by which this objective will be achieved, for example by means of the introduction of car pooling and ride share facilities. This would avoid the need for the reader to refer to the Transportation Master Plan as inferred by the introductory statements provided in Section 4.1.	Agree that the acronym should be spelled out on first reference (Autonomous, Connected, Electric, Shared). As this is an objective, not a policy, it is more stating the City's intent to advance in this direction. Preparing for autonomous vehicles is an endeavour that will take place through much more planning, and as policies are adopted, these will be shared and communicated publicly. I should also note the addition of policy 3.4.i: "To prepare for the widespread use of electric vehicles, the City will investigate and plan for the installation of Level II EV charging stations at parking stalls across the city, including for residential, commercial and industrial buildings."
Karen Buck		4	4.2.1	I am very supportive of "Complete Streets" that would be accomplished by new and complete networks for active transportation. The new networks would have to be built with an emphasis on "safety" through separation from car traffic to really engage the public to leave their cars at home and ride or walk to work year round.	This section has been revised to read: "The concept of complete streets is a transportation and design philosophy that requires streets to be planned, designed, operated and maintained to enable safe, convenient and comfortable travel and access for all users and abilities regardless of their mode of transportation." Safety for cyclists therefore will be encouraged and ways of further providing this safety will be investigated. Other policies in this chapter additionally speak to designing, where feasible, separate bike lanes.
LSRCA		4	4.2.1	The use of Low Impact Design should be included with the design principles for the mobility network. Suggested wording: f) Incorporate Low Impact Design elements into the road right of way, wherever feasible.	This policy has been added to section 4.2.3.1 (policy O).

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	4	4.2.1.a) v)	Requires avoiding the use of window streets. Why are window streets to be avoided? Engineering standards will preclude multiple connection points to collector or arterial roads which is where this condition is typically utilized. This means you are looking for reverse frontage, through lot or flankage conditions, which are not desirable. This policy should not be included in the Official Plan.	We believe that functional design is possible without the implementation of window streets. At the same time, we will revise policy 4.2.1.a.v. to read: "avoid, <u>where possible</u> , cul-de-sacs and window streets."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.2.1a)ii)&iii)	80-100m block depth. The Landowners feel that artificially restricting block depth 80-100m will unnecessarily reduce development opportunities in the Secondary Plan area. 150 metres is more appropriate. Please consider removing the 80-100m depth requirement in its entirety, or at least move it to the Urban Design Guidelines document.	The use of "generally ensure" at the beginning of the policy allows for some variability. If you want to vary from the suggested length and depth for streets and blocks, then you will need to demonstrate how the variance still meets the objectives of walkability.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.2.1a)v)	Avoid 'window streets'. Window streets have been an acceptable design option throughout the design of Hewitt's/Salem. Please explain why this is to be avoided. The Landowners request that the words "Window Streets" be removed from this policy.	We believe that functional design is possible without the implementation of window streets. At the same time, we will revise policy 4.2.1.a.v. to read: "avoid, <u>where possible</u> , cul-de-sacs and window streets."
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	4	4.2.3.1	Numerous policies within the OP are very detailed and prescriptive (e.g. 4.2.3.1 identifies details like minimum street tree planting distances, or the number of houses on a street before dual sidewalks are required). This level of detail is not appropriate at the OP level and should be directed towards the City's engineering standards and/or zoning by-law. Implementation is an issue as an OPA would be required if the standard could not be achieved, regardless of how minor the deviation may be.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. The criteria incorporated into Section 4.2.3.1 of the Official Plan have continued to be included due to their importance in achieving the type of city that stakeholders have expressed they would like Barrie to become. Our intent has been to design them to work in coordination with the Zoning By-law and the City's engineering standards. Staff have also reviewed these policies, and in some cases made changes to incorporate greater flexibility and to ensure appropriateness.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.2.3.1.b)	<p>Requires sidewalks on 2 sides of the street in most areas. This matter was discussed at length during the preparation of the Hewitt's/Salem Secondary Plans and Council established policies in those Plans that detail the dual sidewalk requirement.</p> <p>The decision on dual sidewalk requirements are reviewed during the Conformity Submission where dual/single sidewalk streets are illustrated on the Pedestrian Circulation Plan. The Landowners request that the current process continue and that the words "generally be" at the beginning of this policy.</p> <p>It is important to avoid a policy interpretation that would result in dual sidewalks on most local streets, as this would require large budget increases to the City for snow clearing/maintenance, and asset management (replacement). Adding dual sidewalks on most local streets also reduces off-street parking, creates additional servicing/utility conflicts, and significantly adds significant hard surfaces/runoff from an environmental and stormwater management perspective.</p>	<p>Suggested revision: 4.2.3.1.b) shall read: "Provide sidewalks on both sides of all collectors and arterial roads, and in some cases local streets, as per the in-effect Transportation Demand Management plan or future City standards." The revision to the policy provides more flexibility, and should address the concern stated.</p>
LSRCA		4	4.2.3.1.b.ii	<p>The amount of compaction required to facilitate sidewalks has a negative impact on street trees and their ability to establish and reach maturity. Maintaining sidewalks is also costly for the City (i.e. snow clearing, repairs, etc.). Consider opportunities to reduce the amount of sidewalk in residential areas.</p> <p>Suggested wording: b) ii) Residential streets with less than 50 dwelling units along the entire length of street or for streets that terminate in a dead-end.</p>	<p>The guidelines regarding sidewalks follow City standards. If/when we update City standards for sidewalks, this will be a consideration.</p>
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	4	4.2.3.2	<p>Requires private roads to have the same standard as a public road. As noted previously, this defeats the purpose of having condominium tenure. The Salem Landowners request this policy be removed. If the issue is related to a homeowner not understanding the difference between a condo road and a public road, we suggest that a home buyers map would help to educate the purchaser on the differences.</p>	<p>We have removed the policy asking for private streets to be designed similarly to public streets. We will provide guidelines/standards for private streets through other means.</p>

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.2.3.2a)	Private condo streets will generally incorporate the same standards as public streets. The Landowners request that this policy be removed because it is unreasonable to require private roads to be developed to the same standard as public roads. This policy will lead to less efficient design, and worse, to the complete elimination of condominium roads. We understand that this policy was developed in response to complaints from condominium homeowners. Please consider alternative responses such as requiring the preparation of a 'Condominium Information Map' that educates condo buyers. This would be similar to the 'Community Information Map' prepared for each subdivision to education purchasers.	We have removed the policy asking for private streets to be designed similarly to public streets. We will provide guidelines/standards for private streets through other means.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	4	4.3.1.2	Sets out a number of standards for arterial roads. As noted above, this policy will seek to restrict access which will limit the ability to create a flankage situation thereby requiring either through lots or reverse frontage (also discouraged).	Section 4.3.1.2 has been clarified and updated. We seek to restrict access to arterial roads for a number of reasons; the preference for residential along an arterial is to have side yard frontage or direct frontage with rear access.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	4	4.3.1.2.q.vii	Policy No. 4.3.1.2 (vii) states "If the City has identified a street a part of the complete street network, reconfiguration resulting in a reduced street pavement width (to facilitate wider sidewalks and/or the addition of cycling lanes and/or transit priority lanes) may be explored with the City's Engineering Department.". We request that the City expand and prioritize this policy, emphasizing that in Urban Growth Centres, a smaller right-of-way width should be a priority in design and implementation of Complete Streets. We encourage the City to explore best practices in other municipalities, which include portions of the pedestrian clearways being provided on private property, seamlessly incorporated within a redevelopment of a site.	This policy has been updated to account for variances that may be needed in certain contexts. Please see policy 4.2.3.1.i.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	4	4.3.1.3	Speaks to collector roads. Same comment as above.	These policies have been clarified and updated. We seek to restrict access to collector's roads for a number of reasons, but the restrictions are reduced in comparison with what's required for Arterial Streets.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.3d) & e)	Requires development to have direct street frontage, and only where this is not feasible, that side yards can face a street. 1) Policies d) and e) have duplicate elements. 2) Please clarify the 'feasibility' criteria? 3) The intention of this policy is not clear as it would appear to require more driveways (rather than side lots) on a collector road which is contrary to the direction provided by the City's traffic Department. 4) This policy would also reduce lotting efficiency. 5) The Landowners request removal of these two policies.	These policies been clarified and updated and the duplicative elements removed.

Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	4	4.3.1.4.d	Section 4.3.1.4.d requires that sidewalks in certain areas be “substantially widened beyond the City standard”. This is very open ended and may not be suitable in all locations, e.g. sidewalks in front of ground-related housing in Neighbourhood Areas within the MTSA. This policy should be revised to speak to the potential need for wider sidewalks in this area, and rely on updated City standards that provide an acceptable range of widths to be used based on the circumstance. And perhaps this is more appropriate to be included in Urban Design Guidelines.	Suggested revision to policy: “Where <u>appropriate</u> , sidewalks on Local Streets shall be substantially widened beyond the City standard in Strategic Growth Areas, the Urban Growth Centre, Major Transit Station Areas, and around transit stops.”
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.4a)i)	Require grid street patterns while recognizing constraints. The Landowners request that the word ‘grid’ be replaced with ‘modified grid’ which is appropriate and consistent with the policies in the Hewitt’s and Salem Secondary Plans.	Suggested revision to policy: “Be oriented in a grid or modified grid, while accounting for topographical constraints, the desire for solar orientation or other special considerations including but not limited to connections to adjoining subdivisions.”
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.4d)	Local street sidewalks shall be substantially widened beyond City standard in SGA’s, UGC, MTSA’s and around transit stops. The Landowners request that this policy be removed because there is no apparent flexibility (hence the language ‘shall be’) and there are local street locations where widened sidewalks would be unnecessary and would not meaningfully enhance pedestrian movement (i.e. local ground related housing within Neighbourhood Areas that are within an MTSA). If this policy remains, the words “shall be” should be changed to “may be” and the criteria for considering same should be included.	Suggested revision to policy: “Where <u>appropriate</u> , sidewalks on Local Streets shall be substantially widened beyond the City standard in Strategic Growth Areas, the Urban Growth Centre, Major Transit Station Areas, and around transit stops.”
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.5	Laneway policies. The Landowners request that the word ‘Public or Private’ be placed in front of “Laneway” and rewritten to include public laneway policies. The cross section in this section should match the public laneway standards developed and approved for use in Hewitt’s and Salem. The Landowners object to any laneway policy (private or public) that requires dual sidewalks as illustrated in Figure 8.	The laneway image has been removed to avoid interpretation that a laneway must have dual sidewalks. The aim of this section is to set out the intent for laneways overall, though we have aimed for greater flexibility where appropriate. The preference is to have these policies lay out the vision for both public or private laneways.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.5	Figure 7 Laneway Streetscape. Request that the Laneway figure be revised to show one, not two, pedestrian zones. Dual pedestrian sidewalks are unnecessary in private developments, increase condominium maintenance fees, and reduce design efficiency.	The laneway image has been removed to avoid interpretation that a laneway must have dual sidewalks

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	4	4.3.1.6.3.h	requires cycling storage lockers, racks, shower facilities, and repair apparatus in mixed-use buildings, residential apartment buildings, institutional, and office buildings. It is submitted that a land use plan should not be dictating uses interior to a building.	Cycling storage does impact land use; just as parking does. At the same time, the policy will be revised to be clearer and more flexible, with more specific language being reserved for the Zoning By-law. Suggested policy revision: "Through bicycle parking and facilities standards within the Zoning By-law, the City will require proponents to plan and provide cycling facilities for mixed-use buildings, residential apartment buildings, institutional use buildings and office buildings."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.6.3h)	Requires cycling facilities such as lockers, shower facilities and tire repair apparatus in mixed use buildings, residential apartments, etc. These matters can be encouraged; however, please advise what section of the Planning Act you are relying on to require internal uses within a building.	Cycling storage does impact land use; just as parking does. At the same time, the policy will be revised to be clearer and more flexible, with more specific language being reserved for the Zoning By-law. Suggested policy revision: "Through bicycle parking and facilities standards within the Zoning By-law, the City will require proponents to plan and provide cycling facilities for mixed-use buildings, residential apartment buildings, institutional use buildings and office buildings."
LSRCA		4	4.3.2.1	To better support the urban forest canopy, a policy should be included that requires street trees for all new streets as well as existing streets. Suggested wording: m) Ensure that street trees are incorporated into the design of any new streets and also planted along existing streets where space allows.	Policy 4.2.3.1.c speaks to providing a "planting and furnishing zone"... this would include the planting of street trees. Moreover, section 6.3.2 is dedicated to Urban Forests, and reinforces the City's commitment to the planting of additional trees. We will also be looking into establishing an urban tree canopy target after the proper study is completed.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	4	4.3.2.c)	Speaks to the street system being coordinated with Block Plan and Plan of Subdivision approvals. Is the City intending to implement a Block Plan process?	The policy in question has now been removed.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	4	4.3.j	As a final comment on Section 4, Policy 4.3(j) states "Approval of new industrial, commercial and institutional development including new educational facilities, or other public service facilities shall be subject to the provision of adequate transportation service for all modes of transportation including public transit, active transportation and automobiles....". We seek clarification how staff will assess 'adequate transportation service', especially for infill development where the roads and surrounding context are already established a may limit opportunities.	Through our Transportation Master Plans, we will continue to address transportation needs as the City grows; therefore, an evaluation will be made of transit needs with intensification and infill in mind.

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	4	4.5.a	Concern is expressed from the perspective of the future use and development of those lands situated adjacent the northerly limits of Dunlop Street, between Highway No. 400 and Anne Street. The concern follows from Section 4.5.1 (a) which states that ... "industrial uses shall be directed to lands adjacent the freight supportive corridors ... ". When one considers the policies applicable to lands designated as a Strategic Growth Area, where intensification of the built form is a key planning principle, relative to the policies applicable to a Strategic Economic and Employment District and those policies applicable to lands adjacent a Freight Supportive Corridor, the future direction for the use of the lands developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza is somewhat ambiguous and leads to a degree of uncertainty. In order to recognize the intent of the policies applicable to the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Growth Area, it is suggested that Section 4.5.1 (a) be modified insofar as is necessary to recognize the use and development of those lands situated adjacent the northerly limits of Dunlop Street, between Highway No. 400 and the intersection of Dunlop Street West and Anne Street, for a range of residential, retail and personal service commercial, and, other non-industrial forms of land use in accordance with the policies applicable to the Strategic Growth Area.	Suggested policy revision: "Industrial uses shall be directed to Employment Area lands adjacent to the freight-supportive corridors to capitalize on the nearby rail lines and terminals and road infrastructure to efficiently move goods over long distances."
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	4	4.6.1.f	The obligation in s. 4.6.1(f) of the New OP, which requires a transportation demand management program for all site plan approval applications for office uses greater than 2000 square metres or buildings with greater than 50 residential units is unduly onerous. This requirement should be removed and transportation planning completed on a scale larger than the individual site.	Policy will be revised to read: "The City will require the preparation and implementation of a transportation demand management program for development applications based on the thresholds identified in the City's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines. The transportation demand management program shall:"
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.6.1f)	Requires a Transportation Demand Management Program for all Site Plan applications consisting of more than 50 units or 2000m2 of office space. 1) This policy would lead to the inappropriate development of hundreds of different Transportation Demand Management Programs. 2) The Landowners request that this policy be removed as it exceeds the statutory authority under Section 41 of the Planning Act.	Policy will be revised to read: "The City will require the preparation and implementation of a transportation demand management program for development applications based on the thresholds identified in the City's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines. The transportation demand management program shall:"

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	4	4.7.d	It is requested that in the suite of City considerations for reducing parking standards, that provision of affordable housing and neighbourhood level commercial be added [4.7 d)].	One of the policies in this section states that "The City may consider reduced parking requirements by ... establishing context-sensitive parking requirements that respond to diverse settings, including but not limited to..." Therefore, this policy would be appropriate for further encouraging the reduction of parking standards for affordable housing. Moreover, policy 6.4.2.e.v. states that "consideration will be given to alternative parking ratios" in affordable housing cases.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		4	4.7.e and f	<p>As currently written, Section 4.7 (e) and (f) requires cash-in-lieu in all circumstances where reduced parking is requested. This could translate as a disincentive to reduce parking, especially where the reduction is appropriate or minor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As such, when a development proposal and a request for a parking reduction is supported by a parking justification study, will the City consider removing the CIL requirement? If not, we do recommend that the City reconsider the language in this policy in order to allow for the review of these reductions on a case-by-case basis, and when findings of technical studies support the request for a parking reduction, that the City move forward without the CIL requirement. • In addition, will CIL be applied to requests for parking reduction on affordable housing projects or municipal projects? 	Suggested policy revision for 4.7.e: "Parking reductions may be permitted in all land use designations, in accordance with the City's Cash-in-Lieu of Parking By-law." If an agreement is made to waive Cash-in-Lieu parking requirements, this would be honoured. It is also recommended that policy 4.7.f begin: "The City reserves the right to require cash-in-lieu of parking ..."
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	4	4.7.e and f	Parking Solutions - Please confirm if a ZBA or MV is achieved for a reduced parking requirement, that the City is in support of cash-in-lieu is not required. It is our understanding cash in lieu of parking is only required where the requested reduction is beyond what the City is willing to support.	Suggested policy revision for 4.7.e: "Parking reductions may be permitted in all land use designations, in accordance with the City's Cash-in-Lieu of Parking By-law." If an agreement is made to waive Cash-in-Lieu parking requirements, this would be honoured. It is also recommended that policy 4.7.f begin: "The City reserves the right to require cash-in-lieu of parking ..."

Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	4	4.7.e and f	<p>Policies 4.7 (e) and (f) appropriately permit parking reductions in all land use designations. This permission, however, is qualified as being in accordance with the City's cash-in-lieu of parking by-law. The same policies also require, at a minimum, that cash-in-lieu of parking be paid where a reduction is sought.</p> <p>While requiring cash-in-lieu of parking is an appropriate tool in specific circumstances, it is not in our view, appropriate to require it in all circumstances and that is not how the City has historically, in practice, applied the cash-in-lieu of parking by-law. It is our understanding that the application of cash-in-lieu of parking is the opposite of what is proposed and only applied occasionally. To do otherwise, will serve as a disincentive to reduce parking, even where it is appropriate and justified by a parking justification report.</p>	<p>Suggested policy revision for 4.7.e: "Parking reductions may be permitted in all land use designations, in accordance with the City's Cash-in-Lieu of Parking By-law." If an agreement is made to waive Cash-in-Lieu parking requirements, this would be honoured. It is also recommended that policy 4.7.f begin: "The City reserves the right to require cash-in-lieu of parking ..."</p>
79 Collier	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	4	4.7.p	<p>confirm this policy would not apply to 79 Collier as the property has been out of City ownership for approximately 5+ years.</p>	<p>This policy only applies to City-owned properties that may be candidates for redevelopment moving forward; if a property has already been sold by the City, the policies would no longer apply.</p>
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.7e)	<p>Requires payment of CL to reduce parking requirements. Request that this policy be limited to the UGC.</p>	<p>Suggested policy revision for 4.7.e: "Parking reductions may be permitted in all land use designations, in accordance with the City's Cash-in-Lieu of Parking By-law."</p>
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	4	general	<p>There are many excellent provisions regarding transportation planning and transit infrastructure. However, similar to concerns with Section 3, many of the requirements may not be practical given the size and urban fabric of Barrie and the City's limited public transit infrastructure. Further, the ongoing maintenance costs must be carefully and comprehensively evaluated, particularly with respect to snow removal requirements/costs.</p>	<p>This feedback is appreciated. At this time, as the comment does not recommend any specific changes to policy, we will simply note that the suggestion has been registered.</p>
LSRCA		5	5.3	<p>This section references the natural heritage system and describes it as being identified as Environmental Protection areas on map 3, but also as identified within the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. It's not clear what's meant by "as identified within the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan", please clarify.</p>	<p>Will be changed to: "The city's Natural Heritage System is comprised of a network of features and areas which are identified as Environmental Protection areas on Map 3 of this Plan, and which receive protection through the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan."</p>
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	5	5.5	<p>As noted previously, the Salem Landowners request that Section 5.5, ecological offsetting policies, be removed from the document. Any required offsetting will be undertaken by the LSRCA and as such, there is not a need for policies related to this in the Official Plan.</p>	<p>We will be keeping the reference to ecological offsetting policies in the Official Plan; at the same time, we will clarify that these are not City of Barrie policies, but that the City supports them as "established thorough local conservation authorities through the development process as part of achieving environmental sustainability."</p>

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	5	5.5	The Hewitt's Landowners request that the ecological offsetting policies found in Section 5.5 be removed from the Official Plan. We understand that these policies were included at the request of the LSRCA. In consideration of the changes through Bill 229 that alters the powers of the Conservation Authority, the Hewitt's Landowners do not feel that an LSRCA offsetting program is appropriate for inclusion in an Official Plan.	We will be keeping the reference to ecological offsetting policies in the Official Plan; at the same time, we will clarify that these are not City of Barrie policies, but that the City supports them as "established through local conservation authorities through the development process as part of achieving environmental sustainability."
LSRCA		5	5.5	This section would benefit from additional details and direction regarding which types, sizes, quality, etc. of features offsetting requirements would apply to. Additional clarification should be provided for where features must be replaced (i.e. elsewhere in the City) and at what ratio (i.e. 2:1 area for woodland, 3:1 area for wetland). Clarification should be provided for whether offsetting applies to the loss of vegetation protection zones and buffers. Clarification should be provided for whether cash-in-lieu would be accepted. If yes, how would this value be determined? Further discussion with LSRCA regarding how the City is envisioning the implementation of policies in this section would be welcome and beneficial to both parties.	We have emphasized in the write-up that these offsetting policies are not ours, but that our role is to uphold and support any offsetting policies by local conservation authorities. Therefore, we would be supportive of whatever offsetting policies and approaches you uphold.
NVCA		5	5.5	Section 5.5 deals with offsetting, and provides a fairly generic and appropriate overview of its potential use in the development process. The proposed approach to offsetting mainly references Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority's (LSRCA) policy, which is reasonable given that NVCA's document remains in draft. However, the text is sufficiently open-ended to support NVCA's requirements for offsetting where appropriate.	We intend to clarify this section to state that these are not City policies, but the City supports offsetting policies provided by the governing conservation authority.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	5	5.6	Please provide confirmation that the parks policies in 5.6 adhere to the Hewitt's Landowners' executed Master Parkland Agreement with the City; if not, please amend accordingly.	These policies guide the City's future parks planning and does not require change on behalf of the development industry. However, if there are specific policies in the Master Parkland Agreement that are in conflict, please do identify them for us. Additionally, "Master Parkland Agreement" will be added to the list of documents provided for in 5.9.1.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	5	5.6	Parks policies. 1) The policies do not reflect the executed Master Parkland Agreement between the City and the Hewitt's landowners. 2) Please clarify if additional Parkland is being request for the Post-2031 settlement area lands.	These policies guide the City's future parks planning and does not require change on behalf of the development industry. However, if there are specific policies in the Master Parkland Agreement that are in conflict, please do identify them for us. Additionally, "Master Parkland Agreement" will be added to the list of documents provided for in 5.9.1.

DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	5	5.9	Section 5.9 of the draft Official Plan speaks to Parkland Dedication. Throughout this section, the total "gross" land area is referenced in the calculation of parkland rate. Parkland is not typically calculated with non-developable land (e.g., environmental features) included in the equation. Net calculations are the standard across the board, as natural heritage area and other non-developable features are just that: undevelopable and typically not used to generate parkland. Accordingly, we ask the City to amend this policy to clarify parkland calculations are made on developable land.	By-law 2017-073, Cash-in-lieu of Parkland, simply refers to the "land"; Policies 5.9.1. c and d will be changed to similarly refer to "the land" over "gross land area." Moreover, to align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.9.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.9.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	5	5.9	Parkland dedication. Please clarify if additional parkland dedication will be requested by the City for the expanded settlement area lands. The mapping does not show any additional requirement, and the Master Parkland Agreement extends only to the 2031 settlement boundary limits.	Additional dedication of parkland will be done according to the Planning Act at a future date.
LSRCA		5	5.3.1.f	A goal of 20% tree canopy cover is too low. Literature suggests that the minimum forest cover at a watershed scale should be no less than 30% (How Much Habitat is Enough?, Environment Canada). Considering that tree canopy cover also includes non-forest areas (street trees, park trees, private trees), the goal should be increased to at least 30% if the City's objective of protecting and enhancing the natural heritage system is to be realized. While a 30% goal may seem daunting, there is much that can be accomplished by engaging private landowners to assist with meeting this goal.	Section 6.3.2 Urban Forests states the commitments to expanding the urban tree canopy, and to protecting the stock of existing trees to the greatest extent possible.
LSRCA		5	5.3.1.j	To better discourage the preemptive removal of natural heritage features in advance of a development application, the City should consider including an additional policy that would address and prevent this from happening. Suggested wording: o) Development and site alteration shall be prohibited prior to the approval of a development application. Where a natural heritage feature has been altered or removed by unauthorized development or site alteration, the feature will be conservatively classified, treated as though it was still in place and be subject to the polies of this Plan. Impacted areas shall be restored to the satisfaction of the City, in consultation with the applicable Conservation Authority. Neighbouring Municipalities (i.e. York Region) have a similar policy and it is a very useful tool.	Policy 5.3.1.j addresses this: "To ensure the effective management and retention of the features and functions identified on Map 3, a Natural Heritage System feature will not be reclassified to a lesser level of protection if the feature is intentionally damaged or destroyed. The restoration and rehabilitation of the Natural Heritage System feature, to the satisfaction of the City and applicable Conservation Authority, may be required."

Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	5	5.3.2 and 5.5.2.5	The policy references in 5.3.2.c, 5.3.2.g and 5.5.2.5.d appear to be incorrect.	Policy 5.3.2.c needs to be revised to point to "the permissions outlined in <u>5.3.2(d)</u> ." Policy 5.3.2.g needs to be revised to point to "the process outlined in <u>5.3.2(f)</u> ". The wording in 5.5.2.5.d will be changed to: "The Phosphorus Budget <u>referred to in 5.5.2.5(c)</u> must demonstrate..."
LSRCA		5	5.3.2.2.b	In order to maintain the natural heritage system, breaks and disconnect between features should not be supported. Consider including an additional policy that would prevent this from happening. Suggested wording: Development shall not be permitted if the resulting development would create a disconnect or break in the natural heritage system.	A break or a disconnect would be a negative impact; therefore the request is covered within policy 5.4.2.2.b.
Mark Doherty		5	5.4 and 5.5	I'm writing to you, as I understand this to be an opportunity to voice my opposition to the proposed development at 521 Huronia Rd. Ultimately my neighbors and I all share the same stance about this proposal and the destruction of – what we on Loon Avenue know to be - a very significant wetland. Perhaps unlike my neighbors though, I would like to only ask you why? Why is this a consideration?	The protection of wetlands is primarily provided for in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 of the new draft Official Plan. Moreover, different types of wetlands are classified as Environmental Protection Areas, which receive additional layers of protection. Please refer to Map 3, which delineates which areas receive EPA protection. Additionally, section 2.5.2. states that "any lands shown on Appendix 1 as located within the boundary of a Conservation Authority are also subject to the policies of those authorities." The policies in the draft new Official Plan will be enforced once the draft plan is adopted by Council and approved by the Province. In the meantime, the current Official Plan policies continue to regulate the protection of wetlands.

Megan Pagonis		5	5.4 and 5.5	<p>There are a barrage of developments that continue to be proposed to cut as deeply as possible into these areas. Not only will this affect the amount of wooded and protected land in our city, it affects our ground re-charge and flood plain water management. A good example is the property south of Loon Ave. There is a request for development on a significant woodland edging the wetland. These have long been protected, and clearly the edge of the current neighborhood was designed with this in mind. The backyards of the houses along Loon Ave. are 30-31 meters away from the wetland - this is not a coincidence. The recommendations of the conservation authority in general state that there should be a minimum 30M buffer. So why are we allowing developers to buy these lands for a low price only to challenge and push the conservation authorities to bend these rules to push further and further into these areas? I do not understand why certain development locations are chosen when there are many other pockets that could be developed that don't involve massive tree cutting/de-forestation, and sucking all the ground water out around a wetland to make underground parking possible for 140 new town houses. I would like to see a City plan that stops this from cutting into what little we have left.</p>	<p>The protection of wetlands is primarily provided for in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 of the new draft Official Plan. Moreover, different types of wetlands are classified as Environmental Protection Areas, which receive additional layers of protection. Please refer to Map 3, which delineates which areas receive EPA protection. Additionally, section 2.5.2. states that "any lands shown on Appendix 1 as located within the boundary of a Conservation Authority are also subject to the policies of those authorities." The policies in the draft new Official Plan will be enforced once the draft plan is adopted by Council and approved by the Province. In the meantime, the current Official Plan policies continue to regulate the protection of wetlands.</p>
LSRCA		5	5.4.1	<p>There should be an introduction for this section that provides some explanation for why there are two separate overlays for the natural heritage system in the City.</p>	<p>The policies are listed in Section 5, but the overlay is referenced in Section 2 because of the importance of this overlay to land use planning.</p>
LSRCA		5	5.4.1.d	<p>Any increases to the natural heritage system would be based on incorporating features that warrant being protected. Increases may also support the City's goal of growing the urban canopy copy. It's recommended that wording be revised to not restrict increases to the natural heritage system. Suggested wording: "... Authority, nor shall such minor modifications result in any significant decrease in the size of the Natural Heritage System."</p>	<p>Increases to the Natural Heritage System are not restricted by the policies in section 5.4.1.</p>

NVCA	5	5.4.2	<p>In general, it is recommended that the OP review thresholds and criteria for assigning tiered EPA designations to woodland features within the City. The current rationale for assignment of EPA 1, 2, and 3 to various woodland features is not clear throughout Section 5.4.2, and does not appear to be consistently applied in Map/Schedule 3. Some specific considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oSection 5.4.2.1 states that an EPA1 designation is assigned to Significant Woodland over 10ha. However, in the absence of comprehensive Significant Woodland mapping for the municipality, there may be value in assigning this designation to all woodlands over 10ha. oFurther to the above, 10ha may be an excessive area threshold for this most restrictive designation, especially in a large and growing urban center. In scenarios where woodlands are demonstrably 'significant', it is recommended that the area threshold for inclusion into EPA1 be 4ha. oThe OP provides no definition or criteria for identifying when a woodland feature should be considered a Significant Woodland. Given the relative lack of woodland cover within the City limits, a targeted exercise may be warranted to identify Significant Woodlands on an applicable schedule. 	<p>We have reviewed this section in light of these comments and made some changes for better oversight. As highlighted in the preface to the Definitions section 10.2: "If a term is defined in a Provincial document, the City has carried forward that term into the Plan to ensure consistency. Any other terms defined by the City are listed here, and if they are not listed here then the definition that appears in the Zoning By-law shall apply." As additionally stated in the preface to the Definitions section: "Any other terminology has its regular, customary meaning. If clarification is needed, then it should be sought from the Director of Development Services." Additionally, please note policy 10.1.c) "Where new information becomes available, <u>for example</u>, through floodplain mapping, Natural heritage System mapping, or as a result of more detailed environmental Impact Study (EIS), the most up to date Environmental Protection Area mapping shall take precedence ... under these circumstances, mapping or development limits may be amended without this Plan." We are willing to work with conversation authorities to provide mapping updates longer term.</p>
LSRCA	5	5.4.2.1	<p>As the EP Areas – Level 1 resources represent the most valuable components of the natural heritage system, consider including a policy that dictates minimum vegetation protection zones (VPZ) for specific features. Recommended minimum VPZs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provincially Significant Wetland – 30 m Non-PSW or unevaluated wetland – 15 m Woodland – 10 m Watercourse – 30 m Lake Simcoe Shoreline – 30 m Cultural meadows and cultural thickets within the natural heritage system or abutting protected features – 5 m <p>It would also be helpful to provide guidance with respect to green infrastructure within the outer 50% of the larger VPZs.</p>	<p>Further guidance would be provided through the Environmental Impact Study.</p>

LSRCA	5	5.4.2.1	<p>Consider including policies that provide direction for any relocation of watercourses.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>e) Watercourses shall generally be maintained in their existing locations. Where a development proposal seeks to relocate a watercourse, it must be demonstrated that the relocation will maintain the existing function of the watercourse, will result in a net ecological gain and will not negatively impact the natural heritage system.</p> <p>f) Any relocation or significant alteration of a watercourse must incorporate natural channel design and be supported by a Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment.</p> <p>g) Any relocation of a watercourse must be in compliance with Conservation Authority regulations, and any other applicable Provincial or Federal regulations.</p> <p>The above policy suggestions may also belong in Section 5.5.2</p>	<p>Policy 5.5.1.a.iv) seeks to restrict development in or near watercourses; therefore, it would be weakened by additionally including a policy about the relocation of a watercourse.</p> <p>At the same time, policy 5.5.1.a.i) states the City will “work in partnership with adjacent municipalities and the Conservation Authorities, provincial ministries, the Health Unit and other partners to develop practices that maintain and improve the quality and quantity of lakes and watercourses.” Therefore, as part of this partnership, if a watercourse would need to be relocated, the City would work in partnership with the LSRCA on this, to ensure compliance with regulations and the suggestions set out here.</p>
NVCA	5	5.4.2.1	<p>Section 5.4.2.1 provides the most strict layer of Natural Heritage policy protection (EPA 1), and includes most Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs), and ‘Non-provincially Significant Wetlands’ greater than 0.5ha. However, no explicit policy protections are afforded to wetland features below the 0.5ha threshold. To ensure consistency with Conservation Authority regulations, wetlands below the 0.5ha area threshold (as recognized now or through a development process) should be afforded policy protection, i.e. designated as EPA 2 or 3.</p>	<p>“Wetlands less than 0.5 hectares in size” has been added to EPA level 3</p>

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	5	5.4.2.1.d	<p>Of particular significance is Section 5.4.2.1 (d). If the intent is to refer to the designation which will apply upon adoption of the proposed, new official plan, the reference should simply be to the designation on Maps 1 and 2 of the Plan. If this is not the intent of the wording, clarification is requested. Based upon our review of the policies applicable to the Environmental Protection Areas, and more specifically the Bunkers' Creek watershed, the ultimate intent is to provide for restoration of the watercourse to a naturalized state, wherever feasible and practical. Achievement of this objective will only be possible upon redevelopment of the lands affected. By way of example, should proposals be introduced which envisage redevelopment of the lands to the southeast of Highway No. 400 and/or in the vicinity of the intersection of Dunlop Street and Anne Street, for high density, multi-storey structures consistent with the Strategic Growth Area policies of the draft document, a portion of the lands could be developed as an open space linkage which accommodates the restoration of Bunkers Creek. Such a scenario simply serves to emphasize the need to require that a Secondary Plan be advanced by the City.</p>	This has been clarified that the land use designation would be found on Map 2.
LSRCA		5	5.4.2.2.a	<p>Based on the above comment and the need to provide stronger protection to natural areas still remaining in urban areas, Level 2 features should also be revised to include the following: Woodlands 0.5 ha > 4 ha Woodlands within 30 m of a Level 1 or other Level 2 feature Locally significant natural areas Minimum vegetation protection zones and connectivity linkages</p>	<p>We will add “Woodlands within 30 m of a Level 1 feature into Level 2”; but keep “Woodlands within 30 m of a Level 2 feature in Level 3.”</p> <p>“Minimum vegetation protection zones and connectivity linkages” is already included in this section.</p> <p>Since “woodlands between 4 hectares to 10 hectares” is included in this section (while “significant woodlands” of the same size are level 1), it makes sense to keep “woodlands 0.5 to 4 ha” in level 3 – they still receive protection.</p> <p>As Level 3 is focused on “locally significant features” as per its definition, it makes sense to keep “locally significant natural areas” in Level 3.</p>
LSRCA		5	5.4.2.2.a	<p>Please clarify what is meant by “other watercourses”. Permanent and intermittent watercourses should be considered Level 1 features. Does “other watercourse” refer to ephemeral watercourses? Headwater drainage features?</p>	As watercourses received protection under Level 1 features, the reference will be removed under Level 2.

LSRCA		5	5.4.2.2.b	In order to maintain the natural heritage system, development that would result in features being down classified should not be supported. Consider including an additional policy that would prevent this from happening. Suggested wording: Development shall not be permitted if the development would result in a feature no longer being considered significant or no longer being able to maintain its current Environmental Protection Areas level classification.	Features being shut down would be a negative impact; therefore, the request is covered within policy 5.4.2.2.b.
LSRCA		5	5.4.3.b	Note that a 30 m vegetation protection zone (VPZ) (buffer) applies to woodlands within the Lake Simcoe watershed in the “annexed lands”. A 10 m VPZ applies to woodlands outside of the watershed (i.e. NVCA jurisdiction). Please revise this policy to reflect this.	The policy specifies “a 30.0 metre buffer from the edge of the woodlands within the Lake Simcoe watershed” – as the municipal boundary now includes the annexed lands, the policy would govern this area. A 10 m buffer also has been included to woodlands outside of the watershed.
LSRCA		5	5.5.1.g	Note that Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority Ecological Offsetting Policy (not Plan) applies only to the Lake Simcoe watershed. The policies in the Official Plan should clarify that offsetting would apply to features within the City, regardless of watershed.	There is no incorrect reference here, as the reference has been taken out. The City would work with LSRCA, should ecological offsetting be required. As per this section, policies would apply city-wide.
LSRCA		5	5.5.2	Consider including a policy commitment to not support the piping of watercourses and to seek out opportunities for daylighting any that are currently piped, as well as restoring degraded and disconnected systems. Suggested wording: g) Not permit the piping of any watercourses or headwater areas. h) Seek out opportunities to restore existing piped watercourses at the surface. i) Seek out opportunities to restore degraded systems and remove barriers to fish passage.	Policies 5.5.2.1.b(i) already references increasing/improving fish habitat. We can add in the following policy to 5.5.2.1.b: “Seek to avoid piping watercourses or headwater areas and seek to restore existing piped watercourses to a natural state.”
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	5	5.6.2.5.c	Policy 5.6.2.5c) identifies that “Urban Squares shall be between 0.2 hectares and 1.0 hectares...”. In our submission, it is unclear as to the need for such a rigid policy in the Official Plan for the size of Urban Squares. We suggest flexibility be incorporated to be able to respond to the needs of the community, and suggest the following revised language: “Urban Squares should be planned to be approximately 0.2 ha to 1.0 ha in size”;	Recommended policy revision: "Village Squares should be between 0.2 hectares to 1.0 hectares ..." Please note that the title "urban squares" has been changed to "village squares" to align with existing terminology.

Barb and Brian Tansley	5	5.7.1	Further development along the waterfront should not be allowed.	Barrie's waterfront is designated as Greenspace, and, as set out in 5.7.1, it will be protected and managed in an environmentally responsible manner for future generations. Development adjacent to the waterfront will be permitted according to the land use designations set out on Map 2, but any development along the waterfront shall achieve a standard of design excellence in order for there to be proper integration. Moreover, the Province has designated Barrie's downtown, including lands adjacent to the waterfront, as an Urban Growth Centre. Urban Growth Centres are areas designated by the Province to see greater intensification and house a significant amount of job and population growth. As Barrie has a duty to grow responsibly as the regional centre for Central Ontario, the downtown will indeed be seeing greater intensification. This should also help us bring more affordable housing options to Barrie.
Megan Pagonis	5	5.7.1	Second, the building heights around the waterfront should have cut offs. I don't want to see what happened in Toronto to happen in our city. I moved out of Toronto for a reason 10 years ago. I didn't like how tall every building kept getting. It makes it feel like the city towers over you, and it is not nearly as welcoming as our current building heights are around the water. I don't want to see the waterfront shaded out because they can build many units for a huge premium because they overlook the water. Let's not forget the shorter buildings that stayed within height restrictions at the time that were supposed to have those views. Let's not forget that it is not only the residents of the buildings surrounding the waterfront that should be able to enjoy that space. I have also lived in Vancouver for a few years and can assure you Barrie has a similar feel when you are near the water - the city limits on building height makes a difference to the ambience. It is not menacing, it is enjoyable.	Barrie's waterfront is designated as Greenspace, and, as set out in 5.7.1, it will be protected and managed in an environmentally responsible manner for future generations. Development adjacent to the waterfront will be permitted according to the land use designations set out on Map 2, but any development along the waterfront shall achieve a standard of design excellence in order for there to be proper integration. Moreover, the Province has designated Barrie's downtown, including lands adjacent to the waterfront, as an Urban Growth Centre. Urban Growth Centres are areas designated by the Province to see greater intensification and house a significant amount of job and population growth. As Barrie has a duty to grow responsibly as the regional centre for Central Ontario, the downtown will indeed be seeing greater intensification. This should also help us bring more affordable housing options to Barrie.
LSRCA	5	5.7.1.a	Consider including some additional points that speak to the importance and function of the waterfront as part of the City's natural heritage system. Suggested wording: xiii) The waterfront is in an important component of the natural heritage system and will be managed in an environmentally responsible manner. xiv) Opportunities to naturalize portions of the shoreline along the waterfront will be pursued in balance with providing visual and physical access to the water.	These have been addressed in policies 5.6.3.a.i and xi.

St. Mary's Catholic Cemetery	Catholic Cemeteries and Funeral Services - Archdiocese of Toronto / Richard Hayes	5	5.7.2	The City of Barrie Official Plan 2051, Draft 2 suggests that "Cemeteries, when they are in a location to provide connection to the open space network, greater mobility network and/or active transportation network may be acknowledged by the City as opportunities for passive recreation trails for pedestrians or cyclists." This proposed planning principle is incompatible with the requirements of cemetery operators under the Funeral Burial Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA) that "quiet and good order are maintained in the cemetery at all times." Further CCFS in its operating By-laws expressly forbids all sporting and recreational activities within the property including, but not limited to cycling, skateboarding, roller blading, running and dog walking.	Suggested revised wording: Cemeteries may be acknowledged by the City as opportunities for passive recreational trails for pedestrians or cyclists <u>where compatibility with existing requirements governing cemeteries exists</u> and when they are in a location to provide connection to the open space network, greater mobility network and/or active transportation network.
LSRCA		5	5.8.c	Note that opportunities to enhance connectivity of the natural heritage system are not currently shown on Map 6. Is the intention to revise this map in the near future to identify these locations? It's recommended that opportunities to reconnect the natural heritage system where there are breaks and gaps be pursued and that these locations/areas also be shown on Map 3.	This is a commitment on behalf of the City; as stated in policy 5.7.a, we would look at Map 6 to identify opportunities. The intention is not to currently demonstrate these opportunities on Official Plan maps, but we are committed to enhancing connectivity in the future.
LSRCA		5	5.8.d	This policy should be expanded to also include arterial and connector roads. Suggested wording: During the planning of infrastructure projects, the City will enhance connectivity between Natural Heritage Systems across Highway 400, arterial and collector roads to accommodate the movement of animals and native plants across....	Policy 5.7.d will be changed to: "During the planning of infrastructure projects, the City will identify opportunities to enhance connectivity between Natural Heritage Systems, especially across Highway 400, to accommodate the movement of animals and native plants across the city where development and/or development is proposed." This leaves open addressing other opportunities for the movement of animals/native plants.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	5	5.9.1	Policy 5.9.1 establishes the cash-in-lieu of parkland policies. We seek clarification that these policies align with the City's cash-in-lieu of parkland by-law. As one example, Policy 5.9.1(d) states that a rate of 2% of total gross land area applies to all non-residential development but is silent on Institutional uses. If we are to assume 5.9.1(d) includes Institutional uses then the policy does not align to the cash-in-lieu of parkland by-law which requires a rate of 5% for Institutional uses.	To align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.8.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.8.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	5	5.9.1.c and 5.9.1.d	it is requested that reference to the 5% residential and 2% commercial cash-in-lieu rates be amended from "gross" to "net".	By-law 2017-073, Cash-in-lieu of Parkland, simply refers to the "land"; Policies 5.9.1. c and d will be changed to similarly refer to "the land" over "gross land area." Moreover, to align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.9.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.9.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	5	5.9.1.c and 5.9.1.d	please confirm that the site is not required to pay cash-in-lieu of parkland as it has been satisfied through the Master Parkland Agreement.	This is correct.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	5	5.9.1.c)	Parkland Calculation shall be at the rate of 5% of the total gross land area. The Landowners request that the words "gross" be replaced with "net". Parkland is not given for natural heritage lands or on lands that cannot be developed for other reasons such as gas pipelines (TransCanada) or where significant archaeological resources remain on-site. There is no statutory authority under the Planning Act to require the calculation on "gross" land area.	By-law 2017-073, Cash-in-lieu of Parkland, simply refers to the "land"; Policies 5.8.1. c and d will be changed to similarly refer to "the land" over "gross land area." Moreover, to align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.9.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.9.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	5	5.9.1.c) & d)	Speaks to calculating parkland based on 5% & 2% of the total gross land area. As noted previously, this should be on a net basis as natural heritage features or other major infrastructure would not be included in the calculation. Furthermore, there is no definition of "gross land area" in the Official Plan in which to determine what is included and excluded from the calculation.	By-law 2017-073, Cash-in-lieu of Parkland, simply refers to the "land"; Policies 5.8.1. c and d will be changed to similarly refer to "the land" over "gross land area." Moreover, to align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.9.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.9.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		5	5.9.1.d	We are also requesting clarification on if Policy 5.9.1 (d) aligns with the CIL Bylaw? If not, does the City have plans to revisit the CIL Bylaw?	By-law 2017-073, Cash-in-lieu of Parkland, simply refers to the "land"; Policies 5.8.1. c and d will be changed to similarly refer to "the land" over "gross land area." Moreover, to align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.9.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.9.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."

LSRCA		5	5.9.1.g	<p>In addition to a requirement for parkland to be conveyed to the City, there should be a policy that also requires the conveyance of lands that contain the natural heritage system. It should speak to the requirement for land to be conveyed in good condition. This may involve the removal of refuse and debris, management of invasive species, ecological restoration, etc. The City should not be liable for existing management issues/challenges that exist in the natural heritage system currently in private ownership.</p> <p>Suggested wording: The City shall seek to acquire lands on which the natural heritage system is located, as a condition of development approval.</p> <p>Any land containing natural heritage features that is required to be conveyed to the City shall be in good ecological condition and be free of all encumbrances.</p>	This section (now 5.8.1) speaks to parkland policies specifically.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	5	5.9.1.k	<p>Further, Policy 5.9.1 (k) states," the City may consider alternative means for establishing new parkland and parkland improvements, including, but not limited to: iii) <u>Seeking partnerships</u>, conservation easements, <u>and/or joint provision of land.</u>" We seek clarification on the underlined phrasing. Are the underlined phrases in reference to what is also commonly known as Privately-Owned Publicly-accessible Space ('POPS')? If yes, we suggest using this term as it is a more commonly known description that would be appropriate to include in the policy.</p>	I believe that POPS would be included, however believe policy intent also includes forms other than public-private; therefore policy 5.8.1.k should be revised to state: "iii) seeking partnerships, conversation easements, and/or joint provision of land, for instance through the Privately-Owned Publicly Accessible Space model (POPS)."
Dino Di Gregorio		6	6.6	<p>My comment is that the storm drain just south of my house is getting plugged up by winter sand and salt residue and cigarette butts. Storm management should have a look at it to make sure its cleaned out. I have not seen it done recently or when the watermain was installed.</p> <p>The next issue, my complaint, happens every year and we try to sweep up the residue that settles in front of our driveway due to a dip in the road. It was supposed to be repaired over 2 years ago when the watermain improvement line was installed on our street, but the repair never happened.</p> <p>I even spoke to the Barrie roads supervisor overseeing the watermain install and he assured me that when the curbs and road would be redone after construction finished, our curb would be cutout and replaced at the proper level to avoid a dip, before the road was paved. NOT DONE, the dip is still there, in winter the water freezes in front of our driveway and then the salt and sand residue, I hate repeating myself.. We are getting tired and annoyed to clean this mess up every spring.</p>	While there are policies regulating the development of infrastructure (for instance policy 6.6.4.a states that new developments shall utilize generally accepted Best Management Practices in stormwater management), the Official Plan is a broader land use document that does not impact current protocol for the management of storm drains and watermains. It is best to register this complaint with Service Barrie.

LSRCA		6	6.6	The description of municipal infrastructure should also include green infrastructure (i.e. street trees, landscaped strips, open space, natural heritage features, LIDs, etc).	A policy has been added to section 6.6.1 regarding green infrastructure and alignment has been included throughout section 6.6.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	6	6.3.1.d)	Encourages the use of district energy systems. As noted previously, is the City of Barrie constructing a district energy system?	As per the policy, the City supports and encourages a district energy model; it does not require the implementation of this model. Therefore, flexibility remains should developers choose not to pursue the approach. There is also flexibility in terms of how this type of system can be set up -- it does not necessarily have to be a municipal-wide initiative.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	6	6.3.1.d)	Encourages the use of district energy systems. To our knowledge the City is not planning on developing same. The Landowners request that this reference be removed.	As per the policy, the City supports and encourages a district energy model; it does not require the implementation of this model. Therefore, flexibility remains should developers choose not to pursue the approach. There is also flexibility in terms of how this type of system can be set up -- it does not necessarily have to be a municipal-wide initiative
LSRCA		6	6.3.2	This section should identify the current tree canopy in the City and also speak to the goal for tree canopy cover (recommend 30% for the goal instead of 20% - see comment above).	As stated in policy 6.3.2.b, the City will “strive to expand urban tree canopy coverage by partnering with other interested agencies.” The decision was made to not ultimately state a target in the Official Plan, however we are committed to this work and to further establishing parameters through other means apart from this document.
LSRCA		6	6.3.2.a	Privately owned trees make up a large portion of the City’s tree canopy. Consider including some direction for developing a private tree bylaw for that would restrict the removal of large trees from private lands without good cause or justification. Funds gathered through this type of permitting process can then be redirected to tree planting initiatives elsewhere that would help bolster the urban canopy. Suggested wording: The City may pass a by-law under the Municipal Act that would restrict the removal of large trees from private property.	As stated in policy 6.3.2.b, the City will “protect the stock of existing trees to the greatest extent possible.” This leaves open the possibility of establishing a By-law restricting the removal of large trees (in fact, the City is looking into this currently). Moreover, policies 6.3.2.f requires “a tree protection plan that identifies, preserves, and compensates for tree removal.”
LSRCA		6	6.3.2.e	This policy should clarify that where an Ecological Offsetting Strategy is required for the loss of woodland, additional tree compensation will not also be required.	The policy is flexible enough that it can align with an Ecological Offsetting Strategy. Thus, we would direct the proponent to work with the LSRCA on meeting the appropriate Ecological Offsetting policies.

Ann Krueger / Westside Evangelical Lutheran Church		6	6.4.1	<p>On behalf of my congregation and myself, I commend the city for including needed changes to help our vulnerable homeless population. Specifically I commend you on the new section, 6.4.1 Vulnerable Populations which says: "The City will support and establish, where appropriate, the facilities for providing temporary emergency shelters, as well as cooling and warming stations throughout the City."</p> <p>However, that does not include all basic needs. The provision of 365/24/7 public washrooms and drinking water throughout the City is greatly needed.</p> <p>Please include those needs in the updated Official Plan.</p>	Policy 6.4.1.a will be revised to: "The City will seek to understand, protect, and plan for the unique needs of equity-seeking groups and vulnerable populations, such as the provision of publicly accessible washrooms and drinking water."
John McLean / Grace United Church		6	6.4.1	<p>The congregation of Grace United Church wishes to express its support of the inclusion of section 6.4,1 Vulnerable Populations in the second draft of the City of Barrie's Official Plan. In particular, we are in agreement with: "The City will support and establish, where appropriate, the facilities for for providing temporary emergency shelters, as well as cooling and warming stations throughout the City."</p> <p>We would also advocate for the inclusion in this section, the provision of 365/24/7 open public washrooms and drinking water throughout the City.</p>	Policy 6.4.1.a will be revised to: "The City will seek to understand, protect, and plan for the unique needs of equity-seeking groups and vulnerable populations, such as the provision of publicly accessible washrooms and drinking water."
Marla Tomlinson		6	6.4.1	<p>The prices of rent in Barrie are outrageous. Basement apartments are going for over \$1600 these days, and there aren't many to find. I am a single mother who has a very good job (RVH) and I almost can't afford the rent in my current home. With the lack of rental buildings, there is a huge lack of supply. Landlords are taking advantage of this and asking for rent that is more than it should be.</p> <p>Are there plans for more rental buildings to go up? We have a lot of condo buildings in the works, but we need straight rentals.</p>	There are plans for more rentals in Barrie as part of the Affordable Housing Strategy. The Official Plan is a broader land use planning document, and sets some overarching guidelines for Affordable Housing. Actual implementation of these guidelines and more detailed goals and targets are set elsewhere, primarily through the Affordable Housing Strategy.
SCATEH / Jennifer van Gennip		6	6.4.1	<p>To this end, we ask that you also add year-round, 24/7 public washroom and drinking water access. Our current public washrooms are limited, they are not winterized, and even in the summer months they close overnight. There is a growing awareness of the need for 24/7/365 public washroom access, for vulnerable populations and also as a best practice for designing accessible communities.</p>	Policy 6.4.1.a will be revised to: "The City will seek to understand, protect, and plan for the unique needs of equity-seeking groups and vulnerable populations, such as the provision of publicly accessible washrooms and drinking water."
969, 979, 989 Maplevue Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	6	6.4.1.c	<p>is worded such that housing to be provided within the City for the "entire population" is attainable. It is requested that this be removed. The policy can be re-characterized as supporting the provision of housing across the whole housing continuum.</p>	While we appreciate this suggestion, this policy guides the City's actions and we are focused on making housing attainable for the entire population.

Karen Buck	6	6.4.2	<p>Kudos to Staff and Council for setting aside “affordable housing” in many of the residentially zoned areas. I would also like to see an opportunity for “new” housing types..like tiny houses and new allowances for use of shipping containers for housing construction. Tiny houses are being built so that those with limited resources can live affordably in their neighbourhoods. The Official Plan could also promote Council working with Habitat for Humanity to provide Net Zero housing as another alternative to “affordable housing options. I think there is also an opportunity to have price adjusted units for sale and rent so that there is a mix of different individuals and families living together in “affordable housing options” being offered by the City.</p>	<p>While the intent of the Official Plan is to set out the City's general direction for supporting affordable housing, these are certainly good suggestions and can be taken into consideration through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy. We are also actively working with partners to get more affordable housing built, and the Official Plan does provide for this in policy 6.4.2.b: "The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, private developers, as well as community groups, to provide innovative affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing."</p>
Kelly Patterson McGrath	6	6.4.2	<p>We need to be better at attracting true affordable housing developers and partnering with existing ones like Redwood Park Communities, this is a priority and needs to be addressed completely in the OP. Let's do better. Care for and house our homeless and ensure that rent is affordable for all.</p>	<p>This suggestion is aligned with policy 6.4.2 (b): "The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, private developers, as well as community groups, to provide innovative affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing." Currently, we have partnered with Redwood Park Communities on some developments and we look forward to continuing this relationship. The City's Affordable Housing Strategy is the key document guiding the implementation of affordable housing programs and tools in Barrie.</p>
Leslie Warren	6	6.4.2	<p>I am watching many classic boarding houses disappear into this raging RE market. The city CAN play a role in communicating that boarding is NOT an evil. That it is legal per your current bylaws. etc. But your new ancillary permitting scenario is actually only going to load up on higher ticket rental dollars. I see nothing on the horizon that actually addresses real people budgets of \$900 per month. Nothing. THAT is what is affordable to many EMPLOYED people.</p>	<p>We agree with you that there is a housing affordability crisis in Barrie and that we need a range of solutions available to ensure affordable housing across the spectrum of incomes. Programming to guide the affordability of rentals in Barrie is part of the Affordable Housing Strategy. While the Official Plan is a broader land use planning document, Policies 6.4.c and 6.4.2.b outline the City's mandate to make available affordable housing for all people in Barrie.</p>

SCATEH / Jennifer van Gennip		6	6.4.2	<p>In Draft Two, we see the addition of the term “attainable” but this is an undefined term that could be interpreted as either above or below “affordable.” For this reason, we again recommend deeply affordable housing as a sub-definition within the affordable housing targets. If this cannot be enforced for targets, we feel it would at minimum be an appropriate threshold to use to determine eligibility for the City’s incentive programs such as the CIP.</p> <p>A suggested definition would be: “a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low- to moderate-income households, or 80% of average market rent, whichever is lower. Annual household income will be based upon the most recent Census of Canada statistics for the City of Barrie which is updated every five years, with low- to moderate-income households defined as an annual household income in the lowest 40th percentiles.” (As opposed to the 60th percentile.)</p>	<p>In the definitions section of the Official Plan, Affordable rental housing is defined as the least expensive of: i) a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or ii) a unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area. Therefore all references to affordable rentals throughout the OP follow this definition.</p> <p>Additionally, it is recommended that a reference to deeply affordable housing be incorporated into the preamble of section 6.4: “As part of preparing Barrie for the future and ensuring social and economic resiliency, the City needs to take measures to ensure that attainable housing options are available to all residents (<u>including for those in need of deeply affordable housing</u>), that access is provided to public service facilities...</p>
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	6	6.4.2	<p>Given the changes to property value and rental rates over the last 5 years, it is recommended that through this Official Plan process the City update their affordable housing benchmark to provide a clear understanding to the development industry what will be deemed affordable.</p>	<p>As part of the Affordable Housing Strategy, we continue to track and benchmark both progress and affordability rates; this document is available to the public and updates on progress will continue to be made publicly available.</p>
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	6	6.4.2	<p>It is also our recommendation that in order to accomplish this ultimate goal, particularly for those required to supply 20 percent affordable housing within their developments, that public/private partnerships will be necessary. The challenge in accomplishing this goal will be the fact that the greatest percentage of affordable housing units are planned to be provided in built forms that have the highest construction cost value. It is recommended that Section 6.4.2 be amended to include additional language as follows: b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing.</p>	<p>Agreed. Policy will be revised as follows: “b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing.”</p>
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	6	6.4.2	<p>This section sets out some very restrictive affordable housing policies. The Salem Landowners request the affordable housing policies be revised to encourage the addition of affordable housing units rather than being so prescriptive.</p>	<p>Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan; the existing OP also maintains a 10% target for affordable housing, which has been met. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies.</p>

<p>PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group</p>	<p>MHBC / Andrew Edwards</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>6.4.2</p>	<p>We are concerned with the implications of these policies and request they not be prescriptive. We recommend the City establish policies which enable the collection of revenues for the provision of City sponsored affordable housing. We understand the City recently established a task force to formulate cash-in-lieu of affordable housing policy to be implemented moving forward and suggest the City include this within the affordable housing policies as an alternative to every site providing affordable units. There are various affordable housing target policies in the Plan including but not limited to policies 2.5.(j), and Section 6.4.2. Policy 2.5 (j) requires 10% of all new housing in the City to be affordable, policy 6.4.2 (e)(iii) requires development with more than 40 dwelling units to demonstrate the provision of affordable units and policy (iv) requires all new medium and high-density land use designations to provide 10% affordable units across a range of unit sizes including 3 bedroom units or larger, and policy 2.3.2 (e) (iii) requires at least 20% of housing units developed in the UGC satisfy the criteria for affordable. It is suggested that this policy does not recognize that various projects, in their totality, are being developed as affordable housing projects and thus contributing to the City wide mix of 10%. These policies have the potential to contribute to a lower amount of attainable units if affordable housing units are required on a project by project basis.</p>	<p>Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan; the existing OP also maintains a 10% target for affordable housing, which has been met. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies. The City is contemplating further tools to achieve and incentivize more affordable housing through its Affordable Housing Strategy. To affirm our commitment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: "b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing." While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means.</p>
<p>Leslie Warren</p>		<p>6</p>	<p>6.4.2</p>	<p>Talk talk talk about affordable housing. But it is not defined. Anywhere. As for these words: shared accommodations, co-ownership housing, co-operative housing, community land trusts, land lease community homes, affordable housing, and inclusive and accessible housing for people with special needs Only one question: when? and for how many?</p>	<p>The City of Barrie's Affordable Housing Strategy tracks the development of different types of affordable housing and guides the implementation of different programs and tools to achieve more affordable housing. As for the definition of affordable in the draft new Official Plan, it is given in section 10.2 "Definitions." Affordable: a) In the case of ownership housing, the least expensive of: i) Housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or, ii) Housing for which the purchase price is at least 10 percent below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area; or, b) In the case of rental housing, the least expensive of: i) A unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or, ii) A unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area.</p>

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	6	6.4.2.d	requires ALL ground related housing to include options for purchasers to have two units in the main building, or an additional ancillary structure. With the OP policies providing hard maximum densities and requirements for parking per unit, it is requested that this policy identify the desire for optional second units, but that the option not be a requirement for every unit.	Second Suites will not be a requirement; however, the design option shall be made available, so that -- should the purchaser want a second suite in the relevant development -- the installation of one would be seen as possible.
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	6	6.4.2.d	It is unclear how the requirements of policy 6.4.2.d (i.e. builder options for second dwelling units) will be applied. Specifically, this will need to be transitioned and/or only required for new development applications to account for existing development plans that may not have included lot sizes or home model packages to accommodate safe and attractive second suites (e.g. side yard setbacks for discrete entryways, space in the floor plan for a separated entryway, etc.)	This would only be required for new development applications.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	6	6.4.2.d)	All ground related development shall include design options that provide purchasers the ability to have two residential units. The Landowners request the modification of this policy to require a condition in all draft plan approvals containing more than 40 single detached units, to require the Builder to offer turn-key second suite packages in some of their units. This approach is in place in Hewitt's and there has been significant uptake of Second Suites as a result.	Second Suites will not be a requirement; however, the design option shall be made available, so that -- should the purchaser want a second suite in the relevant development -- the installation of one would be seen as possible. We can additionally look into expanding the Hewitt's pilot project regarding second suites.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	6	6.4.2.e	Policy 6.4.2e) would require that all development applications be supported by an Affordable Housing Report. In our submission, the list of materials that would be considered appropriate to facilitate development should be refined through preconsultation, as there are numerous types of development that would not warrant an Affordable Housing Report, such as those applications proposing strictly nonresidential uses. We suggest revised policy be considered.	Policy will be revised to read: " <u>Development and redevelopment applications occurring outside of Employment Areas and through Draft Plan of Subdivision, Draft Plan of Condominium, Site Plan Or Part Lot Control</u> , shall be supported by a Housing Affordability Report, which will be prepared in accordance with the City's current Terms of Reference, and will provide an opinion by a qualified professional as to how the proposed development or redevelopment provides housing to meet the needs of current and future residents."

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	6	6.4.2.e	requires an Affordable Housing Report, by a qualified professional, for every development and redevelopment. It is requested that this be removed. This adds another layer on to applications, and suggests that a report would be required for an addition of a unit in a dwelling (redevelopment). The policy framework provides sufficient parameters for the City to work towards provision of affordable housing, as well as government initiatives such as the work of the City and the County of Simcoe for provision of affordable units. The City has a way to track this information and it is understood that the City is meeting, or close to meeting, various of its affordable housing targets. Also, much of the affordability price point lags by about 12 to 18 months and is thus potentially out of date when it is being considered.	Policy will be revised to read: "Development and redevelopment applications occurring outside of Employment Areas and through Draft Plan of Subdivision, Draft Plan of Condominium, Site Plan Or Part Lot Control, shall be supported by a Housing Affordability Report, which will be prepared in accordance with the City's current Terms of Reference, and will provide an opinion by a qualified professional as to how the proposed development or redevelopment provides housing to meet the needs of current and future residents."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	6	6.4.2.e)	Requires an affordable housing report. Request the words 'shall' be replaced with 'may' which provides flexibility depending on the nature of the application or, more importantly, if the applicant is proposing the required amount of affordable housing – which would render a study unnecessary.	Policy will be revised to read: "Development and redevelopment applications occurring outside of Employment Areas and through Draft Plan of Subdivision, Draft Plan of Condominium, Site Plan Or Part Lot Control, shall be supported by a Housing Affordability Report, which will be prepared in accordance with the City's current Terms of Reference, and will provide an opinion by a qualified professional as to how the proposed development or redevelopment provides housing to meet the needs of current and future residents."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	6	6.4.2.e.iii	Policy 6.4.2.e)iii) would require that development applications that propose 40 dwelling units or more demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units. In our submission, the policy should introduce flexibility, and we suggest that the text "will be required to demonstrate" be replaced with "are encouraged to provide."	Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies, while also grappling with stewardship. To affirm our commitment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: "b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u> , as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing." While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means.

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	6	6.4.2.e.iii and 6.4.2.e.iv	require all development with 40 residential units or larger to demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units, and that in certain classes of development, three bedroom units or larger are to meet the definition of affordable. These policies have the potential to result in these units being subsidized by the remainder of the units in a project and no guarantee can be provided that these units will remain affordable through resale (especially if large in size). The City has various other policies and mechanisms to rely on for the provision of affordable housing units including using viable incentives. It is requested that these policies be removed.	Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies, while also grappling with stewardship. To affirm our commitment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: "b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u> , as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing." While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	6	6.4.2.e.vi	Incidentally, though under the affordable housing policy heading, s. 6.4.2(e)(vi) of the New OP does not relate to affordable housing and should be deleted.	Agreed; this policy should not be here and will be removed.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	6	6.4.2.iii	6.4.2.iii) – this policy should encourage the demonstration of affordable housing as opposed to requiring it.	Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan; the existing OP also maintains a 10% target for affordable housing, which has been met. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	6	6.4.2.iv	6.4.2.iv) – min target of 10% of affordable units within medium and high-density residential designations continues to be too high. The standard should be 5% within these designations across the city.	Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan; the existing OP also maintains a 10% target for affordable housing, which has been met. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies.
LSRCA		6	6.5.1.2	This section should also reference Ecological Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (ESGRAs) as they follow the same policy regime. This section should also reference LSRCA's Water Budget Offsetting Policy.	The City would work with LSRCA, should the water budget offsetting policy need to be applied. This would be determined through the Environmental Impact Study, Risk Assessment or Hydrogeological Assessment, and thus the policy does not need to be specifically referenced.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		6	6.6.4.b	Furthermore, in Section 6.6.4 (b) Stormwater Management – the Plan mentions that Stormwater is to be controlled on site. BILD recommends that this policy be revised to allow for centralized facilities that service a larger tributary planning area, as is normal practice.	Policy 6.6.4.b will be clarified to ensure understanding of the use of the term "control" in that the City shall maintain control of any stormwater on site, without precluding the possibility of a larger system through which stormwater is managed/controlled in the City. Recommended wording: "The City maintains the right to control stormwater on site."

PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	6	6.6.4.q	any "development and site alteration" within a wellhead protection area requires a risk assessment. It is recommended that the policy is changed to "may" at the discretion of the City/delegated Risk Management Officer.	Risk is always required to be assessed in a wellhead protection area. If there is a case where we wouldn't need a risk assessment, we could scope this out based on site specific applications.
LSRCA		6	6.6.5.b	This should also reference the MECP Guidelines as well as applicable Conservation Authority Guidelines (i.e. LSRCA Technical Guidelines for Stormwater Management Submissions)	MECP guidelines will be added.
LSRCA		6	6.6.5.l	Where existing storm water management ponds were originally designed as online systems, a commitment should be made by the City to take these facilities offline. Suggested wording: Where existing stormwater ponds are online, they shall be retrofitted to separate the facility from the watercourse, where feasible.	This section governs new major developments; the City is committed to best practices and LID development, and agrees that retrofitting existing stormwater ponds where feasible is a best practice.
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	8	8.3.2	policy 8.3.2 may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required and the brief is to identify or map connections to planned or existing community gathering places and activities and opportunities for enhancing these gathering places and provide improved connections; it is submitted that these places may not be on the proposed development lands, no criteria is provided and this provides for additional study and cost to development proposals.	There is no requirement within the policy for a placemaking brief.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	8	8.3.3.a	requires that development proposals shall identify opportunities for the inclusion of public art. It is submitted that the prescribed nature of this policy is not appropriate and would pertain to classes of development, such as minor variances, as well as others.	The policy maintains flexibility by emphasizing that "proposals shall identify oppportunities for the inclusion of public art" rather than requiring public art as part of a development. At the same time, the recommendation is to integrate further flexibility into the policy by stating that public art " <u>is encouraged to</u> connect to, celebrate and honour Barrie's diversity, multiculturalism, Barrie's historical figures, and Indigenous and <u>Métis</u> histories."
Al McNair		8	8.4.1	Historic Neighbourhood areas should not allow development greater than 3 storeys, in order to maintain compatibility with abutting existing dwellings and their surrounding neighbourhoods. Barrie's East End shows many examples of historically compatible intensification which does not exceed 3 storeys in height.	While our focus will be on maintaining compatibility with abutting dwellings and their surrounding neighbourhoods, at the same time we are required to plan for growth strategically; for the most part, development in Neighbourhood Areas, excepting on higher order roads, will be limited to three storeys. There are also additional protections for Historic Neighbourhood Areas to ensure compatibility.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	8	8.4.2.b) and i)	Speaks to archaeological resources. This Ministry of Culture looks after archaeological resources and therefore any policy suggesting the deeding of artifacts and the development of lands containing resources, should all be deferred to the Ministry as they are the approval authority for such things.	Under the Planning Act, the municipality can be the approval authority. However, policy 8.4.2.b) will be further revised to highlight the support of the Ministry: <u>"As supported by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, development shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved."</u> A slight revision will also be made to policy 8.4.2.i) to accommodate for the deletion of policy k: "Where archaeological artifacts of cultural heritage value or interest are discovered in the course of an archaeological assessment in support of a development application, the City may encourage the licensed archaeologist to request direction from the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries to deposit the artifacts <u>at no charge</u> in an appropriate public or Indigenous institution, under Section 66(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	8	8.4.2.k)	Requires that archaeological artifacts be 'deeded' at no cost to the appropriate public authority. The Landowners ask that this policy be deleted because it cannot be implemented. Specifically, artifacts cannot be deeded, and in the case of archaeological resources, there are Ministry licensing requirements associated with cataloging and storing same.	This policy will be deleted as its intent is covered in other policies within Section 8.4.2.
Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	8	8.4.3	Policy 8.4.3 relates to Historic Neighbourhoods, which we understand are identified on Map 8 of the draft OP. Prior to development, Policy 8.4.3 would require a Historic Neighbourhood Character Impact Evaluation, in addition to the Heritage Impact Assessment according to draft Policy 8.4d). Based on our review, the Historic Neighbourhoods do not appear to align with designated Heritage Conservation Districts or other Heritage assets as established by the Heritage Act. We request clarification, and are unclear as to the need of such heritage evaluation for lands that are not recognized by the Heritage Act. We suggest revised policy be considered to clarify that heritage assessments would only be required for lands that are within or adjacent to properties or areas designated under the Heritage Act.	In order to maintain the cultural heritage of Barrie, we maintain that it appropriate to require, in certain cases, assessments/evaluations for properties that are not designated under the Heritage Act. Further direction on this evaluation will be given through documentation outside of the OP.

Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	8	8.4.d	Policy 8.4d) would require a Heritage Impact Assessment prior to development of lands identified on Map 8. Based on our review, the Historic Neighbourhoods do not appear to align with designated Heritage Conservation Districts or other Heritage assets as established by the Heritage Act. In our submission, it is inappropriate to require a heritage impact assessment for a broad area of lands that are not identified as having heritage value under the Heritage Act. We suggest that draft policy be revised to clarify that a heritage impact assessment will only be required for lands that are within or adjacent to properties designated under the Heritage Act, or that the draft policy be removed.	In order to maintain the cultural and historical fabric of a neighbourhood, we maintain that it appropriate to require evaluations for properties that are not designated under the Heritage Act. Further direction on this evaluation will be given through documentation outside of the OP.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	9	9.1	The New OP would be improved by language setting out how to resolve discrepancies between conflicting development parameters, for example the differing height and density provisions in the Medium Density” designation and the overlay policy areas such as the MTSAs, Strategic Growth Areas (“SGAs”) and Intensification Corridors.	The following policy will be added to Section 2.5 “General Land Use Policies”: All General Land Use policies have been designed to complement the Section 2.3 policies guiding community structure elements. Should any policies conflict, the City shall make a context-sensitive decision, based on good planning principles, regarding which policy prevails.
759 Yonge Street / Yonge GO Village	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	9	9.1	As the City is aware, the Yonge GO Subdivision is zoned for a master planned community. Not only is zoning in place, but development is already underway. Currently, Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the Subdivision are serviced. The construction of new homes has started in Phases 1 and 2 and improvements are underway at two new parks. We are of the opinion that the development of the Site must proceed based on the existing zoning, unimpacted by the New OP. Transition policies inserted into the New OP would make this understanding clear and avoid future confusion. Accordingly, we request that the New OP include policies that have the effect of recognizing established development entitlements in situations such as ours.	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process.

PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.1	<p>The 2nd Draft contains no transition regulations as an implementation tool. It is therefore unclear how ongoing development applications at various stages of the development approval process will be impacted when the New Official Plan comes into force and effect. At a minimum, we request a transition policy which confirms that applications deemed to be complete at the date of adoption of the City's new OP will be deemed to conform with the new OP and that any associated/ implementing applications (i.e. a site plan which implements and zoning amendment, or a plan of condominium built in conformity with an approved site plan) are similarly transitioned.</p> <p>It is noted that Policy 9.5.2(m) has been included that deems draft approved subdivisions conform to the Plan. It is requested a similar policy be included to acknowledge other existing approvals and ongoing development applications that have been deemed complete.</p>	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process.
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.2	It is requested that the City include within any recommendation to approve the New Official Plan a blanket waiving of Section 21 (2.1) of the Planning Act to allow for processing of Official Plan Amendments within 2 years of the adoption of the New Official Plan, otherwise it could potentially freeze a landowners ability to undertake a new development project for a period of 2+ years.	We will be following the legislative requirements set out in the Planning Act.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	9	9.4.2.2.	<p>Policy 9.4.2.2 outlines a list of studies that may be required to be submitted in support of an application, including subsection s), which states: "Urban design brief, including site context and block plan, in accordance with the demonstration plans (see the Appendix for example demonstration plans)."</p> <p>The meaning of the requirement for a submission to be "in accordance with" the demonstration plans is unclear. We suggest revised wording be considered. Further, in our submission it is not appropriate for demonstration plans to form a part of the Official Plan, and the demonstration plans may be better suited for inclusion in the Urban Design Guidelines.</p>	We will shorten 9.4.2.2.u to only "urban design brief."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	9	9.4.2.2.1	<p>Policy 9.4.2.2.1 identifies a list of submission materials that are requirements for mid-rise buildings, including a site context/block plan and pedestrian wind study. In our submission the submissions materials required for a mid-rise building submission is overly extensive for this type of built form. We note that as identified by Policy 9.4.2.2.2, the specific submission materials required for mid-rise buildings are the same as what would be required for a tall building. We suggest that revised wording be considered as follows: "development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may require the following", and that subsections a) and d) be removed.</p>	The recommendation is to incorporate flexibility by changing the statement to: "Without prejudicing the other submittals and studies that will be determined through a Pre-Consultation Meeting, development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may be required to including the following:"

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.4.2.2.1	Every mid-rise application must be accompanied by a Pedestrian Wind Study and Sun/Shadow Study. The Landowners ask that the word "must" be replaced with "may" because not every 6-storey application should require a wind study or sun/shadow study, particularly in greenfield areas.	The recommendation is to incorporate flexibility by changing the statement to: "Without prejudicing the other submittals and studies that will be determined through a Pre-Consultation Meeting, development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may be required to including the following:"
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.4.2.2.1 and 9.4.2.2.2	Speaks to "at a minimum" and "must", the studies required for a mid-rise building. A mid-rise building in the Salem Secondary Plan lands is different than within the built boundary and these studies may not be necessary. Perhaps this should be revised to reflect the difference.	The recommendation is to incorporate flexibility by changing the statement to: "Without prejudicing the other submittals and studies that will be determined through a Pre-Consultation Meeting, development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may be required to including the following:"
McCowan Ardagh Road Property (Ardagh Rd and County Rd 27) / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.4.2.2.t	Placemaking brief- policy 9.4.2.2(t) may require an applicant for development to provide a placemaking brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required.	Placemaking briefs would be for development/redevelopment of sites critical to the City's cultural understanding and identity.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.1	A critical policy that is found within the Salem Secondary Plan but has been left out of the draft document is one that advises prospective developers whom are non-participating landowners that they must become a member in good standing with the group, prior to the submission of a development application. The Salem landowners respectfully request this policy remain.	Recommendation is to add the following policy to section 9.5.1: "Landowners in the Designated Greenfield Areas shall become a member of the governing landowners association prior to the City accepting and processing a development application."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.1	The Hewitt's and Salem Secondary Plans contain policies that require landowners to be signatories to the respective Cost Sharing Agreement prior to development approvals. The only related policy that appears in the new OP is in Section 9.5.11d) that allows the use of a holding provision until the developer enters into a Cost Sharing Agreement. Consistent with current practice, the Landowners request that a new policy be included in Section 9.5.1 of the new Official Plan that requires landowners to be a member in good standing of the respective Landowners Groups prior to the City accepting/processing any development applications.	Recommendation is to add the following policy to section 9.5.1: "Landowners in the Designated Greenfield Areas shall become a member of the governing landowners association prior to the City accepting and processing a development application."
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	9	9.5.11.d	Specific policies requiring landowners within these Secondary Plan areas to join the associated cost sharing agreements prior to approval of a subdivision, condominium plan or rezoning have been removed. While policy 9.5.11.d identifies entering into a cost sharing agreement as a potential condition for a Holding Symbol, this does not require such a condition to be applied and comes too late in the process. The OP must include a policy that landowners must be members in good standing with the respective landowner group as a condition of the pre-consultation or conformity exercise, i.e. prior to accepting/processing any development applications.	Recommendation is to add the following policy to section 9.5.1: "Landowners in the Designated Greenfield Areas shall become a member of the governing landowners association prior to the City accepting and processing a development application."

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.11.d	Requires the use of a hold symbol for the requirement of entering into a cost share agreement. In our view, landowners should be required to be a member in good standing with the Salem Landowners Group prior to the submission of development applications to the city. We request this be included in the Official Plan.	Recommendation is to add the following policy to section 9.5.1: "Landowners in the Designated Greenfield Areas shall become a member of the governing landowners association prior to the City accepting and processing a development application."
Trans Canada Pole: 7735 County Rd 27	IPS / Darren Vella	9	9.5.2	We have significant concerns with the substantial difference between phasing permissions between Phases 2 and 3. Development in Phases 3W, and all subsequent phases, is not permitted until 60 percent of the land in the preceding phase, being Phases 2E or 2W, as identified on Appendix 2, is subject to a registered M-Plan or equivalent level of approval, as determined by the City. This wording significantly differs from lands within Phase 2 which requires 60% of Phase 1 lands being approved draft plan of subdivision, approved draft plan of condominium, or registered site plan. Under the proposed policy framework, Phase 3 landowners would require Phase 2 lands to be within a Registered MPlan or other similar approvals. This will significantly alter the timing in which Phase 3 lands can commence Planning Act applications and will ultimately leave the City with a significant building permit gap between Phase 2 and 3 if Phase 3 lands cannot begin their planning process until 60% of phase 2 lands are registered. We request confirmation from the City that the Phasing Plan remain consistent between all Phases in the Secondary Plan areas. We would request that the wording utilized in 9.5.2(i) be used to describe the sequence of phasing in 9.5.2 (iii).	The phasing policies in the draft new Official Plan were deliberated after careful consideration to better align the development process with the supports needed for growth; the process should not result in delays on the City's end.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	9	9.5.2.a.i	states that a condition of Final Approval is occupancy. It is requested that this be removed. With a subdivision, for example, occupancy happens after issuance of a building permit, and a building permit is typically only issued after Final Approval. If the intention is to state that occupancy cannot occur until after Final Approval, it is suggested that the policy be re-worded.	After reviewing this policy, it was determined that it is not appropriate in the Phasing section (9.5.2); however, please note that we will be expanding the Development Agreements and Final Approval Section (9.4.2.8) slightly.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	9	9.5.2.e	Moving from one phase of development to the next should be expedited once appropriate growth management considerations have been met, which primarily should be focused on ensuring that the required infrastructure is available to support growth.	We agree that movement into subsequent development phases should be tied to growth management considerations, which do include a focus on required infrastructure, as per Policy 9.5.2.f. However, for the holistic and sustainable growth of Barrie, we must also take into account other considerations.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.2.h	Requires Sub-Watershed Impact Studies be completed prior to the next phase of development. The SIS for the Salem Secondary Plan encompassed all of the Phase 1, 2 and 3 lands within the current Salem Secondary Plan. The SIS should only be required for those identified as Phase 4 in the Salem area.	If Sub-Watershed Impact studies have already been completed for Phase 1, 2 and 3 lands, then as per the policy, a Sub-watershed Impact Study would only be needed for Phase 4 lands.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.2.i.iii and 9.5.2.i.ii	<p>Policy 9.5.2)i)iii) requires that 60% of Phase 2 East to be registered prior to approvals proceeding in Phase 3 East and then Phase 4 East. Long before the 60% registration timeline is achieved, the vast majority of infrastructure will have already been constructed to support development across all of the East phases. The Hewitt's Landowners believe that this policy will result in delaying the approvals/construction in Phases 3 and 4 East that will be relying in part on already constructed infrastructure.</p> <p>The Landowners request that the phasing requirements noted in 9.5.2)i)ii) apply to all Phases.</p>	The phasing policies in the draft new Official Plan were deliberated after careful consideration to better align the development process with the supports needed for growth; the process should not result in delays on the City's end.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	9	9.5.3	<p>It is requested that the requirement in policy 9.5.3 to review impacts to the City tax base in relation to subdivisions, the requirement for traffic calming, and the requirement for vegetation removal only within 30 days of grading, be reconsidered. With respect to vegetation removal, the Migratory Bird Act, in effect, only allows tree removal during the fall and winter months, and grading normally cannot occur during that time period. Further, development of large sites typically cannot occur within 30 days of vegetation removal. It is requested that these policies be removed or, in the case of vegetation removal, that the policy be amended to provide for an alternative approach to the satisfaction of the City.</p>	Traffic calming requirements will remain. However, it is recommended that policy 9.5.3.j.ii) will be changed to: " <u>Where possible</u> , removal of vegetation shall not occur more than 30 days prior to grading or construction;"
McCowan Ardagh Road Property (Ardagh Rd and County Rd 27)	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.5.3	<p>Subdivision policies - it is requested that the requirement in policy 9.5.3 to review the City tax base in relation to subdivisions, requirement for traffic calming, and requirement for vegetation removal only within 30 days of grading be reconsidered. Further, the lapse date policies of 9.5.3 (i) should include provision for extensions.</p>	<p>It is recommended that policy 9.5.3.j.ii) will be changed to: "<u>Where possible</u>, removal of vegetation shall not occur more than 30 days prior to grading or construction;" it is also recommended that a provision for extensions will be included in policy 9.5.3.i: "Approval of draft plans of subdivision may include provisions which require a subdivider to satisfy certain conditions prior to final approval an registration of the plan of subdivision. The developer will be required to satisfy these conditions within a specified time period, following which the draft plan approval will lapse if the conditions are not satisfied. <u>Extensions may be provided.</u>"</p>
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	9	9.5.3.i	<p>In policy 9.5.3 i), the lapse date should include provision for extensions.</p>	<p>It is recommended that a provision for extensions will be included in policy 9.5.3.i: "Approval of draft plans of subdivision may include provisions which require a subdivider to satisfy certain conditions prior to final approval and registration of the plan of subdivision. The developer will be required to satisfy these conditions within a specified time period, following which the draft plan approval will lapse if the conditions are not satisfied. <u>Extensions may be provided.</u>"</p>

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.3.j	Requires vegetation removal not occurring more than 30 days prior to grading. This is not achievable and should be removed.	It is recommended that policy 9.5.3.j.ii) will be changed to: " <u>Where possible</u> , removal of vegetation shall not occur more than 30 days prior to grading or construction;"
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.3j)ii)	Restricts removal of vegetation outside of 30 days prior to grading/construction. The Landowners request that this policy be removed because it is already contained in the LSPP (S.4.20 DP), and that policy intends to prevent erosion. Given tree removal restrictions under the Migratory Birds Act, there is no practical way to develop large greenfield sites within 30 days of tree removal; however, conformity with the LSPP policy can be maintained by preventing stump removal until closer to earthworks commencing.	It is recommended that policy 9.5.3.j.ii) will be changed to: " <u>Where possible</u> , removal of vegetation shall not occur more than 30 days prior to grading or construction;"
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.5.4	Plan of Condominium: We do not agree with or understand the mandatory ("shall") policies regarding the types of condominium considerations contained in subsections a), b) and c). Subsection d) should also acknowledge condominium exemptions as permitted by the Condominium Act.	Revisions have been made to this section, in part with consideration to the comment.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.4	Provides various condominium tenures. As noted previously, why is vacant land condominium not noted? This is another viable option which has been used successfully elsewhere.	This section has been rewritten to further clarify policies. All condominium types stated under the Condominium Act and Planning Act will be considered for application.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.4	Lists 3 plan of condominium types. The Landowners request that the types of condominiums not be referenced, and a single set of policies be developed. Alternatively, the City should then reference every condominium type, including Vacant Land Condominium's which have been successfully developed in Barrie.	This section has been rewritten to further clarify policies. All condominium types stated under the Condominium Act and Planning Act will be considered for application.
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	9	9.5.4.1	Condo Conversion policies identified in Section 9.5.4.1 are not consistent with Section 2.5.1 where conversion of rental units to ownership require replacement at a ratio of 1:1. If there is a healthy rental market and has been healthy for preceding years, replacement of rental units may be considered onerous.	The conversion rate is 1:1; but as stated in policy 2.5.e.iii) applications for a condominium conversion shall comply with the policies in section 9.5.4.1.
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.5.6.b	The policies of 9.5.6 (Context Sensitive Development) appear to state that infill is a form of intensification and shall be on a lot created between two existing lots that are approximately 150 metres or less apart and that the parcel of land should be in keeping with the existing and anticipated development in the area. It is submitted that the policy could be interpreted that higher order intensification cannot take place as infill development.	Policy 9.5.6.b) will be deleted.

Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	9	9.5.6.b	Policy 9.5.6b) states that “The distance between the existing lot lines in an infill situation shall be approximately 150.0 metres or less”. It is not clear as to the meaning or intent of such a policy, and would request clarification as to applicability and interpretation.	Policy 9.5.6.b) will be deleted.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	9	9.5.6.b	Policy 9.5.6 b) states “The distance between the existing lot lines in an infill situation shall be approximately 150.0 metres or less. We seek clarification on the intent of this policy, why it is included, and how it will be applied.	Policy 9.5.6.b) will be deleted.
Al McNair		9	9.5.7	Site Plan Control should be required for any residential expansion on an existing lot where the building footprint is increased by more than 20% or where landscaping provisions or protection of natural heritage features/functions are required.	Site Plan Control will be required for developments that would occur on properties located within the designated Site Plan Control area. We will also be further specifying that increased oversight will also be needed for special context areas.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	9	9.5.7.1.j	Section 9.5.7.1(j) which pertains to site plan control is unclear. To improve clarity, we suggest the following wording: ... exterior design of buildings, sustainable design elements on any adjoining municipal boulevards/rights-of way (modification underlined) The recommended wording makes it clear that this policy is referring to the municipal property, which we believe is its intent.	To improve clarity, the policy will be changed to: "To address design elements on the exterior of and surrounding a building, including, but not limited to: character, scale, appearance, massing, design features, roof pitch, materials and screening of rooftop mechanical and electrical equipment, and sustainable design elements."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	9	9.5.7.b	Policy 9.5.7 b) identifies that applications NOT subject to site plan control are required to provide elevations; it is assumed that elevations are required for applications which ARE subject to site plan control. Please amend or provide a rationale as to why non-Section 41 applications require elevations.	Policy 9.5.6.b will be revised; the intent of the policy is to ensure regulation for context sensitive areas.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.7b)	Requires elevations for buildings not subject to site plan control. Elevations should be required for buildings subject to SPC. Request removal of the word ‘not’.	Policy 9.5.6.b will be revised; the intent of the policy is to ensure regulation for context sensitive areas.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	9	9.5.9	Policy 9.5.9 states that “When reviewing an application for Minor Variance, the Committee of Adjustment will also consider the relevant policies of this Plan and all of the following criteria: a) That the variance would not cause substantial detriment, hazard, or annoyance that would detract from the character or amenity of nearby properties, and the resultant development would not adversely affect the traffic and parking conditions in the area”. In our submission, the policy should be revised to “all of the following relevant criteria”, since traffic and parking conditions may not be relevant for the particular variance (e.g., minimum setbacks).	Policies related to minor variances will be revised; we will stick to the four tests of the Planning Act.

Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	9	9.5.9	Draft Policy 9.5.9 states that “When reviewing an application for Minor Variance, the Committee of Adjustment will also consider the relevant policies of this Plan and all of the following criteria: a) That the variance would not cause substantial detriment, hazard, or annoyance that would detract from the character or amenity of nearby properties, and the resultant development would not adversely affect the traffic and parking conditions in the area”. In our submission, that this policy is overreaching and unnecessary, given that the assessment of Minor Variance Application the governed by the prescribed tests in the Planning Act.	Policies related to minor variances will be revised; we will stick to the four tests of the Planning Act.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.9	Sets out policies related to Minor Variance applications. The Planning Act sets out the four tests in which an application has to be examined. This section should be amended to be reflect the Planning Act and not create new test within this draft document.	Policies related to minor variances will be revised; we will stick to the four tests of the Planning Act.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	9	9.5.9.a	The conditions included in policy 9.5.9a) cannot reasonably be met as terms such as ‘annoyance’ are too broad and remain undefined. Tests which are not outlined and prescribed through the Planning Act cannot have a reasonable place in this document and so are not in keeping with legislative requirements.	Policies related to minor variances will be revised; we will stick to the four tests of the Planning Act.
Hewitt’s Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.9a)	New test a: cause a substantial detriment, hazard or annoyance that would detract from the character or amenity of nearby properties. The Landowners request removal of this policy because ‘detriment’ and ‘annoyance’ are inappropriate OP policies.	Policies related to minor variances will be revised; we will stick to the four tests of the Planning Act.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	9	block plans (mainly section 9, but also throughout)	There are numerous references to Block Plans without any explanation as to what these are, or where the City intends to require them. We suggest this language be removed as these references are unnecessary given that all lands are either within the built-up area (and will be subject to demonstration plans as shown in Appendix 3) or have been comprehensively planned in the Greenfield area through the Salem and Hewitt Secondary Plan processes and therefore no Block Plan should be required prior to development. To resolve this concern, we request that the City include a site-specific policy that states that the subject lands will not be required to undertake a Secondary or Block Plan prior to, as a requirement of, or condition of development approvals (draft plan of subdivision and zoning bylaw amendment).	Block Plans show the site and how a proposed development fits within the existing and/or planned surrounding fabric and context. We reserve the right to request a Block Plan where needed; if comprehensive planning for a site and the surrounding area is in place, we may not require one.

LSRCA		10	10.2	<p>The following definitions would benefit from additional clarification. Suggested wording provided below.</p> <p>Natural Heritage Features and Areas – include wetlands (non-PSW and unevaluated), woodlands (non-significant), locally significant natural areas, cultural thickets and cultural meadows.</p> <p>Woodlands: treed area, woodlot or forested area, other than a cultivated fruit or nut orchard or a plantation established for the purpose of producing Christmas trees (ORMCP).</p> <p>By using the ELC definition of “Forest”, it would restrict woodlands to treed areas with >60% cover. Many of the woodlands in the natural heritage system are not this dense. Many are woodlands with 35 – 60% cover.</p>	It should be noted that Natural Heritage Features is defined in the body of the Official Plan, therefore having a definition in section 10.2 is duplicative. The definition to Woodlands can be revised.
LSRCA		10	10.2	Please provide a definition for Stormwater Management Facilities. This will assist with conversations during the approval process regarding what is or is not accepted within the outer 50% of a VPZ to a natural heritage feature.	A definition of Stormwater Management facilities has been added.
PBM Realty Holdings / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	10	10.1.e	The use of discrete bulleted permitted uses within a land use designation is a very specific way of listing uses and must be utilized properly. For example, does the term "Residential" include seniors or student housing? We are concerned with the restricted list of employment and commercial uses. Additional expansion of the permitted use lists is recommended.	As highlighted in policy 10.1.e: "uses quoted under definitions in each of the land use categories should not be considered all inclusive. They are intended to illustrate the general intent of the policy."
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	1	It is noted that boundary revisions to the Urban Growth Centre established by the Growth Plan are proposed. Please identify the rationale for such revisions.	The Urban Growth Centre boundaries were revised due to limited development potential east of Essa Road and the presence of cultural heritage resources. At the same time, part of Allandale remains as an MTSA, which will also see intensification, but not at the same scale as the Urban Growth Centre.
Gary Bell		Maps	1	The existing mix of uses, greater intensity of residential uses in some parts, and greater traffic along all of Blake Street, (classified as Arterial with a 41 m ROW), make it functionally an Intensification Corridor. This should be acknowledged on Map 1. A designation of Strategic Growth Area would be appropriate and prescriptive for the section starting at and including at the Commercial District at Johnson Street out to Penetanguishene Road.	The level of intensification forecast for Intensification Corridors would not be suitable for Blake Street; therefore, it will remain classified as an arterial.
Gary Bell		Maps	1	The north part of the lands along the west side of Highway 400 north of Harvie Road is designated Commercial District on Map 2 Land Use. To be consistent and clear it should be designated Strategic Growth Area on Map 1 Community Structure.	The revision to the Strategic Growth Area on Map 1 will be made.
Gary Bell		Maps	1	There is a long existing employment and commercial area along Blake Street east of Johnson Street and particularly near Penetanguishene Road which could be recognized on Map 1 for desired Strategic Growth.	The level of intensification forecast for Intensification Corridors would not be suitable for Blake Street; therefore, it will remain classified as an arterial.

Ballymore	Keith MacKinnon / KLM	Maps	1	Map 1 identifies the Ballymore lands as part of the Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA). The policies related to the MTSA state it is for all lands that are within a 10-minute walking distance to the GO Train Station located north of Mapleview Drive, east of Yonge Street. Given the Ballymore location, we believe these lands do not meet the 10-minute walkable criteria and should be removed from the MTSA hatching.	We are adjusting the boundaries for the Barrie South MTSA, with this in mind.
Sean Mason / 570-586 Yonge	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	1	The rear of 586 Yonge St has been left out of the Strategic Growth Area on Map 1 and should be modified to include these lands with the remainder of the property.	The property at the rear of 586 Yonge should now be included in the Strategic Growth Area.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	1	The natural heritage system limits between the Crisdown and Unilock lands south of Salem, west of Essa do not reflect the approved limits. The natural heritage limits have been reflected on the natural heritage plans provided previously. As noted to staff, we will provide the approved limits.	As mentioned by email, once the approved limits are provided, we will make this change. In the meantime, please also note policy 10.1.c) that allows for NHS changes to be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will always take the most up-to-date, approved information.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	1	A park is missing on the Watersand Phase 2 lands at the terminus of Exell Avenue. This is consistent across many of the schedules.	This update has been completed.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	1	As noted previously, we request the streets and street names for the Phase 4 and employment lands east of Highway 400 be removed as they are not consistent with what will be ultimately shown in future draft plan of subdivision applications.	We include a disclaimer in the legend stating that "roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	1	Please explain how you arrived at the limits of the Barrie South Major Transit Station Area.	The boundary of the MTSA was established based on the Traffic Zones, and this was illustrated back in October 2019 in our Land Needs Assessment report. The boundaries for the MTSA were proposed at that time; however, we will be revisiting the boundaries given on the map.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	1	DGA hatching is missing from the south-east corner of Hewitt's.	The Designated Greenfield Area boundary has been updated and extended to the City limits.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	1	The MTSA overlaps with Neighbourhood Area lands which have vastly different density expectations.	We are revisiting the density target for the Barrie South MTSA, as well as the boundaries.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	Maps	1	We have noted an error in which a portion of our client's lands have been excluded from the Designated Greenfield Area ("DGA") in Map 1 of the Draft Official Plan and request this be corrected to include these lands as part of the DGA.	DGA boundary adjusted to be extended to the City Limits, as the Settlement Boundary Area has been proposed to be extended there too.

Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	2	<p>It is recommended that the City consider implementing pockets of Medium or High density designations to be scattered throughout the City in the Neighbourhood Areas and other areas, where intensified uses, taller buildings/higher densities, already exist and are considered compatible with adjacent uses. By including the existing medium and high density residential uses in the Neighbourhood Area designation appears to downgrade their land use intensification ability and renders their existing uses non-conforming (given Neighbourhood Area maximum building heights of 3 and 4 storeys.) Designating these sites/pockets of Medium or High density land uses would recognize their current existing higher density uses, allow for greater intensification potential, possibility to introduce non-residential uses, and recognize their underlying permitted zoning of apartment dwellings, zoned, RA1 and RA2. The Neighbourhood Area land use designation does not allow for the recognition of existing higher density uses and does not distinguish future high and low density residential uses.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the sites in question and have determined that a change to medium or high density would be inappropriate, given the surrounding neighbourhood context. At the same time, we have implemented a new policy section -- 2.5.6 "existing approvals" -- which upholds all existing approvals and permissions given to a site. This would apply to the sites in question.</p>
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	2	<p>The Plan identifies that the High Density land use designation is to be used in growth areas, Urban Growth Centre and the Strategic Growth Areas; however, on Map 2, Land Use, the only area where the High Density designation is identified is the Urban Growth Centre, the Osmington site at Hwy 400 and Essa Road and at Essa Road and Mapleview. The City should consider more High Density land uses in other areas of the City that can support taller buildings and higher densities such as the Major Transit Station Areas and near Commercial Districts.</p>	<p>This is the first Official Plan to really address Barrie's growth over the next 30 years and we want to ensure that growth is strategic, organic and manageable. At the same time, this will not be the only Official Plan between now and 2051, and as growth continues we may revisit where high density is allowed.</p>
Barb and Brian Tansley		Maps	2	<p>Big Bay Pt Rd map2 We are opposed to putting intensification areas into existing residential neighbourhoods. It appears to be planned medium density and we are concerned the increased density and heights 6-12 stories is just too much. There's also concern that already approved construction sites could increase density and height restriction beyond what's already planned.</p>	<p>Where there is a medium density development planned that will abut a residential neighbourhood, we will ensure that proper transitions and appropriate development limits will be put in place to allow for proper integration within the neighbourhood.</p>

Cecilia Lee/ 599 Dunlop Street West		Maps	2	<p>The land we own is 599 Dunlop Street West, at the corner of Dunlop Street West and Tiffin Street. It is located at the entrance to Barrie on the west side. My land is now grouped under Employment Land - Non Industrial, along Dunlop Street W and Employment Land - Industrial for the area next to it.. The net impact is that these new land use designations do not permit residential.</p> <p>Currently, we have zoning approval of C4 which includes a residential component. It was acquired prior to the creation and subsequent approval of the new Official Plan 2051. Even though we can still sell our land as C4 before the zoning by-law is changed, we have to put our sale on hold with this uncertainty.</p> <p>I am requesting that our land be recognized/honoured for our current privilege which includes a residential component and will be grandfathered in the new Official Plan 2051 and new zoning by-law.</p>	We will now be allowing those sites previously zoned commercial that are now receiving an Employment Area -- Non Industrial designation to maintain all permissions, excepting residential, for the Commercial District designation too. We will also be upholding existing permissions.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	Maps	2	<p>The Draft OP proposes to designate the Site as “Medium Density” and “Neighbourhood Area” as shown to the left. Informed by the current “Commercial General” designation, our concept for the Site has long incorporated commercial development as a cornerstone, complimented by adjacent residential uses at the key Yonge / Mapleview intersection. Request: That the “Commercial District” designation apply to the entire Site.</p> <p>As part of the ongoing development of the Site, we recently attended a site plan pre-consultation meeting with the City to discuss our intentions regarding commercial use on a portion of the Site. While we will be pursuing commercial development on parts of the Site, we acknowledge the ‘overlay policy’ objectives of the City to encourage significant medium and high density residential development near Yonge Street (Intensification Corridor) and near the GO Station (Major Transit Station Area / Strategic Growth Area). Given the size of the Site we believe objectives for intensive residential development can be achieved in conjunction with the planned commercial development and that this is best accomplished with a “Commercial District” designation.</p>	We have designated the entire site Commercial District, which prioritizes commercial development, but encourages a mix of uses, including residential.
Gary Bell		Maps	2	There is a long existing employment and commercial area along Blake Street east of Johnson Street and particularly near Penetanguishene Road which could be recognized on Map 2 for Commercial or Employment- Non-Industrial intent.	The Neighbourhood Area designation allows for commercial uses, including small scale office, as well as retail along an arterial street such as Blake. Therefore, we feel that the designation is appropriate, as it will also help maintain the existing neighbourhood fabric and context.

<p>Marshall Landholdings - 15,13,11,9,5 Peel Street & 118, 98 Mulcaster St</p>	<p>Greg Barker / IPS</p>	<p>Maps</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Under the current Official Plan, the lands are located partially within/adjacent the Urban Growth Centre (Schedule I). Through previous discussions between City staff and the owners, it was understood the subject lands may develop in accordance with the policies of the UGC given their proximity to the UGC. As was the case with the first draft, the second Draft City of Barrie Official Plan, Map 2, identifies the subject lands as being within the Neighbourhood Area designation. The subject lands and the general surrounding area is currently comprised predominantly of existing or planned medium density development within the RM2 zone. There is very little development exhibiting existing low density character, nor would current zoning of this area permit new low density development. This area is not recognized as having existing nor planned low density development. The lands are also adjacent the UGC and lands proposed to be designated as High Density and as such it is anticipated that infrastructure capacity exists or is planned in proximity to the site which could be used to accommodate higher (ie medium) density developments. Given the proximity to the UGC, there is an expectation and a requirement that the area is expected to experience significant physical change in order to accommodate anticipated development which would alter the character of the area. Request: it was understood and agreed that the medium density designation is intended.</p>	<p>We have surveyed the site in detail and given the neighbourhood context, the current land use designation is appropriate. Under this Official Plan, the site may see up to 4 storeys along Mulcaster.</p>
<p>505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street</p>	<p>Jack Krubnik / IPS</p>	<p>Maps</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Our intention in this Official Plan Review is to justify the consideration that 505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street is uniquely positioned for more intensification, taller heights, and more density than has been attributed to it within this Official Plan review. The site is located on an Arterial Road, has a size of approximately 2.7 ha, and has significant frontage along both a watercourse and Yonge Street, which has been identified as an Intensification Corridor. Given this backdrop, and the policy intent of the New Official Plan, particularly related to growth management and Intensification Corridors, we feel that the subject site would be more appropriately designated as Medium or High Density in Official Plan Map 2 – Land Use Designations.</p>	<p>The land use designation for this site will be changed to Medium Density.</p>

70 Pioneer Trail	Brandi Clement / Jones Consulting	Maps	2	<p>A Pre-Consultation meeting was held on December 3, 2020 to discuss a proposed Site Plan consisting of 19 single detached dwellings (File No. D28-052-2020). A formal application for Site Plan Control will be submitted to the City in the summer of 2021. An OMB decision approved a total of 19 single detached dwellings on the lands. Permitted average densities within the current Residential designation include low-density residential uses between 12 and 25 units per net hectare. The approved concept of 19 units provides for a density of approximately 9 units per net hectare (19 units / 2.17 ha). Based on these policies, the proposed use on the subject lands as permitted by the OMB is permitted; however, the density does not meet the minimum density standard. The minimum target of 50.0 units per hectare can be difficult to achieve where other policies must be met such as respecting existing character, having regard for natural heritage features, intensification policies, topographical features and property configuration. Further, the EPA-Level 1 designation is too restrictive for the subject lands which has been approved by the OMB for development. We respectfully request that the City review the minimum density targets for lands designated Neighbourhood Area in the draft Official Plan to provide for a greater range, revise the language to be less restrictive to allow for greater flexibility, and identify the existing OMB decision on these lands.</p>	<p>The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process. The minimum density target for local roads in a Neighbourhood Area will also be removed.</p>
Allandale Centre / 367-371, 375, 389, 393 Yonge Street	Street Properties / Luisa Di Iulio	Maps	2	<p>Site currently in an Intensification Node and on an Intensification Corridor and designated "General Commercial." The site hosts several one-storey commercial and office buildings. The site is proposed in Draft 2 of the new OP to be designated Neighbourhood Area. We would request that the properties be re-designated to "Medium Density" and that a higher height be provided for this site than the current proposed Medium Density policies for the following reasons: the site remains located on an intensification corridor; the site has a greater depth than is characteristic of many underutilized parcels of land on Intensification Corridors, thus providing for appropriate depths for transition to the adjacent low density neighbourhood; the site is within walking distance of a school, commercial, parks and trails; as a land assembly, the site provides ample opportunity to allow for at grade amenity space, commercial and landscaping.</p>	<p>Existing permissions for the site will be maintained, as per a new policy introduced to section 2.5. At the same time, we feel that the current land use designation is appropriate for the area.</p>

McCowan Ardagh Road Property (Ardagh Rd and County Rd 27)	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	Maps	2	<p>It is requested the lands on the Site identified as Neighbourhood Area be designated Medium Density on Map 2 in order to reflect this intended built form. This request was included in letter to City dated December 22, 2020.</p> <p>We believe Medium Density would be a more appropriate designation for the site as the site has a constrained developable area, is not immediately adjacent to any other built form and is somewhat isolated. Maximizing the density on the site in the context of the surround area would make efficient use of the site and allow for a greater variety of built form in this area of the City which predominately consists of single detached dwellings on the south side of Ardagh Rd and further to the east.</p>	Intensification in this area would be difficult to service by transit; the Neighbourhood Area designation respects the surrounding context for the area.
10-24 Grove Street West	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	Maps	2	<p>Our Client's primary concern with the 2nd Draft of the New Official Plan is that it does not clearly identify or carry forward the existing OP and ZBL permissions that exist on their lands. As the City is aware these lands received site specific OPA and ZBA approvals back in 2018. Our Client acquired these lands in early 2021 and have been actively working through the site plan approval process for a large purpose built rental project. It is requested that the property be identified on Map 2 as a Defined Policy Area and all site specific permissions be recognized and carried forward within Section 2.8 - Defined Policy Areas.</p>	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process.
Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	Maps	2	<p>Our review of Map2, entitled Land Use Designations, indicates that there is a note on the schedule which reads ... "All land use designations extend to the centre line of the street and up to the highway right-of-way where appropriate."</p> <p>To avoid any confusion as to the intent of the foregoing note on Map 2, it is suggested that reference should be made to the highway right-of-way existing as of the date of adoption of the proposed (new) Official Plan. Clarification is also sought in relation to the phrase "where appropriate" as this suggests that situations may exist where the designations are not to be interpreted to extend to the centreline of the street or up to the highway right-of-way. This is of particular significance in the context of lands in the vicinity of Dunlop Street</p>	We have revised the disclaimer on the map to provide greater clarification.

265 St Vincent Street	Mark Blair	Maps	2	<p>I would like to formally provide a submission requesting my property at 265 St Vincent Street be designated Medium Density (orange) in the third draft of the City of Barrie's Official Plan (OP).</p> <p>Factors supporting this reclassification from Neighbourhood Area (yellow) to Medium Density (orange) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is a large land parcel at the intersection of a 4 lane arterial road (St Vincent) and a collector road (Grove St), with frontage along both roads - It is strategically located within 1.5 km of Georgian College & RVH, 2km from Downtown Barrie, & has easy and quick highway access, & bus routes servicing the property - The intersection it is located in has a gas station, & a 4-story apartment building, with more 3-4 story apartment buildings within a block of this intersection on Grove Street going West, representing a transitioning area for density-appropriate growth - Having a medium density designation that will allow 6+ stories instead of a limit of 4 stories, will facilitate the city's goal of increasing density-based housing supply quicker and sooner, as an increase in density designation will facilitate me attracting interest in developing my property sooner, instead of continuing to operating it as a chiropractor office, which due to its valuable location and the lack of housing in Barrie, is no longer the highest and best use of this site. 	We have reviewed the site, and given the surrounding neighbourhood context and that the site is not in an intensification area, we believe that a limit of four storeys is appropriate.
Smart Centres / 15 Harvie Rd	Mark Resnick	Maps	2	<p>We request that the Land Use Designation on Map 2 Land Use Designations for the eastern portion of the property between future Bryne Drive extension and Highway 400 be changed from "Employment – Industrial" to "Employment – Non-Industrial".</p> <p>The change in designation is requested as the "Employment – Non-Industrial" designation affords greater flexibility of land uses which we desire, inclusive of a range of Employment uses including Office, major retail, and industrial uses such as distribution, manufacturing, and warehousing. This desired flexibility was not offered in Employment designations established in the first draft of the Official Plan.</p>	We have reviewed the site, and the land use designation has been changed to Employment Non-Industrial.
52, 56, 58 Lakeside Terrace	JD Development Group / Sally Campbell	Maps	2	<p>Upon review of the policies of the draft Official Plan as proposed, the subject lands should be designated 'High Density' to recognize the current permissions, densities and building heights on the subject lands. Anything less than this would limit the development potential of our property.</p>	We have reviewed the site, and the land use designation has been changed to high density.

Ballymore	Keith MacKinnon / KLM	Maps	2	In the event that the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies are replaced with new City-wide land use designations and policies, we ask that Blocks 1-16, 22, 23 and 32, all-inclusive on the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan should be designated Neighbourhood Area. Only Block 24 which is located on the south side of Kneeshaw Drive in the south portion of the property should be designated Medium density. That Map 2 be revised to redesignate the draft approved blocks on the north side of Kneeshaw from Medium Density to Neighbourhood Area while leaving the larger block with frontage onto Lockhart designated as Medium Density. This will allow Ballymore to provide a range of heights, housing types and densities.	We have revised the site's land use designations; Blocks 1-16, 22, 23 & 32 are now Neighbourhood Area; and Block 24 is Medium Density.
St. Joseph Developments (Dunlop and Miller Drive)	DSF / David White	Maps	2	The Dunlop Street frontage is currently designated General Commercial in the existing Official Plan and zoned C4 by By-law 2009-141. This commercial designation is proposed to be eliminated for my client's lands and replaced by an Employment Non-Industrial designation. This proposed designation is effectively a down designation which removes a number of critical uses. The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation has a strange assortment of permitted uses that would appear to be out of character for the site and surrounding area. The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation will not permit the appropriate development of the site with uses that are realistic and practical and which represent good planning for a "gateway" to the City. We request that the existing Commercial designation continue on this site or in the alternative the site receive a special site specific designation that permits all of the existing commercial uses.	This and other sites that were formerly "General Commercial" and are now Employment Area - Non-Industrial. These sites will now receive the permissions in the Commercial District designation, excepting for residential. Existing approvals will also be upheld through a policy addition to section 2.5.

Sean Mason / 405 Essa Road	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	2	<p>Under the current policy framework, it is our opinion that the subject property should be considered for medium density with new policy considerations under this designation. It is our opinion that a greater extent of the Essa Road corridor should be marked for greater levels of intensification. There are many examples of recent approvals that have not been adequately identified on Map 2. 440 and 390 Essa Road are two examples with recent approvals that should be designated more appropriately in the medium or high-density designations (i.e. densities greater than 125 uph). The subject lands lie directly across the street from 390 Essa Road. A pre-consultation meeting has already taken place for a proposed mixed-use building that would not align with the Neighborhood Area designation. A Neighborhood meeting has also been scheduled and this application is planned to be deemed complete in advance of the new Official Plan being adopted. The medium density designation would allow for a greater opportunity for the City to accomplish intensification goals, develop transit supportive densities and offer opportunities to create more attainable housing in areas where services are within walking distance. The subject lands also lie within a 10-minute walk to an underutilized municipal park (Harvie Park) and Trillium Woods Elementary School.</p>	<p>We will be adding a qualifier to the policy on intensification corridors in Neighbourhood Areas that may allow for up to 8 storeys. Moreover, existing approvals will be upheld in the Official Plan, once implemented.</p>
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	2	<p>Given its location at the intersection of Hurst Drive (arterial road) and along the railway corridor, the property lends itself to medium density residential development along the railway corridor. The lands slope toward the railway corridor and based on preliminary site design concepts, a six-storey building could be placed into the slope providing a six-storey height profile on the east (Hurst Drive/Rail Line) with a four or five storey profile on the west. The remainder of the site will transition with a lower density built form (i.e. townhouses) toward the rear of the site adjacent to the existing neighborhood. Tollendale Village, located along Hurst Drive just north of the site, possesses a dense built form that can be complemented by this proposal. We respectfully request that this site be a candidate for the medium density designation.</p>	<p>We have reviewed this site in-depth, and the permission of four storeys is appropriate for this area.</p>
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	2	<p>Exell Avenue is shown as a collector road west of Reid Drive. Given that it does not go anywhere, this section should be removed and should be shown as a local road only.</p>	<p>Exell Avenue will continue to show as a collector in its entirety. We have reviewed this with Transportation and this continuation is needed to support active transportation infrastructure.</p>
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	2	<p>A road pattern with street names for the lands on the south side of McKay Road West and County Road 27 are not accurate and should be removed.</p>	<p>The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."</p>

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	2	The street pattern and street names for the lands on the south side of McKay Road East and should be removed.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	2	The NHS limits are not correct on the Crisdawn lands south of Salem, west of Essa Road.	As mentioned by email, once the approved limits are provided, we will make this change. In the meantime, please also note policy 10.1.c) that allows for NHS changes to be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will always take the most up-to-date, approved information.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2	515 Mapleview Drive East (BEMP Property)(D12-431): The 'medium density' block on the BEMP property (Mapleview Drive and Madeline) does not reflect the approved draft plan and zoning.	We have reviewed the site and believe the designation to be correct. Changes were completed as per the latest plan submitted for red-line revision. Blocks 257 & 258 from Draft Plan D12-431 are identified as mixed use blocks. The two blocks were designated as Medium Density. The zoning for the two blocks is Neighbourhood Mixed Use.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2	989 Yonge Street (ASA Development): The north-east corner of Lockhart Road and Yonge Street is designated "Neighbourhood Area". This area should be designated "Medium Density".	We have reviewed the site, and have changed the land use designation to medium density.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2	750 Lockhart (Ballymore): In the event that the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies are replaced with new City-wide land use designations and policies, Ballymore requests that Blocks 1-16, 22, 23 and 32, all inclusive on the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan should be designated Neighbourhood Area. Only Block 24 which is located on the south side of Kneeshaw Drive in the south portion of the property should be designated Medium density. Additionally, ALL figures and/or maps in the new OP should be revised to show the alignment for Collector Road Kneeshaw Drive (including the roundabouts) as per the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan.	Kneeshaw Drive has been aligned to correspond with the latest plans received. We have also revised the site's land use designations; Blocks 1-16, 22, 23 & 32 are now Neighbourhood Area; and Block 24 is Medium Density.
Park Place	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	2	The designation proposed for the SW corner of Bayview/Harvie Rd. is Non-Industrial Employment. The size, 8,451 msq. and location of the site does not readily lend itself to development under these policies. We are of the view that the site should be designated as Commercial District to allow for development as planned and permitted under the existing OP designation and zoning. As you may know our client has entered into an agreement of purchase and sale for these lands and the beneficial owner has filed a pre-consultation application. Current plans envisage a modern car wash and convenience retail development. We would like to ensure that this project does not have any future policy obstacles.	We will be expanding permissions for the Non-Industrial Employment area. Moreover, existing approvals will be upheld once the Official Plan is implemented.

Cedar Links Golf Course / 611 Huronia	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	2	Upon review of the Official Plan framework, we would respectfully request that the subject lands be considered for the Employment Area – Non-Industrial Designation. The subject lands are located on the periphery of the employment area and are not located on a Freight Supportive Corridor. The location of the subject lands can serve as a buffer along with the existing commercial plaza to the west from heavier industrial uses.	Cedar Links Golf Course will maintain its current designation. The site <u>just north</u> of Cedar Links Golf Course (571 Huronia; the northeast corner of Huronia and Mapleview) will be changed to Employment Non-Industrial.
571 Huronia Rd	IPS / Kyle Galvin	Maps	2	Upon review of the Official Plan framework, we would respectfully request that the subject lands be considered for the Employment Area – Non-Industrial Designation. The subject lands are located on the periphery of the employment area and are not located on a Freight Supportive Corridor. The location of the subject lands can serve as a buffer along with the existing commercial plaza across the street to the south west from heavier industrial uses.	The site just north of Cedar Links Golf Course (571 Huronia; the northeast corner of Huronia and Mapleview) will be changed to Employment Non-Industrial.
17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	2	It is our opinion that based on the location of the subject site relative to the Major Transit Station and the unique characteristics of the subject lands make it more suitable for the High-Density Designation for several reasons. 1. The subject site is in an important location to support growth and will play a pivotal role in intensification initiatives for the City and the ability to strive towards creating a more complete community. 2. The subject site is near Essa Road. Essa Road is a main arterial road and transit priority location. This is a location in which high density development should be considered. 3. The subject lands are in close proximity to Highway 400/Essa Interchange. 4. It is understood that among others, the Medium Density designation is to provide a transition area from the High Density Areas to Neighbourhood Area Designated lands. The subject site is located approximately 62m from the nearest Neighbourhood Area designated lands which allows for ample transition from High Density to Neighbourhood Area Designation. The development of high density residential is appropriately buffered from Neighborhood Areas where transition and lower densities would be considered more appropriate. 5. Placing high density in this location is not viewed as negatively impacting abutting developments and would permit a built form that is similar to the land uses that have	We have reviewed the site in depth, and believe the existing land use designation is appropriate for the area, given the surrounding neighbourhood context. Medium Density will allow for up to 12 storeys. At the same time, existing approvals will be upheld.

61 Big Bay Pt. Rd: CW Bellrose GP	R.G. Richards / Ron Richards	Maps	2	The designation proposed for the Site in the draft official plan is Non-Industrial Employment. The size (8,451 msq.) and location of the Site does not, in our opinion, readily lend itself to development under these proposed policies. We are of the view that the site should be designated as Commercial District to allow for development as planned and permitted under the existing OP designation and zoning.	We have reviewed the site in detail, and believe that the Non-Industrial Employment land use designation is appropriate. At the same time, the Non-Industrial Employment land use designation has been revised to allow for some expanded permissions.
545 Dunlop St. West: AGC Developments	David S White/DSW	Maps	2	The Dunlop Street frontage is currently designated General Commercial in the existing Official Plan and zoned C4 by By-law 2009-141. This commercial designation is proposed to be eliminated for my client's lands and replaced by an Employment Non-Industrial designation. This proposed designation is effectively a down designation which removes a number of critical uses. The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation will not permit the appropriate development of the site with uses that are realistic and practical and which represent good planning for a "gateway" to the City. We request that the existing Commercial designation continue on this site or in the alternative the site receive a special site specific designation that permits all of the existing commercial uses.	For sites such as the one referenced by the commenter, while the designation will remain Employment Non-Industrial, all Commercial District permissions -- excepting for residential -- will apply.
19 Dundonald Street	James Hunter/IPS	Maps	2	Blake Street is adjacent to the subject lands and is identified by the Official Plan as an 'Arterial Street', where up to four (4) storeys of height is permitted under the Neighbourhood Area designation. However, a site located at 1 Blake Street to the south of the subject lands has been included in this designation, despite an existing building height of eight (8) storeys. We encourage the City to closely examine the surrounding area and accurately reflect the land use designations, based on existing built forms.	We have changed 1 Blake Street to Medium Density to recognize the existing height of eight storeys on the property. At the same time, this area not within an intensification corridor, and the subject property in question is within a historic neighbourhood with adjacent low density uses. Given this, we believe the Neighbourhood Area designation to be appropriate.
19 Dundonald Street	James Hunter/IPS	Maps	2	As overviewed under Section 1.0, we are requesting the City consider applying an alternative designation on the subject lands to align with the proposed application and intended land use for this location, more specifically the 'Medium Density' designation. Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, the Medium Density designation is the most appropriate designation for the subject lands, as discussed in the following section.	We have reviewed the site in depth. Given that the subject property is within a historic neighbourhood with adjacent low density uses, we believe the Neighbourhood Area designation to be appropriate.

70&76 Edgehill Drive	Darren Vella / IPS	Maps	2	Given that 70 Edgehill is directly abutting 76 Edgehill, and is the last property along Edgehill Drive, it is respectfully requested that 70 Edgehill possess the same designation at 76 Edgehill. This will ensure a comprehensive plan can be developed for both parcels without the need for further amendments to the Official Plan. 70 Edgehill is an excellent candidate for medium or high density development based on its buffer from surrounding low density residential uses and its adjacency to other high density approvals and structures. Furthermore, Edgehill Drive contains a number of medium and high density developments which are currently incorrectly designated Neighbourhood Area in this Draft of the Official Plan. These existing buildings should be placed in the medium or high density category in the next draft of the Official Plan.	We have reviewed the property in depth, and will be redesignating the site as Medium Density.
JohnMark Holdings_220 Mapleview Drive East	MHBC / Wes Crown	Maps	2	the best planned use for the subject property would be the "Employment Area – Non-Industrial" designation. Changes to Map 2 of the Draft new Official Plan would be required.	The property's land use designation will be changed to Employment Area -- Non-Industrial.
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	2	The sites at 35 Blake Street and 7 & 15 Vancouver Street are currently occupied by 3 and 4 storey buildings designated Residential and zoned Residential Apartment Dwelling RA1-2 and RA1. Seeking consideration for a Medium Density designation to recognize existing apartment uses and the potential for future intensification on sites that are already built at higher densities than that envisioned by the Neighbourhood Area designation.	The sites will retain their Neighbourhood Area designation, as Medium Density would not be appropriate given the surrounding area context. At the same time a policy will be introduced in section 2.5 that upholds existing permissions; therefore, all previous height permissions will be upheld should redevelopment take place on the site.
Michelle Lackey		Maps	2	Why are the vacant lands south of Loon Ave/East of Huronia Road (ie Lovers Creek Ravine) being considered for residential zoning, when they have been identified as EP Level 1 and are adjacent to a Provincially Significant Wetland and sit upon a significant woodland? Parts of these lands are currently zoned for light industrial and agricultural uses which would likely be more appropriate for the environmental impact of these lands than residential. I think their designations should remain as they are now OR, the city should consider re-zoning them to Environmental Protection or Greenspace.	The new official plan will not come into effect until it is approved by Council and then by MMAH. Therefore, we must uphold any rezoning that happens ahead of the implementation of the Plan. At the same time, no matter what the zoning is for a property, EP Level 1 designations prevail and the EP Level 1 land will remain protected.
Sean Mason / 570-586 Yonge	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	3	In addition, the rear of 586 Yonge St is incorrectly designated Natural Heritage System, EPA-Level 2, on Map 3 which should be modified to align with the Natural Heritage System mapping on Maps 1 and 2, and recognize the previous approvals granted which established the development limits to the extent that the Natural Heritage lands were dedicated to the Conservation Authority.	This change will be made accordingly.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	3	The Natural Linkage Area shown between the Crisdawn and Unilock lands south of Salem, west of Essa Road are not correct.	As mentioned by email, once the approved limits are provided, we will make this change. In the meantime, please also note policy 10.1.c) that allows for NHS changes to be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will always take the most up-to-date, approved information.
Cedar Links Golf Course / 611 Huronia	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	3	Through the development process associated with the previous employment conversion request, the Natural Heritage features on site were walked with MNRF and LSRCAs and ultimately surveyed to delineate their boundaries. We would request that Map 3 be revised to reflect these boundaries in the next draft of the Official Plan.	Please provide the documentation from the LSRCAs and MNRF to confirm their agreement and then we will make this change. Furthermore, please consider policy 10.1.c), which allows for NHS, floodplain and EIS changes to be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will take the most up-to-date, approved information.
19 Dundonald Street	James Hunter/IPS	Maps	3	On Map 3 (Natural Heritage Protection Overlays), the subject lands include a 'EPA – Level 3' classification. These resources are identified as being more regionally or locally significant features and supporting components of the Natural Heritage Resource network. The subject lands have benefited from extensive environmental work being completed for a pending Zoning By-law Amendment application on the lands. As part of the assessments, it has been concluded that the subject lands can be developed without negligible impacts on the existing features or abutting features. Through the pending ZBA application, justification will be provided through environmental studies/assessments to support removal of the Level 3 overlay on the subject lands.	Existing approvals will be upheld by the Official Plan, once implemented, as per a new policy added to section 2.5. Furthermore, please consider policy 10.1.c), which allows for NHS, floodplain and EIS changes to be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will take the most up-to-date, approved information.
NVCA		Maps	3	Map Schedule 3 identifies an area of land at the western end of Ardagh Road (north side) as EPA2, which adjoins a broader area of EPA1. The area of EPA1 represents the present area of Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) as mapped by the province. However, most or all of the adjoining area of EPA2 is recognized as wetland by the NVCA and, for planning purposes is considered to be a part of the broader PSW. The discrepancy in designations in this location represents an issue because, although the EPA2 designation recognizes the significance of the feature, it potentially permits development pending the results of site-specific study (EIS). Through various past pre-consultations, NVCA has notified applicants that development within the wetlands in this location will not be supported. It is recommended that the City use this OP update as an opportunity to refine the EPA1/EPA2 in this location to capture the full extent of wetland area. Mapping has been attached to this email to illustrate the area of field-verified wetland in this location. Data layers can be provided upon request.	These changes have been made.

800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	Maps	5	<p>Related to the foregoing we also note that Map 5 of the New OP shows a 41 metres right-of-way for Mapleview Drive across the frontage of our Site, whereas the Schedule E of the existing OP shows this as being a 34 metre right-of-way. The right-of-way width across our Site should be left at 34 metres.</p>	<p>The right-of-ways provided and updated in the new Official Plan are in accordance with our most recent Transportation Master Plan and MTO's guidelines. Though we have also made some updates through the proper EA approvals avenue and will provide a disclaimer on Map 5. We realize appropriate right-of-way widths are an ongoing, broader conversation and we will continue work on this.</p>
Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	Maps	5	<p>We are unaware of any updates to the Transportation Master Plan or Environmental Assessment with respect to the proposed improvements to Dunlop Street West which have identified the need for a 55 metre (i.e. 180 foot) right-of-way over the section of Dunlop Street West between Anne Street and Cedar Pointe Drive. Accordingly, we question the justification for the increase from 41 to 55 metres in the absence of an update to the Environmental Assessment for the improvements to Dunlop Street West between Anne Street and Ferndale Drive. Given the significance of this issue, we confirm our request for a copy of the comments provided by the Ministry of Transportation in relation to the draft of the new official plan. Should this information and the documentation or reports upon which Council relied in determining that a 55 metre right-of-way was appropriate not be forthcoming, please advise as to the reasons for the requested documents and related information being withheld. we confirm our request for copies of the comments provided by the Ministry of Transportation in relation to the draft of the Official Plan as well as copies of the documentation referred to by Staff during the course of the May 19, 2021, public open house in relation to the proposed right-of-way width of Dunlop Street West between Anne Street and Cedar</p>	<p>We have been advised that the requested documentation has been provided.</p>

Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	Maps	5	<p>We ask that the City not take a “one size fits all approach” with respect to road widenings, and although this new maximum ROW width is protected for Arterial Roads in Map 5 of the Draft Official Plan Amendment, we request that the OPA include allowances for reduced / alternative ranges on roads within the Urban Growth Centres and the Strategic Growth Areas . This is further demonstrated in Policy 4.2(d) which states “the City may establish sub-typologies for streets to respond to the community structure and different land uses and guidance will be provided in the Urban Design Guidelines.” While we are supportive of the general intent of this policy, we request this policy be expanded to more explicitly permit reduced dimensions for protected right-of-way widths within Urban Growth Centres. The same principles should be reinforced in the Urban Design Guidelines when they are prepared. We request that the road widening policies for Arterial Roads, located in Urban Growth Centres in the Draft OPA be modified to reflect the intentions of the City’s policies for Complete Streets, and further, we would like to review appropriate road widths with Transportation Staff.</p>	<p>The right-of-ways stated are needed by the City. However, there is a policy addition that states that in some cases reduced setbacks will be contemplated -- this would include those contexts that the commenter has referenced.</p>
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	5	<p>Exell Avenue, west of Reid Drive, is shown as a 24m collector road. Given it terminates at a neighbourhood park, it is our opinion this should be identified as a local road.</p>	<p>Exell Avenue will continue to show as a collector in its entirety. We have reviewed this with Transportation and this continuation is needed to support active transportation infrastructure.</p>
Hewitt’s Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	5	<p>Fenchurch west of Ball Gate should be 24m, not 27m as per the approved draft plan and existing Hewitt’s Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>We have reviewed this with Transportation, and we will be changing the right-of-way width to 24 metres.</p>
Hewitt’s Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	5	<p>Sheppard Drive east of Madeline Drive is a local street, not a 27 m collector as per the approved draft plan of subdivision and existing Hewitt’s Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>The right-of-way widths for Sheppard have been updated on Map 5. The map is guided by the most recent Transportation Master Plan, MTO guidelines and EA approvals. We realize that right-of-way widths are an ongoing conversation and we will continue to work on this.</p>
Hewitt’s Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	5	<p>Lockhart Road is identified as having a maximum road width of 34 metres. The Landowners request that the widening reflect the approved Environmental Assessment and negotiations with the City concurrent with draft plan applications. This includes 34 metre width west of Yonge Street and 34 metres in width tapering to 27 metres in width east of Yonge Street.</p>	<p>We are showing the mid-block right-of-way width agreed to with the land owners group. Where possible, we are also showing additional requirements reflective of approved EAs where the widening is in excess of the mid-block width. Map 5 is also guided by the most recent Transportation Master Plan and MTO guidelines. We realize that right-of-way widths are an ongoing conversation and we will continue to work on this.</p>

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	5	Mapleview Drive is shown as being 41 metres in width to the 20th Sideroad. Similar to point D4.a above, the widening of Mapleview tapers to 34 metres.	The right-of-ways provided in the new Official Plan are in accordance with our most recent Transportation Master Plan as well as MTO guidelines and EA approvals. We realize appropriate right-of-way widths are an ongoing, broader conversation and we will continue work on this.
Gary Bell		Maps	6	It would be useful to repeat the Mixed-Use Trails Off Road from Map 4A Mobility on Map 6 to show how the Parks and NHS areas are connected.	The trail layer from Map 4A has been added to Map 6.
HIP Development	MHBC / Trevor Hawkins	Maps	6	The proposed Map 6 identifies two portions of the site as "Park." It is not clear why any portion of the lands is identified as Park, as the lands are approved for a residential development and a community institutional use (YMCA). We ask that the mapping be corrected to remove the "Park" designation from the lands. This request was previously made in our first submission, however the mapping has not been revised.	This change has been completed as per the latest approvals for the site.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	6	The neighbourhood Park, which terminates at Exell Avenue is not shown.	The park has been added, as per the parks master plan for Salem.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	6	The Stormwater Management Pond on the south side of Walker Street, immediately east of the NHS does not exist and should be removed. This should be consistent across all of the schedules.	The stormwater management pond has been removed as indicated.
Barb and Brian Tansley		Maps	7	Drinking water intake protection area zone 2 map7 Conflicts with plans for strategic growth area Yonge and Big Bay Pt Rd Well head protection at Yonge ,Minet's Point and Hurst also conflicts with Strategic growth area . So how can our drinking water be protected if there's so much construction over such a large vulnerable area?	The policies pertaining to the protection of drinking water intake are found in Section 6.5; the relevant policies will be applied to all protection area zones, regardless of location.

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	Maps	7	<p>Based upon a review of Map 7, there are no areas specifically identified as Groundwater Recharge Areas.</p> <p>Rather, the policies set out in Section 6.5.1.2 state that a significant groundwater recharge area is an area identified as such by any public body for the purposes of implementing the Provincial Policy Statement, an area as may determined by way of an assessment report required under the Clean Water Protection Act, or, an area so defined by the Conservation Authority.</p> <p>It follows that lands could be identified as a Groundwater Recharge Area without the need for an amendment to the Official Plan. As a result, affected land owners would not have any right of appeal concerning the inclusion of their property holdings within a ground water recharge area.</p> <p>The effect of the foregoing policy statements is to infer the designation of lands as a Ground Water Recharge Area by means of other instruments and/or decisions made by public bodies. Given the proposed policy framework associated with the use and development of lands determined to be within a Ground Water Recharge Area, it is submitted that Map 7 should be revised to clearly delineate and/or clarify the extent of existing, identified Ground Water Recharge Areas referenced in Section 6.5.1.2.</p> <p>In the event that areas are identified as a Ground Water</p>	We will ensure that ground water recharge areas are captured. As we are also adding in highly vulnerable aquifers onto the map, we will likely be breaking Map 7 into a Map7a and a Map7b in the future.
NVCA		Maps	7	<p>Previous comments have been addressed, however we note the following that Section 6.5.1.2- Groundwater Recharge Areas states:</p> <p>“Significant groundwater recharge areas are reflected in Map 7 which are meant to improve or restore the quality and quantity of groundwater in these areas and the function of the recharge areas”.</p> <p>It is noted that the significant recharge areas and highly vulnerable aquifers are not outlined in the referenced map 7.</p>	We will ensure that ground water recharge areas are captured. As we are also adding in highly vulnerable aquifers onto the map, we will likely be breaking Map 7 into a Map7a and a Map7b in the future.

Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	8	Please explain the rationale for the Boundary expansion of the Historic Neighbourhoods from those recognized in the Historic Neighbourhoods Strategy that introduce the Kempenfelt and East End Neighbourhoods where there is no overlap with the Urban Growth Centre. Please consider development objectives to be discussed at the presubmission stage in order that the applicant understands what is expected in the built form, or exemption from the requirements.	The expansion of the historic neighbourhoods beyond those recognized in the current Official Plan was done on the request of the Heritage Barrie Advisory Committee, comments from the public, and Ward Councillors. The intent of these comments is to protect existing cultural heritage resources and historic character. The majority of the lands included within these new historic neighbourhoods are within the Neighbourhood Area designation, and as such the built form or development policies of the Neighbourhood Area designation and policies of the Historic Neighbourhoods are commensurate and complementary. Additional policies have been added to the Neighbourhood Area designation to protect the residential and low rise character of these areas.
Gary Bell		Maps	8	Celebration Space in legend of Map 8 needs attention.	Spelling correction has been made.
Gary Bell		Maps	8	How was the northern limit of Historic Neighbourhood East End determined not to include Strabane and Melrose Avenues?	The northern limit of the boundary is based on a historic plan. We will be changing the boundary to Strabane Street on the north end to accommodate the historic nature of the area more appropriately.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	Maps	8	gathering space is proposed on the property. The approved Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies provide for parks, open space areas, village squares and natural heritage areas secondary plan wide, and there has been a detailed and integrated collective landowner approach for these "common spaces", including exchange of payment for these uses. The proposed OP should honour this long and detailed arrangement, and thus, the gathering space should be removed from the site. The policies identify that gathering spaces are to be provided in medium and high density areas [8.3.2] whereas this proposed gathering space is located in a Neighbourhood Area designation. The general location is also identified in the existing Secondary Plan for a stormwater management facility.	Recommendation is to further clarify policy 8.3.2.a as not all gathering spaces are found in medium and high density areas: "Gathering spaces include traditional municipal parks, as well as modern spaces found more in medium and high density areas (such as urban squares). All gathering spaces should be well-designed and appropriately programmed." Many of the municipal parks across the city have been identified as gathering spaces. Gathering spaces are intended to pick up parks, and some stormwater facilities intended to be open to the public for walking. Therefore, the intent of a gathering space should align with the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies, even if it is a new term.

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	Maps	8	Given that the Dunlop Village Plaza is isolated and disjointed from the established residential communities to the east of Anne Street, south of Highway No. 400, north and south of Dunlop Street, and, that it is not demonstrative of a valuable cultural heritage resource or group of historic buildings and/or streetscape, it is submitted that the subject lands and adjacent properties fronting upon the northerly limits of Dunlop Street West do not meet the criteria for inclusion within the West Village Historic Neighbourhood. Accordingly, on behalf of our Client we request that the boundary of the West Village Historic Neighbourhood be re-evaluated and that the lands located at 304 Dunlop Street West, which are developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza, not form part of the Historic Neighbourhood referred to as West Village.	While the subject lands themselves may not have buildings that have cultural heritage value, the site is within a historic neighbourhood context as it rears onto lots that fronts onto Henry Street. Henry Street has a historic streetscape. This streetscape is reinforced by historic buildings on Anne St. This means that any development occurring on 304 Dunlop St. west will need to have regard for the historic streetscape of Henry Street. When treated as a whole vs an individual parcel, 304 Dunlop Street indeed forms part of the West Village historic neighbourhood.
HIP Development	MHBC / Trevor Hawkins	Maps	8	Similarly, Map 8 identifies what appears to be the former Red Story Field as a "Gathering Space." Given the approved zoning and the ongoing Site Plan application, we request that the lands be removed from Map 8.	This request has been addressed.
Al McNair		Maps	8	I suggested previously that this neighbourhood should extend northerly to the designated Strategic Growth Area along Bell Farm Road and Georgian Drive. A suggested map of this boundary is attached to my earlier submission.	Following a site visit to the area of the proposed boundary, staff determined that extending the boundary of the East End Historic Neighbourhood beyond Strabane Ave is not appropriate.
518-524 Tiffin St. W.	Shelagh and Harold Ois	Maps	1 and 2	<p>We propose that the vacant lots (518-524) again be included in the planned DGA Employment Area, as it had been in the 2018 OP and as laid out in Schedule B, 2018. This would provide land use flexibility to these properties going forward consistent with the planned DGA Employment Area that they abut in this new OP draft 2. The inclusion of the lots in the DGA Employment area is also consistent with the development of a heavier transportation pathway along Tiffin St. W.</p> <p>In contrast to Schedule B of the 2018 Official Plan, there are several lots, including 518-524, that have been left out of the Tiffin St. W. DGA Employment area (Map 1, 2021, Land Use - Industrial, Map 2, 2021), and have been included strictly as part of the DGA Natural Heritage System and Greenspace (Map 1 and 2, 2021).</p> <p>It also seems contradictory that these properties, as they are interpreted in the Draft 2 OP, will abut a freight corridor and will be exposed to increased traffic and an increase in road salt. Given the heavy regulations on land use and development for EP land, it will be a challenge for small landowners to actively participate in mitigation efforts necessary to reduce chloride (Map 7, 2021) to protect Barrie's clean drinking water from the increased winter salt application (6.5.1.3, 6.5.1.4) from the proposed Tiffin St. freight corridor. In fact, any desirable future development in the surrounding area will be hampered by the EP designation</p>	Changes to properties 518 to 254 Tiffin Street have been made as requested; the new land use designation is Employment Area -- Industrial. Map 3 has also been updated to change the NHS to Level 1 with permissions. 530 and 538 Tiffin Street were also included in these changes.

Canadian Tire Real Estate	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	Maps	1 and 2	<p>Canadian Tire does not support the general intent of the revised Draft Official Plan policies to facilitate the transition of 75 Mapleview Drive West into an Employment Area Designation, whereas the lands are currently designated “General Commercial” under the in-effect Official Plan, which is reflective of their existing commercial function. Accordingly, it is our position that the land use designation proposed by the September 2020 Draft Official Plan, being the “Commercial District” designation, is more appropriate for 75 Mapleview Drive West and is more consistent with the existing land use, which is for entirely commercial purposes including a Canadian Tire store, gas bar, and Beer Store. The proposed Employment Areas land use designation does not align with the current function of these lands, and would limit and restrict the uses that are existing on site, being Retail and Major Retail.</p>	<p>We will be adding a policy to Employment Non-Industrial that allows for sites such as yours to retain the permitted uses given under the Commercial District designation, excepting for residential.</p>
Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	Maps	1 and 2	<p>A fundamental aspect in the Second Draft Official Plan that Maverick does not support is the proposed “Employment Area – Non-Industrial” designation applied to the Maverick lands at 406 and 436 Bryne Drive, 52 Caplan Avenue, and 60-70 Mapleview Drive. The proposed designation is not consistent with the current or intended commercial function of these lands or general area, and reduces the range of land use permissions currently afforded to the lands under the in-effect “General Commercial” land use designation. It is unclear to us why staff have determined that the lands located on the westerly side of Bryne Drive should be redesignated “Employment Area – Non-Industrial”. It appears to us that a more natural division between the existing commercial uses and the existing industrial area/uses (to the west) would be the westerly limits of the Maverick Lands, as per the in-effect OP and Zoning By-law mapping. It is our position that the Maverick Lands should be considered the same as the lands directly to the east (across Bryne Drive), which are proposed in the Second Draft to be designated as “Commercial District”, and within a “Strategic Growth Area”. Importantly, the methodology used by the Land Needs Assessment does not consider any of the Maverick lands as Employment for the purpose of evaluating the City’s existing employment land base, noting “that the employment land supply has been carried out in accordance to the guidelines in</p>	<p>We will be adding a policy to Employment Non-Industrial that allows for sites such as the one referenced by the commenter to retain the permitted uses given under the Commercial District designation, excepting for residential. The intention of Employment Non-Industrial is to provide a buffer between Employment Areas and non-employment areas, and thus you will be able to develop according to a much more expansive list of permitted uses than properties within the Employment Area -- Industrial designation.</p>

Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	1 and 2	<p>Seeking City's consideration of expanding the Strategic Growth Area boundary to include the lands located at 299 Lakeshore Drive and to designate them Commercial District or Medium Density consistent with the lands on the south side of the intersection of Minet's Point and Lakeshore Drive, therefore recognizing their potential for creating future strategic growth in this area.</p>	The lands north of Lakeshore, on the corner of Minet's Point, can become Medium Density and we can extend the SGA boundary to include them.
505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street	Jack Krubnik / IPS	Maps	1,2	<p>The appropriate levels of intensification for areas abutting Intensification Corridors is greater than that envisioned within Neighbourhood Areas in the Draft Official Plan. Lands abutting Intensification Corridors should be reconsidered for Medium and High Density designations.</p>	There are a combination of lands abutting Intensification Corridors, and some of these lands are designated medium and high density. At the same time, we have kept significant portions of lands abutting Intensification Corridors as Neighbourhood Areas, to recognize the fabric of these areas as primarily made up of low-density residential. At the same time, Neighbourhood Areas fronting onto an Intensification Corridor may be able to see greater heights, as long as appropriate transitions are in place.
Al McNair		Maps	2, 3	<p>This mapping needs to be thoroughly re-examined to ensure that the small but important parcels of natural heritage lands in older Barrie are protected to the maximum. The recently annexed lands have much better protection and are much more robust than the more fragmented natural heritage system in the older city.</p> <p>For example, the ravine areas southeast and southwest of Vine Crescent should be designated Natural Heritage System, NOT Neighbourhood Area or Medium Density.</p>	We would only be able to revise Natural Heritage System boundaries through a comprehensive and planned update, or through individual development applications. We are open to both in the future, but currently we do not have the authority to undertake this exercise on our own.
David O'Brien		Maps	2, 3 and 8	<p>I wanted in the public record that there is a registered archeological site at the south west corner of Harvey Road and Hwy 400.</p> <p>It is known as the Molson Site and registered as BcGw-27 with the Province of Ontario. I am concerned that on Map 2 of the plan this area is listed as land use Industrial employment. It is also indicated on Map 3 to be EPA 3, but this covers a much larger area than the Molson site. There is also no indication of the Molson site on Map 8 that covers Historic features.</p> <p>I believe this is a mistake that can lead to the loss of this recognized and valuable feature within Barrie if it is not acknowledged in the Official Plan. Can you make an effort to recognize the existence of the Molson site and make efforts to protect it.</p>	Section 8.4.2. contains archaeological assessment policies. No development on the site would occur without an archaeological assessment and conformity with the Ontario Heritage Act.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2, 3, 6	953 Mapleview Drive East (Mapleview South): The limits of the Sandy Cove Creek are in the final stages of realignment approval and tendering for construction has been released. Please update the NHS mapping to reflect the new channel alignment.	The alignment has not yet been approved. Once there is approval, these changes can be made. Please note policy 10.1.c, which states that NHS, floodplain and EIS changes can be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will take the most up-to-date, approved information.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2, 6	Mapleview Drive East (Crisdawn/Pratt Hansen) (D12-426): i. The neighbourhood Park boundary on the Pratt subdivision (Hewitt's Gate Subdivision) at Prince William Way/Lally Terrace, is not consistent with the Master Parkland Agreement. It is correctly shown on Map 8. ii. A Village Square is missing as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement east of the NHS area on Winery Way. It is correctly shown on Map 8. iii. A park is missing on the south portions of the lands closer to Lockhart as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement. It is correctly shown on Map 8.	Changes are being made to be consistent with what is shown on Map 8. The land use designation has been changed to Greenspace for each park indicated.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2, 6	883 Mapleview Drive East (Bulut): There are no 'Natural Heritage System' lands on this property, which is draft plan approved.	The land use designation for this area has been changed to Greenspace, where appropriate.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2, 6	979 Mapleview Drive East (Sandy Creek Estates): Parkland missing as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement. It is correctly shown on Map 8.	The land use designation has been changed to Greenspace, as per the master plan agreement.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2, 6	620 Lockhart (Mattamy Homes): A park missing on the south portions of the lands closer to Lockhart as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement. It is conceptually correct on Map 8, but the configuration does not reflect the approved Conformity Plan. Please update and revise.	The land use designation has been changed to Greenspace, as per the master plan agreement.

Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	Maps	2a	In the Salem Secondary Plan, the Land Use Map (Schedule 8C) identifies a future school site on the Ruby Red Maple lands with an asterisk. The Land Use Map on the new Draft OP now identifies this school as a specific area with the Community Hub designation. While we do not object to identifying this general location for a potential future school, there should be acknowledgement that the subdivision layout and best location for this school has not yet been determined and a guarantee that no OPA will be required to adjust the location or size of the Community Hub area. The Community Hub land use designation has been applied to the potential future school and community centre locations in the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary plans. While updates were made to the Community Hub policies since the last draft OP, the new draft policies still do not provide adequate flexibility or appropriate transitioning in circumstances where the School Board or City decide to not construct said school or community centre. The lands should be permitted to develop in accordance with the adjacent land use designation to ensure that the development is appropriate for the community. In particular, requiring non-residential uses or a mixed-use development with a residential density of 125-300 units per hectare (i.e. between medium and high density development) may not be compatible with the surrounding area and land use designation, particularly in the Neighbourhood Area. We request that the underlying designation on this school site remain as low and/or medium	We will be adding a policy into the Community Hub land use designation that emphasizes that if no institutional use is on a site, then development may take place in accordance with the land use permissions for neighbouring sites.
505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street	Jack Krubnik / IPS	Maps	3, 6	However, public access to these parks and the natural heritage system needs to be better aligned with municipal planning for growth. To achieve this, the City of Barrie should place higher density land use designations adjacent to, or in close proximity to, parks and the natural heritage system. The existing practice of low density uses adjacent to parks and the natural heritage system further engrains issues of access and inequity in the planning process, whereby wealthier owners of detached residential dwellings can afford access to the health and educational opportunities of natural areas.	We appreciate this comment and its intent. At this time, as no direct policy suggestion for the Official Plan has been given, we simply attest that the comment has been registered.
Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	4a	Watersand Commercial Block is now designated as a Network Hub. Section 4.4.2.2.a advises the City Shall direct medium and high density development around these hubs. The commercial block does not have medium or high density residential uses nor does the surrounding land uses. As a result, and noted previously, this should be located on the east side of Veterans Drive along the Employment blocks. (Map 4A)	The draft plan for D12-423 show a commercial area that is currently zoned NMU. The draft Official Plan proposes that these lands accommodate additional uses and density over the long term. This increase in density and use is envisioned to generate and support increased transit ridership over the long term. As such, a mobility network hub is appropriate in this general area.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	4a	A Future Salem Mobility Hub is identified at the SW corner of McKay Road West and Veterans Drive. This parcel is draft plan approved with commercial uses at that corner. This should be located on the east side of Veterans Drive along the employment lands.	To ensure greater accuracy is reflected, the location of the Network Hub has been moved to the road intersection.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	4a	The road pattern and street names as noted above, should be removed on the south side of McKay Road West and County Road 27 and on the south side of McKay Road East.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	4a	All trails shown should be identified as conceptual only.	Map 4a includes the following note: "Roads, trails and cycling networks within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change." Therefore, these trails are identified as conceptual.
Canadian Tire Real Estate	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	Maps	4A	Map 4A of the Official Plan labels two features as "Commuter Cycling Network (On – Road)". We seek clarification if the intent is for the separate features are to be labelled differently.	Map 4a will be changed so that there is only one cycling network listed.
Sean Mason / 429 & 431 Little Avenue	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	4B	The lands are within the Neighborhood Area (Map 2) and on a local road (Map 4B) (Little Avenue). The current Official Plan, Schedule D Roads Plan, identifies this stretch of Little Ave, from Yonge Street to Hurst Drive, as an arterial road. On Schedule E Road Widening Plan, it is identified as having a road right of way width of 27m, which is consistent with the draft Official Plan Map 5. Little Ave is a significant connection corridor from Yonge Street to Hurst Drive. It is our opinion that this stretch of Little Ave should remain an arterial road. We are requesting that this modification be made to 4B.	Little Avenue, between Yonge Street and Hurst Drive, has been changed to an Arterial.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	4b	Reid Drive south of Salem and McKay Road between Reid Drive and Veterans Drive should not be identified as a "Freight Supportive Corridor".	The Freight Supportive Corridor has been removed.
Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	All Maps	A park is shown on the southside of Walker Street, immediately east of the NHS system which is not consistent with the draft approved plan of subdivision.	The land use designation has been changed to Neighbourhood Area; the park has been removed on the other maps.
Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	All Maps	A park is not shown on the Watersand Phase 2 lands, north of McKay, west of Reid Drive	This change has been made.
St. Joseph Developments (Dunlop and Miller Drive)	DSF / David White	Maps	All Maps	The City has been provided with correspondence from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry indicating that the Provincially Significant Wetland designation previously shown on part of the St. Joseph's property has been removed. We are therefore requesting that the Natural Heritage System designation be replaced with an appropriate development designation.	The presence (or lack thereof) of NHS features needs to be confirmed through an EIS that is accepted by the City and the appropriate Conservation Authority. Please also note Policy 10.1.c), which states that NHS, floodplain and EIS changes can be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will take the most up-to-date, approved (through the proper avenues) information.
Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	All Maps	As noted previously, Exell Avenue which is a proposed collector Road extending into the Watersand Phase 2 area (north of McKay Road West, west of Reid Drive), is not required as does not go anywhere. This should be shown as a local road in its place.	This road segment remains a collector, as the width is needed for active transportation infrastructure.

Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	All Maps	As noted previously, all maps have road configurations for the future employment (Watersand) and residential (Watersand) lands, with street names, that do not make sense in their makeup and should not be shown as the lands will not be developed in that format.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."
Gary Bell		Maps	All Maps	Harvie Road over Highway 400 has been correctly shown on Map 4A Mobility and it should be similarly shown on the other Maps.	Harvie Road and the surrounding roads have been adjusted as needed, to reflect current alignment.
Ballymore	Keith MacKinnon / KLM	Maps	All Maps	Additionally, ALL figures and/or maps in the new Official Plan should be revised to show the alignment for Collector Road Kneeshaw Drive (including the roundabouts) as per the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan. A copy of the Draft Approved Plan is attached for ease of reference.	Kneeshaw Drive has been aligned to correspond with the latest plans received.
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	Maps	All Maps	On the Rainsong Phase 2 lands (i.e. NW corner of Lockhart and Yonge), the street network on all maps and appendices does not match the layout on the Conformity Plan that was approved by the City in 2020. While these are still proposed streets, the OP should reflect the most updated information.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."
Trans Canada Pole: 7735 County Rd 27	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	Appendix 1	A review of the revised mapping Schedules reveals that on Maps 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 the natural heritage/hazard features have been removed in Draft 2 based on Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Case Number PL140770, 140771, 140772. I would like to note that Appendix 1 – Conservation Authority Areas still identifies an NVCA Floodplain in error. Given the previously agreed upon changes of removing the natural heritage/hazard features, this floodplain area should also be removed. The NVCA was also involved in the previous Board hearing in which the revisions proposed were accepted by their office. It is requested that the NVCA Floodplain be removed in its entirety from the subject property.	The NVCA Floodplain data is updated by the Conservation Authority; we only use it for reference. However, to accommodate the commenter's request, we have outlined the area and made the appropriate change.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	Maps	Appendix 2	We request that the City move the Dorsay Phase 3 lands into Phase 2 and that the Phase 4 lands become Phase 3. There does not appear to be a need for a fourth phase.	Phasing changes have been completed so that Phase 3 lands have been incorporated into Phase 2; and so that some Phase 4 lands, as appropriate, have been incorporated into Phase 3.
969, 979, 989 Maplevue Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	Maps	Appendix 2	Appendix 2: Phasing Maps -- colours in the legend are wrong; don't match up with phases for the "East area"	The mapping symbology and legend have been revised.
969, 979, 989 Maplevue Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	Maps	Appendix 2	It is assumed that north of the NHS area the site is identified as being in Phase 1 and Phase 2. The Appendix should be revised to reflect that the area north of the NHS area is in Phase 1 in accordance with the existing policy framework [Hewitt's OP policy 9.7.3.2 e)]. It is noted that NO pumping station is required as per the policies of this section.	The boundaries have been revised in light of the Natural Heritage System lands.
969, 979, 989 Maplevue Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	Maps	Appendix 2	It is assumed that the portion of the site above the NHS area is proposed to be partly in Phase 1 and partly in Phase 2, and the lands south of the NHS area are proposed to be in Phase 2.	The boundaries have been revised in light of the Natural Heritage System lands.

Trans Canada Pole: 7735 County Rd 27	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	Appendix 2	<p>Appendix 2 identifies the subject lands split between Phases 3 West and 4 West (Figure 2). The southern portion (approximately 25.0 hectares) is under Phase 3W, while the northern portion (approximately 12.0 hectares) is Phase 4W. It is unclear why 12.0 hectares of land is placed into Phase 4W. My experience with phased development within Secondary Plan areas is that the delineation of phases generally follows the ability to deliver infrastructure, major roads, natural heritage features, major concession/property lines, etc.</p> <p>In this circumstance, none of the identified features exist between Phase 3W and 4W on the Trans Canada site. The proposed phasing plan places the subject lands in a scenario where two separate Plan of Subdivision applications will be required. This in my opinion, would not result in the best planning outcome given that such a small parcel remains in Phase 4W. Furthermore, infrastructure that would be required to develop Phase 3 lands will also support Phase 4 lands based on its limited size and configuration. It is requested that the Phase 3W boundary be enlarged to extend to the limits of Essa Road which is a logical boundary to terminate Phase 3 W on the Trans Canada Pole site.</p>	The boundaries will change so that the entirety of Trans Canada Pole is contained in Phase 3W.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	Appendix 2	Similar to above, the lands identified as Phase 4 West should have the road pattern and street names removed.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change." Only roads from draft approved plans of subdivision will be revised.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	Appendix 2	The Phasing numbers do not match the colours in the legend.	The mapping symbology and legend have been revised.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	Maps	Maps 2 and 3	As previously requested, Section 2.7.4 Natural Heritage Protection: The Natural Heritage System limits identified on Map 2 and 3 of the Draft Official Plan do not reflect the detailed ground-truthed information that we currently have with respect to DIV's lands. We implore that the natural heritage mapping on the subject lands be revised to reflect our fieldwork – we will provide a plan for the City's use.	When it comes time for a development application on this site, the Natural Heritage work will be reviewed at that time. Please note Policy 10.1.c), which states that NHS, floodplain and EIS changes can be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will take the most up-to-date, approved (through the proper avenues) information.
Kelly Patterson McGrath		n/a	Communications Suggestion	Show us that all of the plans and documents that are currently in play or being worked on – GHG, Active Transportation Master Plan, Climate Action Plans, Stormwater Climate Action Fund etc. are all linked and connected to the OP – is there an overall matrix that shows these connections and how they feed each other and that they are not being worked on in isolation of the OP or visa vera.	These plans are not being worked on in isolation; all departments have reviewed the OP and provided commentary to bolster alignment. Furthermore, future master plans, for instance, will specifically be guided by the Official Plan.

Kelly Patterson McGrath		n/a	Communications Suggestion	We need to do better at engaging the public's feedback in this City. We need to look to other City's like Ottawa, and their best practices for engagement. What do they do differently to get the engagement level that they get?	We appreciate the suggestion of Ottawa as a comparator and agree that public engagement is critical and we continually strive to find more effective ways of engaging the community. For this most recent round of engagement on draft 2 of the Official Plan, we advertised the Open House and Public Meeting through social media, through the newspaper, via radio, through a press release and through reaching out via email to community groups and via email lists. We will continue to review options for improving engagement and welcome any specific suggestions you may have for spreading the word.
Kelly Patterson McGrath		n/a	Communications Suggestion	The Plan is 210 pages long using language that is often jargon based - it is daunting and complex. The general public need to see something that is clear and easy to understand. When we do provide feedback, that important feedback seems to have not been heard. We did not get a summary of the most recent concerns/feedback and have them addressed (2020). Barrie's 2019 engagement feedback was summarized but not linked to any changes made. SOLUTION - I would look to the (Ottawa) New Official Plan FAQ's as an example of completing the feedback circle here. The questions are all answered, Barrie's community engagement questions and concerns have not been answered or Is there any where to see that the changes have been implemented or at least addressed in the FAQ's for all of this process from the beginning. (in email provides links to Ottawa's engagement communications)	We hope that this comment matrix provides more transparency for how comments are received and reviewed. We recommend that the public compares the commitments made in this comment matrix with the tracked-changes working version of the new Official Plan.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	Feedback	The Hewitt's Landowners request that Council and Staff consider and support the scheduling of a 2nd Statutory Public Meeting for the fall of 2021.	A public meeting will be scheduled for the fall, though it will not be statutory.
LSRCA		n/a	General	Please ensure the final document is an accessible document and a navigable PDF with a clickable table of contents and bookmarks.	This will be done with the final draft version.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	General	While improvements have been made since the first draft, we continue to feel that the Official Plan contains many numerical, overly detailed, and prescriptive (i.e., shall be) policies that eliminate the interpretive flexibility needed to successfully implement this new Official Plan. Unless changed, the nature of these prescriptive policies would lead to regular Official Plan Amendment applications to accompany future development proposals.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.

DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	n/a	General	We request that the City remove overly prescriptive policy and development requirements from the Official Plan, and rather provide general guidance to make the intent of the Official Plan clear. Specifically, policies specifying setback requirements, locations of street trees, sidewalk widths, area or context driven height and density requirements, and similar policies should be simplified or removed in favour of more detailed planning process which will appropriately determine these requirements.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.
Alex Remonde		n/a	General	Witnessing Molson park drive change to mapleview, the bars change hands downtown and the ever reaching hand of expansion grow across simcoe enlightens me to the fact that change is inevitable but the right kind of change is crucial. Barrie as it stands today sits on a precipice, to fall in line with other communities that uphold economic growth above all other or to preserve the jewel we have been given. I realize the pressures to stimulate and grow economy are ever present but the desires of the community that built us to this point and their views should not be ignored now.	The views of the community are very important and public engagement has helped to drive the development of this draft new Official Plan, including the development of each section (these were based on themes prioritized by the community). As the Official Plan continues to guide the development of future documents (such as future master plans), a transparent engagement process will continue to be prioritized before anything is approved.
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	n/a	General	All Prescriptive design related policies through the New OP should be written as "should generally" or "are encouraged to provide," etc in order to clearly state the City's design objective while not requiring an Official Plan Amendment each time an objective cannot be fully achieved on a site.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	General	We request that you reconsider the attainability and built form implications of the densities noted in the Official Plan. We also note that units per hectare is an ineffective planning tool when assessing density on sites that are small, infill or are medium/high density. Accordingly, we recommend that you consider using Floor Space Index as a more precise tool to understand and implement the intended built form.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction.

LSRCA		n/a	General	<p>It would provide greater clarity if several terms used throughout the document were better defined. Consider including definitions for the following terms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public utilities Environmental Impact Study Vegetation Protection Zone Hydrological features Valley lands Riparian area Infrastructure Hydrogeological Report 	<p>We have added some terms into the definition. Additionally, as highlighted in the preface to the Definitions section 10.2: "If a term is defined in a Provincial document, the City has carried forward that term into the Plan to ensure consistency. Any other terms defined by the City are listed here, and if they are not listed here then the definition that appears in the Zoning By-law shall apply." Our use of other terms in the Official Plan for those terms highlighted are consistent with the definitions provided by the Province.</p> <p>We have also made the decision not to provide definitions for required studies. As additionally stated in the preface to the Definitions section: "Any other terminology has its regular, customary meaning. If clarification is needed, then it should be sought from the Director of Development Services."</p>
LSRCA		n/a	General	<p>The terms Environmental Impact Study and Natural Heritage Evaluation are interchangeable; however, it's recommended that only one of these terms be used throughout the document to prevent any confusion.</p> <p>For example, if Environmental Impact Study is used throughout, a definition for this term should be included which specifies that this document may also be referred to as a Natural Heritage Evaluation.</p>	<p>5.5.2.1.c) is the only reference to a natural heritage evaluation. We will take this out.</p>
Al McNair		n/a	General	<p>An Official Plan amendment should be required for any redevelopment or expansion of any such sites in Neighbourhood Areas.</p>	<p>An Official Plan amendment would be required for any developments requesting an exemption from the policies of the OP.</p>
Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	n/a	General	<p>Overall, policies continue to be very prescriptive with lots of "shall" and very difficult to read and interpret. Official Plans are supposed to be guiding documents with "motherhood policies" and use more of "should" and "may".</p>	<p>The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.</p>
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	n/a	General	<p>As you know, an Official Plan is a guiding document that provides flexibility and interpretation with policies which generally direct how and where the City should grow. The draft Official Plan is completely opposite wherein it is very prescriptive and removes any flexibility inherent within the plan. The issue with such a prescriptive document is it will ultimately require private developments to amend the document regularly. In our view, when a document leads to regular amendments being filed, it is a sign the policies are not effective.</p>	<p>The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by</p>

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	n/a	General	As noted in the previous submission, the document remains very difficult and cumbersome to read and interpret. There continues to be too many sections and sub sections that it is confusing. In addition, there is a substantial amount of urban design terminology used within the document, which are better suited to be included in the Urban Design Guidelines. Based on this, the Salem landowners are of the opinion the document should continue to be simplified.	We have worked on reducing the overall size of the draft Official Plan and making it simpler between Drafts 1 and 2. We will continue to look out for opportunities to further simplify the document, without affecting clarity.
HIP Development	MHBC / Trevor Hawkins	n/a	General Confirmation	As the Barrie Central development has already submitted a Site Plan application and is in the process, confirmation should be provided to such applicants, in the form of transition policies that such applications will continue to be processed under the current policy and guideline framework notwithstanding the potential introduction of new guidelines and the policies in the Second Draft of the Official Plan.	The Official Plan will not be adopted by Council or submitted to MMAH for some time yet; those applicants who have received Site Plan approval will be permitted to continue under the conditions that have been agreed upon. At the same time, a transition policy can be included in the Official Plan.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	n/a	Secondary Plan Policies	The continuity of the planning from the Hewitt Secondary Plan and its area specific policies must be recognized in the Official Plan for the subject lands, either through the reinsertion of a separate chapter like the City's current Official Plan or by including all Hewitt Secondary Plan policies in the areas specific policies in appropriate sections of the Draft Official Plan 2051.	The guiding philosophy of this draft new Official Plan is "One City, One Vision, One Plan." As Barrie continues to grow into a mid-sized city, the intent is to integrate all areas within the city comprehensively. We have integrated the Secondary Plan policies to the best of our ability into this Official Plan, and have also taken note of your other suggestions. We feel confident that we can continue to work with landowners within the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas to achieve build out smoothly and successfully.
Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	n/a	Secondary Plan Policies	As noted previously, the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas are not that old and are currently being implemented after being approved in 2016 by the OMB (now LPAT). Why remove all of these policies when only one current landowner has applied for an Official Plan Amendment in the Hewitt's Secondary Plan area? All other landowners have complied with the policies in the plan to seek their current approvals.	The guiding philosophy of this draft new Official Plan is "One City, One Vision, One Plan." As Barrie continues to grow into a mid-sized city, the intent is to integrate all areas within the city comprehensively. We have integrated the Secondary Plan policies to the best of our ability into this Official Plan, and have also taken note of your other suggestions. We feel confident that we can continue to work with landowners within the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas to achieve build out smoothly and successfully.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	n/a	Secondary Plan Policies	As noted previously all of the approved plans did not require an amendment to the Secondary Plan and given that development is still proceeding, the landowners feel it is important to keep the Secondary Plan largely intact.	The guiding philosophy of this draft new Official Plan is "One City, One Vision, One Plan." As Barrie continues to grow into a mid-sized city, the intent is to integrate all areas within the city comprehensively. We have integrated the Secondary Plan policies to the best of our ability into this Official Plan, and have also taken note of your other suggestions. We feel confident that we can continue to work with landowners within the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas to achieve build out smoothly and successfully.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	Secondary Plan Policies	The Hewitt's Landowners feel that the implementation of an entirely new policy framework at this time is inappropriate, and request that the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policy framework be maintained and included as a distinct Section in the new OP.	The guiding philosophy of this draft new Official Plan is "One City, One Vision, One Plan." As Barrie continues to grow into a mid-sized city, the intent is to integrate all areas within the city comprehensively. We have integrated the Secondary Plan policies to the best of our ability into this Official Plan, and have also taken note of your other suggestions. We feel confident that we can continue to work with landowners within the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas to achieve build out smoothly and successfully.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	Servicing Capabilities	Please provide the master servicing and utility analysis that demonstrates that there is servicing capacity to support the densities noted in B2. Tens of millions of dollars of infrastructure have and are continuing to be constructed to support the Hewitt's Secondary Plans and the Landowners are concerned that widespread replacements/upgrades of brand-new infrastructure would be required to support development at the proposed required densities.	This analysis is currently being conducted as part of our Municipal Comprehensive Review. The results of this analysis will be available publicly as part of a staff report to go to Council.
Karen Buck		n/a	Throughout	I enjoy living in my neighbourhood in Barrie because past initiatives have given the neighbourhood good access to park areas and there are also natural areas that have been kept to ensure that the natural environment is a living functioning part of the City. The upcoming Official Plan should be strong on land conservation and protect the natural functioning of the environment. Save natural area, protect water quality and Lake Simcoe.	We agree that we need to protect our environment, including our natural areas, our water quality and Lake Simcoe. There are policies focused throughout the draft new Official Plan focused on this, and I would call attention in particular to Section 5, Planning a Waterfront and Green City, and Section 6, Planning a Resilient City.
Gary Bell		n/a	Throughout	The terms will and shall in the Official Plan should be consistently used. Shall is directive and mandatory. Will is less so. Most policies refer to the City as the subject of actions. There are only a few policies which indicate that Council shall, may or will take or not take a particular action. Perhaps the distinction, if any, between the City and City Council could be indicated in the Foundations preamble, or the reference to Council in the policies should be changed to the City.	We can undertake a review of where/when City Council is mentioned and where/when the City more broadly is mentioned, and the verbage attached to any action being directed by the City and City Council. A distinction between the work of the City and the work of City Council could be given in the foundation section (p. 3 of the preamble).

Gary Bell		n/a	Throughout	Are the Salem and Hewitt's Creek Secondary Plans and detailed policies fully integrated and included in the new OP?	To the extent that the growth management strategies guiding the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plans are included in the new Official Plan, they are fully integrated. The actual policies however may not be identical.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	n/a	Throughout	Reference to tenure should be removed throughout the document.	Where appropriate, we will replace tenure with housing "options."
PBMR Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	n/a	Throughout (especially in Section3)	The City's New Official Plan should build in greater flexibility to allow applications that deviate from specific design requirements to proceed without the need for an Official Plan Amendment at the discretion of City staff. The City's Draft New Official Plan provides many specific design criteria that are more consistent with provisions found in the City's Zoning By-law. By enshrining these in the City's Official Plan without flexible language it will require many applications moving forward to also apply for an Official Plan Amendment, even for something seemingly minor such as providing 49% ground floor non-residential uses instead of 50% (2.6.1.3 d).	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and ... identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	n/a	Urban Design Guidelines	In our view, it is important that the proposed new urban design guidelines be reviewed in connection with the New OP. Since the new urban design guidelines are not expected until fall 2021, the New OP should not be adopted at least until then.	We plan to release to commenters on the Official Plan a working version of the Urban Design Guidelines, in conjunction with the working tracked-changes version of the Official Plan. From there, a full new draft of the UDGs will be developed.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	Urban Design Guidelines	Request that these be provided in tandem with the release of the 3rd draft of the Official Plan. There is a mandatory requirement to implement the Guidelines and a lack of clarity at what, if any, flexibility will be afforded in implementing the UDG (Policy 3.1.3.1a).	We plan to release a working version of the Urban Design Guidelines for review in the fall, in connection with a tracked-changes working version of the new Official Plan.

Melchior Management	Janet Foster	n/a	Zoning By-laws	<p>Has the City envisioned what the implementing zoning bylaw will look like when recognizing and permitting mixed uses? How will the existing zoning permissions currently afforded to properties be maintained? Will the City pre-zone lands or is rezoning to be applied on an individual site basis.</p>	<p>We are currently in the process of starting the update to the Zoning By-law. The questions you ask regarding mixed uses and existing zoning permissions are pertinent, and we will be addressing them. Moreover, there will be public engagement in conjunction with the Zoning By-law update, to ensure both that there is transparency and that you are able to provide feedback on what may or may not work.</p>
---------------------	--------------	-----	----------------	--	--

Statutory Public Meeting: Record of Comments Received

Leading up to the statutory public meeting, held on June 2, 2021, the following submissions were received on draft two of the Official Plan. This section therefore provides a record of the comment submissions received.

From: [Alex Remonde](#)
To: [NewBarrieOP](#)
Subject: Expansion should not always be considered progress
Date: Thursday, May 20, 2021 12:08:58 AM

This email seeks to highlight the actual uniqueness and power that the municipality holds. My personal mailing address resides in Angus but I have spent the entirety of my youth growing up in barrie. Witnessing Molson park drive change to mapleview, the bars change hands downtown and the ever reaching hand of expansion grow across simcoe enlightens me to the fact that change is inevitable but the right kind of change is crucial. Barrie as it stands today sits on a precipice, to fall in line with other communities that uphold economic growth above all other or to preserve the jewel we have been given. I realize the pressures to stimulate and grow economy are ever present but the desires of the community that built us to this point and their views should not be ignored now. We claim to be the premier waterfront of Ontario but there's not premier about falling in line with the model that other municipalities across Southern Ontario have followed. The changing of the guard lies in your hands. I trust our elected officials with follow their hearts and not the allure of "progress".

Joanne Werth

From: Andrew Edwards
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 2:24 PM
To: NewBarrieOP; Tomasz Wierzba
Cc: Kory Chisholm
Subject: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of Marydel Homes
Attachments: MHBC_FINAL 2nd Draft Barrie OP Review Letter 79 Collier - 02June2021.pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz,

On behalf of our client, Marydel Homes, please find attached comment letter regarding the second draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan.

Regards,

ANDREW EDWARDS, BES | Planner

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 236 | F 705 728 2010 |
aedwards@mhbcpplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at aedwards@mhbcpplan.com or 705-309-1668. Thank you.

111



KITCHENER
WOODBRIDGE
LONDON
KINGSTON
BARRIE
BURLINGTON

June 2, 2021

Tomasz Wierzba, RPP
Policy Planner

City of Barrie

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

RE: 79 Collier Street - Marydel Homes
City of Barrie Official Plan 2nd Draft (May 2021)

In a letter dated December 22, 2020, we provided comment on the first draft of the Official Plan. The purpose of this letter is to provide comments on the second draft of the City of Barrie Draft Official Plan, dated May 6, 2021, as they relate to landholdings known as 79 Collier Street. The following comments are respectfully submitted. Words/sentences in red font are suggested edits to policies.

Notwithstanding these comments, we reserve the right to comment on the future draft that is provided with responses to the comments submitted as well as the revised draft Urban Design Guidelines when they are released to the public.

As you know the Owner is actively developing the property and has recently received 2nd submission comments on their ongoing site plan approval application. While the Owner anticipates having planning approvals in place prior to the new OP and Urban Design Guidelines coming into effect we have still reviewed the proposed policy context as it relates to the proposed development.

Overall there are 5 fundamental concerns with the 2nd Draft of the City of Barre OP and the process to date:

1. Rushed Comment Period - Comment period for the 2nd Draft is far too short for a document of this importance and magnitude. The Public and Stakeholders were provided 3 months to review the 1st Draft in late 2020

which is a more appropriate timeframe. Only having a 1 month window to review the 2nd Draft which has had substantial changes and no formal response to comments is a challenge. It is critical the Public and Stakeholders be provided additional time to review the next Draft with the revised Urban Design Guidelines and a compiled comment response table provided by the City.

2. Importance and Weight of New OP - Importance of getting the New Official Plan right the first time as there is no appeal rights for the Public and Stakeholders and the Planning Act includes a two year moratorium on amending New Official Plans unless this is waived by Council.
3. Lack of Transition Regulations - The 2nd Draft contains no transition regulations as an implementation tool. It is therefore unclear how ongoing development applications at various stages of the development approval process will be impacted when the New Official Plan comes into force and effect.
4. Urban Design Focus - The 2nd Draft is very much an Urban Design based and focused document, however we do not have the key implementation document (the revised Urban Design Guidelines) for many of these policies within the 2nd Draft. In the absence of this it is impossible to complete a comprehensive review. Additionally the 2nd Draft contains a lot of challenging urban design verbiage/terminology that is unclear and undefined which leaves a lot of room for varying interpretation of these policies. For example **Section 3.2.1 (i)(c)** requires all development applications to demonstrate it will improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place.
5. Prescriptive nature of the Official Plan - Many policies throughout the 2nd Draft are written in an absolute and prescriptive manner with no flexibility, very much like a Zoning By-law. An Official Plan is meant to provide broad long term policy direction and provide room for flexible interpretation of policies and goals. As written most development applications moving forward would likely require an Official Plan Amendment to proceed. For example **Section 2.6.3.3 d)** requires High Density development with a residential component shall have a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare. Many sites will not be able to achieve this density on a site by site basis while others will be able to far exceed it. This should be written as a general target and not an absolute requirement. This also would remove flexibility for mixed-use buildings that are primarily commercial/office to incorporate a small residential component.

All Prescriptive design related policies through the New OP should be written as "should generally" or "are encouraged to provide," etc.

Draft Official Plan

1. Affordable housing - There is no question that the provision of affordable housing is a basic human right/requirement and a critical component of inclusive community. However, the mandatory provision for affordable housing in all new developments is not practical or achievable. All developments are not conducive to the provision of truly affordable housing due to building type, location, proximity to supportive amenities, and financial feasibility. We are concerned with the implications of these policies and request they not be prescriptive for all developments. We recommend the City establish policies which enable the collection of revenues for the provision of City sponsored affordable housing.

There are various affordable housing target policies in the Plan including but not limited to policies 2.5.0), and Section 6.4.2. Policy 2.5.0) requires 10% of all new housing in the City to be affordable, policy 6.4.2 (e)(iii) requires development with more than 40 dwelling units to demonstrate the provision of affordable units and policy (iv) requires all new medium and high-density land use designations to provide 10% affordable units across a range of unit sizes including 3 bedroom units or larger, and policy 2.3.2 (e) (iii) requires at least 20% of housing units developed in the UGC satisfy the criteria for affordable. It is suggested that this policy does not recognize that various

projects, in their totality, are being developed as affordable housing projects and thus contributing to the City wide mix of 10%. These policies have the potential to contribute to a lower amount of attainable units if affordable housing units are required on a project by project basis. Further with an owner occupied product, it is not understood how the City can guarantee that the unit will remain affordable to the second buyer once sold as affordable to the first buyer.

2. 2.3.6 (d) public transit infrastructure should not be the onus of the developer as this is operated by the City. Suggest this should be removed, an OPA should not be required if City does not have public transit or active transit infrastructure in place.
3. Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) - this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.
4. Section 2.7.1 - Historic Neighbourhoods: There should be acknowledgement that a significant amount of intensification is expected within the Historic Neighbourhoods along identified Intensification Corridors, Strategic Growth Areas and lands with higher density permissions.
5. Policy 3.3.4 a) ii) c) - This should be written to generally apply, some sites may be appropriate for a reduced rear yard setback such as if a site backs onto a natural area, highway or other use where it is appropriate to site the building closer to the rear lot line.
6. Section 3.3.4- High Rise buildings
 - (a)(ii)(d) *Any tower, including its balconies, -5-Rel-1 **should** be setback from the podium by a minimum of 3.0 metres along all public street frontages to ensure an appropriate human-scaled pedestrian environment and mitigate wind impacts at street level;*
 - (a)(ii)(f) *Where more than one High-Rise Building is located on the same lot, the distance between the towers at the twelfth storey and above shall be at least -38 **25.0** metres,*
 - (a)(ii)(c) *The tower of a High-Rise Building WHI **should** be setback a minimum of B **12.5** metres from: (1) the side property line; (2) the rear property line, and; (3) the centre line of an abutting right-of- way.*
7. Policy 3.3.4(a)(ii)(c) - this should be a general policy and if it cannot be achieved other provisions to apply a buffer/transition can be applied.
8. Policy 4.7 (e)(f)- Parking Solutions- Please confirm if a ZBA or MV is achieved for a reduced parking requirement, that the City is in support of cash-in-lieu is not required. It is our understanding cash in lieu of parking is only required where the requested reduction is beyond what the City is willing to support.
9. Policy 4.7(p) - confirm this policy would not apply to 79 Collier as the property has been out of City ownership for approximately 5+ years.
10. Placemaking brief - policy 8.3.2 may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required and the brief is to identify or map connections to planned or existing community gathering places and activities and

opportunities for enhancing these gathering places and provide improved connections; it is submitted that these places may not be on the proposed development lands, no criteria is provided and this provides for additional study and cost to development proposals.

11. Infill - the policies of 9.5.6 (Context Sensitive Development) appear to state that infill is a form of intensification and shall be on a lot created between two existing lots that are approximately 150metres or less apart and that the parcel of land should be in keeping with the existing and anticipated development in the area. It is submitted that the policy could be interpreted that higher order intensification cannot take place as infill development.
12. Section 9 Implementation: It is imperative that transition provisions be included in the City's Official Plan. As you know, there are several substantial development proposals currently in progress based on the City's existing Official Plan designations and policies.

Many of these applications are at significant risk given the revised OP policies. Appropriate transition provisions are even more critical given there is no appeal mechanism for the City's single tier OP, no OP amendments for two years (unless Council waives this Section of the Planning Act) and certain policy restrictions within the context of the City's next municipal comprehensive review.

At a minimum, we request a transition policy which confirms that applications deemed to be complete at the date of adoption of the City's new OP will be deemed to conform with the new OP and that any associated/ implementing applications (i.e. a site plan which implements and zoning amendment, or a plan of condominium built in conformity with an approved site plan) are similarly transitioned.

It is noted that Policy 9.5.2(m) has been included that deems draft approved subdivisions conform to the Plan. It is requested a similar policy be included to acknowledge other existing approvals and ongoing development applications that have been deemed complete.

13. Section 10.1 e) Interpretation: We appreciate this caveat and interpretative clause, however, the use of discrete bulleted permitted uses within a land use designation is a very specific way of listing uses and must be utilized properly. Additional expansion of the permitted use lists is recommended. It is suggested that the OP is acting like a zoning by-law and this is restrictive and would require undue process (an OPA) if a building type that meets the policy context is not permitted in the OP.

The following are comments regarding the Urban Design policies:

14. Section 3.1.3.2 Application of Urban Design Guidelines- Must be clear that there is flexibility in not achieving every specific guideline due to site specific circumstance but the intent of the guideline can be demonstrated through other means and that should a relevant guidelines not be achieved that it does not trigger an Official Plan Amendment.
15. Placemaking brief- policy 9.4.2.2(t) may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required.
16. Human Scale Design- policy 3.2.1 (a)(i)(c) It is not understood how a development proposal "shall" "improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place".

17. Sustainable and Resilient Design - it is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document for example, all development (which would include, for example, minor variances shall demonstrate passive design strategies, use of environmentally preferable products, enhancement of environmental quality, and optimization of operational and maintenance practices, among others.
18. Green Development Standards - A Sustainable Development Report is a new requirement for specific development applications. For a development application to demonstrate conformity to the Official Plan, it is unknown how these policies are to be addressed and their appropriateness in a land use planning document is questioned.

Your consideration of the above noted comments is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

MHBC

W&il

Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP

Partner

Joanne Werth

From: Andrew Edwards
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 2:02 PM
To: NewBarrieOP; Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca
Cc: Kory Chisholm
Subject: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of Artenosi Developments Group
Attachments: MHBC_FINAL 2nd Draft Barrie OP Review Letter 284 Dunlop - 02June2021.pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz,

On behalf of our client, Artenosi Developments Group, please find attached comment letter regarding the second draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan.

Regards,

ANDREW EDWARDS, BES | Planner

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 236 | F 705 728 2010 |
aedwards@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at aedwards@mhbcplan.com or 705-309-1668. Thank you.



KITCHENER
WOODBRIDGE
LONDON
KINGSTON
BARRIE
BURLINGTON

June 2, 2021

Tomasz Wierzba, RPP
Policy Planner

City of Barrie

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

RE: Mccowan Ardagh Road Property
City of Barrie Official Plan 2nd Draft (May 2021)

In a letter dated December 22, 2020, we provided comment on the first draft of the Official Plan. The purpose of this letter is to provide comments on the second draft of the City of Barrie Draft Official Plan on behalf of our Client Artenosi Developments Group, dated May 6, 2021, as they relate to landholdings known as 284 and 286 Dunlop Street West, and 119 and 121 Henry Street. The following comments are respectfully submitted. Words/sentences in red font are suggested edits to policies.

Overall there are 5 fundamental concerns with the 2nd Draft of the City of Barrie OP and the process to date:

1. Rushed Comment Period - Comment period for the 2nd Draft is far too short for a document of this importance and magnitude. The Public and Stakeholders were provided 3 months to review the 1st Draft in late 2020 which is a more appropriate timeframe. Only having a 1 month window to review the 2nd Draft which has had substantial changes and no formal response to comments is a challenge. It is critical the Public and Stakeholders be provided additional time to review the next Draft with the revised Urban Design Guidelines and a compiled comment response table provided by the City.
2. Importance and Weight of New OP - Importance of getting the New Official Plan right the first time as there is no appeal rights for the Public and Stakeholders and the Planning Act includes a two year moratorium on amending New Official Plans unless this is waived by Council.
3. Lack of Transition Regulations - The 2nd Draft contains no transition regulations as an implementation tool. It is therefore unclear how ongoing development applications at various stages of the development approval process will be impacted when the New Official Plan comes into force and effect.

113 COLLIER STREET/ BARRIE/ ONTARIO/ L4M 1H2 / T 705 728 0045 / F 705 728 2010 / WWW.MHBCPLAN.COM

4. Urban Design Focus - The 2nd Draft is very much an Urban Design based and focused document, however we do not have the key implementation document (the revised Urban Design Guidelines) for many of these policies within the 2nd Draft. In the absence of this it is impossible to complete a comprehensive review. Additionally the 2nd Draft contains a lot of challenging urban design verbiage/terminology that is unclear and undefined which leaves a lot of room for varying interpretation of these policies. For example **Section 3.2.1 (i)(c)** requires all development applications to demonstrate it will improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place.
5. Prescriptive nature of the Official Plan - Many policies throughout the 2nd Draft are written in an absolute and prescriptive manner with no flexibility, very much like a Zoning By-law. An Official Plan is meant to provide broad long term policy direction and provide room for flexible interpretation of policies and goals. As written most development applications moving forward would likely require an Official Plan Amendment to proceed. For example **Section 2.6.3.3 d)** requires High Density development with a residential component shall have a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare. Many sites will not be able to achieve this density on a site by site basis while others will be able to far exceed it. This should be written as a general target and not an absolute requirement. This also would remove flexibility for mixed-use buildings that are primarily commercial/office to incorporate a small residential component.

All Prescriptive design related policies through the New OP should be written as "should generally" or "are encouraged to provide," etc.

Since the City is proposing a number of substantial changes from the Current Official Plan to the Draft New Official Plan it is imperative that transition regulations be included in the City's Official Plan. As you know, there are several substantial development proposals currently in progress based on the City's existing Official Plan designations and policies. Many of these applications are at significant risk given the revised OP policies. Including strong transition regulations within the New Official Plan will allow current development applications to continue through the process without having to potentially restart the development approval process or make substantial changes to their design and generally reduce potential confusion in the processing of applications when the New Official Plan comes into effect as well as provide certainty to the development industry to understand which document and policy context they are dealing with moving forward.

Draft Official Plan

1. Affordable housing - There is no question that the provision of affordable housing is a basic human right/requirement and a critical component of inclusive community. However, the mandatory provision for affordable housing in all new developments is not practical or achievable. All developments are not conducive to the provision of truly affordable housing due to building type, location, proximity to supportive amenities, and financial feasibility. We are concerned with the implications of these policies and request they not be prescriptive for all developments. We recommend the City establish policies which enable the collection of revenues for the provision of City sponsored affordable housing.

There are various affordable housing target policies in the Plan including but not limited to policies 2.5.0), and Section 6.4.2. Policy 2.5 UI requires 10% of all new housing in the City to be affordable, policy 6.4.2 (e)(iii) requires development with more than 40 dwelling units to demonstrate the provision of affordable units and policy (iv) requires all new medium and high-density land use designations to provide 10% affordable units across a range of unit sizes including 3 bedroom

units or larger, and policy 2.3.2 (e) (iii) requires at least 20% of housing units developed in the UGC satisfy the criteria for affordable. It is suggested that this policy does not recognize that various projects, in their totality, are being developed as affordable housing projects and thus contributing to the City wide mix of 10%. These policies have the potential to contribute to a lower amount of attainable units if affordable housing units are required on a project by project basis. Further with an owner occupied product, it is not understood how the City can guarantee that the unit will remain affordable to the second buyer once sold as affordable to the first buyer.

2. 2.3.3 (f) - Confirm SGA at Dunlop and Anne St still enables a tall building built form with ground floor non-residential use that will achieve the planned economic function. This is not clear based on the SEED policies as they state the primary use must be non-residential, whereas by the nature of a mixed use building if all the upper floors are residential the residential component will have far more floor area than that of the non-residential ground floor component.
3. 2.6.8 - Strategic Employment and Economic District (SEED) - Our Client submitted a ZBA application for a mixed use building in May 2021. We request confirmation the proposed built form would be deemed to conform with the proposed SEED policy framework. We would request a meeting with City staff to review this further.
4. 2.3.6 (c) what if conflict with underlying land use designation?
5. 2.3.6 (d) public transit infrastructure should not be the onus of the developer as this is operated by the City. Suggest this should be removed, an OPA should not be required if City does not have public transit or active transit infrastructure in place.
6. Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) - this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.
7. Policy 3.3.4(a)(ii)(g) - this should be a general policy and if it cannot be achieved other provisions to apply a buffer/transition can be applied.
8. Section 2.6.8 Strategic Employment and Economic District (SEED): We understand and appreciate the rationale for the SEEDs; however, we have concerns with the implementation of these policies and the restricted range of permitted uses and development standards. Further detailed discussion with City Staff is required.
 - a. 2.6.8.1 Permitted Uses - Can City staff confirm the permitted uses presented are in addition to the underlying/existing designation and not exclusive. PBM's properties at 364 St. Vincent Street and 30 Alliance Boulevard have existing industrial use permissions and have tenants using the properties for industrial purposes and we request these existing permissions be carried forward.
 - b. 2.6.8.2 h) Land Use Policies - Can City staff confirm the intent of this policy? It does not appear any SEED designated lands are also designated Employment Areas.
 - c. 2.6.8.3 b) Development Standards- Can City staff confirm the intent of generally requiring buildings to be limited to 6 storeys in height is meant to be flexible and if lands are located in other areas (along intensification corridors or higher order streets that consideration for increased heights will be considered without the need for an Official Plan Amendment?

9. Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) - this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.
10. Section 2.7.1 - Historic Neighbourhoods: There should be acknowledgement that a significant amount of intensification is expected within the Historic Neighbourhoods along identified Intensification Corridors, Strategic Growth Areas and lands with higher density permissions.
11. Policy 3.3.4 a) ii) c) - This should be written to generally apply, some sites may be appropriate for a reduced rear yard setback such as if a site backs onto a natural area, highway or other use where it is appropriate to site the building closer to the rear lot line.
12. Section 3.3.4 - High Rise buildings
 - (a)(ii)(d) *Any tower, including its balconies, -5-Rel-1 **should** be setback from the podium by a minimum of 3.0 metres along all public street frontages to ensure an appropriate human-scaled pedestrian environment and mitigate wind impacts at street level;*
 - (a)(ii)(f) *Where more than one High-Rise Building is located on the same lot, the distance between the towers at the twelfth storey and above shall be at least 38 **25.0** metres,*
 - (a)(ii)(c) *The tower of a High-Rise Building wi-1-1 **should** be setback a minimum of **B 12.5** metres from: (1) the side property line; (2) the rear property line, and; (3) the centre line of an abutting right-of-way.*
 - (a)(ii)(g) *In order to provide appropriate transitions, towers wi-1-1-**should generally** be setback at least 70.0 metres from low rise residential built form on lands designated Neighbourhood Areas on Map 2; however, this does not apply to those towers located within the Urban Growth Centre which will be instead be setback at least 30.0 metres.*
13. Policy 3.3.4(a)(ii)(c) - this should be a general policy and if it cannot be achieved other provisions to apply a buffer/transition can be applied.
14. Policy 4.7 (e)(f)- Parking Solutions- Please confirm if a ZBA or MV is achieved for a reduced parking requirement, that the City is in support of cash-in-lieu is not required. It is our understanding cash in lieu of parking is only required where the requested reduction is beyond what the City is willing to support.
15. Placemaking brief - policy 8.3.2 may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required and the brief is to identify or map connections to planned or existing community gathering places and activities and opportunities for enhancing these gathering places and provide improved connections; it is submitted that these places may not be on the proposed development lands, no criteria is provided and this provides for additional study and cost to development proposals.
16. Infill - the policies of 9.5.6 (Context Sensitive Development) appear to state that infill is a form of intensification and shall be on a lot created between two existing lots that are approximately 150 metres or less apart and that the parcel of land should be in keeping with the existing and anticipated development in the area. It is submitted that the policy could be interpreted that higher order intensification cannot take place as infill development.

17. Section 10.1 e) Interpretation: We appreciate this caveat and interpretative clause, however, the use of discrete bulleted permitted uses within a land use designation is a very specific way of listing uses and must be utilized properly. Additional expansion of the permitted use lists is recommended. It is suggested that the OP is acting like a zoning by-law and this is restrictive and would require undue process (an OPA) if a building type that meets the policy context is not permitted in the OP.

The following are comments regarding the Urban Design policies:

18. Section 3.1.3.2 Application of Urban Design Guidelines - Must be clear that there is flexibility in not achieving every specific guideline due to site specific circumstance but the intent of the guideline can be demonstrated through other means and that should a relevant guidelines not be achieved that it does not trigger an Official Plan Amendment.
19. Placemaking brief- policy 9.4.2.2(t) may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required.
20. Human Scale Design - policy 3.2.1 (a)(i)(c) It is not understood how a development proposal "shall" "improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place".
21. Sustainable and Resilient Design - it is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document for example, all development (which would include, for example, minor variances shall demonstrate passive design strategies, use of environmentally preferable products, enhancement of environmental quality, and optimization of operational and maintenance practices, among others.
22. Green Development Standards - A Sustainable Development Report is a new requirement for specific development applications. For a development application to demonstrate conformity to the Official Plan, it is unknown how these policies are to be addressed and their appropriateness in a land use planning document is questioned.

Your consideration of the above noted comments is appreciated.

Yours truly,

MHBC

W&il

Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP
Partner

cc. *Dean Arsenosi | Arsenosi Developments Group*

Joanne Werth

From: Andrew Edwards
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 3:17 PM
To: NewBarrieOP; Tomasz Wierzba
Cc: Kory Chisholm
Subject: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of Grove Street Developments Inc.
Attachments: MHBC_Final Grove St Barrie OP Comment Letter 2nd Draft - 2June2021.pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz,

On behalf of our client, Grove Street Developments Inc., please find attached comment letter regarding the second draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan.

Regards,

ANDREW EDWARDS, BES | Planner

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 236 | F 705 728 2010 | aedwards@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at aedwards@mhbcplan.com or 705-309-1668. Thank you.

111



KITCHENER
WOODBRIDGE
LONDON
KINGSTON
BARRIE
BURLINGTON

June 2, 2021

Tomasz Wierzba, RPP
Policy Planner

City of Barrie

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

**RE: Comments on Second Draft of Official Plan
10-24 Grove Street West**

In a letter dated December 22, 2020, we provided comment on the first draft of the Official Plan. The purpose of this letter is to provide comments on the second draft of the City of Barrie Draft Official Plan on behalf of our Client Grove Street Development Inc., dated May 6, 2021 as they relate to the landholdings noted above. The following comments are respectfully submitted.

Site Specific Comments

Recognition of Existing Approvals - Our Client's primary concern with the 2nd Draft of the New Official Plan is that it does not clearly identify or carry forward the existing OP and ZBL permissions that exist on their lands. As the City is aware these lands received site specific OPA and ZBA approvals back in 2018. Our Client acquired these lands in early 2021 and have been actively working through the site plan approval process for a large purpose built rental project. Many of the specific proposed policies within the 2nd draft are of concern and contrary to the existing site specific approvals and permissions.

It is requested that the property be identified on Map 2 as a Defined Policy Area and all site specific permissions be recognized and carried forward within Section 2.8 - Defined Policy Areas.

Affordable housing - There is no question that the provision of affordable housing is a basic human right/requirement and a critical component of inclusive community. However, the mandatory provision for affordable housing in all new developments is not practical or achievable and is of concern to our Client. All developments are not conducive to the provision of truly affordable housing due to building type, location, proximity to supportive amenities, and financial feasibility. Additionally by mandating each development

includes a prescribed amount of affordable units will likely at the same time increase the cost of the remaining market units which would be working against this objective.

It is requested these policies not be prescriptive for all developments and be subject to available funding which is an approach the City has taken in the past.

General Comments

Overall there are 5 fundamental concerns with the 2nd Draft of the City of Barre OP and the process to date:

1. Rushed Comment Period - Comment period for the 2nd Draft is far too short for a document of this importance and magnitude. The Public and Stakeholders were provided 3 months to review the 1st Draft in late 2020 which is a more appropriate timeframe. Only having a 1 month window to review the 2nd Draft which has had substantial changes and no formal response to comments is a challenge. It is critical the Public and Stakeholders be provided additional time to review the next Draft with the revised Urban Design Guidelines and a compiled comment response table provided by the City.
2. Importance and Weight of New OP - Importance of getting the New Official Plan right the first time as there is no appeal rights for the Public and Stakeholders and the Planning Act includes a two year moratorium on amending New Official Plans unless this is waived by Council.
3. Lack of Transition Regulations - The 2nd Draft contains no transition regulations as an implementation tool. It is therefore unclear how ongoing development applications at various stages of the development approval process will be impacted when the New Official Plan comes into force and effect.
4. Urban Design Focus - The 2nd Draft is very much an Urban Design based and focused document, however we do not have the key implementation document (the revised Urban Design Guidelines) for many of these policies within the 2nd Draft. In the absence of this it is impossible to complete a comprehensive review. Additionally the 2nd Draft contains a lot of challenging urban design verbiage/terminology that is unclear and undefined which leaves a lot of room for varying interpretation of these policies. For example **Section 3.2.1 (i)(c)** requires all development applications to demonstrate it will improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place.
5. Prescriptive nature of the Official Plan - Many policies throughout the 2nd Draft are written in an absolute and prescriptive manner with no flexibility, very much like a Zoning By-law. An Official Plan is meant to provide broad long term policy direction and provide room for flexible interpretation of policies and goals. As written most development applications moving forward would likely require an Official Plan Amendment to proceed. For example **Section 2.6.3.3 d)** requires High Density development with a residential component shall have a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare. Many sites will not be able to achieve this density on a site by site basis while others will be able to far exceed it. This should be written as a general target and not an absolute requirement. This also would remove flexibility for mixed-use buildings that are primarily commercial/office to incorporate a small residential component.

All Prescriptive design related policies through the New OP should be written as "should generally" or "are encouraged to provide," etc.

As public and stakeholders will not be afforded any appeal rights under the Planning Act on the City's New Official Plan it is critical that the public and stakeholders be provided with additional opportunity to review

further revisions to the 2nd Draft accompanied by the City's comment response table prior to any consideration by Council.

As the public and stakeholders are not afforded any appeal rights it is requested that the City include within any recommendation to approve the New Official Plan a blanket waiving of Section 21 (2.1) of the Planning Act to allow for processing of Official Plan Amendments within 2 years of the adoption of the New Official Plan, otherwise it could potentially freeze a landowners ability to undertake a new development project for a period of 2+ years.

Since the City is proposing a number of substantial changes from the Current Official Plan to the Draft New Official Plan it is imperative that transition regulations be included in the City's Official Plan. As you know, there are several substantial development proposals currently in progress based on the City's existing Official Plan designations and policies. Many of these applications are at significant risk given the revised OP policies. Including strong transition regulations within the New Official Plan will allow current development applications to continue through the process without having to potentially restart the development approval process or make substantial changes to their design and generally reduce potential confusion in the processing of applications when the New Official Plan comes into effect as well as provide certainty to the development industry to understand which document and policy context they are dealing with moving forward.

Draft Official Plan

1. Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) - this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.
2. Section 10.1e) Interpretation: We appreciate this caveat and interpretative clause, however, the use of discrete bulleted permitted uses within a land use designation is a very specific way of listing uses and must be utilized properly. Additional expansion of the permitted use lists is recommended. It is suggested that the OP is acting like a zoning by-law and this is restrictive and would require undue process (an OPA) if a building type that meets the policy context is not permitted in the OP.
3. Section 3.1.3.2 - Must be clear that there is flexibility in not achieving every specific guideline due to site specific circumstance but the intent of the guideline can be demonstrated through other means. Deviations from individual urban design guidelines should not require an Official Plan Amendment.
4. Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) - this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.
5. Section 2.7.1 - Historic Neighbourhoods: There should be acknowledgement that a significant amount of intensification is expected within the Historic Neighbourhoods along identified Intensification Corridors, Strategic Growth Areas and lands with higher density permissions.
6. Policy 3.5.6 a) ii) g) - This should be written to generally apply, some sites may be appropriate for a reduced rear yard setback such as if a site backs onto a natural area, highway or other use where it is appropriate to site the building closer to the rear lot line.

7. Section 3.3.4- High Rise buildings -All these prescriptive urban design policies should be written in a flexible manner and not as a "shall" in order to avoid requiring Official Plan Amendments on individual design policies that can be addressed through Zoning and Urban Design Review.

Examples of how these prescriptive policies should be revised include:

- (a)(ii)(d) *Any tower, including its balconies, -5-Rel-1 **should** be setback from the podium by a minimum of 3.0 metres along all public street frontages to ensure an appropriate human-scaled pedestrian environment and mitigate wind impacts at street level;*
- (a)(ii)(f) *Where more than one High-Rise Building is located on the same lot, the distance between the towers at the twelfth storey and above-5-A€!..I. **-should-beat** least 38 25.0 metres,*
- (a)(ii)(c) *The tower of a High-Rise Building wi-11 **should** be setback a minimum of B 12.5 metres from: (1) the side property line; (2) the rear property line, and; (3) the centre line of an abutting right-of-way.*
- (a)(ii)(g) *In order to provide appropriate transitions, towers wi-1-1-**should generally** be setback at least 70.0 metres from low rise residential built form on lands designated Neighbourhood Areas on Map 2; however, this does not apply to those towers located within the Urban Growth Centre which will be instead be setback at least 30.0 metres.*

8. Policy 3.3.4(a)(ii)(c) - this should be a general policy and if it cannot be achieved other provisions to apply a buffer/transition can be applied.
9. Policy 3.3.4(a)(ii)(i) this should be removed or be a general policy, no need to provide a minimum of 5 storeys of separation between every tower. Visual interest can be provided for in other ways.
10. Infill - the policies of 9.5.6 (Context Sensitive Development) appear to state that infill is a form of intensification and shall be on a lot created between two existing lots that are approximately 150 metres or less apart and that the parcel of land should be in keeping with the existing and anticipated development in the area. It is submitted that the policy could be interpreted that higher order intensification cannot take place as infill development.

The following are comments regarding the Urban Design policies:

11. Section 3.1.3.2 (a) - Must be clear that there is flexibility in not achieving every specific guideline due to site specific circumstance but the intent of the guideline can be demonstrated through other means. Again these policies should not be written in a manner that would require an Official Plan Amendment for a site that cannot meet an individual design requirement policy.
12. Placemaking brief- policy 9.4.2.2(t) may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required.
13. Human Scale Design - policy 3.2.1 (a)(i)(c) It is not understood how a development proposal "shall" "improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place".

14. Sustainable and Resilient Design - it is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document for example, all development (which would include,

for example, minor variances shall demonstrate passive design strategies, use of environmentally preferable products, enhancement of environmental quality, and optimization of operational and maintenance practices, among others.

15. Green Development Standards - A Sustainable Development Report is a new requirement for specific development applications. For a development application to demonstrate conformity to the Official Plan, it is unknown how these policies are to be addressed and their appropriateness in a land use planning document is questioned.

Your consideration of the above noted comments is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

MHBC

W@Jl

Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP
Partner

Cc. Greg Jones | Grove Street Developments Inc.
Sarah Reeve | Grove Street Developments Inc.

Joanne Werth

From: Andrew Edwards
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 1:46 PM
To: NewBarrieOP;Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca
Cc: Kory Chisholm
Subject: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of McCowan & Associates Ltd.
Attachments: MHBC_Barrie OP 2nd Draft Review-McCowan-Ardagh Road - 02June2021.pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz,

On behalf of our client, McCowan and Associates Ltd., please find attached comment letter regarding the second draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan.

Regards,

ANDREW EDWARDS, BES | Planner

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 236 | F 705 728 2010 |
aedwards@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at aedwards@mhbcplan.com or 705-309-1668. Thank you.



KITCHENER
WOODBRIDGE
LONDON
KINGSTON
BARRIE
BURLINGTON

June 2, 2021

Tomasz Wierzba, RPP
Policy Planner

City of Barrie

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

RE: Mccowan Ardagh Road Property
City of Barrie Official Plan 2nd Draft (May 2021)

In a letter dated December 22, 2020, we provided comment on the first draft of the Official Plan. The purpose of this letter is to provide comments on the second draft of the City of Barrie Draft Official Plan, dated May 6, 2021 as they relate to landholdings on the north side of Ardagh Road (NE of Ardagh Road and County Rd 27) as generally outlined in the figure below. The property currently has no municipal address. The following comments are respectfully submitted.

Overall there are 5 fundamental concerns with the 2nd Draft of the City of Barre OP and the process to date:

1. Rushed Comment Period - Comment period for the 2nd Draft is far too short for a document of this importance and magnitude. The Public and Stakeholders were provided 3 months to review the 1st Draft in late 2020 which is a more appropriate timeframe. Only having a 1 month window to review the 2nd Draft which has had substantial changes and no formal response to comments is a challenge. It is critical the Public and Stakeholders be provided additional time to review the next Draft with the revised Urban Design Guidelines and a compiled comment response table provided by the City.
2. Importance and Weight of New OP - Importance of getting the New Official Plan right the first time as there is no appeal rights for the Public and Stakeholders and the Planning Act includes a two year moratorium on amending New Official Plans unless this is waived by Council.
3. Lack of Transition Regulations - The 2nd Draft contains no transition regulations as an implementation tool. It is therefore unclear how ongoing development applications at various stages of the development approval process will be impacted when the New Official Plan comes into force and effect.

113 COLLIER STREET/ BARRIE/ ONTARIO/ L4M 1H2 / T 705 728 0045 / F 705 728 2010 / WWW.MHBCPLAN.COM

4. Urban Design Focus - The 2nd Draft is very much an Urban Design based and focused document, however we do not have the key implementation document (the revised Urban Design Guidelines) for many of these policies within the 2nd Draft. In the absence of this it is impossible to complete a comprehensive review. Additionally the 2nd Draft contains a lot of challenging urban design verbiage/terminology that is unclear and undefined which leaves a lot of room for varying interpretation of these policies. For example **Section 3.2.1 (i)(c)** requires all development applications to demonstrate it will improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place.


5. Prescriptive nature of the Official Plan – Many policies throughout the 2nd Draft are written in an absolute and prescriptive manner with no flexibility, very much like a Zoning By-law. An Official Plan is meant to provide broad long term policy direction and provide room for flexible interpretation of policies and goals. As written most development applications moving forward would likely require an Official Plan Amendment to proceed. For example **Section 2.6.3.3 d)** requires High Density development with a residential component shall have a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare. Many sites will not be able to achieve this density on a site by site basis while others will be able to far exceed it. This should be written as a general target and not an absolute requirement. This also would remove flexibility for mixed-use buildings that are primarily commercial/office to incorporate a small residential component.

All Prescriptive design related policies through the New OP should be written as “should generally” or “are encouraged to provide,” etc.

Notwithstanding these comments, we reserve the right to comment on the future draft that is provided with responses to the comments submitted as well as the revised draft Urban Design Guidelines when they are released to the public.

As shown on the excerpt below, the site (outlined in the red box) is proposed to be to be designated both “Neighbourhood Area” (yellow area) and Natural Heritage System (green area) on Map 2.

Excerpt of Map 2:



The following are general comments on the Draft Official Plan:

1. We have previously had discussions with City staff regarding the intended built form for the developable area of this parcel and had discussed concepts identifying medium density low to mid-rise built form being appropriate as this Site fronts onto an Arterial and can take advantage of existing infrastructure.

It is requested the lands on the Site identified as Neighbourhood Area be designated Medium Density on Map 2 in order to reflect this intended built form. This request was included in letter to City dated December 22, 2020.

We believe Medium Density would be a more appropriate designation for the site as the site has a constrained developable area, is not immediately adjacent to any other built form and is somewhat isolated. Maximizing the density on the site in the context of the surround area would make efficient use of the site and allow for a greater variety of built form in this area of the City which predominately consists of single detached dwellings on the south side of Ardagh Rd and further to the east.

We would request the opportunity to have a meeting to discuss this further with City Staff.

2. Subdivision policies- it is requested that the requirement in policy 9.5.3 to review the City tax base in relation to subdivisions, requirement for traffic calming, and requirement for vegetation removal only within 30 days of grading be reconsidered. Further, the lapse date policies of 9.5.3 (i) should include provision for extensions.
3. Affordable housing - There is no question that the provision of affordable housing is a basic human right/requirement and a critical component of inclusive community. However, the mandatory provision for affordable housing in all new developments is not practical or achievable. All developments are not conducive to the provision of truly affordable housing due to building type, location, proximity to supportive amenities, and financial feasibility. We are concerned with the implications of these policies and request they not be prescriptive for all developments. We recommend the City establish policies which enable the collection of revenues for the provision of City sponsored affordable housing.

There are various affordable housing target policies in the Plan including but not limited to policies 2.5 U), and Section 6.4.2. Policy 2.5 U) requires 10% of all new housing in the City to be affordable, policy 6.4.2 (e)(iii) requires development with more than 40 dwelling units to demonstrate the provision of affordable units and policy (iv) requires all new medium and high-density land use designations to provide 10% affordable units across a range of unit sizes including 3 bedroom units or larger, and policy 2.3.2 (e) (iii) requires at least 20% of housing units developed in the UGC satisfy the criteria for affordable. It is suggested that this policy does not recognize that various projects, in their totality, are being developed as affordable housing projects and thus contributing to the City wide mix of 10%. These policies have the potential to contribute to a lower amount of attainable units if affordable housing units are required on a project by project basis. Further with an owner occupied product, it is not understood how the City can guarantee that the unit will remain affordable to the second buyer once sold as affordable to the first buyer.

4. Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) - this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.

The following are comments regarding the Medium Density Designation and associated policies:

5. In the Medium Density designation, a development, as long as it is not on an intensification corridor and is within 70 metres of an NA designation (among other matters) may be permitted to have townhouses (2.6.2.2 i) and those townhouses are required to have ground floor commercial or retail if the building is on a Collector or Arterial road (2.6.2.2 e) and a mix of residential and non-residential uses is required (2.6.2.2 c) in all circumstances. However the development can be exempt from requiring commercial if it meets one of a handful of tests; mostly related to whether there is commercial close by and the site is not on an Arterial road (2.6.2.2 g) and notwithstanding policy (g) the commercial exemption policies don't apply in some areas. It is not known what the "townhouse" built form therefore is if it is required to have a mix of uses and might require ground floor commercial or retail depending on what type of street it is on; it is assumed that it is a live/work unit. It is suggested that if townhouses (without commercial) are permitted, that this be stated and it is also suggested that the commercial policies be simplified.

The following are comments regarding the Designated Greenfield Area policies:

6. Designated Greenfield Area and tenure - Policy 2.4.2.3 i) identifies that to meet the DGA density target, among other matters, new development is to provide for a range of unit types, tenures, and built form; "tenure" is not related to density and this should be removed.

The following are comments regarding the Urban Design policies:

7. Section 3.1.3.2 Application of Urban Design Guidelines- Must be clear that there is flexibility in not achieving every specific guideline due to site specific circumstance but the intent of the guideline can be demonstrated through other means and that should a relevant guideline not be achieved that it does not trigger an Official Plan Amendment.
8. Placemaking brief- policy 9.4.2.2(t) may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required.
9. Human Scale Design- policy 3.2.1 (a)(i)(c) It is not understood how a development proposal "shall" "improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place".
10. Sustainable and Resilient Design - it is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document for example, all development (which would include, for example, minor variances shall demonstrate passive design strategies, use of environmentally preferable products, enhancement of environmental quality, and optimization of operational and maintenance practices, among others.
11. Green Development Standards - A Sustainable Development Report is a new requirement for specific development applications. For a development application to demonstrate conformity to the Official Plan, it is unknown how these policies are to be addressed and their appropriateness in a land use planning document is questioned.

We thank you for consideration of these comments. We reserve the right to comment on any future drafts of the Official Plan and Urban Design Guidelines.

Yours truly,

MHBC

W&i

Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP
Partner

cc. *Ron Mccowan | Mccowan & Associates Ltd.*

Joanne Werth

From: Andrew Edwards
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 3:10 PM
To: NewBarrieOP; Tomasz Wierzba
Cc: Kory Chisholm
Subject: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of PBM Realty Holdings Inc.
Attachments: MHBC FINAL - PBMR 2nd Draft OP Comments - 2June2021.pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz,

On behalf of our client, PBM Realty Holdings Inc., please find attached comment letter regarding the second draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan.

Regards,

ANDREW EDWARDS, BES | Planner

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 236 | F 705 728 2010 |
aedwards@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at aedwards@mhbcplan.com or 705-309-1668. Thank you.

111



KITCHENER
WOODBRIDGE
LONDON
KINGSTON
BARRIE
BURLINGTON

June 2, 2021

Tomasz Wierzba, RPP
Policy Planner

City of Barrie

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

**RE: PBM Realty Holdings Inc.
Comments on City of Barrie Official Plan 2nd Draft (May 2021)**

The purpose of this letter is to provide comments on the second draft of the City of Barrie Draft New Official Plan ("the 2nd Draft"), dated May 6, 2021 as they relate to landholdings held by PBM Realty Holdings Inc. ("PBMR") and its affiliated companies. Those landholdings are identified as follows:

- 364 St. Vincent Street
- 49 Truman Road
- 125 Brock Street
- 168 Tiffin Street
- 191 John Street
- 217 Dunlop Street East; and,
- 30 Alliance Boulevard

These comments are submitted as a follow up to the comments that were submitted on the 1st Draft dated December 22nd, 2020 by Mitchinson Planning & Development Consultants Inc. It is noted many of the December 2020 comments remain unaddressed within the 2nd Draft and therefore we are reiterating those previous comments as well as providing additional comments.

Overall there are 6 fundamental concerns with the 2nd Draft of the City of Barre OP and the process to date:

1. Rushed Comment Period - Comment period for the 2nd Draft is far too short for a document of this importance and magnitude. The Public and Stakeholders were provided 3 months to review the pt Draft in late 2020 which is a more appropriate timeframe. Only having a 1 month window to review the 2nd Draft which has had substantial changes and no formal response to comments is a challenge. It is critical the Public and

Stakeholders be provided additional time to review the next

113 COLLIER STREET/ BARRIE/ ONTARIO/ L4M 1 H2 / T 705 728 0045 / F 705 728 2010 / WWW.MHBCPLAN.COM

Draft with the revised Urban Design Guidelines and a compiled comment response table provided by the City.

2. Importance and Weight of New OP - Importance of getting the New Official Plan right the first time as there is no appeal rights for the Public and Stakeholders and the Planning Act includes a two year moratorium on amending New Official Plans unless this is waived by Council.
3. Lack of Transition Regulations - The 2nd Draft contains no transition regulations as an implementation tool. It is therefore unclear how ongoing development applications at various stages of the development approval process will be impacted when the New Official Plan comes into force and effect.
4. Urban Design Focus - The 2nd Draft is very much an Urban Design based and focused document, however we do not have the key implementation document (the revised Urban Design Guidelines) for many of these policies within the 2nd Draft. In the absence of this it is impossible to complete a comprehensive review. Additionally the 2nd Draft contains a lot of challenging urban design verbiage/terminology that is unclear and undefined which leaves a lot of room for varying interpretation of these policies. For example **Section 3.2.1 (i)(c)** requires all development applications to demonstrate it will improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place.
5. Permitted Uses - There are wholesale changes in land use designations proposed that will have the effect of altering the range of uses permitted on properties. It is requested that all existing land use permissions be carried forward in the New OP. For example two of PBMR's landholdings located within the proposed SEED designation currently have and are used for industrial purposes and the SEED designation proposed to remove all industrial use permissions. Please refer to the Appendix for a compiled comparison table of permitted uses within the Current OP and Current Zoning By-law compared to the 2nd Draft of the New OP.
6. Prescriptive nature of the Official Plan - Many policies throughout the 2nd Draft are written in an absolute and prescriptive manner with no flexibility, very much like a Zoning By-law. An Official Plan is meant to provide broad long term policy direction and provide room for flexible interpretation of policies and goals. As written most development applications moving forward would likely require an Official Plan Amendment to proceed. For example **Section 2.6.3.3 d)** requires High Density development with a residential component shall have a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare. Many sites will not be able to achieve this density on a site by site basis while others will be able to far exceed it. This should be written as a general target and not an absolute requirement. This also would remove flexibility for mixed-use buildings that are primarily commercial/office to incorporate a small residential component.

All Prescriptive design related policies through the New OP should be written as "should generally" or "are encouraged to provide," etc in order to clearly state the City's design objective while not requiring an Official Plan Amendment each time an objective cannot be fully achieved on a site.

The following comments are respectfully submitted. Notwithstanding these comments, we reserve the right to comment on additional items as well as the Draft Urban Design Guidelines when they are released to the public in the future.

It is understood through attendance at the public open house held on May 19th that the City will not be providing a comment response table on the 1st Draft of the Official Plan but will be doing so with comments received on the 2nd Draft of the Official Plan.

It is noted that the New Official Plan is a lengthy and detailed document and while a time period of 3 months was provided for the public and stakeholders to review and comment on the 1st Draft, only 1 month was provided for the public and stakeholders to review and comment on the 2nd Draft. This is a challenging timeframe, especially without the benefit of a comment response table from the City nor a corresponding Urban Design Guideline which many of the policies in the Draft New Official Plan directly correlate to.

As public and stakeholders will not be afforded any appeal rights under the Planning Act on the City's New Official Plan it is critical that the public and stakeholders be provided with additional opportunity to review further revisions to the 2nd Draft accompanied by the City's comment response table prior to any consideration by Council.

As the public and stakeholders are not afforded any appeal rights it is requested that the City include within any recommendation to approve the New Official Plan a blanket waiving of Section 21 (2.1) of the Planning Act to allow for processing of Official Plan Amendments within 2 years of the adoption of the New Official Plan, otherwise it could potentially freeze a landowners ability to undertake a new development project for a period of 2+ years.

Since the City is proposing a number of substantial changes from the Current Official Plan to the Draft New Official Plan it is imperative that transition regulations be included in the City's Official Plan. As you know, there are several substantial development proposals currently in progress based on the City's existing Official Plan designations and policies. Many of these applications are at significant risk given the revised OP policies. Including strong transition regulations within the New Official Plan will allow current development applications to continue through the process without having to potentially restart the development approval process or make substantial changes to their design and generally reduce potential confusion in the processing of applications when the New Official Plan comes into effect as well as provide certainty to the development industry to understand which document and policy context they are dealing with moving forward.

General Comments on the Draft Official Plan:

1. We support the City's decision to extend the timeframe of the New Official Plan to 2051 to align with the 2020 Provincial Growth Plan.
2. In general we believe the City's New Official Plan should build in greater flexibility to allow applications that deviate from specific design requirements to proceed without the need for an Official Plan Amendment at the discretion of City staff. The City's Draft New Official Plan provides many specific design criteria that are more consistent with provisions found in the City's Zoning By-law. By enshrining these in the City's Official Plan without flexible language it will require many applications moving forward to also apply for an Official Plan Amendment, even for something seemingly minor such as providing 49% ground floor non-residential uses instead of 50% (2.6.1.3 d).
3. Section 2.3.5 Employment Areas - The range of uses permitted in the new employment area designations are more restrictive than those currently permitted by Barrie's existing OP and

Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Please refer to the Appendix for a comparison in permitted uses. These use restrictions appear contrary to the draft OP goals for economic prosperity which are expressed throughout the Plan. Please refer to the Appendix for a full comparison table as it relates to PBMR's landholdings.

4. Affordable housing - There is no question that the provision of affordable housing is a basic human right/requirement and a critical component of inclusive community. However, the mandatory provision for affordable housing in all new developments is not practical or achievable. All developments are not conducive to the provision of truly affordable housing due to building type, location, proximity to supportive amenities, and financial feasibility. We are concerned with the implications of these policies and request they not be prescriptive for all developments. We recommend the City establish policies which enable the collection of revenues for the provision of City sponsored affordable housing. We understand the City recently established a task force to formulate cash-in-lieu of affordable housing policy to be implemented moving forward and suggest the City include this within the affordable housing policies as an alternative to every site providing affordable units.

There are various affordable housing target policies in the Plan including but not limited to policies

2.5. (j), and Section **6.4.2. Policy 2.5 (j)** requires 10% of all new housing in the City to be affordable, policy **6.4.2 (e)(iii)** requires development with more than 40 dwelling units to demonstrate the provision of affordable units and policy **(iv)** requires all new medium and high-density land use designations to provide 10% affordable units across a range of unit sizes including 3 bedroom units or larger, and **policy 2.3.2 (e) (iii)** requires at least 20% of housing units developed in the UGC satisfy the criteria for affordable. It is suggested that this policy does not recognize that various projects, in their totality, are being developed as affordable housing projects and thus contributing to the City wide mix of 10%. These policies have the potential to contribute to a lower amount of attainable units if affordable housing units are required on a project by project basis. Further with an owner occupied product, it is not understood how the City can guarantee that the unit will remain affordable to the second buyer once sold as affordable to the first buyer.

5. **Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii)** - this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.
6. **Urban Growth Centre** - We fully support the City correcting the mapping of the Urban Growth Centre in the pr Draft and identifying the property at 217 Dunlop Street East as being within the Urban Growth Centre and designated High Density.
7. **Section 2.5(a)** - What constitutes a "slight variation" and why are variations to height and density excluded? In the effort to limit the amount of future Official Plan Amendment applications flexibility to allow for appropriate variations in height and density should be allowed to proceed without the need to amend the Official Plan and can be considered through the Zoning By-law Amendment process.
8. **Section 2.6.1.3(d)-On** what basis was mandatory ("shall") 50% ground floor retail and commercial uses determined to be required of low and mid-rise buildings fronting onto Collector and Arterial Streets and Intensification Corridors? This policy should be revised to allow greater flexibility as not every property fronting onto Collector or Arterial Streets or Intensification Corridors for a variety of reasons may not be appropriate to

- 9. Section 2.6.2.1 - Medium Density Permitted Uses & 2.6.3.1 High Density Permitted Uses:** Is seniors' housing, assisted living and long term care homes included in the Residential category? We recommend that the various forms of seniors and assisted living/care homes be included as a permitted use in both the Medium and High Density designations.
- 10. Section 2.6.8 Strategic Employment and Economic District (SEED):** We understand and appreciate the rationale for the SEEDs; however, we have concerns with the implementation of these policies and the restricted range of permitted uses and development standards. Further detailed discussion with City Staff is required.
- a. **2.6.8.1 Permitted Uses** - Can City staff confirm the permitted uses presented are in addition to the existing designation and not exclusive. PBMR's properties at 364 St. Vincent Street and 30 Alliance Boulevard have existing industrial use permissions and have tenants using the properties for industrial purposes and it is critical these existing permissions be carried forward.
 - b. **2.6.8.2 h) Land Use Policies** - Can City staff confirm the intent of this policy? It does not appear any SEED designated lands are also designated Employment Areas.
 - c. **2.6.8.3 b) Development Standards** - Can City staff confirm the intent of generally requiring buildings to be limited to 6 storeys in height is meant to be flexible and if lands are located in other areas (along intensification corridors or higher order streets) that consideration for increased heights will be considered without the need for an Official Plan Amendment?
- 11. Section 2.6.10 Employment Area - Industrial:** We have concerns with the restricted range of permitted uses and development standards. We request that existing use permissions be carried forward. Please refer to the Appendix for a full comparison table as it relates to PBMR's landholdings. Further detailed discussion is required.
- 12. Section 4 Planning for Transportation and Mobility:** There are many excellent provisions regarding transportation planning and transit infrastructure. However, similar to concerns with **Section 3**, many of the requirements may not be practical given the size and urban fabric of Barrie and the City's limited public transit infrastructure. Further, the ongoing maintenance costs must be carefully and comprehensively evaluated, particularly with respect to snow removal requirements/costs.
- 13. Policy 6.6.4(q)** requires that any "development and site alteration" within a wellhead protection area requires a risk assessment. It is recommended that the policy is changed to "may" at the discretion of the City/delegated Risk Management Officer.
- 14. Section 9 Implementation:** It is imperative that transition provisions be included in the City's Official Plan. As you know, there are several substantial development proposals currently in progress based on the City's existing Official Plan designations and policies.

Many of these applications are at significant risk given the revised OP policies. Appropriate transition provisions are even more critical given there is no appeal mechanism for the City's single tier OP, no OP amendments for two years (unless Council waives this Section of the Planning Act) and certain policy restrictions within the context of the City's next municipal comprehensive review.

At a minimum, we request a transition policy which confirms that applications deemed to be complete at the date of adoption of the City's new OP will be deemed to conform with the new OP and that any associated/ implementing applications (i.e. a site plan which implements and zoning amendment, or a plan of condominium built in conformity with an approved site plan) are similarly transitioned.

It is noted that **Policy 9.5.2(m)** has been included that deems draft approved subdivisions conform to the Plan. It is requested a similar policy be included to acknowledge other existing approvals and ongoing development applications that have been deemed complete.

15. **Section 9.5.4 Plan of Condominium:** We do not agree with or understand the mandatory ("shall") policies regarding the types of condominium considerations contained in **subsections a), b) and c). Subsection d)** should also acknowledge condominium exemptions as permitted by the Condominium Act.
16. **Section 10.1e) Interpretation:** We appreciate this caveat and interpretative clause, however, the use of discrete bulleted permitted uses within a land use designation is a very specific way of listing uses and must be utilized properly. For example, does the term "Residential" include seniors or student housing? We are concerned with the restricted list of employment and commercial uses. Additional expansion of the permitted use lists is recommended.

General Comments on the Draft Urban Design Policies:

17. **Section 3.1.3.2 Application of Urban Design Guidelines -** Must be clear that there is flexibility in not achieving every specific guideline due to site specific circumstance but the intent of the guideline can be demonstrated through other means and that should a relevant guidelines not be achieved that it does not trigger an Official Plan Amendment.
18. It is challenging to review the Urban Design Policies in the absence of the updated Draft Urban Design Guidelines. It is requested additional time be provided in the future for the public and stakeholders to review the future 3rd Draft of the New Official Plan together with the updated Draft Urban Design Guidelines.
19. **Human Scale Design - policy 3.2.l(a)(i)(c)** It is not understood how a development proposal "shall" "improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place".
20. **Sustainable and Resilient Design -** it is not understood how the policies of **3.2.3** can (or should) be achieved through a land use document for example, all development (which would include, for example, minor variances shall demonstrate passive design strategies, use of environmentally preferable products, enhancement of environmental quality, and optimization of operational and maintenance practices, among others.

- 21. Green Development Standards** - A Sustainable Development Report is a new requirement for specific development applications. For a development application to demonstrate conformity to the Official Plan, it is unknown how these policies are to be addressed and their appropriateness in a land use planning document is questioned.

Site Specific Comments on Draft Official Plan

PBMR and its affiliated companies own several properties in the City of Barrie. Our site specific comments are as follows:

- 1) 217 Dunlop Street East:** The subject site is currently designated City Centre Commercial and Urban Growth Centre by Barrie's existing OP. It is a Brownfield site with a Ministry issued Record of Site Condition and Certificate of Property Use.

The site is the subject of a rezoning application for development of a 15 storey residential condominium building. A Neighbourhood meeting was held on October 22, 2020, ZBA, Site Plan Approval and Draft Plan of Condominium Applications were submitted in January 2021 and deemed complete on February 19, 2021. The statutory public meeting was recently held on April 27, 2021 and the Owner and consultant team are working towards making a resubmission addressing all comments received from members of the public, the City and other commenting agencies.

Previous comments made in regards to sufficient transition policy for applications that have been deemed complete are critical to eliminate uncertainty as this development proposal continues to advance through the development approval process.

We appreciate and support the City correcting the mapping within the 2nd Draft of the New Official Plan and identifying the property as being within the Urban Growth Centre and designated as High Density.

Section **2.6.3.3 d)** High Density Development Standards, we have concerns with a prescribed minimum density of 300 units per hectare. We suggest this should be a target average density applied across the high density designation and not a required minimum on every individual application. Many properties within this designation may be challenged to achieve a density this high based on constraints and should not require an Official Plan Amendment if the general intent of the policy to intensify with taller built form is being maintained.

Section 3.3.4 High Rise Buildings, we have concerns with the prescriptive nature of many of the specific urban design criteria presented and proposed to be enshrined as OP policy rather than incorporated within the City's forthcoming Draft Urban Design Guidelines.

Can the City confirm the interpretation of **3.1.3.2 c)** is that should an applicant not be able to meet any of the specific urban design criteria presented in the City OP, through a sufficient Urban Design Brief providing rationale for why the guideline cannot be met, the development can then proceed without the need for an Official Plan Amendment? (ex, **3.3.4 a) ii) g)** 70m separation from towers to low rise built form).

- 2) 364 St. Vincent Street and 30 Alliance Boulevard:** The subject sites are currently designated Highway 400

Industrial by Barrie's existing OP and zoned Highway Industrial (HI) by Barrie's Comprehensive Zoning By-law
2009-141

The Draft OP now designates the site as a Strategic Growth Area (Map 1) and Strategic Economic Employment District (Map 2).

While certain components of the new OP policies have merit including the long term mixed use intent of the SEED, however our client is extremely concerned with the restricted range of permitted uses proposed, specifically the existing industrial type land use permissions proposed to be removed which our Client has existing long term tenants that would fall under. Should the New Draft OP be approved as proposed almost all of PMBR's existing tenants who generate a substantial amount of jobs and economic benefit within the City would no longer be permitted under the City's Official Plan and they would be challenged to attract any new tenants should existing tenants leave.

An opportunity to discuss this further with City staff is requested.

- 3) 191 John Street, 125 Brock, 168 Tiffin and 49 Truman Road:** The subject sites are currently designated General Industrial by Barrie's existing OP and are zoned General Industrial (GI) by Barrie By-law 2009-141.

The Draft OP designates the sites as Employment Area - Industrial (Map 2). As described in the preceding, our client is extremely concerned with the restricted range of permitted uses and the onerous urban design requirements for industrial sites.

It is requested all existing use permissions be carried forward in the New OP.

While urban design goals in industrial areas have merit these long term goals need to be balanced with the market realities of the existing industrial areas in the City of Barrie which are primarily intended to accommodate large format industrial uses that often don't demand comparatively high rents and are generally not highly trafficked areas outside of those working in them. Overly onerous urban design requirements that increase the cost of constructing and maintaining these buildings will drive up rents and may lead to long term high employment generating tenants leaving the City.

Yours truly,

MHBC

W@Jl

Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, RPP, MCIP
Partner

Cc. Peter Moore | PBM Realty Holdings Inc.

Christina Wilson | PBM Realty Holdings Inc.

Nicola Mitchinson | Mitchinson Planning and Development Consultants

Appendix:

Table 1. General Industrial (current) vs. Proposed Employment Area - Industrial Designation (2nd Draft OP)

191 John Street, 125 Brock, 168 Tiffin and 49 Truman Road

Current Official Plan Permitted Uses - General Industrial Designation	Current Zoning By-law General Industrial (GI) Zone Permitted Uses	Proposed "Employment Area - Industrial Designation" Permitted Uses in Draft Official Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manufacturing, processing, • Servicing, storage of goods and raw materials, • Industrial warehousing and similar such uses. • Commercial uses which serve the industrial area, such as a restaurant as part of a multi-tenant building, may be permitted • Industrial areas adjacent to residential lands shall be placed in a separate category in the Zoning By-law and will permit a greater range of nonindustrial, service based uses such as recreational uses, sports facilities and other service-based industrial uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animal shelter • Bakery • Concrete product manufacturing • Foundry • Manufacturing and Processing in Wholly Enclosed Buildings • Material Recovery Facility • Cannabis Production Facility • Outdoor Storage • Outdoor Storage of Sand, Gravel, Stone, Soil or Salt • Printing and Publishing • Rail Transfer Facility • Recyclable Materials Transfer Station • Rental Store Excluding Video and Electronic Rentals • Research/Development Facility • Self-Storage • Truck terminal • Warehousing in wholly enclosed buildings excluding self-storage • Wholesale establishment • Accessory Employee Use • Accessory Retail • Adult Entertainment Parlour • Automotive Repair Establishment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manufacturing and Fabrication; • Parks and Open Space; • Distribution Facility/warehousing/storage (excluding retail sales warehouse); • Waste management (per policies in Section 6.6.3 b); • Assembly and processing; and, • Office (excluding Major Office).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Building Supply Centre● Car Wash● Custom workshop● Data processing centre● Drive through facility● Dry cleaning establishment● Golf driving range● Nursery or garden supply● Office● Office, medical● Outdoor display and sales area● Restaurant● Service store● Trade centre● Transmission establishment, cellular and electronic● Veterinary clinic● Heavy equipment dealer● Kennel● Industrial school	
--	--	--

Table 2. Current Official Plan & ZBL v. Proposed SEED Designation

364 St. Vincent Street and 30 Alliance Boulevard

Current Official Plan Permitted Uses - Highway 400 Industrial Designation	Current Zoning By-law Highway Industrial (HI) Zone Permitted Uses	Proposed "SEED" Permitted Uses in Draft Official Plan
<p>Prestige industrial and office based uses. These uses shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate administration offices; • Business and professional uses; • Research and development facilities; and • High technology manufacturing or assembling operations. <p>Commercial uses such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restaurants as part of multi-tenant buildings, • Accessory retail, and • Accessory employee uses may be permitted on the same lot as the manufacturing, research or office establishment provided the commercial use is ancillary or accessory to the primary use in function and floor space occupancy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bakery • Manufacturing and Processing in Wholly Enclosed Buildings • Outdoor Storage • Printing and Publishing • Rail Transfer Facility • Research/Development Facility • Warehousing in wholly enclosed buildings excluding self-storage • Wholesale Establishment • Accessory Employee Use • Accessory Retail • Assembly Hall • Bank • Building supply centre • Conference Centre • Data Processing Centre • Drive Through Facility • Hotel, Motel • Office • Office, medical • Restaurant • Trade centre • Veterinary clinic • Commercial school • Industrial school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office (including Major Office); • Public service facilities; • Community facilities; • Training centres and post-secondary education facilities; • Parks and Open Space; • Day Care; • Health services and medical laboratory; • Hospitality and Tourism, as directed by the Zoning By-law; • Workshop (up to 2,000.0 square metres); • Recreational facilities; • Residential and Live-work units; • Commercial; and, • Convenience Retail as part of a mixed-use development.

Joanne Werth

From: Ann Krueger
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 2:04 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: updates to Barrie's Official Plan
Categories: Yellow Category

Greetings

On behalf of my congregation and myself, I commend the city for including needed changes to help our vulnerable homeless population. Specifically I commend you on the new section, 6.4.1 Vulnerable Populations which says: "The City will support and establish, where appropriate, the facilities for providing temporary emergency shelters, as well as cooling and warming stations throughout the City."

However, that does not include all basic needs. The provision of 365/24/7 public washrooms and drinking water throughout the City is greatly needed.

Please include those needs in the updated Official Plan.

Respectfully

Rev. Ann Krueger

Pastor

Westside Evangelical Lutheran Church

"We are God's work of art,

created in Christ Jesus for the good works

which God has already designated to make up our way of life."

Eph. 2:10

May 27, 2021

City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

cityclerks@barrie.ca

newbarrieop@barrie.ca

Attention: Mayor Lehman and Members of Council

Dear Mayor Lehman and Council:

RE: New City of Barrie Official Plan (2nd Draft)

220 Mapleview Drive East, o/b JohnMark Holdings Inc.

Our File 20371B

MHBC Planning has been retained by JohnMark Holdings Inc. to provide them planning advice and guidance with respect to their property at 200 Mapleview Drive East and to provide comments on their behalf to the City regarding the new Official Plan and how it proposes to address the unique development issues of the property.

Our Clients property is strategically located north of Mapleview Drive in a major employment area in the City of Barrie, approximately 1.6 kilometres east of Provincial Highway 400. The property is a corner lot located northwest of the intersection of Mapleview Drive and Huronia Road and abutting the railway line.

The area is comprised of commercial and office uses on the southwest corner of the intersection and light industrial uses on the other three corners as transitional land uses to the conservation land and residential neighbourhoods further to the east along Mapleview Drive. Further to the west and along Welham Road are more traditional major office and industrial employment uses. The subject property has an approximate frontage of 265 metres on Mapleview Drive, a frontage of approximately 159 metres on Huronia Road and an approximate area of 6.4 hectares (15.8 acres).

The location of the property is identified in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1 – Location Map



As the City and Council are aware, the property supports a significant portion of the Lover's Creek Marsh, a Provincially Significant Wetland. With this feature, and the required minimum 30 metre buffer, the effective developable area of the property is broken into two areas with a total remaining developable area at the intersection of Maplevue and Huronia Road being approximately only 1 hectare in size. Moreover, the planned widenings of both Maplevue Drive and Huronia Road will further reduce the developable portion of the subject lands. These development constraints and design imperatives will make it difficult, if not impossible, for our Client to achieve the planned land use and "Employment Area - Industrial" functions as set out in the draft New Official Plan as shown on Figure 1 attached.

It is our opinion that in light of these significant environmental constraints, the City's goal of protecting and designating all Level 1 NHS resources, creating a planning framework that achieves the employment goals for the City, and being consistent and in conformity with the PPS and Growth Plan, that the best planned use for the subject property would be the "Employment Area - Non-Industrial" designation. Changes to Map 2 of the Draft new Official Plan would be required.

Please accept this request and comments on behalf of our Clients. We look forward to continuing to work with City Staff in the consideration of this request and making the changes to the new Official Plan to further ground truth its land use structure, designations and policy approach to city building.

We look forward to your review and response. Yours truly,


MHBC

Wesley R. Crown, BES, MCIP, RPP
Associate

Attachment

c. John Di Flaviano

Figure 1 **F**



LAND USE

CITY OF BARRIE
OFFICIAL PLAN 2nd DRAFT - MAY 2021
MAP 2 - LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

220 Maplevie Drive East


Part Lot 10, Concession 12
Geographic Township of Innisfil
City of Barrie
County of Simcoe

LEGEND

-  Subject Property
-  Neighbourhood Area
-  Employment Area - Industrial
-  Commercial District
-  Natural Heritage System
-  Greenspace

DATE May 27, 2021

SOURCES
City of Barrie - Official Plan 2nd Draft - May 2021



20371B - Planning Letter



Joanne Werth

From: Barb Tansley
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 3:25 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: Draft 2 official plan - comments

Categories: Yellow Category

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for taking the time to consider these comments.

Re: strategic growth area - Big Bay Pt Rd map2 We are opposed to putting intensification areas into existing residential neighbourhoods. It appears to be planned medium density and we are concerned the increased density and heights 6-12 stories is just too much. There's also concern that already approved construction sites could increase density and height restriction beyond what's already planned.

Re: waterfront

Further development along the waterfront should not be allowed.

Re: Drinking water intake protection area zone 2 map7 Conflicts with plans for strategic growth area Yonge and Big BayPt Rd Well head protection at Yonge ,Minet's Point and Hurst also conflicts with Strategic growth area .

So how can our drinking water be protected if there's so much construction over such a large vulnerable area?

Sincerely,

Barb and Brian Tansley

Joanne Werth

From: Victoria Mortelliti
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 2:23 PM
To: NewBarrieOP; cityclerks
Cc: 'Kim Taylor'; Michelle Banfield; Tomasz Wierzba; Danielle Chin
Subject: Re-submission - BILD | City of Barrie Draft II Official Plan - June 2 Public Meeting
Attachments: 06022021 - BARRIE SECOND DRAFT OP - REVISED BILD SUBMISSION.pdf

Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hello again,

My apologies for the confusion. I unfortunately sent you a premature BILD submission this morning as a few additional comments from our membership came forward earlier this afternoon, and I didn't want them to go unnoticed.

Provided that the deadline for comments on the OP Website is 4PM I hope this revised submission is good to go.

I appreciate your time.

Please let me know,

Victoria Mortelliti, B.URPI
Planner, Policy & Advocacy
416-303-1880

Building Industry and Land Development Association

From: Victoria Mortelliti

Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 8:49 AM

To: 'new.barrieop@barrie.ca' <new.barrieop@barrie.ca>; 'cityclerks@barrie.ca' <cityclerks@barrie.ca>

Cc: 'Michelle Banfield' <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>; Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>

Subject: BILD Submission | City of Barrie Draft II Official Plan - June 2 Public Meeting

Good morning,

Please find attached BILD's Submission regarding the City of Barrie's Draft II of the new Official Plan in time for this evening's Public Meeting. Prior to the start of this meeting, we respectfully ask that this letter is circulated to all members of Council.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

If you could kindly send a confirmation of receipt –

Thank you,

Victoria Mortelliti, B.URPI
Planner, Policy and Advocacy
416-303-1880



Building Industry and Land Development Association

20 Upjohn Road | Suite 100 | Toronto, ON M3B



June 2, 2021

Mayor Jeff Lehman and Members of Council
City of Barrie

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON,
L4M 4T5

C/O new.barrieop@barrie.ca and cityclerks@barrie.ca

Dear Mayor Lehman and Members of Council,

RE: City of Barrie | Draft II of the City's new Official Plan.

BILD is the voice of the home building, land development and professional renovation industry in the Greater Toronto Area and Simcoe County. The building and renovation industry provides \$536 million in investment value and employs around 5,000 people in the City. BILD is proudly affiliated with the Ontario and Canadian Home Builders' Associations.

The Building Industry and Land Development Association ('BILD') is in receipt of *Draft Two of the City's new Official Plan* that is to be brought forward to today's June 2nd Statutory Public Meeting. Since its official release on May 6th, we have undertaken a review of this draft in preparation for today's meeting, and on behalf of our BILD Simcoe Chapter would like to request a few items of clarification from staff at today's meeting.

To begin, and prior to getting to the principle sentiments of this letter, we want take the time to thank City staff from the Official Plan project team for responding to some of our concerns outlined within our initial letter that was submitted in December 2020, regarding the first draft of the City's Official Plan. Since this submission, the City has made some positive improvements to the Official Plan, such as:

- Changing the planning horizon from 2041 to 2051.
- Making the document more concise in order to have clearer distinction between policies of intent vs. land use direction.
- Re-organized, clarified policies, and have made development policies more consistent within the land use designation section.

We appreciate these refinements as it will ensure that the City is preparing an Official Plan that is on its way to support the fostering of complete communities where people can live, work and play.

As your community building partner, we acknowledge the collaborative approach the City has taken throughout this review, and thank you for the opportunity to provide an additional set of comments, as BILD is kindly requesting clarification on the following items prior to the adoption of this Official Plan.

Affordable Housing

Regarding the Affordable Housing provisions within this Draft Official Plan, BILD remains concerned that by embedding the requirement for affordable housing (10% city average and

20% in the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Areas) without understanding the specific policies, structure or framework on how this is to be achieved, can become very problematic and can lead to many appeals. In particular, we believe that the definition of

20 Upjohn Road, Suite 100, Toronto, ON M3B 2V9

bildgta.ca



Affordable is wide open to interpretation as it relates to low and moderate household incomes. As such, we are kindly requesting clarification on the following:

- Kindly confirm how a developer is going to be able to fulfill the requirement or be able to assess the financial burden at the front end of the planning approval?
- Has the City contemplated any tools that would be able to provide for more affordable housing such as a Community Benefits Charge, City incentives of zoning and infrastructure, as well as partnerships with all levels of government? If not, when and how will this be considered?
- How is the stewardship of these affordable units going to be maintained into the future? How will the City ensure these units remain in neighbourhoods for their intended purpose rather than being flipped in short order at market prices?

Specifically, we are also seeking clarification on how the 10% City-wide affordable housing requirement as set out in Section 2.5 (j) relates to the minimum 20% requirement for Urban Growth Centres (UGCs) and Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) set out in Section 2.3.2 (e)

(ii) and Section 2.3.4 (iii) respectively.

- When building in MTSAs or UGCs, will the development industry have to include the 10% city-wide requirement on top of the 20% area-specific requirement?

We are seeking additional clarification specifically regarding the 20% affordability requirement within Urban Growth Centres. This policy as written reads as an inclusionary zoning policy, and in order to carry-out this requirement as per the Provincial Regulation - a Development Permit System (DPS) or Protected Major Transit Station Area (PMTSA) has to be in place. We are of the understanding that inclusionary zoning is currently not being considered within this OP or within the Affordable Housing Strategy Update that the City is currently undertaking.

- As such, we are recommending that this policy be modified to include language acknowledging that a DPS or PMTSA must be in place prior to the requirement being enforced or revise the proposed policy as voluntary.

Overall, we recommend that this Official Plan should focus on the goal of having a broad range of housing types and tenures for various income levels, rather than unachievable policies that can hinder and dissuade the industry from participating.

Parking Solutions - Cash In-Lieu (CIL) Parking

As currently written, Section 4.7 (e) and (f) requires cash-in-lieu in all circumstances where reduced parking is requested. This could translate as a disincentive to reduce parking, especially where the reduction is appropriate or minor.

- As such, when a development proposal and a request for a parking reduction is supported by a parking justification study, will the City consider removing the CIL requirement? If not, we do recommend that the City reconsider the language in this policy in order to allow for the review of these reductions on a case-by-case basis, and when findings of technical studies support the request for a parking reduction, that the City move forward without the CIL requirement.
- We are also requesting clarification on if Policy 5.9.1 (d) aligns with the CIL Bylaw? If not, does the City have plans to revisit the CIL Bylaw?
- In addition, will CIL be applied to requests for parking reduction on affordable

housing projects or municipal projects?

Human Design Scale

We are of the opinion that the language set out in this policy will lead to a magnitude of appeals.

- Specifically, we kindly recommend that Section 3.2.1 (b) (iii) be revised as the current language suggests that there should never be Official Plan Amendments (OPAs) for height or density.

Designated Greenfields

As specified in Section 2.4.2.3 (c), City is proposing that 52% of housing is to be high/medium density.

- Being that this is a very intense built form, is this percentage realistic in a Greenfields setting, particularly since significant sections of the Greenfield areas have already been planned and finalized?

As noted in Section 2.4.2.3 (f), the City is proposing that the minimum density will be 79 persons/jobs/hectare.

- Can the City kindly elaborate on how this number was finalized as a minimum requirement for Greenfield development?


Additional Comments

In Section 2.6.1.3 (d) Development Standards - mentions that the minimum requirement is 50% non-residential use for the ground floor of a low and mid-rise unit fronting a collector and or arterial road, if there is no other commercial use within 450 metres. We kindly ask that the City review this policy as this rigid provision could be problematic and hinder the development of affordable housing units.

Furthermore, in Section 6.6.4 (b) Stormwater Management – the Plan mentions that Stormwater is to be controlled on site. BILD recommends that this policy be revised to allow for centralized facilities that service a larger tributary planning area, as is normal practice.

As your community building partner, we trust you will find our comments helpful. We very much value our cooperative working relationship with the City, and look forward to your response on these items. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at vmortelliti@bildgta.ca.

Thank you,



Victoria Mortelliti, B.URPI
Planner | Policy & Advocacy
BILD

CC: Kim Taylor, Simcoe Chapter Chair, BILD
Michelle Banfield, Director of Development Services, City of Barrie
Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner, City of Barrie
BILD Simcoe Chapter Members

Joanne Werth

From: Victoria Mortelliti
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 8:49 AM
To: NewBarrieOP; cityclerks
Cc: 'Kim Taylor'; Michelle Banfield; Tomasz Wierzba
Subject: BILD Submission | City of Barrie Draft II Official Plan - June 2 Public Meeting
Attachments: 06 02 2021 - BILD Submission - Second Draft Barrie OP.pdf

Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Good morning,

Please find attached BILD's Submission regarding the City of Barrie's Draft II of the new Official Plan in time for this evening's Public Meeting. Prior to the start of this meeting, we respectfully ask that this letter is circulated to all members of Council.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

If you could kindly send a confirmation of receipt –

Thank you,

Victoria Mortelliti, B.URPI
Planner, Policy and Advocacy
416-303-1880



Building Industry and Land Development Association
20 Upjohn Road | Suite 100 | Toronto, ON M3B 2V9
bildgta.ca | renomark.ca | torontohomeshows.com



June 2, 2021

Mayor Jeff Lehman and Members of Council
City of Barrie

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON,
L4M 4T5

C/O new.barrieop@barrie.ca and cityclerks@barrie.ca

Dear Mayor Lehman and Members of Council,

RE: City of Barrie | Draft II of the City's new Official Plan.

BILD is the voice of the home building, land development and professional renovation industry in the Greater Toronto Area and Simcoe County. The building and renovation industry provides \$536 million in investment value and employs around 5,000 people in the City. BILD is proudly affiliated with the Ontario and Canadian Home Builders' Associations.

The Building Industry and Land Development Association ('BILD') is in receipt of *Draft Two of the City's new Official Plan* that is to be brought forward to today's June 2nd Statutory Public Meeting. Since its official release on May 6th, we have undertaken a review of this draft in preparation for today's meeting, and on behalf of our BILD Simcoe Chapter would like to request a few items of clarification from staff at today's meeting.

To begin, and prior to getting to the principle sentiments of this letter, we want take the time to thank City staff from the Official Plan project team for responding to some of our concerns outlined within our initial letter that was submitted in December 2020, regarding the first draft of the City's Official Plan. Since this submission, the City has made some positive improvements to the Official Plan, such as:

- Changing the planning horizon from 2041 to 2051.
- Making the document more concise in order to have clearer distinction between policies of intent vs. land use direction.
- Re-organized, clarified policies, and have made development policies more consistent within the land use designation section.

We appreciate these refinements as it will ensure that the City is preparing an Official Plan that is on its way to support the fostering of complete communities where people can live, work and play.

As your community building partner, we acknowledge the collaborative approach the City has taken throughout this review, and thank you for the opportunity to provide an additional set of comments, as BILD is kindly requesting clarification on the following items prior to the adoption of this Official Plan.

[Affordable Housing](#)

We are seeking clarification on how the 10% City-wide affordable housing requirement as set out in Section 2.5 (j) relates to the minimum 20% requirement for Urban Growth Centres (UGC) and Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) set out in Section 2.3.2 (e) (ii) and Section 2.3.4 (iii) respectively.

20 Upjohn Road, Suite 100, Toronto, ON M3B 2V9

bildgta.ca



- When building in MTSAs or UGCs, will the development industry have to include the 10% city-wide requirement on top of the 20% area-specific requirement?

We are seeking additional clarification specifically regarding the 20% affordability requirement within Urban Growth Centres. This policy as written reads as an inclusionary zoning policy, and in order to carry-out this requirement as per the Provincial Regulation - a Development Permit System (DPS) or Protected Major Transit Station Area (PMTSA) has to be in place. We are of the understanding that inclusionary zoning is currently not being considered within this OP or within the Affordable Housing Strategy Update that the City is currently undertaking.

- As such, we are recommending that this policy be modified to include language acknowledging that a DPS or PMTSA must be in place prior to the requirement being enforced or revise the proposed policy as voluntary.

Parking Solutions - Cash In-Lieu (CIL) Parking

As currently written, Section 4.7 (e) and (f) requires cash-in-lieu in all circumstances where reduced parking is requested. This could translate as a disincentive to reduce parking, especially where the reduction is appropriate or minor.

- As such, when a development proposal and a request for a parking reduction is supported by a parking justification study, will the City consider removing the CIL requirement? If not, we do recommend that the City reconsider the language in this policy in order to allow for the review of these reductions on a case-by-case basis, and when findings of technical studies support the request for a parking reduction, that the City move forward without the CIL requirement.
- We are also requesting clarification on if Policy 5.9.1 (d) aligns with the CIL Bylaw? If not, does the City have plans to revisit the CIL Bylaw?
- In addition, will CIL be applied to requests for parking reduction on affordable housing projects or municipal projects?


Human Design Scale

We are of the opinion that the language set out in this policy will lead to a magnitude of appeals.

- Specifically, we kindly recommend that Section 3.2.1 (b) (iii) be revised as the current language suggests that there should never be Official Plan Amendments (OPAs) for height or density.

As your community building partner, we trust you will find our comments helpful. We very much value our cooperative working relationship with the City, and look forward to your response on these items. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at vmortelliti@bildqta.ca.

Thank you,



Victoria Mortelliti, B.URPI
Planner | Policy & Advocacy
BILD



CC: Kim Taylor, Simcoe Chapter Chair, BILD

Michelle Banfield, Director of Development Services, City of Barrie

Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner, City of Barrie

BILD Simcoe Chapter Members

Joanne Werth

From: Cameron Sellers
Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 4:24 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba; Michelle Banfield; NewBarrieOP
Cc: Darren Vella
Subject: Community Hub designation

Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hi Michelle & Tomasz,

We would like to offer an opinion on the mandated density requirements of the Community Hub designation in the City's draft new Official Plan. This is not on behalf of any clients, but rather our opinion of good Planning practices.

Currently, the new OP requires a minimum density of 125.0 units per hectare within Community Hub lands (2.6.4.3 A) with a maximum of 300.0 units per hectare.

Given that Community Hub lands are dispersed throughout the City in varying locations / settings / neighbourhoods, we believe the density requirements (at least the minimum requirement) should be tiered, based on their position within the City, in similar fashion to the Neighbourhood Area designation under 2.6.1.3 e i).

We recommend having a minimum density requirement for Community Hub lands adjacent to Local roads vs. those adjacent to Collector / Arterial roads, and possibly a third tier for Community Hub lands fronting Intensification Corridors.

Can you please confirm this will be captured as feedback received in advance of tomorrow's Public Meeting?

Thank you,



Cameron Sellers, B.B.A.

PARTNER

647 Welham Road, Unit 9A, Barrie, ON L4N 0B7

Tel: 705 - 812 - 3281 extension 24 | Fax: 705 - 812 - 3438

E-Mail: csellers@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com

Joanne Werth

From: Cecilia Lee
Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 6:30 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba; cityclerks; NewBarrieOP; Tara McArthur
Cc: C Lee
Subject: Comments for the Public Meeting on June 2 2021 re: Barrie Official Plan 2051 Draft 2
Categories: Yellow Category

Hi all,

My name is Cecilia Lee and I am in a group which owns a property in Barrie. The land we own is 599 Dunlop Street West, at the corner of Dunlop Street West and Tiffin Street. It is located at the entrance to Barrie on the west side. I have reviewed Draft 2 of the Barrie Official Plan 2051 and would like to submit my comments below.

My land is now grouped under **Employment Land - Non Industrial**, along Dunlop Street W and **Employment Land - Industrial** for the area next to it.. The net impact is that these new land use designations do not permit residential.


Currently, we have zoning approval of C4 which includes a residential component. It was acquired prior to the creation and subsequent approval of the new Official Plan 2051. Even though we can still sell our land as C4 before the zoning by-law is changed, we have to put our sale on hold with this uncertainty.

I am requesting that our land be recognized/honoured for our current privilege which includes a residential component and will be grandfathered in the new Official Plan 2051 and new zoning by-law.

Please advise.Thanks.

Cecilia Lee

--



Joanne Werth

From: Chris Corosky | Armel
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 11:23 AM
To: Tomasz Wierzba
Cc: NewBarrieOP; cityclerks; Kris Menzies (kmenzies@mhbcplan.com); Mandy Scully | Armel; kimb
Subject: Comments on New OP - 800 Yonge Street and)
Attachments: 658 662 Mapleview and 800 Yonge - June 2 2021 - New OP Comments.pdf; Letter to Barrie re 658 & 662 Mapleview and 800 Yonge 12 21 20.pdf

Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz.

Please see our attached comments regarding the New OP pertaining to 800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive. I have also included a copy of the comments we provided to the City regarding Draft 1 of the New OP in December 2020. Please confirm receipt, and we look forward to meeting with the City to discuss our comments.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. Chris

Chris Corosky

Vice President, 2144176 Ontario Limited

ccorosky@armelcorp.com

Commerce Court West • 199 Bay Street • Suite 2900

P.O. Box 459 • Toronto • Ontario • M5L 1G4

2144176 Ontario Limited

June 1, 2021

Email Delivery > > tomasz.wierzba@barrie.ca

City of Barrie, City Hall
70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie,
ON, L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

Re: Draft Two – Barrie OP Update - 800 Yonge St., 658 & 662 Mapleview Dr. (Barrie West)

We are writing with respect to our property located at 800 Yonge Street and 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive (the "Site") which is depicted in the graphic below. Collectively, the three addresses constitute a contiguous ±22 acre parcel with frontage on both Yonge Street and Mapleview Drive. We believe this is a premier location and want to work with the City to make it the best it can be.

We first wrote regarding the City's proposed new Official Plan (the "New OP") on December 21, 2020. A copy of that correspondence is enclosed for ease of reference. The purpose of this letter is to provide our further comments based on the second draft of the New OP, which was released on May 6, 2021.

Our comments focus on the intended designation of the Site but also include other items of general concern.

The Proposed Designation of the Site

The Site is currently designated "General Commercial" and we have been working toward its development with City Staff on that basis. The New OP proposes to designate the lands "Medium Density". The Site should not be designated "Medium Density", but rather "Commercial District" which would maintain their commercial purpose but also allow flexibility for residential mixed use.



We emphasize that there has been a long-standing historical intention for commercial uses on the Site. The intention is based, in part, on the policies found in the Painswick South Secondary Plan. In addition, site specific approvals for commercial uses were obtained in 2007. We would be happy to further discuss the specific history and provide additional information which we believe will clearly demonstrate that the proper

As part of the ongoing development of the Site, we recently attended a site plan pre-consultation meeting with the City to discuss our intentions regarding commercial use on a portion of the Site. While we will be pursuing commercial development on parts of the Site, we acknowledge the 'overlay policy' objectives of the City to encourage significant medium and high density residential development near Yonge Street (Intensification Corridor) and near the GO Station (Major Transit Station Area / Strategic Growth Area). Given the size of the Site we believe objectives for intensive residential development can be achieved in conjunction with the planned commercial development and that this is best accomplished with a "Commercial District" designation.

Related to the foregoing we also note that Map 5 of the New OP shows a 41 metres right-of-way for Mapleview Drive across the frontage of our Site, whereas the Schedule E of the existing OP shows this as being a 34 metre right-of-way. The right-of-way width across our Site should be left at 34 metres.

Additional Comments

In addition to the comments found in our December 2020 letter, we offer the following:

1. It is presently unclear when Council intends to consider the New OP, however, we believe that all parties would benefit from a good period of reflection on the New OP, as revised. Council should not rush to adopt the New OP, because getting it right takes time, and it is in the interest of all parties to ensure it is properly vetted prior to adoption. In our view, it is important that the proposed new urban design guidelines be reviewed in connection with the New OP. Since the new urban design guidelines are not expected until fall 2021, the New OP should not be adopted at least until then.

2. Instead of how it is currently written, s. 2.5.5 of the New OP should read:

Any change in land use or introduction of a new land use not otherwise already permitted by the underlying land use designation or existing zoning will require an amendment to the Plan... (additions underlined).

This change simply recognizes the Zoning By-law is best suited to regulate the use of land.

3. We note that the New OP generally requires 10% of new units to meet affordability criteria; 20% in Major Transit Station Areas ("MTSAs"). We caution the City against unintended consequences of such a policy. For example, it may mean that while one unit in a building becomes more affordable, every other unit becomes less affordable. Instead, we would like to see the City incentivise construction of affordable housing by using the other planning tools at its disposal. For example, units could be made more affordable by providing exemptions from development charges or property tax breaks for units meeting certain conditions.

Incidentally, though under the affordable housing policy heading, s. 6.4.2(e)(vi) of the New OP does not relate to affordable housing and should be deleted.

4. The obligation in s. 4.6.1(f) of the New OP, which requires a transportation demand management program for all site plan approval applications for office uses greater than 2000 square metres or buildings with greater than 50 residential units is unduly onerous. This requirement should be removed and transportation planning completed on a scale larger than the individual site.

5. Section 9.5.7.1(j) which pertains to site plan control is unclear. To improve clarity, we suggest the following wording:

... exterior design of buildings, sustainable design elements on any adjoining municipal boulevards/rights-of way
(modification underlined)

The recommended wording makes it clear that this policy is referring to the municipal property, which we believe is its intent.

6. The New OP would be improved by language setting out how to resolve discrepancies between conflicting development parameters, for example the differing height and density provisions in the "Medium Density" designation and the overlay policy areas such as the MTSAs, Strategic Growth Areas ("SGAs") and Intensification Corridors.
7. It is requested that High-Rise Building policy 3.3.4(ii)(g) dealing with minimum setbacks of towers from "Neighbourhood Areas" be removed as this design parameter is not appropriate for an official plan. Rather, this type of language is best incorporated into urban design guidelines. We recommend that any required setback for towers in MTSAs, SGAs or Intensification Corridors be the same as apply to towers in the Urban Growth Centres, being suggested 30 metres or less dependent on other design parameters as may be specified in the urban design guidelines and in context with local site conditions.
8. We request that the 45 degree angular plane requirement of "Medium Density" transitional policies be removed from the New OP as it too is overly prescriptive for an official plan. There may be instances where a good design can be achieved, but slavish adherence to an abstract angular plane cannot. In such instances, amendment to the OP would be required to allow a design to proceed. As with tower setback provisions, angular plane provisions are better suited to urban design guideline documents which permit a reasonable degree of flexibility.

Our initial letter requested an opportunity to meet with the City to discuss our comments, which to date has not occurred. We continue to believe that a meeting would be extremely beneficial and again request that you advise of a meeting time that would be convenient.

Yours truly,

2144176 Ontario Limited



Chris Corosky, Vice President

c.c. Kris Menzies
new.barrieop@barrie.ca
cityclerks@barrie.ca
Mandy Scully
Kim Beckman

att. As above

2144176 Ontario Limited

December 21, 2020

Delivered by Email > kathy.suggitt@barrie.ca

City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

Attention: Ms. Kathy Suggitt, RPP, Manager of Strategic Initiatives, Policy and Analysis

Dear Ms. Suggitt:

Re: Draft Official Plan Preliminary Review
658 & 662 Mapleview and 800 Yonge Street

We are writing with respect to our property located at the north-west corner of Yonge Street and Mapleview Drive, municipally addressed as 800 Yonge Street, as well two smaller properties municipally addressed as 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive (under separate ownership for which I am also a signing officer) that we collectively refer to as Barrie West (the "Site").

This letter provides our comments based on our preliminary review of the draft Official Plan (the "Draft OP"), which are respectfully submitted.

The Effect of the Draft OP on the Site



The Draft OP proposes to designate the Site as "Medium Density" and "Neighbourhood Area" as shown to the left.

The "Medium Density" designation would apply to 800 Yonge Street (shown in orange), which accounts for the majority of the Site area (± 21.5 ac).

The "Neighbourhood Area" designation would apply to 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive (shown in yellow), forming a minority of the Site (± 0.5 ac).

Current Site Condition and Planning Framework

The Site is currently vacant and ready for development. It is anticipated that the entire 22 acres will be developed comprehensively for commercial and residential uses.

The Site has long been designated “General Commercial” in the City’s Official Plan. Prior to its current designation, the Painswick South Secondary Plan earmarked the Site for commercial use, surrounded by residential use. The commercial designation has already been implemented, as the majority of the Site is currently zoned General Commercial “C4”, permitting a full complement of commercial uses and some institutional uses.

Our Vision for the Site

Informed by the current “Commercial General” designation, our concept for the Site has long incorporated commercial development as a cornerstone, complimented by adjacent residential uses at the key Yonge / Mapleview intersection.

Our vision for the area is a “village concept” which integrates existing residential neighbourhoods west of Yonge Street, planned neighbourhoods east of Yonge Street and the Barrie South GO station, with supportive commercial floorspace to be developed on the Site. To put it simply, the Site is the final piece of the integrated village emerging at the Yonge / Mapleview intersection.

Our Request

Our initial review of the Draft OP results in our respectful requests for the following:

1. That the “Commercial District” designation apply to the entire Site.
2. The consolidation of all key policies applicable to the “Commercial District” into one section.
3. We agree with the objective of integrating higher density residential development into existing or proposed Commercial Districts to achieve mixed-use built form, however the policies should be clear that the mix of residential and commercial uses envisioned in the “Commercial District” can occur in either a vertical or horizontal form.
4. That seniors housing be listed as a permitted use within the “Commercial District” designation.
5. That urban design policies provide a set of flexible guidelines, rather than taking a prescriptive, regulatory approach.
6. That the City simplify its policy context for overlapping areas including Major Transit Station Area (“MTSA”), Strategic Growth Area (“SGA”), Intensification Corridor, Intensification Area and Urban Growth Centre policies.
7. Reduce the minimum density target for the Barrie South MTSA and clarify that it is to be applied across the entirety of the MTSA.

Reasons for Our Request

Given the proximity of the Site to the Barrie South GO Station, planned improvements for Mapleview Drive and anticipated growth of Barrie to the south, the Site will play a prominent role in the area. As mentioned, the missing element in the area is commercial uses, which would function well on the Site.

We have already made considerable investments in the Site based on our vision for it and its longstanding commercial designation and zoning. Business plans have been made. Preliminary site plan layouts have been formulated. Just this year, the City approved a zone change (Bylaw 2020-074) to harmonize the zoning of the smaller lots with the commercial zoning applicable to balance of the Site.

We are therefore not in favour of the Site being re-designated to Medium Density and Neighbourhood Area. We believe that the entire 22 acre parcel should retain its long standing permission for commercial use with a “Commercial District” designation in the new Official Plan.

Based on our preliminary review of the Draft OP, the policies of the “Commercial District” designation, in conjunction with other, underlying policies, provide flexibility to integrate commercial and medium density residential uses on the Site. Twenty two (22) acres provides a canvas large enough to create an attractive mixed-use development that contributes to the overall planned function for this area.

Given proximity to Yonge Street and the Barrie South GO Station the Site is also identified in the Draft OP to be within an Intensification Corridor (IC), Major Transit Station Area (MTSA), and Designated Greenfield Area (DGA) and would be subject to all of the policies for those areas. The policies for Intensification Areas, Low-Rise Buildings, Mid-Rise Buildings, and potentially Mobility Hubs would also apply. Although the uses contemplated in the Commercial District designation and all of the foregoing underlying policies are generally consistent with our intentions for the Site, it provides for a confusing and overlapping policy regime.

For example, per the definition in the *Growth Plan*, Strategic Growth Areas would include the Urban Growth Centre (UGC), MTSA and ICs. The proposed “Intensification Area” policies in the Draft OP would similarly apply to UGC, SGAs, MTSA and ICs. We therefore suggest that the City simplify the policy context for these areas in the Draft OP to consolidate policies between the various areas/identifications, where possible.

Policy 2.3.4(d) requires that development within the Barrie South MTSA shall help achieve an average minimum density of 150 units per hectare. The *Growth Plan* establishes the minimum density target for an MTSA on a priority transit corridor that is served by GO Transit as 150 residents and jobs combined per hectare and this density target is to be applied across the entirety of the MTSA. While the Barrie South MTSA is not on a priority transit corridor and therefore this target does not even apply, we note that the policy in the draft OP applies the 150 density target on a units per hectare basis, resulting in a much higher density target than that contemplated in the *Growth Plan* which would apply to residential units only and does not include employment uses. A density of 150 units per hectare would also be well in excess of what is planned in the UGC (Downtown) which is proposed to be the highest density area in the City. This policy should be revised to establish a more appropriate minimum density target and to provide clarity that the target applies across the entirety of the MTSA and not to any particular development therein.

The uses permitted by the “Commercial District” designation, in conjunction with applicable policies that would apply to the Site will best facilitate an appropriate mix of commercial and medium density residential uses that serve to support the overall planned function for this area.

Our General Comments on the Draft OP

Our more general comments on the Draft OP follow.

1. The organizational approach of the Draft OP requires the reader to jump to multiple sections of the document to understand all of the policies that could apply to a property. Consolidating all policies that could apply to a site into one section would more concisely communicate intentions, remove conflicts, and provide the reader with a more direct and clearer understanding of policy direction.
2. There are inconsistent policies within the Draft OP. In some instances, this raises questions as to which policies should prevail, and in others, direct conflicts arise.
3. There is a heavy reliance on referencing external regulations or guidelines that are subject to change without public process, which tends to undermine the planning process.
4. Section 2.5.1 relates to the provision of affordable housing by the private sector. As an implementation tool, will the City consider the use of incentive tools such as relief from Development Charges? If not, the resulting impact may be to drive up the price of ‘market’ units, which would be contrary to the underlying policy objective.
5. Will parkland dedication credit be given for the provision of 20% of lot area for “semi-public open space” as is required pursuant to Section 3.3.5.2.2.c? This should be clearly acknowledged in the policy and if not, this policy should be removed.
6. The third paragraph of Section 5.9 (Parkland Dedication) states:

In addition to parkland dedication, open space resources will continue to be required through the development process, but outside of the parkland dedication process. These resources complement Barrie’s parkland, providing additional opportunities for passive recreation, establishing linkages between community resources, and contributing to a healthy natural environment.

The contribution of such open space resources by the private sector should be assigned a parkland dedication credit and the policy should be amended to reflect this. If this is not the intention, this policy should be removed.

7. It is unclear what is meant by Ecological Offsetting, as referenced in Section 5.5. If it is a payment, a formula for determining the value should be specifically set out in the policy.
8. It is unclear what the legislative basis for Ecological Offsetting is. If the request for such payments is in fact legally valid, any payment requirements associated with ecological offsetting should be set out in the Official Plan policy so that they are established through a transparent public process and subject to consideration, amendment or appeal, as with any land use policy.

9. Section 3.3.5.2.1 h) encourages public art contributions from the private sector. Section 8.3.3 is much more prescriptive regarding public sector requirements, and refers to external documents such as “the City’s Public Art Policy” and a non-referenced section of the Draft OP. It is requested that the policy be amended so that obligations and requirements are clear, and not subject to change without a public approval process.
10. Regulating tenure of buildings within a land use planning document is not appropriate. Accordingly, any reference to tenure within the Draft OP should be removed.
11. Section 9.4.2.2 contains a listing of approximately 38 different types of background studies that may be required as part of a complete application. Hypothetically, could a zone change application be submitted for a property to permit ‘medium density development’ without an accompanying site plan application to articulate what is being proposed, ie could approvals be staged in concert with the submission of various background studies? Can language be added to clarify that the studies to be required and the scope of those studies will be appropriate to the nature of the application to be submitted?
12. In addition to the exhaustive urban design policies of the Draft OP (in sections 3, 4, and 5), the Draft OP relies on an external, 228 page, document entitled *City Wide Urban Design Guidelines*. The applicability of these Guidelines is described as follows on page 4:

The guidelines are phrased in the passive tone recognizing that they are guidelines rather than regulation. However, the guidelines are enabled by the Official Plan, which makes provision for the guidelines to essentially be mandatory while offering flexibility for the guidelines to be adapted if a site is constrained (as long as the spirit and intent of the guidelines are maintained).

External documents can be changed without legislative requirement for public input. Mandatory requirements should be subject to transparent, legislatively enabled approval processes, particularly if they are being enforced through the official plan. Moreover, guidelines should set parameters rather than rules to be strictly adhered to, and we ask that the policy be amended to reflect this.

13. Appendix 2 – Designated Greenfield Area Phasing Plan – identifies the phasing in a portion of the Designated Greenfield Area. It shows that all of the “white space”, which would include the Site, is to be developed post the year 2041. We suggested that this is not the intent and the appendix should be revised.


Conclusion

Our initial comments are respectfully submitted for your consideration. We look forward to further opportunities to provide input on the Draft OP.

We would be pleased to virtually meet with you to review our comments and look forward to your response to the questions and requested clarifications raised herein.

Yours truly,

2144176 Ontario Limited



Chris Corosky, Vice President

c.c. Kris Menzies, MHBC
newbarrieop@barrie.ca

Joanne Werth

From: Chris Corosky | Armel
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 11:17 AM
To: Tomasz Wierzba
Cc: NewBarrieOP; cityclerks; Kris Menzies (kmenzies@mhbcplan.com); Mandy Scully | Armel; kimb
Subject: Comments on New OP - Heritage Square Plaza (624 Yonge Street)
Attachments: 624 Yonge Street - June 1 2021 - New OP Comments.pdf; Letter to Barrie re 624 Yonge 12 21 20.pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz.

Please see our attached comments regarding the New OP pertaining to 624 Yonge Street (Heritage Square Plaza).

I have also included a copy of the comments we provided to the City regarding Draft 1 of the New OP in December 2020. Please confirm receipt, and we look forward to meeting with the City to discuss our comments.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. Chris

Chris Corosky

Vice President, 3251586 Canada Inc.

ccorosky@armelcorp.com

Commerce Court West • 199 Bay Street • Suite 2900

P.O. Box 459 • Toronto • Ontario • M5L 1G4

3251586 Canada Inc.

June 2, 2021

Email Delivery >> tomasz.wierzba@barrie.ca

City of Barrie, City Hall
70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie,
ON, L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

Re: Draft Two – Barrie OP Update – Heritage Square (624 Yonge Street)

We are writing with respect to our property located at the south-west corner of Yonge Street and Big Bay Point Road (the "Site"). The Site is municipally addressed as 624 Yonge Street, commonly referred to as Heritage Square and depicted in the graphic below (the "Site").

We first wrote regarding the City's proposed new Official Plan (the "New OP") on December 21, 2020. A copy of that correspondence is enclosed for ease of reference.

The purpose of this letter is to provide our further comments based on the second draft of the New OP, which was released on May 6, 2021. Our comments focus on the intended designation of the Site but also include other items of general concern.

The Proposed Designation of the Site



The New OP would designate the site "Commercial District". The "Commercial District" designation is appropriate for the Site, which is presently developed as a commercial plaza. Importantly, the "Commercial District" permits residential development as part of a mixed-use development along with a variety of other uses.

OP would also apply to the Site.

Additional flexibility is required in the New OP to allow for intensification of existing plazas such as the Site. The Site is fully serviced but is not yet fully built out. We are concerned that design policies of s. 2.3.6 and s. 3.3.6 use strong language intended to force development to occur closer to the street, which is incompatible with the existing servicing scheme for the Site. Rebuilding existing services would be inefficient and contradictory to provincial policy. Accordingly, we request that a policy be added to the New OP to permit intensification of existing sites, such as this one, based on designs that are compatible with existing servicing.

We are encouraged to see that “Commercial Districts” may be used for higher density residential uses, as part of a mixed-use development. This will enable sites, such as Heritage Square, to transition to include some future medium or high density residential development as a complement to existing commercial uses. We endorse this policy approach.

Additional Comments

In addition to the comments found in our December 2020 letter, we offer the following:

1. It is presently unclear when Council intends to consider the New OP, however, we believe that all parties would benefit from a good period of reflection on the New OP, as revised. Council should not rush to adopt the New OP, because getting it right takes time, and it is in the interest of all parties to ensure it is properly vetted prior to adoption. In our view, it is important that the proposed new urban design guidelines be reviewed in connection with the New OP. Since the new urban design guidelines are not expected until fall 2021, the New OP should not be adopted at least until then.
2. Instead of how it is currently written, s. 2.5.5 of the New OP should read:

Any change in land use or introduction of a new land use not otherwise already permitted by the underlying land use designation or existing zoning will require an amendment to the Plan...
(additions underlined).

This change simply recognizes the Zoning By-law is best suited to regulate the use of land.

3. We note that the New OP generally requires 10% of new units to meet affordability criteria; 20% in Major Transit Station Areas (“MTSAs”). We caution the City against unintended consequences of such a policy. For example, it may mean that while one unit in a building becomes more affordable, every other unit becomes less affordable. Instead, we would like to see the City incentivise construction of affordable housing by using the other planning tools at its disposal. For example, units could be made more affordable by providing exemptions from development charges or property tax breaks for units meeting certain conditions.

Incidentally, though under the affordable housing policy heading, s. 6.4.2(e)(vi) of the New OP does not relate to affordable housing and should be deleted.

4. The obligation in s. 4.6.1(f) of the New OP, which requires a transportation demand management program for all site plan approval applications for office uses greater than 2000 square metres or buildings with greater than 50 residential units is unduly onerous. This requirement should be removed and transportation planning completed on a scale larger than the individual site.

5. Section 9.5.7.1(j) which pertains to site plan control is unclear. To improve clarity, we suggest the following wording:

... exterior design of buildings, sustainable design elements on any adjoining municipal boulevards/rights-of way (modification underlined)

The recommended wording makes it clear that this policy is referring to the municipal property, which we believe is its intent.

6. The New OP would be improved by language setting out how to resolve discrepancies between conflicting development parameters, for example the differing height and density provisions in the "Medium Density" designation and the overlay policy areas such as the MTSAs, Strategic Growth Areas ("SGAs") and Intensification Corridors.
7. It is requested that High-Rise Building policy 3.3.4(ii)(g) dealing with minimum setbacks of towers from "Neighbourhood Areas" be removed as this design parameter is not appropriate for an official plan. Rather, this type of language is best incorporated into urban design guidelines. We recommend that any required setback for towers in MTSAs, SGAs or Intensification Corridors be the same as apply to towers in the Urban Growth Centres, being suggested 30 metres or less dependent on other design parameters as may be specified in the urban design guidelines and in context with local site conditions.
8. We request that the 45 degree angular plane requirement of "Medium Density" transitional policies be removed from the New OP as it too is overly prescriptive for an official plan. There may be instances where a good design can be achieved, but slavish adherence to an abstract angular plane cannot. In such instances, amendment to the OP would be required to allow a design to proceed. As with tower setback provisions, angular plane provisions are better suited to urban design guideline documents which permit a reasonable degree of flexibility

Our initial letter requested an opportunity to meet with the City to discuss our comments, which to date has not occurred. We continue to believe that a meeting would be extremely beneficial and again request that the New OP project team advise of a meeting time that would be convenient.

Yours truly,
3251586 Canada Inc.



Chris Corosky, Vice President

c.c. Kris Menzies
new.barrieop@barrie.ca
cityclerks@barrie.ca
Mandy Scully

Kim Beckman

att. As above

3251586 Canada Inc.

December 21, 2020

Delivered by Email > kathy.suggitt@barrie.ca

City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

Attention: Ms. Kathy Suggitt, RPP, Manager of Strategic Initiatives, Policy and Analysis


Dear Ms. Suggitt:

Re: Draft Official Plan Preliminary Review
624 Yonge Street – Heritage Square Plaza

We are writing with respect to our property located at the south-west corner of Yonge Street and Big BayPoint Road known as Heritage Square Plaza, municipally addressed as 624 Yonge Street (the "Site").

This letter provides our comments based on our preliminary review the Draft Official Plan (the "DraftOP"), which are respectfully submitted.

The Effect of the Draft OP on the Site



The Draft OP proposes to designate the Site "Commercial District". The "Commercial District" designation identifies lands where large scale retail and commercial uses exist or are proposed. The designation permits these retail and commercial uses to be supplemented by residential, office, or institutional uses, allowing their evolution toward mixed use areas.

In keeping with the transitional aspirations toward mixed use, much of the development related policy applicable in the "Commercial District" applies to residential rather than commercial uses.

Our Request

We generally agree that a “Commercial District” designation is appropriate for the Site, however we respectfully request:

1. In addition to the “Commercial District” policies, the Site is also subject to the policies for Intensification Corridors, Intensification Areas (“IA”), Strategic Growth Areas (“SGA”), Built Up Areas, Mobility Hubs, Low-Rise Buildings, and Mid-Rise Buildings. It is requested that, where possible, the policies for these areas, particularly those for the SGA, IA and IC areas, be consolidated and clarified, as there is overlap, repetition and internal conflicts among the policies for the various areas.
2. The Commercial District policies should be revised to make it clearer that that the envisioned mix of residential and commercial uses can occur in either a vertical or horizontal form.
3. Seniors housing should be listed as a permitted use within the “Commercial District” designation.
4. The “Commercial District” policies should enable partially developed sites to achieve maturity in a manner that flexibly integrates existing ‘on-the-ground’ built form with the newer urban design aspirations of the Draft OP.
5. The Site is partially developed, and a number of new buildings are planned in order to complete its development. The layout of future buildings is based on a City approved site plan. In some cases, design parameters of the site plan are different than those set out in the Draft OP. For example, the Draft OP (s. 3.4.3) does not permit surface parking between the front face of a building and the public sidewalk and requires that all buildings have a minimum height of two storeys or 7.5 metres. Neither of these parameters are consistent with actual built form of the Site that has occurred to date.
 - a. The Draft OP should be revised to include policies applicable to partially developed sites so that layout of new buildings appropriately meshes with existing built form.
 - b. There should be flexibility to permit single storey commercial buildings in a manner consistent with existing buildings on a partially developed site.
 - c. There should be flexibility, where second storeys on commercial buildings are required, to be designed as a façade, as opposed to leasable space.
6. Urban design policies should be revised to provide a set of flexible guidelines, rather than taking a prescriptive, regulatory approach.

Our General Comments on the Draft OP

Further to the foregoing, the following list highlights specific sections of the Draft OP that we have comments and questions on.

2. Section 2.5.1 relates to the provision of affordable housing by the private sector. As an implementation tool, will the City consider the use of incentive tools such as relief from Development Charges? If not, the resulting impact may be to drive up the price of 'market' units, which would be contrary to the underlying policy objective. The use of these incentive tools should be referenced in the policy.
3. Section 2.6.5.2(a) of the "Commercial District" permits Low-Rise and Mid-Rise buildings. Section 2.6.5.2 f) and g) respectively permits buildings of up to 10 storeys and a density range of 50 to 300 units per hectare ("uph").
 - a. Is the low end of the density range (50 uph) interpreted as the minimum permitted within a Commercial District?
 - b. Conversely, are buildings of 10 storeys tall enough to achieve the high end of the density range? We note that SGA policies of s. 2.3.3 encourage higher densities, higher levels of intensification, and taller buildings. We also note that the Intensification Area policies s. 3.4.3 generally limits height of buildings to 4 to 8 storeys within an SGA – seemingly inconsistent with higher end density targets of the Commercial District.
 - c. Mid-Rise buildings are described as having 7 to 12 storeys in s. 3.5.5 of the Draft OP, which conflicts with the maximum building height permitted in the Commercial District. Which section takes precedence?
4. Section 2.6.5.2(b) permits a combination of permitted uses, "within one building or in multiple buildings, on the same property or parcel". Please confirm that this means a single purpose residential building (with no ground floor retail) is permitted in the "Commercial District".
5. Will credit be given for the provision of 20% of lot area for 'semi-public open space' as is required pursuant to s. 3.3.5.2.2.c? This should be clearly acknowledged in the policy and if not, this policy should be removed.
6. The third paragraph of Section 5.9 (Parkland Dedication) states:

In addition to parkland dedication, open space resources will continue to be required through the development process, but outside of the parkland dedication process. These resources complement Barrie's parkland, providing additional opportunities for passive recreation, establishing linkages between community resources, and contributing to a healthy natural environment.

The contribution of such open space resources by the private sector should be assigned a parkland dedication credit and the policy should be amended to reflect this. If this is not the intention, this policy should be removed.

7. It is unclear what is meant by Ecological Offsetting, as referenced in Section 5.5. If it is a payment, a formula for determining the value should be specifically set out in the policy.
8. It is unclear what the legislative basis for Ecological Offsetting is. If the request for such payments is in fact legally valid, any payment requirements associated with ecological offsetting should be set out in the Official Plan policy so that they are established through a transparent public process and subject to consideration, amendment or appeal, as with any land use policy.
9. Section 3.3.5.2.1 h) encourages public art contributions from the private sector. Section 8.3.3 is much more prescriptive regarding public sector requirements, and refers to external documents such as “the City’s Public Art Policy” and a non-referenced section of the Draft OP. It is requested that the policy be amended so that obligations and requirements are clear, and not subject to change without a public approval process.
10. Regulating tenure of buildings within a land use planning document is not appropriate. Accordingly, any reference to tenure within the Draft OP should be removed.
11. Section 9.4.2.2 contains a listing of approximately 38 different types of background studies that may be required as part of a complete application. Additional clarity should be added to this policy to acknowledge that the actual studies which will be required for a particular application and the scope of those studies will be appropriate to the type and nature of the application.
12. In addition to the exhaustive urban design policies of the Draft OP (in sections 3, 4, and 5), the Draft OP relies on an external, 228 page, document entitled *City Wide Urban Design Guidelines*. The applicability of these Guidelines is described as follows on page 4:

The guidelines are phrased in the passive tone recognizing that they are guidelines rather than regulation. However, the guidelines are enabled by the Official Plan, which makes provision for the guidelines to essentially be mandatory while offering flexibility for the guidelines to be adapted if a site is constrained (as long as the spirit and intent of the guidelines are maintained).

External documents can be changed without legislative requirement for public input. Mandatory requirements should be subject to transparent, legislatively enabled approval processes, particularly if they are being enforced through the official plan. Moreover, guidelines should set parameters rather than rules to be strictly adhered to, and we ask that the policy be amended to reflect this.


13. Appendix 2 – Designated Greenfield Area Phasing Plan – identifies the phasing in a portion of the Designated Greenfield Area. It shows that all of the “white space”, which would include the Site, is to be developed post the year 2041. We suggested that this is not the intent and the appendix should be revised.

Conclusion

Our initial comments are respectfully submitted for your consideration. We look forward to further opportunities to provide input on the Draft OP.

We would be pleased to virtually meet with you to review our comments and look forward to your response to the questions and requested clarifications raised herein.

Yours truly,
3251586 Canada Inc.



Chris Corosky, Vice President

c.c. Kris Menzies, MHBC
newbarrieop@barrie.ca

Joanne Werth

From: Chris Corosky | Armel
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 11:13 AM
To: Tomasz Wierzba
Cc: NewBarrieOP; cityclerks; Kris Menzies (kmenzies@mhbcplan.com); Mandy Scully | Armel; kimb
Subject: Comments on New OP - Yonge GO Village (759 Yonge Street)
Attachments: Yonge GO Village - June 2 2021 - New OP Comments.pdf; Letter to Barrie re Yonge GO Village 12 21 20.pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz.

Please see our attached comments regarding the New OP pertaining to 759 Yonge Street (Yonge GO Village).

I have also included a copy of the comments we provided to the City regarding Draft 1 of the New OP in December 2020. We look forward to meeting with the City to discuss our comments.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. Chris

Chris Corosky

Vice President, 3251586 Canada Inc.

ccorosky@armelcorp.com

Commerce Court West • 199 Bay Street • Suite 2900

P.O. Box 459 • Toronto • Ontario • M5L 1G4

3251586 Canada Inc.

June 2, 2021

Email Delivery > > tomasz.wierzba@barrie.ca


City of Barrie, City Hall
70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie,
ON, L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

Re: Draft Two – Barrie OP Update – Yonge GO Village (759 Yonge Street)

We are writing with respect to our property located at 759 Yonge Street (the “Site”) which is generally depicted in the graphic below. The Site is also referred to as the Yonge GO Subdivision.



We first wrote regarding the City’s proposed new Official Plan (the “New OP”) on December 21, 2020. A copy of that correspondence is enclosed for ease of reference.

The purpose of this letter is to provide our further comments based on the second draft of the New OP, which was released on May 6, 2021. Our comments focus on the relationship between the current development status of the Site and the proposed New OP.

As the City is aware, the Yonge GO Subdivision is zoned for a master planned community. Not only is zoning in place, but development is already underway. Currently, Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the Subdivision are serviced. The construction of new homes has started in Phases 1 and 2 and improvements are underway at two new parks.

We are of the opinion that the development of the Site must proceed based on the existing zoning, unimpacted by the New OP. Transition policies inserted into the New OP would make this understanding clear and avoid future confusion. Accordingly, we request that the New OP include policies that have the effect of recognizing established development entitlements in situations such as ours.

Our December 2020 letter requested an opportunity to meet with the City to discuss our comments, which to date has not occurred. We continue to believe that a meeting would be extremely beneficial and again request that you advise of a meeting time that would be convenient.

Yours truly,
3251586 Canada Inc.

A large, stylized handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Chris Corosky', is written over the typed name.

Chris Corosky, Vice President

c.c. Kris Menzies
new.barrieop@barrie.ca
cityclerks@barrie.ca
Mandy Scully

Kim Beckman

att. As above

3251586 Canada Inc.

December 21, 2020

Delivered by Email > kathy.suggitt@barrie.ca

City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

Attention: Ms. Kathy Suggitt, RPP, Manager of Strategic Initiatives, Policy and Analysis

Dear Ms. Suggitt:

Re: Draft Official Plan Preliminary Review

Yonge GO Village

We are writing with regard to our Yonge GO Village property located immediately north of the BarrieSouth GO Station (the "Site").

This letter provides our comments based on our initial review of the draft Official Plan (the "Draft "OP"), which are respectfully submitted.

The Effect of the Draft OP on the Site



As shown to the left, the Draft OP proposes to designate the northerly portion of the Site as "Neighbourhood Area" and the southerly portion (closest to the GO station) "Medium Density".

The Draft OP also identifies parks, open space, and natural areas that correspond to the draft plan of subdivision approved by the City in 2017 for the Site.

Except as otherwise noted below, the Draft OP designations correspond to the Mixed Use Corridor and Mixed Use Node zones implemented through Zoning Bylaw 2017-66 and the approved draft plan of subdivision.

Current Site Condition and Planning Framework

Following draft plan approval in 2017, we entered into a subdivision agreement with the City and ultimately registered Subdivision Plan 51M-1187 in July, 2020. The Subdivision Plan matches the proposed "Neighbourhood Area" designation. The registration of the Subdivision Plan, together with recent engineering approvals, effectively "locks in" the form of development for the "Neighbourhood Area" on the Site. Site servicing is currently underway and home construction will commence in 2021, all in compliance with Zoning Bylaw 2017-66.

We intend to proceed with development on the proposed "Medium Density" portion of the Site, also in accordance with Zoning By-law 2017-66. The uses permitted by Zoning Bylaw 2017-66 generally correspond to the intended townhouse and mid-rise apartment development contemplated by the DraftOP.

Our Requests

Our initial review of the Draft OP results in our respectful requests for the following:

1. Given that development within the "Neighbourhood Area" designation is underway, please confirm that we can proceed with the development as approved in the draft plan, as well as any condo plans, site plans or any other form of *Planning Act* application complying with the zoning bylaw and official plan amendment approved for the Site, notwithstanding the provisions of the Draft OP.
2. Based on the recent approvals that have been granted for the Site, we anticipate that the area subject to the "Medium Density" designation will also be permitted to develop consistent with our recently approved Zoning By-law 2017-66 and related Official Plan Amendment #4, and again ask the City to confirm that this would be the case.
3. We request confirmation that all of our recently obtained planning approvals will continue to apply to the Site notwithstanding some of the altered policy nuances of the Draft OP, if adopted and approved in its current form.
4. We request confirmation that the ground floor commercial requirements of the Draft OP will not be used to modify regulations contained in Zoning Bylaw 2017-66.
5. Alternatively, due to incompatibility between the proposed policy and existing permissions for the Site, site-specific exemptions such as the following should be provided to exempt the Site from the application of:
 - a. subs. 2.6.1.3(f) and (g);
 - b. subs. 2.6.2.2(e);
 - c. subs. 3.5.2(b); and,
 - d. subs. 3.5.3(a).

The above clauses are provided by way of example. Additional policy exemptions may be required to align new OP policy with the approved zoning bylaw (2017-66) applying to our site.

Our General Comments on the Draft OP

Beyond the foregoing key requests, the following list of items highlight sections of the Draft OP where clarification is required or amendments requested to certain policies as they apply to the Site:

1. The Site has a split designation of “Medium Density” and “Neighbourhood Area”. The Site is also on an Intensification Corridor (“IC”), is part of the Major Transit Station Area (“MTSA”), and, by extension is a Strategic Growth Area (“SGA”), subject to the Mobility Hub policies. It is also in the Designated Greenfield Area. It is requested that, where possible, the policies for these areas, particularly those for the MTSA, SGA and IC areas, be consolidated and clarified, as there is overlap, repetition and internal conflicts among the policies for the various areas. For example, the South Barrie MTSA (area wide) requires an average minimum density of 150 uph while other MTSA policies, found in of subs. 3.4.3(m), generally limit development to 4-8 storey buildings. The proposed level of density cannot be achieved with this built form.
2. The density target for the Barrie South MTSA should be amended to reflect the direction of the highest density being located downtown. Notwithstanding the direction found in s. 1.3 of the Draft OP for the downtown to have the highest density, the MTSA policies related to the Barrie South MTSA provide for an average minimum density of 150 units *per* hectare (2.3.4 d). This is considerably higher than the minimum density target in the Urban Growth Centre (“UGC”), which is a minimum of 150 persons and jobs *per* hectare (2.3.2 i) over the entire UGC. Furthermore, the density requirement is considerably higher than the minimum density targets for MTSA on priority transit corridors in the *Growth Plan*, and we note that the South Barrie GO Station is not on a “priority transit corridor”.
3. Intensification Area design policies (s. 3.4.3) are applicable to the Site as it is on an Intensification Corridor, within a SGA and within the MTSA. Within this area, the requirements in 3.4.3 i) to provide appropriate indoor amenity space for occupants and providing for underground parking, where appropriate (3.4.3 k iv)) are inappropriate as they control element internal to the building design.
4. Intensification areas and parking – the policies requiring underground parking in 3.4.3 k iv) should be revised to be more flexible and instead suggest that underground parking “should” be provided as used in s. 3.6 a) of the Plan.
5. It is requested that the policy requiring development in the Intensification Areas (including the MTSA) to provide parks and open spaces be removed (see s. 3.4.3 f) as park requirements are set out in other sections of the Draft OP. This policy also makes reference to s. 3.3.5.1.2 which does not appear to exist. We note, appropriate parks have been provided on the Site, as approved in previous development applications.
6. There is confusion in the Draft OP regarding medium density built form. For example, the built form policies of subs. 3.5.5(a) identify that mid-rise buildings are over 6 storeys up to a maximum of 12 storeys. However, the “Medium Density” policies (which only permit mid-rise buildings) in subs. 2.6.2.2 j) and k) provide for a minimum height of 4 stories and a maximum of 12 stories. We note that Zoning Bylaw 2017-66 permits a maximum of 8 storeys.

7. Regulating tenure of buildings within a land use planning document is not appropriate. Accordingly, any reference to tenure within the Draft OP should be removed.
8. In addition to the exhaustive urban design policies of the Draft OP (in sections 3, 4, and 5), the Draft OP relies on an external, 228 page, document entitled *City Wide Urban Design Guidelines*. The applicability of these Guidelines is described as follows on page 4:

The guidelines are phrased in the passive tone recognizing that they are guidelines rather than regulation. However, the guidelines are enabled by the Official Plan, which makes provision for the guidelines to essentially be mandatory while offering flexibility for the guidelines to be adapted if a site is constrained (as long as the spirit and intent of the guidelines are maintained).

External documents can be changed without legislative requirement for public input. Mandatory requirements should be subject to transparent, legislatively enabled approval processes, particularly if they are being enforced through the official plan. Moreover, guidelines should set parameters rather than rules to be strictly adhered to, and we ask that the policy be amended to reflect this.

9. Appendix 2 – Designated Greenfield Area Phasing Plan – identifies the phasing in a portion of the Designated Greenfield Area. It shows that all of the “white space”, which would include the Site, is to be developed post the year 2041. We suggest that this is not the intent and the appendix should be revised.
10. Phasing policies – the Site is within the Designated Greenfield Area (DGA). It is not understood how s. 9.5.2(e) affects development outside of the Hewitt and Salem secondary plan areas. Similarly, subsections g – j also seem to apply to Hewitt and Salem secondary plan areas.

Conclusion

Our initial comments are respectfully submitted for your consideration. We look forward to further opportunities to provide input on the Draft OP.

We would be pleased to virtually meet with you to review our comments and look forward to your response to the questions and requested clarifications raised herein.

Yours truly,

3251586 Canada Inc.



Chris Corosky, Vice President

c.c. Kris Menzies, MHBC
newbarrieop@barrie.ca

From: [Dino](#)
To: [NewBarrieOP](#)
Subject: Stormwater management
Date: Friday, May 28, 2021 3:11:59 PM

Hi Barrie,

My comment is that the **storm drain** just south of my house is getting plugged up by winter sand and salt residue and cigarette butts. Storm management should have a look at it to make sure its cleaned out. I have not seen it done recently or when the watermain was installed.

The next issue, my complaint, happens every year and we try to sweep up the residue that settles in front of our driveway due to a dip in the road. It was supposed to be repaired over 2 years ago when the watermain improvement line was installed on our street, but the repair never happened.

I even spoke to the **Barrie roads supervisor overseeing the watermain install** and he assured me that when the curbs and road would be redone after construction finished, our curb would be cutout and replaced at the proper level to avoid a dip, before the road was paved. NOT DONE, the dip is still there, in winter the water freezes in front of our driveway and then the salt and sand residue, I hate repeating myself.. We are getting tired and annoyed to clean this mess up every spring.

Regards,

Dino Di Gregorio

Joanne Werth

From: Gary Bell
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 4:08 PM
To: NewBarrieOP; Tomasz Wierzba
Subject: Comments on New Barrie Official Plan
Attachments: Comments on New Barrie Official Plan.pdf

Categories: Yellow Category

Hello Tomasz

Attached are my comments on a partial reading of the draft new Official Plan.

I request that City Planning acknowledge the comments, questions and indicate Staff response in a Table to go to City Council. This is often done in OP Reviews. This will demonstrate to the people submitting comments an appreciation of their time and input and an accountability for any response.

Regards

Gary

*Gary Bell, RPP
Consulting Planner*

Comments on City of Barrie New Official Plan

I was born and raised in Barrie and have had the good fortune to have had most of my working career in Barrie. These are my personal comments and suggestions on some parts of the new Barrie Official Plan.

While reading the new Draft Barrie Official Plan 2051 (the Plan) I felt good about the expressions about the City and community we have, and intend to be over the next thirty years. Well done to the Barrie Official Plan Planning Team.

These are some general comments:

- The terms will and shall in the Official Plan should be consistently used. Shall is directive and mandatory. Will is less so. Most policies refer to the City as the subject of actions. There are only a few policies which indicate that Council shall, may or will take or not take a particular action. Perhaps the distinction, if any, between the City and City Council could be indicated in the Foundations preamble, or the reference to Council in the policies should be changed to the City.
- Are the Salem and Hewitt's Creek Secondary Plans and detailed policies fully integrated and included in the new OP?

1. Section 1.

The Community Vision Statement includes a reference to "focussed" development for downtown vibrancy. The meaning of "focussed" is not clear here or elsewhere in the Plan.

The Founding Principles are well expressed.

2. Section 2. An Urban and Complete City

The existing mix of uses, greater intensity of residential uses in some parts, and greater traffic along all of Blake Street, (classified as Arterial with a 41 m ROW), make it functionally an Intensification Corridor. This should be acknowledged on Map 1. A designation of Strategic Growth Area would be appropriate and prescriptive for the section starting at and including at the Commercial District at Johnson Street out to Penetanguishene Road.

The defined policy area 2.8.6 would be better and more explicitly expressed as: "The Extractive Industrial overlay policies apply to this area until such time as the mineral aggregate operation on the subject lands is no longer licensed under the Aggregate Resources Act. Then the Natural Heritage System designation and policies apply." Similarly, the reference to the underlying Natural Heritage System should be included in policy 2.7.5.

3. Design Excellence- the Objectives are well expressed.

3.2.1 Human Scale. The issue of compatibility of redevelopment in established neighbourhoods is a major and re-occurring question at Council. The term compatibility in The Plan is mostly in reference between different land uses not between low density and greater intensity residential buildings.

9.5.6 Context Sensitive Intensification provides a useful policy e). City Council thru The Plan can articulate what it means to be compatible forms of new development in existing neighbourhoods. It is worthwhile for The Plan to provide as much certainty as possible to existing single detached

residential owners and to development interests, as to what is and what is not acceptable height, massing, and appearance. Although it is recognized that you cannot regulate good taste.

The question that needs attention is "Where are Mid-Rise Buildings and High-Rise Buildings expected or permitted?" Are there locational criteria in The Plan for these forms of development or re-development?

Comments on Maps

The north part of the lands along the west side of Highway 400 north of Harvie Road is designated Commercial District on Map 2 Land Use. To be consistent and clear it should be designated Strategic Growth Area on Map 1 Community Structure.

There is a long existing employment and commercial area along Blake Street east of Johnson Street and particularly near Penetanguishene Road which could be recognized on Map 1 for desired Strategic Growth and on Map 2 for Commercial or Employment- Non-Industrial intent.

Harvie Road over Highway 400 has been correctly shown on Map 4A Mobility and it should be similarly shown on the other Maps.

It would be useful to repeat the Mixed-Use Trails Off Road from Map 4A Mobility on Map 6 to show how the Parks and NHS areas are connected.

Celebration Space in legend of Map 8 needs attention.

How was the northern limit of Historic Neighbourhood East End determined not to include Strabane and Melrose Avenues?

The opportunity to comment on The Plan for our future City and community development is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Gary Bell". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Gary Bell, RPP

Joanne Werth

From: Greg Barker
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 12:57 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: New OP comments - Marshall Landholdings
Attachments: Marshall land holdings (Peel and Mulcaster) Letter May 2021.pdf
Categories: Yellow Category

Good afternoon,

Please find attached comments relative to the City's second draft OP.

As requested in the letter, we would like the opportunity to speak with staff on these landholdings at your earliest convenience. Please contact the undersigned when able.

Thank you for considering our comments. Greg



Greg Barker, B.A.A.

PARTNER

647 Welham Road, Unit 9, Barrie, ON L4N 0B7

Tel: 705 - 812 - 3281 extension 23 | Fax: 705 - 812 - 3438

E-Mail: gbarker@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

City of Barrie
70 Collier Street L4M
4T5

May 31, 2021

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

Re: City of Barrie Draft Two Official Plan
Colby & Randy Marshall, 1901285 Ontario Inc & Sheriff Properties 15,13,11,9,5 Peel
Street & 118, 98 Mulcaster Street

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Further to our correspondence on the City's first Draft Official Plan dated December 21, 2020 and on behalf of Colby & Randy Marshall, 1901285 Ontario Inc & Sheriff Properties (herein as "the owners") owners of 15,13,11,9,5 Peel Street & 118, 98 Mulcaster St, City of Barrie, Innovative Planning Solutions (IPS) is providing the following correspondence reiterating our position relative to the City's second Draft Official Plan. Based on our review of the second draft Official Plan, we are again requesting that the City designate the subject lands as Medium Density rather than the currently proposed Neighbourhood Area

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION and SURROUNDING LAND USES

The subject lands are located on the northern edge of Downtown Barrie and the Urban Growth Centre (located adjacent the UGC Boundary) generally at the intersection of Mulcaster/Peel Street and Codrington St. The lands are approximately .53 ha in size with the following approximate frontages:

Sophia St: 65m Peel St:
71m Codrington St: 23m
Mulcaster St: 24m

The lands are currently designated as Residential and zoned RM2. Under the current Official Plan, the lands are located partially within/adjacent the Urban Growth Centre (Schedule I). Through previous discussions between City staff and the owners, it was understood the subject lands may develop in accordance with the policies of the UGC given their proximity to the UGC.

The lands contain a variety of existing dwellings and built forms, consistent with the character of the area. The owners intend to acquire additional lands to compile a larger block of land for re-development in the future.

647 WELHAM ROAD, UNIT 9, BARRIE ONTARIO L4N 0B7

TEL: (705) 812-3281 FAX: (705) 812-3438 EMAIL: INFO@IPSCONSULTINGINC.COM

Surrounding the subject property include to the north, single detached and multiple unit dwellings along with Environmental Protection lands, to the east are additional multiple unit dwellings, to the south is the UGC and currently contains an existing commercial building and multiple unit dwelling and to the west are additional existing multiple unit dwellings of various sizes and densities.

3.0 CITY OF BARRIE SECOND DRAFT NEW OFFICIAL PLAN

As was the case with the first draft, the second Draft City of Barrie Official Plan, Map 2, identifies the subject lands as being within the Neighbourhood Area designation.

The general land use designations are provided in section 2.6 of the Official Plan, including Section 2.6.1 relative to the neighbourhood area and are discussed below in general terms relative to the subject lands and current approvals.

The neighbourhood area designation is intended to recognize existing and new low density neighbourhoods and communities which are dominated by human scale built form. Lands designated as Neighbourhood Area are recognized to have limited infrastructure capacity, and as such are not planned to accommodate high levels of intensification and urbanization. The land use policies of Section 2.6.1.1 (c) provides that lands designated as neighbourhood area shall:

c) Be considered “established neighbourhoods” and are not intended to experience significant physical change that would alter their general character.

The subject lands and the general surrounding area is currently comprised predominantly of existing or planned medium density development within the RM2 zone. There is very little development exhibiting existing low density character, nor would current zoning of this area permit new low density development. This area is not recognized as having existing nor planned low density development. The lands are also adjacent the UGC and lands proposed to be designated as High Density and as such it is anticipated that infrastructure capacity exists or is planned in proximity to the site which could be used to accommodate higher (ie medium) density developments. Given the proximity to the UGC, there is an expectation and a requirement that the area is expected to experience significant physical change in order to accommodate anticipated development which would alter the character of the area.

The first draft official plan provided:

The Medium Density designation is intended to facilitate the gradual increase of densities and built form between lands designated Neighbourhood Area and the higher densities and built forms at the centre of Strategic Growth Areas. In addition, lands designated Medium Density are planned to accommodate a mix of uses, with minimum non-residential floor areas required, with exceptions where appropriate.

Based on the above, it was understood and agreed that the medium density designation is intended to facilitate a gradual increase/transition of densities and built forms between the neighbourhood area and the Strategic Growth Areas, which includes the Urban Growth Centre. Lands to the south of the subject lands are located within the UGC and are proposed to be designated as High Density. While the high density designation on lands within the UGC is not disputed, there are a number of design/transition policies within the OP which would have the potential effect of restricting development within the UGC in close proximity to lands designated neighbourhood area. This has a potential negative impact on the development potential of lands within the UGC, an area where the

Province and City target the highest densities. For example, section 3.3.4 (g) on high rise buildings restricts towers from within 30m of lands designated as neighbourhood area. Understanding that the UGC is the appropriate location for high rise/towers, placing lands within the neighbourhood area adjacent the UGC would neutralize lands within a 30m setback of the UGC from the development of a tower. It is our opinion that in this instance, the medium density designation would be the appropriate designation to implement adjacent the high density designation, so it can achieve the intention of providing a transition as previously set out in Section 2.6.2.

The neighbourhood area lands which are intended to capture existing and new low density neighbourhoods, in our opinion should not be located adjacent lands which are designated as high density and located within the UGC, where there is an expectation and in some instances a requirement to secure higher densities and developments. The medium density designation, as previously noted, is intended specifically to facilitate a gradual increase of densities between the neighbourhood area and the UGC. This will facilitate an appropriate transition to the neighbourhood area extending away from the UGC, while ensuring that lands within the UGC can be developed in accordance with applicable policy. Through our vast experience with previous and ongoing development applications within the City, compatibility is often a main concern and priority for members of the public. Often there are suggestions to provide for more appropriate transitions of density and built forms from existing low density areas.

The medium density designation requested would provide provisions for a transition to/from lands within the neighbourhood area designation, including permitted uses to accommodate a transition to the neighbourhood area. For example, the second draft Official Plan requires setbacks to existing low density uses (singles, semis, towns) and a 45 degree angular plane which can be achieved on the property to adjacent development. The transition policies, coupled with the development standards will ensure that a suitable transition is provided to the neighbourhood area designation, while accommodating a gradual decrease in density from the UGC. The medium density designation is considered appropriate as it would reflect appropriate development of the site and maintain the ability to achieve high density development within the UGC. It is understood that any development concepts for the subject lands will be required to demonstrate conformity with the applicable Official Plan policies, including applicable Urban Design policies, including ensuring a suitable transition is between both high and low density areas.

In the alternative of the requested medium density designation, we would request the City consider including lands adjacent the UGC under Section 2.6.1.3 (c) (i) Development Standards. This would permit lands directly abutting the UGC to develop in a transitional manner to the UGC and in a similar fashion as lands along an intensification corridor.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Based on our review of the second draft new City of Barrie Official Plan, we formally request the subject lands, 15,13,11,9,5 Peel Street & 118, 98 Mulcaster St be designated as Medium Density as we believe this designation is more appropriate adjacent the proposed high density designation and UGC. Based on Map 2 the majority of lands adjacent the UGC are proposed as Medium Density. The medium density designation is ideal to provide for a more gradual transition between neighbourhood area and high density/strategic growth area lands. Further, the medium density designation permits lower building heights and built forms where required to satisfy the transition policies of the plan. As such, we do not anticipate any conflict with designating and developing the subject lands in accordance with the requested medium density designation while ensuring lands within the UGC can be developed to their full potential and an appropriate transition to lands

designated neighbourhood area is provided. Further, we would request City staff contact the undersigned to discuss this landholding in greater detail.

Respectfully submitted,

Innovative Planning Solutions

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Greg Barker", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Greg Barker, B.A.A.
Partner

Joanne Werth


From: Jack Krubnik
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 11:19 PM
To: NewBarrieOP; Tomasz Wierzba
Cc: Darren Vella
Subject: City of Barrie Official Plan 2051 - Draft Two Official Plan Comments
Attachments: City of Barrie MCR Review.pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Hello, I am writing on behalf of my client to provide a review of the Draft Two Official Plan as it pertains to the lands at 505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street, City of Barrie, County of Simcoe. We are submitting these comments to respond to the stated June 02, 2021 deadline for public comment on Draft Two of the Official Plan.

Our intention in this Official Plan Review is to justify the consideration that 505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street is uniquely positioned for more intensification, taller heights, and more density than has been attributed to it within this Official Plan review.

The Planning commentary pertaining to the Official Plan policies follows each identified Official Plan policy.

I trust that this email and the attachment will find you well. I look forward to your review and our continued discussion related to our Planning Policy concerns.



Jack Krubnik, MCIP, RPP

Senior Project Manager

647 Welham Road, Unit 9A, Barrie, ON, L4N 0B7
Tel: 705 – 812 - 3281 X31 Fax: 705 – 812 - 3438

E-Mail: jkrubnik@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

May 31, 2021

City of Barrie, City Hall70
Collier Street
P.O Box 400 2297
Highway 12Barrie,
ON
L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

Re: **Draft Two Official Plan Comments**
505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street
City of Barrie, County of Simcoe

The attached document provides written comments on the Draft Official Plan as they pertain to 505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street, City of Barrie. The commentary pertaining to Official Plan policies are the bullet items, which follow the identified policy.

City of Barrie Official Plan 2051
“One City, One Vision, One Plan”
DRAFT 2 for Public Review

May 6, 2021

Our intention in this Official Plan Review is to justify the consideration that 505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street is uniquely positioned for more intensification, taller heights, and more density than has been attributed to it within this Official Plan review. The site is located on an Arterial Road, has a size of approximately 2.7 ha, and has significant frontage along both a watercourse and Yonge Street, which has been identified as an Intensification Corridor. Given this backdrop, and the policy intent of the New Official Plan, particularly related to growth management and Intensification Corridors, we feel that the subject site would be more appropriately designated as Medium or High Density in Official Plan Map 2 – Land Use Designations.

OFFICIAL PLAN POLICY

2.3 Becoming a Complete City and Elements of Barrie’s Community Structure **2.3.3 Strategic Growth Areas (SGAs)**

h) The City will connect Strategic Growth Areas with higher order transit by establishing dedicated transit facilities along Intensification Corridors.

- This policy acknowledges that dedicated transit facilities are planned along Intensification Corridors. Strategic Growth Areas are also intended to be connected via Intensification Corridors, which will contain these dedicated transit facilities. This policy gives credence to the argument for more density and opportunities for intensification along Intensification Corridors. Therefore, it is appropriate to designate lands close to dedicated transit facilities for medium and/or high density to make efficient use of land and to optimize the transit infrastructure.

2.3.6 Intensification Corridors

Intensification Corridors are areas for higher density and mixed-use development adjacent to Arterial Streets connecting Barrie's main growth areas.

a) For those street segments identified as Intensification Corridors:

- i) The properties fronting those streets are the properties envisioned for development or redevelopment; and,
- ii) Development or redevelopment must be oriented towards those street segments.

- The opening paragraph under Intensification Corridors, as well as policy a) should make it clear to all that properties that are envisioned for development or redevelopment will be for higher densities and mixed-use development as properties along an Intensification Corridor connect Barrie's main growth areas. For these reasons, Official Plan Map 2 – Land Use Designations needs to better consider and reflect the need for Medium and High Density land use designations along the Yonge Street Intensification Corridor. Specifically, at an area of 2.7 ha in size, and well positioned between Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA) and Strategic Growth Areas (SGA), our site is a good candidate for transit-oriented development along an Intensification Corridor. It also has significant frontage along Yonge Street, which makes it a strong candidate for grade related commercial uses and offering the types of densities that best support transit uses and optimize transit infrastructure. Furthermore, the site is also bounded by the Natural Heritage System to its south and east, which greatly reduced its impact on adjacent land uses and improves its transition to more sensitive land uses.

b) The function of Intensification Corridors is to support transit-oriented development in areas outside of Strategic Growth Areas, Urban Growth Centre, and Major Transit Station Areas, and take a forward-looking approach to development that is walkable and with a range of uses that support transit users in accordance with the respective land use designation.

- Policy b) supports the suggestion that Intensification Corridors require Medium Density and High Density land use designations adjacent to them, as they are to be transit-supportive, and support transit-oriented development outside of Strategic Growth Areas, Urban Growth Centres, and Major Transit Station Areas. Transit-oriented development by definition is creating vibrant, livable, sustainable communities which are compact, walkable, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use communities centered around high-quality train systems. These elements are necessary to lower our dependence on a car for mobility and survival.

c) Intensification Corridors are expected to accommodate a scale of development and built form suitable for their planned function, in accordance with Section 3 and the respective land use designation.

- As illustrated, the land use designations along the Yonge Street Intensification Corridor, do not provide for enough variety of land uses, especially medium and high density land uses, to accommodate a more appropriate scale of development and built form suitable for their

planned function along Intensification Corridors. In contrast Bayfield Street, which is another Arterial Road in Barrie that has been identified as an Intensification Corridor, has been almost entirely identified as a Strategic Growth Area (SGA), with Medium Density and Commercial District land use designations located along its entire length. Bayfield Street is an Intensification Corridor whose land use designations more appropriately support the policy supporting intensification Corridors.

d) All new development and redevelopment along Intensification Corridors will require public transit infrastructure and active transportation infrastructure that also incorporates winter city design elements, as detailed in the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines.

- It would be very difficult for new development and redevelopment to require public transit infrastructure if the development is low-scale and low density. This is a policy that will not likely be successfully achieved in Neighbourhood Areas. To optimize public transit infrastructure, Intensification Corridors need to consider Medium and High Density land use designation that permits a mix of uses to best fulfill the objective of this policy.

2.3.7 Neighbourhoods

Neighbourhoods are where the majority of residents live and are illustrated on Map 1. Within the Built-Up Area, these areas are historically low density residential, and are envisioned to continue to evolve to integrate a range of housing forms, as well as services and amenities to support the daily needs of residents. In addition to other policies of this Plan, the following policies shall apply to Neighbourhoods:

a) Neighbourhoods are expected to accommodate a scale of development and built form suitable for their planned function, in accordance with the policies of Section 3 of this Plan, the respective land use designation, and the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines.

- The scale of development and built form within Neighbourhoods will be limited by the Neighbourhoods designation. Low-rise and low-density development has received little traction by landowners and developers of commercial and multiple housing units, and there is nothing seen within these policies to suggest support for this type of housing will increase within Neighbourhoods. More consideration of higher density development and redevelopment friendly policies need to be considered along Intensification Corridors to accommodate a scale of development and built form suitable for their planned function. Neighbourhoods is a designation that is less appropriate along an Intensification Corridor and confuses the message to the public and landowners about the real intent of these areas. To alleviate confusion about future planning along Intensification Corridors, Yonge Street needs to be provided with land use designations similar to Bayfield Street.

b) Neighbourhoods within the Built-Up Area are generally considered to be areas where low-impact intensification is expected to occur as these neighbourhoods mature over time, subject to the applicable land use designation.

- It is not clear how low-impact intensification is defined or can appropriately support Intensification Corridors. The Official Plan does not appear to define the term low-impact intensification. Regardless, transit supportive intensification and density is required to optimize transit infrastructure along an Intensification Corridor.

c) Neighbourhoods shall be planned, through appropriate plans of subdivision or other planning processes under the *Planning Act*, to provide a range of parcel sizes and street patterns to maintain the flexibility needed to achieve a variety of built form types and uses permitted within the land use designations on Map 2, and allow for redevelopment and intensification.

- If a variety of built form types and uses is the goal of this policy, then a designation other than Neighbourhoods needs to be considered adjacent to areas such as Intensification Corridors, where presently the land uses are primarily Neighbourhoods. Some parcel sizes are large enough and uniquely situated, it is appropriate for them to contain higher density. A higher density land use designation will also maintain the flexibility needed to achieve a variety of built form. The Neighbourhoods designation will not provide this.

d) Development within Neighbourhoods shall foster linkages to the Natural Heritage System and Greenspace as well as other recreational areas within 500.0 metres.

- There should be more of a focus on connecting higher densities and growth areas to the Natural Heritage System. These are more important connections that concentrating on connectivity to the low-rise and low-density Neighbourhoods.

e) Development within Neighbourhoods shall permit and encourage opportunities for a full range of housing

- It is not clear how this policy is being supported. More Neighbourhood areas adjacent to Intensification Corridors should be designated to High Density to better promote opportunities for a full range and scale of housing. Presently, the current version of this Draft of the OP has a large gap between Medium Density (max 125 uph) and High Density (min 300 uph). It is not clear how to define a project that is between 126-299 uph? This is a large density gap that will fulfill many intensification objectives.

2.4 Growth Management

2.4.2.1 City-Wide Growth Management Policies

c) The City shall track all development to ensure an achievement of this housing mix by 2051.

Developments which contribute to an increase in medium and high-density housing will be encouraged.

- To achieve this goal, the City should look to provide more strategic areas for growth, such as along Intensification Corridors. Much of the City is still Neighbourhoods, even where it makes less sense and may contradict the City's own policy's, such as along Intensification Corridors. Intensification Corridors are appropriate areas for more strategic growth.

2.4.2.2 Built-Up Area

a) The City will take a balanced approach to growth management by directing 50% of annual residential growth to within the Built-Up Area in accordance with the following:

- i) Development within the Built-Up Area shall be directed toward Strategic Growth Areas including the Urban Growth Centre and the Allandale Major Transit Station Area and lands fronting onto Intensification Corridors as shown on Map 1;
- This policy specifically directs development within the Built-Up Area towards lands fronting onto Intensification Corridors within a Built-Up Area. This policy reinforces that Intensification

Corridors are important areas for development, and a more nuanced consideration of land uses and density along Intensification Corridors is required. As it exists, too much of the Intensification Corridor has still been designated Neighbourhoods. Lands fronting onto Intensification Corridors need to be considered for a High Density land use designation.

2.6 Land Use Designations

2.6.1 Neighbourhood Areas

2.6.1.2 Land Use Policies

c) Be considered established neighbourhoods and are not intended to experience significant physical change that would alter their general character, except for those lands denoted as Designated Greenfield Area, or located on an Intensification Corridor (Map 1), or lands fronting on to Arterial or Collector Streets (Map 4a and Map 4b).

- As Neighbourhoods are not intended to experience significant physical change that would alter their general character, except within areas such as Intensification Corridors, this makes an argument for the consideration of lands abutting Intensification Corridors to be for higher density uses. Without redesignating lands abutting Intensification Corridors, there will be continued conflict between Intensification Corridors and Neighbourhood Areas and the shape, scale, and form of development within Neighbourhoods Areas adjacent to Intensification Areas.

d) Permit new development in built-out neighbourhoods that respects and reinforces the existing scale, height, massing, lot pattern, building type, orientation, character, form, and planned function of the immediate local area, as set out in the Section 3 of this Plan.

- New development, or redevelopment along Intensification Corridors will have difficulty reinforcing the existing scale, height, massing, lot pattern, building type, orientation, character, form, and planned function of the immediate local area, as policy c) acknowledges that areas denoted as Designated Greenfield Area or located on an Intensification Area can experience significant physical change that would alter their general character.

e) 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.

- The appropriate levels of intensification for areas abutting Intensification Corridors is greater than that envisioned within Neighbourhood Areas in the Draft Official Plan. Lands abutting Intensification Corridors should be reconsidered for Medium and High Density designations.

2.6.1.3 Development Standards

c) Development may be permitted up to a maximum of six storeys in the Neighbourhood Area designation where:

- i) The proposed development fronts onto and is oriented toward the Intensification Corridor;
- To create vibrant mixed-use complete communities more flexibility for height and density needs to be considered for lands fronting onto Intensification Corridors. There should be more policy attention towards reducing impact rather than limiting heights, as many land uses and developments benefit from economies of scale or building efficiencies that may be greater than six storeys. Furthermore, the goal of transit-oriented development will be limited and hampered

by a six storey height limit adjacent to Intensification Corridors. Some parcels are sufficiently sized to accommodate more height and density along Intensification Corridors, while also appropriately considering impact to the established Neighbourhood Area communities.

- Development along Intensification Corridors should also promote grade related commercial uses. However, it can be difficult to attract commercial tenants in this economic environment, without providing for more density within a development to support the commercial grade related use. High density developments best support commercial uses in developments, which in turn will support a complete community and growth along an Intensification Corridor.

2.6.2 Medium Density (maximum residential density of 125 units per net hectare)

2.6.2.3 Development Standards

d) The maximum residential density for a development shall be 125 units per net hectare.

- If Medium Density is a maximum of 125 units per net hectare and High Density has a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare, in which category does a development fit which has a density of 126-299 units per hectare? More clarification on how Medium Density works within the mid-rise building section of the OP is necessary.

2.6.3 High Density (minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare)

2.6.3.3 Development Standards

d) Development with a residential component shall have a minimum residential density of 300.0 units per hectare.

- If Medium Density is a maximum of 125 units per net hectare and High Density has a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare, in which category does a development fit which has a density of 126-299 units per hectare? More clarification on how Medium Density works within the mid-rise building section of the OP is necessary.

OFFICIAL PLAN MAPS

Official Plan Map 1 – Community Structure

- Intensification Corridors such as Essa Road and Yonge Street need to be provided with more opportunities for growth, through Medium Density and High Density designations being permitted along Intensification Corridors. Presently much of these two Intensification Corridors do not have the appropriate growth designations to appropriately support the Intensification Corridors. Much of these two Intensification Corridors have Neighbourhood Area designations abutting them. These land designations do not sufficiently or appropriately support an Intensification Corridor and the transit infrastructure they are intended to support and connect.

Official Plan Map 2 – Land Use Designations

- Intensification Corridors support transit-oriented development in areas outside of Strategic Growth Areas, the Urban Growth Centre, and Major Transit Station Areas. They take a forward-looking approach to development that is walkable and with a range of uses that support transit users in accordance with the respective land use designation. As such, Intensification Corridors such as Essa Road and Yonge Street need to be provided with more opportunities for growth. Presently much of these two Intensification Corridors do not have the appropriate growth

designations to support the flexibility for opportunities along Intensification Corridors. Much of these two Intensification Corridors have Neighbourhood Area designations abutting them. Neighbourhoods will not appropriately meet the intent of an Intensification Corridor. By definition, Neighbourhood Areas are low-rise areas with lower-densities. Neighbourhoods will not appropriately support grade-related commercial uses or the development of complete communities. Nor will Neighbourhoods have the density and level of intensification, or promote the range of uses necessary to support transit. Therefore, the Neighbourhood land designation does not sufficiently or appropriately support an Intensification Corridor. Medium Density and High Density land use designations should be considered along Intensification Corridors, to support the intention of an Intensification Corridor

Official Plan Map 3 – Natural Heritage Protection Overlays

- The Natural Areas identified in Map 3 represent an asset of the City of Barrie. They appropriately identify areas of sensitivity and areas requiring protection. However, public access to these natural assets needs to be better aligned with municipal planning for growth. To achieve this, the City of Barrie should place higher density land use designations adjacent to, or in close proximity to natural areas. This will better utilize public spaces as public amenities and goes hand in hand with the municipal goals of planning for and creating healthier communities and a population that is better exposed to the benefits of natural areas. Planning for medium and higher density development near natural areas will better knit natural areas into the City fabric and will increase public exposure and knowledge of natural areas. This in turn will lead to the improved protection of natural areas.
- The existing practice of low density uses adjacent to natural areas further engrains issues of access and inequity in the planning process, whereby wealthier owners of detached residential dwellings can afford access to the health and educational opportunities of natural areas.

Official Plan Map 4A – Mobility Network

Official Plan Map 4B – Mobility Network

- Both Map's 4A & 4B identify Yonge Street for Commuter Cycling (On - road) and as an Arterial road classification. For the most part the Arterial Road classification supports the Intensification Corridor classification, and further strengthens the notion that an Arterial Road, which is an Intensification Corridor and is identified for on-street commuter cycling, should be supported by a mix of uses and both medium and higher density land uses.

Official Plan Map 5 – Road Widening

- Map 5 recognizes the arterial nature of Yonge Street, and the fact that it is an Intensification Corridor that will be planned for on-road cycling, by planning for a wide 34m right-of-way.
- It is more appropriate for a 34m right-of-way, that is an Arterial and a planned Intensification Corridor, to be planned for a mix of uses and medium and higher density development alongside the corridor. A mix of uses and medium to higher density uses will also better support the ability of a 34m right-of-way to support transit presently, and in the future with any potential transit improvements.

Official Plan Map 6 – Parks and Open Space Network

- Parks and Open Space Networks in Map 6 represent an asset of the City of Barrie. They appropriately identify areas of sensitivity and areas requiring protection. However, public access to these parks and the natural heritage system needs to be better aligned with municipal planning for growth. To achieve this, the City of Barrie should place higher density land use designations adjacent to, or in close proximity to, parks and the natural heritage system. This will better utilize public spaces as public amenities and goes hand in hand with municipal goals of planning for and creating healthier communities and a population that is better exposed to the benefits of natural areas. Planning for medium and high density development near natural areas will better knit natural areas into the City fabric and will increase public exposure and knowledge of natural areas. This in turn will lead to the improved protection of natural areas.
- The existing practice of low density uses adjacent to parks and the natural heritage system further engrains issues of access and inequity in the planning process, whereby wealthier owners of detached residential dwellings can afford access to the health and educational opportunities of natural areas.

Should you have any additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Innovative Planning Solutions



Darren Vella, BSc, MCIP, RPP
President & Director of Planning



Jack Krubnik, MCIP, RPP
Senior Project Manager

Joanne Werth

From: James Newlands
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 4:00 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Cc: Jamie Robinson
Subject: Barrie New OP - Draft #2 - MHBC Comments - 164 Innisfil Street
Attachments: MHBC - Comments on City of Barrie Draft 2 OP Review - 164 Innisfil Stree. pdf
Categories: Yellow Category

Good afternoon,

Please see attached MHBC's comments on Draft 2 of the City's new Official Plan on behalf of our Client who owns 164 Innisfil Street.

Please let us know if you have any questions or comments. We would be happy to discuss our comments with City staff. Kind regards,

JAMES NEULANDS HBComm, MSc, MCIP, RPP | Planner

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at jnewlands@mhbcplan.com or 705-238-0540.

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 234 | F 705 728 2010

| jnewlands@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



MEMO

To:	Michelle Banfield, RPP, Director of Development Services
From:	Jamie Robinson, BES, MCIP, RPP & James Newlands, HBComm., MSc., MCIP, RPP
Date:	June 2, 2021
File:	164 Innisfil Street - 17272B
Subject:	Official Plan Draft 2 Comments - City of Barrie Official Plan Review – Employment Area Policies

The second draft of the City of Barrie’s Official Plan has been released for comments and a Public Meeting is to be held on June 2nd, 2021 for City staff to present the draft new Official Plan.

This correspondence has been prepared on behalf of our Client, the owner of 164 Innisfil Street, to provide comments on the second draft of the Official Plan. These comments build on our previous comments on the first draft that were dated December 21, 2020.

The Second Draft of the New Official Plan continues to identify our Client’s site to be within an Employment Area and designates the site as Employment Area – Non-Industrial. We offer the following comments based on our review of the Employment Area Policies in Draft 2 of the New Official Plan:

- We support the City in the decision to designate the site as Employment Area - Non-Industrial. The site, and other properties in the surrounding area, contain buildings that were historically used for industrial uses but are now used for a wide range of employment uses, including non-industrial jobs. Our Client’s site serves as an ideal transitional site to provide buffering between lands designated for industrial uses and more sensitive land uses.
- We support the permission of retail as a secondary use within the Employment Area - Non-Industrial designation and would also support the inclusion of retail uses as a principal use as this is permitted by the PPS.
- We agree the inclusions of the existing uses as a permitted use, as well as the uses permitted in the industrial designation.
- In Section 2.6.9.2 c) the second sentence should be deleted. This sentence selectively recites some of the permitted uses of Section 2.6.9.2 and then applies an added “criteria” of “compliment”. It is recommended that this sentence be removed and that Section 2.6.9.1 stand on its own in establishing the list of permitted uses in the designation. If this sentence is to remain, it would appear to be more appropriate in the preamble to section 2.6.9.

- Within Section 2.6.9.2, we have concerns with the principle of using the percentages and maximum size limits - it is our opinion that these are regulatory approaches that should not be included in the policy document and are better applied through the implementing Zoning By-law. The reasons and solutions follow:
 - Despite the language in Section 10.1 d), which enables flexibility in the interpretation of numbers, the use of the word "shall" in the subsections of section 2.6.9.2, instead of "should" or "generally" places hard limits on the numbers and would precipitate an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) for any deviation from the maximums. The Zoning By-law is the better location for the numbers and the Zoning By-law process requires the same public notice procedures as an OPA.
 - It remains our recommendation that the 25% cap be removed from Section 2.6.9.2 ii) and iii). It is recommended that "secondary to the principle use" is a sufficient requirement and that the section should be modified to state, 'The implementing zoning by-law will establish provisions to ensure that secondary uses are secondary to the principle use.'
 - The recommended approach would have administrative benefit of taking an application having 26% of floor area being dedicated to a secondary use from an OPA and ZBA application before Council to a Committee of Adjustment application.
- While we do not support a cap number in the Official Plan; if one is used, it is our recommendation that it be increased to 3,500 square metres.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments, and for taking the time to review and consider. If the proposed recommendations are not proposed to be reflected in the final document, we would appreciate the opportunity to discuss options with you so that we can achieve a constructive solution.

From: [john foster](#)
To: [Tomasz Wierzba](#); [NewBarrieOP](#); [cityclerks](#)
Cc: [dmelchior](#); [Janet Foster](#)
Subject: June 2, 2021 2nd Draft City of Barrie Official Plan
Date: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 3:52:04 PM
Attachments: [2nd Draft Barrie OP - Melchior June 2 Public Meeting.pdf](#)

Public Meeting June 2, 2021

Please find enclosed comments for the City of Barrie 2nd Draft Official Plan Comments on behalf of Melchior Management.

Thank you for your consideration. Janet

Foster

June 2, 2021

By email to:

tomasz.wierzba@barrie.ca

new.barrieop@barrie.ca

cityclerks@barrie.ca

Tomasz Wierzba
Policy Planner City
of Barrie

Re: 2nd Draft City of Barrie Official Plan Review

**Comments for Consideration for Properties owned by Melchior Management
299 Lakeshore Drive, 99/110 Anne Street, 35 Blake Street &**

7 and 15 Vancouver Street

Dear Tomasz:

I have been retained by Melchior Management to provide planning advice on their land holdings regarding how the City of Barrie 2nd Draft Official Plan policies would affect these lands.

I attended the Public Open House that was hosted by Barrie on May 19th, at which time there were a number of questions that remained unanswered given the time constraints. Barrie planning staff proposed a meeting to discuss and answer questions. A meeting date has not yet been scheduled and I look forward to our meeting in the near future.

Comments and suggested land use and policy revisions have been provided for properties listed above. In addition, the questions for which additional information has been requested have been included for your information.

Please accept these comments for consideration of our requested revisions for each of the properties listed above and questions regarding the proposed Official Plan policies in finalizing the Official Plan Community Structure, Land Use Designations and planning policies.

Thank you for your consideration and continued discussion further to the Public Meeting on June 2, 2021 Yours truly,



Janet Foster, RPP
Planner

Attachment

Cc. Dino Melchior

Specific Property Locations

1. The property at **299 Lakeshore Drive** forms part of a commercial/office intersection at Lakeshore Drive and Minet's Point Road, which extends to the Yonge Street corridor. Both Lakeshore and Minet's Point are classed as Arterial Roads, having the highest order of traffic volume capacity and recognition of a Strategic Growth Area. The lands are in close proximity, across Lakeshore Drive, of the Strategic Growth Area. In addition, the lands are in close proximity to the Rail corridor and the Allandale GO station.

The proposed land use designation for the lands is Neighbourhood Area which would diminish redevelopment potential and does not recognize the existing office uses and potential for future expansion of mixed uses on the site.

From the Official Plan, a Strategic Growth Area is to depict long term growth centres that include residential growth, commerce, jobs and social interactions. They are areas of major activity planned around transit facilities. They are areas of primary gateways into the City; mixed use areas with wide ranges of uses, higher densities and taller buildings.

The Strategic Growth Centre (SGA), on Map 1, is recognized in this immediate area but only includes the south half of the intersection of Minet's Point and Lakeshore, but not the north half. The south half includes a major office building on the southwest side and vacant lands on the southeast side. The north half of the intersection includes the subject lands which are occupied by a major office use. The northeast side includes a real estate office. Both of these office uses would be considered Major Office Uses.

From Map 2, Land Use, the north side of the intersection is identified as Neighbourhood Area. The south side of the intersection is recognized as Medium Density on the southwest side, and Medium Density and Open Space on the southeast side; however, both are within the SGA. The intersection could be considered a Gateway into the City Centre, Waterfront Area and the Urban Growth Centre. It is located in close proximity to the Major Transit Area (GO Station). A Major Office use (which the subject lands are currently built for) is not permitted in a Neighbourhood Area Land Use Designation.

The intersection should be consistent and all 4 corners should be recognized as a SGA and the land use should reflect Medium Density as per the south half of the intersection which permits a Major Office use, as reflected by the current use of the subject lands.

Seeking City's consideration of expanding the Strategic Growth Area boundary to include the lands located at 299 Lakeshore Drive and to designate them Commercial District or Medium Density consistent with the lands on the south side of the intersection of Minet's Point and Lakeshore Drive, therefore recognizing their potential for creating future strategic growth in this area.



2. The property at **99/110 Anne Street South** functions as a commercial plaza. The current land use designation is General Commercial and the existing zoning is General Commercial Special Provision C4-SP9 (no residential uses permitted).


The subject lands are proposed to be recognized as Employment Area on Map 1, Community Structure, and designated Non-Industrial Employment Area on Map 2, Land Use.

The proposed land use designation is Non-Industrial Employment, where retail uses require a primary use, ie. office. However, the existing zoning of C4 allows a wide range of commercial uses not limited by requiring a primary use. Tenant turnover is frequent which makes it difficult to monitor primary users when negotiating leases.

Non-Industrial Employment Area (NIEA) uses shall accommodate employment uses that support the industrial uses and act as a buffer to more sensitive land uses. NIEAs facilitate a wide range of non-industrial employment uses that support industrial uses, serve the general public or create new economic development opportunities. Uses include office, commercial and major retail uses and other uses. Major Retail is defined as “Large scale or large format standalone retail stores or largescale retail centres that have the primary purpose of retail commercial activity.”

The subject lands are currently designated and zoned for Commercial Uses. The policies of the new OP are difficult to understand how to facilitate new uses given that non industrial/commercial uses change over time and make it difficult to track whether a primary use exists in order to allow a secondary use. Further explanation is required regarding how the current permissions under the OP and Zoning Bylaw would continue to be implemented.


Because this property is already zoned for commercial uses, the owner is seeking assurances that the range of commercial uses currently permitted will be taken into consideration when the new zoning bylaw is reviewed. Further discussion and clarification on allowing commercial permissions without primary uses is requested, or broadening the range of primary uses.





3. The sites at **35 Blake Street and 7 & 15 Vancouver Street** are currently occupied by 3 and 4 storey buildings designated Residential and zoned Residential Apartment Dwelling RA1-2 and RA1. However, the proposal is to redesignate the lands to Neighbourhood Area, diminishing/limiting their existing zoning permissions for higher density and future accommodation for more affordable units, which would have a desirable recreational waterfront location and easy access to commercial services at the intersection of Blake and Johnson Streets as well as easy public transit access on Blake Street.

Seeking consideration for a Medium Density designation to recognize existing apartment uses and the potential for future intensification on sites that are already built at higher densities than that envisioned by the Neighbourhood Area designation.



Proposed Questions for Further Discussion

1. It is noted that boundary revisions to the Urban Growth Centre established by the Growth Plan are proposed. Please identify the rationale for such revisions.
2. The policies identify that minor revisions to the Plan may be considered without an Official Plan amendment; however, increases to height and density will not be considered. Will an Official Plan amendment be required in instances where increases are contemplated? Also, will an Official Plan amendment be required if minimum requirements cannot be satisfied, for example minimum densities or building heights?
3. Please explain the rationale for the Boundary expansion of the Historic Neighbourhoods from those recognized in the Historic Neighbourhoods Strategy that introduce the Kempenfelt and East End Neighbourhoods where there is no overlap with the Urban Growth Centre. Please consider development objectives to be discussed at the presubmission stage in order that the applicant understands what is expected in the built form, or exemption from the requirements.
4. It is recommended that the City consider implementing pockets of Medium or High density designations to be scattered throughout the City in the Neighbourhood Areas and other areas, where intensified uses, taller buildings/higher densities, already exist and are considered compatible with adjacent uses. By including the existing medium and high density residential uses in the Neighbourhood Area designation appears to downgrade their land use intensification ability and renders their existing uses non-conforming (given Neighbourhood Area maximum building heights of 3 and 4 storeys.) Designating these sites/pockets of Medium or High density land uses would recognize their current existing higher density uses, allow for greater intensification potential, possibility to introduce non-residential uses, and recognize their underlying permitted zoning of apartment dwellings, zoned, RA1 and RA2. The Neighbourhood Area land use designation does not allow for the recognition of existing higher density uses and does not distinguish future high and low density residential uses.
5. Has the City envisioned what the implementing zoning bylaw will look like when recognizing and permitting mixed uses? How will the existing zoning permissions currently afforded to properties be maintained? Will the City pre-zone lands or is rezoning to be applied on an individual site basis.
6. The Parking solutions identified in Section 4.7 identify that as a minimum, request for a reduction in parking spaces will be in accordance with the City's Cash-in-lieu of Parking Bylaw. The policies regarding parking should explain the Cash-in-Lieu of Parking Bylaw.
7. Condo Conversion policies identified in Section 9.5.4.1 are not consistent with Section 2.5 c) where conversion of rental units to ownership require replacement at a ratio of 1:1. If there is a healthy rental market and has been healthy for preceding years, replacement of rental units may be considered onerous.

From: [John Bartosik](#)
To: [NewBarrieOP](#)
Date: Thursday, May 6, 2021 9:10:53 PM

Barrie will protect and improve air quality and promote energy efficiency through enhancement of the City's tree canopy cover and vegetation to provide shade, reduce the urban heat island effect, trap pollution, and control run-off. This will be implemented through green urban design standards. In regards to your above statement why is it that development of new subdivisions continues in the manner it does by stripping away all trees, brush, wetlands and soil usually to the clay and water table? Allow me to share the following:

With a little research I discovered that a newlyman made creek in the annexed lands just south 100 metres from the Madelaine and Mapleview East intersection is actually drainage from a shallow subterranean lake my home and many others are sitting on top of. Tapped and excavated to surface just a short distance downhill from my home at 585 Mapleview Dr. East. My 25 foot dug well has been providing us with an abundance of clean pure water since the 1960's. The amount and quality in this aquifer is now being jeopardized. The surface of the earth has been removed as much as 20 feet in places. This twenty five hectare plot behind my home once owned by Lockmaple? developments will soon be covered with concrete and pavement. The creek will become part of a man made tunneling system running under many homes and streets slated for development as so called storm water management.

(I thought nature was managing rainfall just fine) Firstly the great water cycle has been severed

...the rains will no longer be filtered and cleaned through the natural sponge of trees, brush, meadow and topsoil that was once here. Soon, it will all be diverted into concrete pipes that eventually flow straight into a series of large retention ponds to slow down the particulates. There was a woodlot of about 10 acres completely cut down. The natural air conditioner removed can never be replaced in 50 years. The unnatural flow feeding our beloved Lake Simcoe with pure, unfiltered rainfall will carry with it microscopic particles of roof tops, concrete, asphalt, car exhaust, jet fuel exhaust, micro plastic from dryer exhaust, natural phosphorus from airborne construction silt, dog waste, road salt, etc. etc. But wait, what about this subteranean lake under us all on this hilltop? I guess a kind of barrier of manmade surfaces will be created preventing rainwater from penetrating and being filtered and eventually, just dry up! Ah... but the city will provide us with a new clean, chlorinated supply of water as they transform our once upon a time 2 lane country road into a 5 lane major artery. This exact spot was a hillside wetlands in a habitat of many animal, bird, insect and frog species. Their songs, melodies, chirps orchestrated the most beautiful music to wake up to and to fall asleep with. I have seen over the 2 decades here, herds of deer grazing in these meadows, coyotes and on a couple occasions even timber wolves.

These days, the songbirds are vulnerable to predators, their habitat has been removed. Their morning songs these days are scarce.

It seems part of the development is still negotiating with our political leaders meanwhile this 20 hectare plot has become an environmental and ecological anomaly contributing to our demise. The hilltop has been transformed into a mini valley desert of silt, sand, gravel and rocks aligned in a north south direction. The hot humid southerly summer winds are not only heated up even more by this valley but accelerate through this man made runway. Last week it was a squall of fine particles in my eyes, I could feel the grit in my teeth. I could not see my neighbours house 3 doors down because of the airborne silt. Last summer a mini tornado sling shot it's way across this anomaly taking down the main leader and 2 -18 inch branches from my maple tree, the first obstacle in its path at the end of the runway. It then crossed the road knocking down a dozen or

more mature trees in a small wood lot park, then continued on north to get cooled off by the deep waters of nearby Lake Simcoe.

I am amazed and enlightened to bear witness as to how the construction of a residential neighbourhood can actually create such a anomaly affecting our environment, wildlife habitats, and ecology.

while disturbing the weather, climate and health of our personal lives. Such a delicate, balanced and fragile environment... so close to the shores of our beloved Lake Simcoe, the great equalizer of our Great Water Cycle.

...and just exactly what will this new official plan do differently than what it does now when it comes to the kinds of damage that has unknowingly happened in my backyard., to the environment, the climate change contributions of development, and the myriad of subterranean lakes and headwaters of Lover's creek, and Hewitt's creek feeding and very much a part of the Great Water Cycle of Lake Simcoe. ..in this area of the newly annexed lands.

When will the stripping of vast quantities of the earth's skin and life forms living in and on top of it stop for future development and the well being of all creatures not just us.

Joanne Werth

From: John McDermott
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 11:30 AM
To: Tomasz Wierzba
Cc: Tara McArthur; NewBarrieOP; Keith Lahey; Clifford Cole
Subject: Proposed (New) Official Plan, City of Barrie
Attachments: ltr_T Wierzba re City of Barrie Proposed OP_May 31, 2021.pdf
Categories: Yellow Category

Good Morning Tomasz,

Further to our attendance at the Public Open House on May 19, 2021, attached is a copy of our writtensubmission in relation to the proposed (new) Official Plan for the City of Barrie.

By way of this e-mail, a copy has been forwarded to Tara McArthur in order that it may be provided to the Chairand Members of the City of Barrie Planning Committee.

Regards,
John McDermott, MCIP, RPP

This E-mail message (including attachments, if any) is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, proprietary, confidential and exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and erase this E-mail message immediately.

May 31, 2021

Corporation of the City of Barrie
Development Services Department
70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 4T5

Attention: Mr. Tomasz Wierzba
Policy Planner

Re: Proposed New Official Plan for the City of Barrie
Our File: PN 5139

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

As noted in our previous correspondence of May 10, 2021, and, as stated during our attendance at the May 19, 2021, virtual public open house, we have been retained by 1287363 Ontario Limited, owner of the Dunlop Village Plaza, municipal address of 304 Dunlop Street West, to assist in the review and consideration of the draft of the proposed, new Official Plan for the City of Barrie. Based upon our review of the draft document, there are a number of concerns which arise in relation to the designation and policies applicable to the future use and development of the lands situated at 304 Dunlop Street West, which lands are developed for the purposes of a retail and personal service commercial plaza.

On behalf of our Client and as requested by City Staff during the course of the May 19, 2021, virtual public open house, a summary of the issues and concerns arising from our review of the draft of the proposed Official Plan is provided in the following paragraphs. To assist you in the consideration of the various issues and concerns, we have categorized our comments as being of primary and secondary significance. On behalf of 1287363 Ontario Limited, we offer the following comments for your review and consideration.

Part One - Primary Issues & Concerns

1.1 Community Structure (Map 1)

The lands developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza, 304 Dunlop Street West, form the westerly extent of an area designated as a *Strategic Growth Area* on Map 1 to the proposed Official Plan. The Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Growth Area is one of nine areas so designated throughout the City of Barrie. It is understood that Strategic Growth Areas are to become focal points for residential growth, commerce, jobs and places of activity which promote social interaction leading to the creation of complete communities.

The Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Growth Area (**SGA**) encompasses those lands situated adjacent the north and south limits of Dunlop Street West, between Eccles Street to the east and the Highway No. 400 corridor on the west, and, those lands located to the west of Anne Street, north and south of Dunlop Street, in the general vicinity of the intersection of Dunlop Street West and Anne Street. It is noted that the those lands situated opposite the Dunlop Village Plaza and to the south of Dunlop Street West, west of the intersection of Hart Drive and Dunlop Street West, are designated within the Employment Area land use classification.

Re: Proposed Official Plan

Subject to confirmation by the City of Barrie, the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Growth Area encompasses approximately 24 hectares (i.e. 59 acres). It follows that the net area, exclusive of roads and open space features to be retained in their natural state, is in the order of 17 hectares (i.e. 42 acres).

As previously noted, Strategic Growth Areas are described as key locations throughout the City of Barrie intended to serve as focal points for residential growth, commerce, jobs and opportunities for social interaction. The policies set out in Section 2.3.3 of the draft Plan further advise that a Strategic Growth Area is to accommodate higher levels of intensification, tall buildings, and higher, transit supportive densities. The policies further state that such areas are to become distinct places of major activity which support regional shopping destinations and which function as mixed uses areas.

In accordance with Section 2.3.3(b) of the draft plan, it is understood that the City will plan a critical population mass for each SGA. In this context the policies state that determination of the critical population mass is to be based upon, among other generally stated considerations, the ability to attract food retailers to provide area residents with fresh food options within the SGA. While specific reference is not made to major grocery chains, studies suggest that a population of 10,000 to 12,000 people is necessary to sustain a supermarket or mainline, independent grocery store. Given the extent of lands designated within the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street SGA, achieving the population threshold necessary to support a supermarket or mainline independent grocery store would require that the area be planned to support a density in the order of 400 persons per hectare (i.e. 150 to 200 persons per acre).

It follows that in designating the lands as a Strategic Growth Area, significant intensification and redevelopment of the built form will be necessary to achieve a density in the order of 400 persons per hectare. Based upon field studies completed throughout this area in recent years, the area in question is largely occupied by retail and personal service commercial forms of land use, such as the Dunlop Village Plaza and the Anne Street Plaza, retail gasoline and automotive service facilities, and lower density, ground related housing, most notably adjacent the north and south limits of Henry Street and along Dunlop Street, west of Anne Street, there being only one 12 storey, apartment dwelling house within the Dunlop Street West SGA.

In view of the existing pattern and configuration of property ownership, and, the distribution and nature of existing land uses within the within the Dunlop Street West -Anne Street SGA, the area which demonstrates the greatest potential for intensification of the built form is in the vicinity of the intersection of Dunlop StreetWest and Anne Street and on those lands to the west of Anne Street, north and south of Henry Street. In providing for the intensification of the built form as envisaged by the policies applicable to this area, it is submitted that the policies should provide specific direction in terms of the means by which the City will determine the critical population mass and the future pattern of land use and development.

There is a need for the City of Barrie to provide for intensification of the built form of the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street SGA by means of a comprehensive plan based upon a series of well defined criteria. While reference is made to the implementation of a Secondary Plans at the discretion of the City of Barrie in paragraph (e) of Section 2.5, entitled General Land Use Policies, and, in Section 7.3.5, it is submitted that the policies concerning the basis for establishing the critical population mass, the pattern of land use and the future built form of this area should not be permissive. Rather, the policies should mandate the requirement for the preparation of a Secondary Plan for the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street SGA based upon a series of well defined criteria.

The requirement to undertake the preparation and approval of a Secondary Plan, a process which allows for public review and consultation, prior to proceeding with the approval of development proposals on an ad-hoc

Re: Proposed Official Plan

basis in response to site specific applications, will ensure a meaningful path forward in achieving the generally stated policies applicable to the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Growth Area having regard for the balance of the policies set out in the draft Official Plan.

The need to require the preparation of a Secondary Plan, in advance of consideration of site specific development proposals, is underscored by Section 2.3.3(f) and the reference to the Strategic Growth Area centred at the Dunlop Street and Anne Street interchange as an area which is primarily intended for non-industrial, economic and employment functions supported by residential uses. In addition to mandating the requirement for the preparation of a Secondary Plan, the policies should, among other matters, state that the Secondary Plan will identify the basis for determination of the critical population threshold, the ratio of residential to employment uses, the pattern of land use and the built form, inclusive of the means by which the natural environmental features associated with the Bunkers Creek will be restored and integrated to create an effective and efficient civic design leading to achievement of a complete community.

1.2 Land Use Designations (Map 2)

The lands developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza are designated within a "Strategic Economic and Employment District (SEED)" land use classification on Map 2 to the proposed Official Plan. While minor deviations exist, our review of Map 2 suggests that the extent and boundary of those lands forming part of the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street SEED area are relatively synonymous with the extent of those lands identified as a Strategic Growth Area previously referenced on Map 1.

By way of reference to Section 2.6.8 of the draft official plan, lands designated within the Strategic Employment and Economic District land use classification have been identified by the City as areas where there is potential for clusters of employment uses, either established or emerging. In accordance with Section 2.6.8.1 of the draft document, the permitted uses are to include a relatively broad range of uses and activities inclusive of offices; public service facilities; community facilities; training centres and postsecondary educational facilities; parks and open space; day care; health services and medical laboratories; hospitality and tourism uses to be specified in the implementing zoning by-law; workshops up to 2,000 square metres; recreational facilities; residential and live-work units; commercial uses; and, convenience retail where part of a mixed use development. The foregoing policy provides limited, if any, guidance in relation to the forms of employment uses, specifically industrial forms of land use, which would form part of an industrial cluster permitted within the Dunlop Street West SEED area.

Section 2.6.8.2(a) states that lands designated within the SEED classification are envisioned as mixed use areas with residential, retail and commercial uses supportive of emerging industry clusters. The policy goes on to state, in part, that such areas are intended ... "to support the development of mixed use industry clusters, ...within Strategic Growth Areas".

Given our understanding of the intent of the policies applicable to Strategic Growth Areas, that is areas which are intended to be focal points of residential growth and intensification of the built form, and, the absence of industry within the area generally delineated as forming part of the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street SEED area, we question the rationale of providing for mixed use industry clusters. The introduction of industrial forms of development within the Dunlop Street West SEED area may result in land use conflicts by reason of the differing priorities for the use of lands in close proximity. Furthermore, if industrial uses are to be permitted on lands designated within the SEED classification as proposed by way of Section 2.6.8.2(a), it would

suggest that the supply of lands available for intensification of the built form and the introduction of higher densities will be further restricted.

Re: Proposed Official Plan

To avoid the uncertainty created by the draft policy framework, clarification is sought as to the intent of the policy as relates to the introduction of, what are referred to as, *emerging and mixed use industry clusters* within the Dunlop Street West SEED area.

It is understood that the Dunlop Street West Corridor, between the Highway No. 400 interchange and Toronto Street, is one of two *Strategic Growth Areas* where the lands are designated within a *Strategic Employment and Economic District* land use classification. Specific reference is made to Section 2.6.8.2(c)(ii), a policy which specifically applies to the Dunlop Street Corridor between the Highway No. 400 and Toronto Street. The policy in questions states that it is the intent *"to create connections between companies and incubators*

within the Urban Growth Centre, the Georgian College Satellite Campus downtown and surrounding employment lands. This Strategic Growth Area shall be planned to accommodate predominantly office uses related to knowledge based firms and creative industries."

The foregoing policy states that office uses related to knowledge based firms shall be the predominant form of land use within that portion of the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Growth Area. No reference is made to the use of lands for retail and personal service commercial uses and/or intensification of the built form and the introduction of higher density, transit oriented, residential development. Given the somewhat obtuse references to the introduction of sensitive land uses, specifically residential uses, within areas designated within the SEED land use classification, clarification is sought as to means by which the Municipality will achieve the goals and objectives previously discussed in relation to the development and use of lands forming part of the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Growth Area.

In summary, it is submitted that refinement of the policy framework applicable to those lands forming part of the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Employment and Economic District, which are also classified as a Strategic Growth Area, is required to avoid speculation and uncertainty with respect to the future use and development of the area in question. Initially, the policies speak to intensification of the built form to create complete communities inclusive of high density residential development and regional shopping destinations. In contrast, the SEED policies place significant emphasis upon offices and mixed use industry clusters as the predominant forms of land use. The need to provide for spatial separation between the differing forms of land use may be effective to compromise the ability of the City to realize the significance of the area as a Strategic Growth Area.

1.3 Natural Heritage Protection Overlays (Map 3)

The lands developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza are traversed by two areas denoted as *"Environmental Protections Areas - Level One With Existing Development Subject to Section 5.4.2.1(d)"* .. of the draft official plan.

The policies applicable to lands identified as an Environmental Protection Area are directed towards the maintenance, protection, enhancement and restoration of the natural heritage system and its ecological functions. It is further understood that, in accordance with Section 5.4.2.1(a) of the draft plan, Level One Resources are the components of the Natural Heritage System which are to be afforded the highest level of protection.

The designation of portions of the lands developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza would appear to be consistent with the sections of Bunkers Creek, south-east of the Highway No. 400 corridor, encased

within the concrete box culverts which traverse the site and which subsequently extend in a south-easterly direction beneath Dunlop Street and the adjacent properties to the south of Dunlop Street, west of Anne Street. To the east of Anne Street the concrete box culvert discharges into a natural ravine area.

Re: Proposed Official Plan

Of particular significance is Section 5.4.2.1(d) which reads as follows, namely:

"Notwithstanding the land use limitations applicable to properties identified as Level One, where an existing designation permits other forms of development, such development may proceed subject to the policies of Level 2 and the appropriate policy application process."

Clarification is sought in relation to the term *"existing designation"*. If the intent is to refer to the designation which will apply upon adoption of the proposed, new official plan, the reference should simply be to the designation on Maps 1 and 2 of the Plan. If this is not the intent of the wording, clarification is requested.

Based upon our review of the policies applicable to the Environmental Protection Areas, and more specifically the Bunkers' Creek watershed, the ultimate intent is to provide for restoration of the watercourse to a naturalized state, wherever feasible and practical. Achievement of this objective will only be possible upon redevelopment of the lands affected.

By way of example, should proposals be introduced which envisage redevelopment of the lands to the south-east of Highway No. 400 and/or in the vicinity of the intersection of Dunlop Street and Anne Street, for high density, multi-storey structures consistent with the Strategic Growth Area policies of the draft document, a portion of the lands could be developed as an open space linkage which accommodates the restoration of Bunkers Creek. Such a scenario simply serves to emphasize the need to require that a Secondary Plan be advanced by the City to provide for the future pattern of land use and development within the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Growth Area.

1.4 Mobility Network (Maps 4A & 4B)

In general terms, the underlying principle of the Mobility policies is to promote a reduced dependency upon automobiles through the establishment of a comprehensive mobility network which places emphasis upon both public transit and active modes of transportation, namely walking and cycling. Section 4.1.1(d) states that the intent is to achieve a modal split of 12 percent as of 2041. Clarification is sought as to how this metric is to be measured relative to other modes of transportation. Is it the intent of the Plan that other modes of transportation, namely transit and active modes, will represent the balance, some 88 percent, of movements within the City of Barrie?

Dunlop Street West is designated as an Arterial Road, as is Anne Street north and south of Dunlop Street West. It is further noted that Dunlop Street West, west of Anne Street, Anne Street South between Dunlop Street West and Tiffin Street, and, Tiffin Street west of Anne Street South, are designated as *"Freight Supportive Corridors."* The area bounded by the three aforementioned road sections is largely designated for Employment forms of land use, the primary exception being those lands located north and south of Dunlop Street, west of Highway No. 400, which are designated as Employment - Non-Industrial on Map 2, entitled Land Use Designations.

Classification of the aforementioned road sections as *Freight Supportive Corridors* would appear to be in response to the designation of the area generally bounded by Dunlop Street West, Anne Street South and Tiffin Street, for Employment forms of land use. While we appreciate the need to provide for heavy truck routes within and throughout the City, concern is expressed from the perspective of the future use and development of those lands situated adjacent the northerly limits of Dunlop Street, between Highway No. 400

and Anne Street. The concern follows from Section 4.5.1(a) which states that ... *"industrial uses shall be directed to lands adjacent the freight supportive corridors..."*.

Re: Proposed Official Plan

When one considers the policies applicable to lands designated as a Strategic Growth Area, where intensification of the built form is a key planning principle, relative to the policies applicable to a Strategic Economic and Employment District and those policies applicable to lands adjacent a Freight Supportive Corridor, the future direction for the use of the lands developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza is somewhat ambiguous and leads to a degree of uncertainty.

While those lands located adjacent Dunlop Street West, to the west of Highway No. 400, are designated on Map 2 as an Employment - Non Industrial area, a similar measure of relief is not afforded the section of Dunlop Street West between Highway No. 400 and the intersection of Dunlop Street West and Anne Street. In order to recognize the intent of the policies applicable to the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Growth Area, it is suggested that Section 4.5.1 (a) be modified insofar as is necessary to recognize the use and development of those lands situated adjacent the northerly limits of Dunlop Street, between Highway No. 400 and the intersection of Dunlop Street West and Anne Street, for a range of residential, retail and personal service commercial, and, other non-industrial forms of land use in accordance with the policies applicable to the Strategic Growth Area.

1.5 Road Widening (Map 5)

At the present time, the existing Dunlop Street West right-of-way, opposite the Dunlop Village Plaza, typically varies from approximately 24 to 29 metres, extending to slightly greater than 31 metres in the vicinity of the signalized intersection opposite Hart Drive.

The Environmental Assessment Report with respect to the proposed improvements to Dunlop Street West between Anne Street and Ferndale Drive, undertaken on behalf of the City of Barrie by A. J. Burnside & Associates in 2007 and subsequently updated in 2009, identified a need to provide for the widening of Dunlop Street West, between the Highway No. 400 corridor and Anne Street, to 37.5 metres. Subsequently, the City of Barrie Transportation Management Plan, undertaken by RSW and completed in June of 2019, established a right-way-width for Dunlop Street West, between Anne Street and the Highway No. 400 corridor of 41 metres. Presumably the Transportation Master Plan formed the basis for Schedule E, entitled Road Widening Plan, attached to and forming part of the approved Official Plan for the City of Barrie now in effect, whereon the right-way-width of Dunlop Street West, between Anne Street and Cedar Ponte Drive, is denoted as 41 metres.

By way of a detailed inset on Map 5, entitled Road Widening, to the proposed (new) Official Plan, the right-of-way width of Dunlop Street West, between Anne Street and Cedar Pointe Drive, is proposed as 55 metres. Clearly this is a significantly greater right-of-way than has previously been identified by way of both the Environmental Assessment for the improvements to Dunlop Street West, completed in 2007 and updated in 2009, and the Transportation Master Plan completed in 2019.

The writer raised this issue during the course of the public open house of May 19, 2021. In response to the writer's question concerning the basis for identification of a right-of-way width of 55 metres over this section of Dunlop Street West, Staff indicated that Council had previously endorsed the enhanced right-of-way width. Staff further indicated that the need for the enhanced right-of-way width was, in part, related to the construction of the proposed new Highway No. 400 - Dunlop Street interchange and that the road widening was determined in consultation with the Ministry of Transportation.

To assist in understanding the basis for the 55 metre right-of-way, the writer requested a copy of the comments received from the Ministry of Transportation in relation to the draft official plan. In response, the writer was advised that such comments would not be made available to the public.

Re: Proposed Official Plan

We are unaware of any updates to the Transportation Master Plan or Environmental Assessment with respect to the proposed improvements to Dunlop Street West which have identified the need for a 55 metre (i.e. 180 foot) right-of-way over the section of Dunlop Street West between Anne Street and Cedar Pointe Drive. Accordingly, we question the justification for the increase from 41 to 55 metres in the absence of an update to the Environmental Assessment for the improvements to Dunlop Street West between Anne Street and Ferndale Drive.

Given the significance of this issue, we confirm our request for a copy of the comments provided by the Ministry of Transportation in relation to the draft of the new official plan. Should this information and the documentation or reports upon which Council relied in determining that a 55 metre right-of-way was appropriate not be forthcoming, please advise as to the reasons for the requested documents and related information being withheld.

1.6 Cultural City Features (Map 8)

The lands developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza are delineated on Map 8, entitled Cultural City Features, as forming part of a Historical Neighbourhood, more specifically the West Village. The West Village Neighbourhood is one of eight areas, inclusive of the Downtown and other residential areas, situated to the south-east of the Highway No. 400 corridor, five of which encompass shoreline areas of Kempenfelt Bay.

The policies applicable to Historic Neighbourhoods state that the areas demonstrate cultural heritage character by virtue of the grouping of historic buildings and streetscapes which are recognized as valuable cultural heritage resources but which have not been individually evaluated or considered appropriate for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Given that the Dunlop Village Plaza is isolated and disjointed from the established residential communities to the east of Anne Street, south of Highway No. 400, north and south of Dunlop Street, and, that it is not demonstrative of a valuable cultural heritage resource or group of historic buildings and/or streetscape, it is submitted that the subject lands and adjacent properties fronting upon the northerly limits of Dunlop Street West do not meet the criteria for inclusion within the West Village Historic Neighbourhood. Accordingly, on behalf of our Client we request that the boundary of the West Village Historic Neighbourhood be re-evaluated and that the lands located at 304 Dunlop Street West, which are developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza, not form part of the Historic Neighbourhood referred to as West Village.

Part Two - Secondary Issues**2.1 Land Use Designations (Map 2)**

Our review of Map 2, entitled Land Use Designations, indicates that there is a note on the schedule which reads ... *"All land use designations extend to the centre line of the street and up to the highway right-of-way where appropriate."*

To avoid any confusion as to the intent of the foregoing note on Map 2, it is suggested that reference should be made to the highway right-of-way existing as of the date of adoption of the proposed (new) Official Plan. Clarification is also sought in relation to the phrase *"where appropriate"* as this suggests that situations may exist where the designations are not to be interpreted to extend to the centreline of the street or up to the highway

right-of-way. This is of particular significance in the context of lands in the vicinity of Dunlop Street West and the Highway No. 400 corridor.

Re: Proposed Official Plan2.2 Part Four - Planning A Connected and Mobile City

Throughout Part Four of the draft Plan, reference is made to development of an ACES mobility network. It is respectfully submitted that, to afford readers an improved understanding of the intent of the policy statement in question, the initial reference, specifically in Section 4.1.1 (i), should be to the creation of an Automated Connected Electronic Shared mobility network if, in fact, that is what is intended by the policy statement in question.

It would also be of benefit to the reader if some form of guidance could be provided as to the means by which this objective will be achieved, for example by means of the introduction of car pooling and ride share facilities. This would avoid the need for the reader to refer to the Transportation Master Plan as inferred by the introductory statements provided in Section 4.1.

2.3 Drinking Water System - Vulnerable Areas (Map 7)

it is understood that the designation of lands within a Vulnerable Wellhead Protection Area on Map 7 is intended to serve as an overlay to the land use designations set out on Map 2 to the proposed Official Plan. (i.e. Section 6.5.1.3(b)).

The lands developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza are delineated within an area identified as a Wellhead Protection Area - Level B (2 Year Capture Zone). Designation of the lands developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza as part of a Wellhead Protection Area would appear to be a result of the lands being situated within the wellhead capture areas associated with two municipal wells in the vicinity of Boys Street and Victoria Street, the wells being located approximately 380 metres and 520 metres respectively to south-east of 304 Dunlop Street West.

By way of reference to Section 6.5.1.2(a) of the proposed Official Plan, it is stated that significant groundwater recharge areas are reflected on Map 7. The policies indicate that such areas are meant to improve or restore the quality and quantity of groundwater in these areas and the function of the recharge areas.

Based upon a review of Map 7, there are no areas specifically identified as Groundwater Recharge Areas. Rather, the policies set out in Section 6.5.1.2 state that a significant groundwater recharge area is an area identified as such by any public body for the purposes of implementing the Provincial Policy Statement, an area as may determined by way of an assessment report required under the Clean Water Protection Act, or, an area so defined by the Conservation Authority.

It follows that lands could be identified as a Groundwater Recharge Area without the need for an amendment to the Official Plan. As a result, affected land owners would not have any right of appeal concerning the inclusion of their property holdings within a ground water recharge area.

The effect of the foregoing policy statements is to infer the designation of lands as a Ground Water Recharge Area by means of other instruments and/or decisions made by public bodies. Given the proposed policy framework associated with the use and development of lands determined to be within a Ground Water Recharge Area, it is submitted that Map 7 should be revised to clearly delineate and/or clarify the extent of existing, identified Ground Water Recharge Areas referenced in Section 6.5.1.2.

In the event that areas are identified as a Ground Water Recharge Area in the future, such areas should be delineated by way of an amendment to Map 7 and, as may be necessary, the text of the official plan.

Re: Proposed Official Plan

Concluding Remarks

On behalf of our Client, we appreciate the opportunity to make this submission in relation to the draft of the proposed (new) Official Plan for the City of Barrie, a very worthwhile endeavour which is intended to establish a framework for the future development and use of lands throughout the City over the next 30 years. We trust that Staff will give due consideration to the issues and concerns identified by way of this submission as the comments are intended to be of a constructive nature with a view to providing greater certainty in relation to the intent and purpose of the Plan.

As you may appreciate, we would have preferred to discuss the issues and concerns raised in this submission during the course of the May 19, 2021, public open house. However, the ability to provide for a more fulsome discussions of the issues with City Staff was not feasible or possible given the virtual meeting format and the need to hear from all participants within the time allotted for comments.

It would be of assistance if Staff could advise as to the means by which all comments received in relation to the draft of the proposed official plan will be addressed. It is understood from comments made by Staff in response to questions raised during the course of the May 19, 2021, public open house, that a report outlining the nature of the comments and submissions received through the public consultation process, and the nature of any revisions proposed to the draft document in response to the comments and submissions, would be compiled for Council's review and consideration prior to proceeding with recommendation of the proposed new Official Plan to Council for adoption. Should this be the intent of Staff, we hereby request that Staff provide us with a copy of the summary document .

As noted in this submission, we confirm our request for copies of the comments provided by the Ministry of Transportation in relation to the draft of the Official Plan as well as copies of the documentation referred to by Staff during the course of the May 19, 2021, public open house in relation to the proposed right-of-way width of Dunlop Street West between Anne Street and Cedar Pointe Drive.

In closing, we confirm our request for notice of any future public meetings held to present and discuss the proposed official plan and/or the comments and submissions received in relation thereto. Similarly, in accordance with our previous correspondence of request of May 10, 2021, we request Notice of Adoption of the Plan in accordance with the provisions of Section 17(23) of the Planning Act, R.S.O, 1990, c. P. 13, as amended. Should you have any questions or require clarification in relation to those matters set out in this submission, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
McDermott & Associates Limited

v//44't-))e,-p{o#:

John McDermott, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.,
Principal Planner

copy: Chair & Members

City of Barrie Planning Committee

MCDERMOTT & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

LAND USE & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

1287363 Ontario Limited
Attn. Mr. Keith Lahey

GowlingWLG

Attn. Mr. Clifford Cole

Joanne Werth

From: Brandi Clement
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 1:01 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: Submission for 70 Pioneer Trail-2nd Draft of Official Plan
Attachments: Let re 2nd OP Draft_70 Pioneer Trail.pdf
Categories: Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz

Please find a submission for the 2nd Draft of the Barrie OP for our client's lands at 70 Pioneer Trail. Thank you.Regards,

Brandi L. Clement, MURP, AICP, MCIP, RPP

Partner

The Jones Consulting Group Ltd.

229 Mapleview Drive East, Unit 1, Barrie, ON L4N0W5
Phone (705) 734-2538 ext 224 Fax (705) 734-1056

Cell (705) 795-0337

Email bclement@jonesconsulting.com
www.jonesconsulting.com



Please note that The Jones Consulting Group will be blocking all emails containing compressed attachments with file extensions such as .zip or .rar. When sending a .zip file please rename the extension to .zi_ or use an FTP site.

RESTRICTED ACCESS BUSINESS OPERATIONS

As the health and safety of our clients, suppliers, staff and families is our top priority during this period of uncertainty, commencing April 5th 2020, and until further notice, the Jones Consulting Group Ltd. office will be closed.

We are closely monitoring the situation and are following the practices recommended by local and international authorities to minimize the risk of exposure to the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) while doing everything in our power to ensure that our services continue uninterrupted.

Therefore, please note, until further notice, the Jones Consulting Group staff will be working remotely and will respond by e-mail and/or phone only. The office access will be closed.

We remain committed to providing the service you have come to expect from us, however, during this time, the Jones Consulting Group Ltd. may be rescheduling non-essential or non-urgent services as deemed appropriate in order to reduce exposure to the virus and protect everyone's health.



May 31st, 2021

VIA EMAIL

Tomasz Wierzba, MCIP, RPP
Policy Planner

City of Barrie

70 Collier Street, P.O Box 400
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5
new.barrieop@barrie.ca

**Re: Comments re. 2nd Draft of City of Barrie Official Plan
70 Pioneer Trail, Barrie**

Our client, Fernbrook (Parkside) Ltd., is in the process of developing the lands known municipally as 70 Pioneer Trail. A Pre-Consultation meeting was held on December 3, 2020 to discuss a proposed Site Plan consisting of 19 single detached dwellings (File No. D28-052-2020). A formal application for Site Plan Control will be submitted to the City in the summer of 2021. The subject lands are currently designated Residential in the Official Plan, as per a previous Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) decision in 2006 (OMB File No. O040209; City File No. D14-1415). Further, the OMB decision approved a total of 19 single detached dwellings on the lands. Permitted average densities within the current Residential designation include low-density residential uses between 12 and 25 units per net hectare. The approved concept of 19 units provides for a density of approximately 9 units per net hectare (19 units / 2.17 ha).

The 2nd Draft of the Official Plan continues to propose a designation on the subject lands of Neighbourhood Area and EPA-Level 1 with existing development designation subject to 5.4.2.1.d. The Neighbourhood Area designation is proposed to provide most of the City's low rise housing stock, permit development that respects the existing scale, and permit limited levels of intensification. Section 2.6.1.3(e)(i) identifies a minimum residential density for development occurring on lands fronting on or accessed by local streets should be 50.0 units per hectare. Based on these policies, the proposed use on the subject lands as permitted by the OMB is permitted; however, the density does not meet the minimum density standard of 50.0 units per hectare. In our opinion, the minimum target of 50.0 units per hectare on lands fronting onto local roads or above can be difficult to achieve on certain properties where other policies must be met such as respecting existing character, having regard for natural heritage features, intensification policies, topographical features and property configuration. Further, the EPA-Level 1 designation is too restrictive for the subject lands which has been approved by the OMB for development.

We respectfully request that the City review the minimum density targets for lands designated Neighbourhood Area in the draft Official Plan to provide for a greater range, revise the language to be less restrictive to allow for greater flexibility, and identify the existing OMB decision on these lands. We look forward to your review and continuing to be involved in this process. Please also accept this letter as our formal request to be notified of all future meetings regarding the Official Plan Review process.

Sincerely,

THE JONES CONSULTING GROUP LTD.



Brandi L. Clement, MURP, AICP, MCIP, RPP
Partner

Cc: Fernbrook (Parkside) Ltd., Owner

Head Office:
Form 11 Rev 2

Barrie

229 Maplevue Drive, Unit 1 Barrie, ON L4N 0W5

705-734-2538 • 705-734-1056 fax
www.jonesconsulting.com

Joanne Werth

From: Brandi Clement
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 8:31 AM
To: NewBarrieOP
Cc: Rick Martellacci
Subject: Letter re 2nd Draft of City of Barrie Official Plan-377 Big Bay Point Road
Attachments: Letter re. 2nd OP Draft_377 BBP.pdf
Categories: Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz

Please find attached a letter that we are submitting on behalf of our client for the lands at 377 Big Bay Point Road in reference to the 2nd Official Plan Draft. Thank you.

Regards,

Brandi L. Clement, MURP, AICP, MCIP, RPP

Partner

The Jones Consulting Group Ltd.

229 Mapleview Drive East, Unit 1, Barrie, ON L4N0W5
Phone (705) 734-2538 ext 224 Fax (705) 734-1056

Cell (705) 795-0337

Email bclement@jonesconsulting.com
www.jonesconsulting.com



Please note that The Jones Consulting Group will be blocking all emails containing compressed attachments with file extensions such as .zip or .rar. When sending a .zip file please rename the extension to .zi_ or use an FTP site.

RESTRICTED ACCESS BUSINESS OPERATIONS

As the health and safety of our clients, suppliers, staff and families is our top priority during this period of uncertainty, commencing April 5th 2020, and until further notice, the Jones Consulting Group Ltd. office will be closed.

We are closely monitoring the situation and are following the practices recommended by local and international authorities to minimize the risk of exposure to the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) while doing everything in our power to ensure that our services continue uninterrupted.

Therefore, please note, until further notice, the Jones Consulting Group staff will be working remotely and will respond by e-mail and/or phone only. The office access will be closed.

We remain committed to providing the service you have come to expect from us, however, during this time, the JonesConsulting Group Ltd. may be rescheduling non-essential or non-urgent services as deemed appropriate in order to reduce exposure to the virus and protect everyone's health.



May 28, 2021

VIA EMAIL

Tomasz Wierzba, MCIP, RPP
Policy Planner

City of Barrie

70 Collier Street, P.O Box 400
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5
new.barrieop@barrie.ca

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

**Re: Comments re. 2nd Draft of City of Barrie Official Plan
Property: 377 Big Bay Point Road**

Our client, Big Bay 4 Inc., is in the process of developing the lands known municipally as 377 Big Bay Point Road with upwards of 29 Townhouses. A Pre-Consultation meeting was held on August 14, 2020 and a Neighbourhood Meeting was held on May 13th, 2021 (File No. D28-031-2020). Formal applications for a Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Condominium have not been submitted as of yet but are expected to be submitted to the City in the summer of 2021.

The subject lands are currently designated Residential in the Official Plan. Permitted densities within this designation include low-density residential uses to a maximum of 25 units per net hectare, medium density uses to a maximum of 53 units per net hectare, and high density uses in excess of 54 units per net hectare. The plan proposes a density of approximately 50 units per net residential hectare is permitted within the current Official Plan designation.

The 2nd Draft of the Official Plan designates the subject lands as Neighbourhood Area. This designation provides most of the City's low rise housing stock, permits development that respects the existing scale, and permits limited levels of intensification. Permitted uses within this designation include residential, home occupation, parks and open spaces, day care and private home day care, supportive housing, commercial, and retail. Townhouses are a permitted housing type in the Neighbourhood Area designation, among other buildings types including detached dwelling, semi-detached dwelling, additional residential units, low-rise buildings and mid-rise buildings. Additionally, the minimum residential density for development occurring on lands fronting on streets classified as collector or above should be 60.0 units per hectare. Based on these policies, the proposed use is permitted; however, the density of the proposed townhouse development does not meet the minimum density standard of 60.0 units per hectare considering the lands front onto Big Bay Point Road, an arterial road. Further, Section 3.3.2(f) notes to provide privacy and daylight/sunlight conditions for adjacent lower scale housing that proposed townhouses that abuts the rear years of a lot with a detached house, semi-detached house, or townhouse, shall generally be setback a minimum 7.5 metres from the property line. The proposed development does not propose a rear yard setback of 7.5 metres as the infill site is constrained by the shape and topography of the lot.

In our opinion, the minimum density target of 60.0 units per hectare on lands fronting onto collector roads or above can be difficult to achieve when considering various items such as property configuration, topography and location. We agree with the softened language in the 2nd Official Plan Draft which notes 'should be' rather than 'shall be' as long as this is considered to be less restrictive

language meaning that if for various reasons a property cannot achieve this density then an Official Plan Amendment is not required. Further, in our opinion the Official Plan should not have prescriptive language requiring a particular setback distance as an Official Plan document is to be more general where a zoning by-law includes specific prescriptive requirements. We would request that the City have language suggesting how to provide appropriate buffers between new and existing development but that language identifying exact distances be excluded.

We look forward to your review and continuing to be involved in this process. Please also accept this letter as our formal request to be notified of all future meetings regarding the Official Plan Review process.

Sincerely,

THE JONES CONSULTING GROUP LTD.



Brandi L. Clement, MURP, AICP, MCIP, RPP
Partner

Cc: Big Bay 4 Inc., Owner

Joanne Werth

From: Judi Shields
Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 12:18 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: Comment on Barrie Official Plan Draft 2
Categories: Yellow Category

To Whom It May Concern:

The congregation of Grace United Church wishes to express its support of the inclusion of section 6.4,1 Vulnerable Populations in the second draft of the City of Barrie's Official Plan. In particular, we are in agreement with: "The City will support and establish, where appropriate, the facilities for for providing temporary emergency shelters, as well as cooling and warming stations throughout the City."

We would also advocate for the inclusion in this section, the provision of 365/24/7 open public washrooms and drinking water throughout the City.

Yours truly,

John McLean
Chair

Official Board

Grace United Church
Barrie

Joanne Werth

From: Kelly Lagace
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 12:01 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba; NewBarrieOP
Subject: 969, 979 + 989 Mapleview Dr E (Barrie) - Sandy Creek Estates Inc. Comments on 2nd Draft of Official Plan
Attachments: Initial Review of Draft 2 Official Plan Letter - 21-06-02.pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Good morning Mr. Wierzba,

Please kindly find attached a letter from Sandy Creek Estates Inc. outlining comments from our office's review of thesecond draft of the Official Plan, particularly concerning our properties at 969, 979 and 989 Mapleview Drive East.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our remarks,

Kelly Lagace

Crystal Homes

**Bronte Community Developments Corporation
Harvest Hills Development Corporation**

Paris Grand Estates Inc.

**TSTL (Deerpath) Building Corporation
TWKD Developments Inc.**

Phone: (289) 337-3486 ext. 203

Fax: (289) 337-4050

E-mail: kelly@crystalhomes.com

Disclaimer: This communication may contain information that is legally privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please note that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Anyone who receives this message and any attachments thereto in error should please notify the sender immediately by telephone or e-mail and delete them from his or her computer.



June 2, 2021

City Hall of Barrie70
Collier Street
P.O. Box 400
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 4T5

new.barrieop@barrie.ca

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

tomasz.wierzba@barrie.ca

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

Re: Initial Review of the Draft 2 Official Plan – May 2021 Version

Please accept the following as comments on Draft 2 of the City of Barrie Official Plan (OP) – May 2021 version with respect to the parcels located at 969, 979 and 989 Mapleview Drive East (southwest and southeast corner of Mapleview Drive East and the extension of Terry Fox Drive). These remarks are in addition to our previous comments dated December 22, 2020.

The subject lands are proposed to be designated (as per various screen shots included below):

- Designated Greenfield Area – Map 1
- “Medium Density” and “Neighbourhood Area” – Map 2
- “Natural Heritage System” (NHS) on the stream corridor going through the property and the southern boundary – Map 2
- Future Gathering Space – Map 8
- Phases 1 and 2 (north of the NHS), and Phase 2 (south of the NHS) – Appendix 2


The subject property is outlined in red on the maps below.

Map 2 – Land Use Designations:




- | | | |
|--|---|--|
|  Neighbourhood Area |  Natural Heritage System |  Defined Policy Area |
|  Medium Density |  Greenspace | |

Map 8 – Cultural City Features:



Appendix 2 – Phasing Plan:



It is noted in Appendix 2 above, that the legend colours do not match the phasing labels on the Plan. To this end, it is assumed that the portion of the site above the NHS area is proposed to be partly in Phase 1 and partly in Phase 2, and the lands south of the NHS area are proposed to be in Phase 2. There is comment on the phasing further below.

We reserve the right to comment on additional items, as well as, comment on the draft Urban Design Guidelines.

POLICY COMMENTS

1. **Current Proposal** – There is a proposal for a mixed-use, ground oriented commercial/residential development, and a “regional” stormwater management pond on the lands north of the NHS. This is consistent with the existing policy context. The lands south of the NHS are in a different phase and an application for these lands will be forthcoming when permitted under the policy context.
2. **Designated Greenfield**
 - Policy 2.4.2.3 c) identifies that the housing mix for the Designated Greenfield Area shall target a higher-than-historical proportion of medium and high density housing with at least 52% of housing being high density development. It is understood that the 52% figure emanated from the City’s Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). The MCR identifies a second suite in a residential unit as a form of high density development. It is requested that the OP recognize the intent of the MCR by acknowledging that second suites meet the 52% policy criteria.
 - Policy 2.4.2.3 e) v) discusses the creation of neighbourhoods with parks and schools as their focal points within a five-minute walk of most residents. It is requested that “open space or natural heritage system” be one of the listed focal points. These naturalized areas can provide for appropriate focal points within a community.
 - Policy 2.4.2.3 f) identifies that the planned density is 79 people and jobs per hectare to the year 2051. It is understood that this was intended to identify 62 people and jobs per hectare to 2041 and 79 from 2041 to 2051; please confirm. Also, it is requested that the policy be amended to identify that the development is to be measured across the entire Designated Greenfield Area and not on a site-by-site basis.
 - For policy 2.4.2.3 h), new applications should not be evaluated against previous approvals which conformed under previous policies. Also, the density target “test” is to be applied across the entirety of the Designated Greenfield Area, not on a site-by-site basis. It is requested that this policy be removed.
 - Reference to tenure should be removed throughout the document.
3. **Conformity** [Policy 2.5.3 b)] – Requiring consistency with the City’s Urban Design Guidelines should be removed; Council can provide direction to staff on this matter. The Guidelines have not been completed and should not be elevated to the level of policy without the Planning Act direction related to policy.

4. **Condominium Roads** – It is questioned why a condominium street is not permitted to connect to a condominium street as per policy 2.5 d).
5. **Neighbourhood Area** – Policy 2.6.1.3 d) requires retail and commercial uses within a five minute walk of other retail and commercial uses (450 metres) within Neighbourhood Areas on Collector or Arterial Streets or Intensification Corridors. This will have the effect of dispersing commercial uses along a road. Commercial uses rely on synergies which include adjacency to each other. It is requested that this policy be removed or, at a minimum, be changed to 800 metres (approximately a 10 minute walk).
6. **Neighbourhood Area** – As per policies 2.6.1.3 e) i) and ii), the residential density on local roads is identified as a minimum of 50 uph, and on Collector and above streets, the minimum is 60 uph. The densities provided are too high and preclude many types of development other than stacked townhouses or mid-rise buildings. On Collector and higher order roads, densities would be reached that are similar to those for the UGC and are well above the Designated Greenfield Density of 62 and 79 people and jobs per hectare [2.4.2.3 f)]. At 62 people and jobs per hectare, this results in a uph in the range of 25, not 50. The inclusion of the word “should” in the policy does not provide sufficient policy direction. The uph should be appropriately lowered to reflect the policy intent and the people and jobs per hectare.
7. **Medium Density** – As identified, the lands between Mapleview Drive East (an Arterial Road) and the NHS area to the south on the site are proposed to be designated “Medium Density”. The property is near the furthest extent of the eastern edge of the City and has limited area for development due to the need to accommodate a “regional” stormwater management facility. It is suggested that a large built form in this section is not appropriate, does not provide a destinational aspect to it, nor will it be serviced by a large nearby population as the intended realignment of the Sandy Cove Creek channel abutting the property will reduce the population that would have utilized Terry Fox Drive to get to Mapleview Drive East. The planned function of Terry Fox Drive as a Collector Road has effectively been moved further east due to the upcoming creek realignment. It is requested therefore that the building height policies of 2.6.2.3 c) be amended to provide for a minimum height of three stories along Arterial streets for this location.
8. **Medium Density** – Policy 2.6.2.3 b) i) provides criteria where single use residential is permitted where there is “...existing commercial or retail lands within...”. It is requested that this be amended to allow for **planned** commercial or retail (not just existing). Many developments are master planned and, as such, planned commercial or retail could be provided for which would satisfy the policy context of having such uses in proximity to planned residential.
9. **Human Scale Design** – It is not understood how a development proposal “shall” demonstrate “improve the city’s legibility, navigability and sense of place” [3.2.1 a)].
10. **Over Development** – Policy 3.2.1 b) relates to, among others, exceedances in maximum permitted height or density, “inappropriate built form”, “unwarranted variances” and shadow impacts. A hard approach to these matters as criteria for over development will, it is submitted, reduce design and functional flexibility and potentially usurps someone’s right to have variances considered if the Planning Act tests can be met. For example, a height exceedance for a desired

design element, or higher density for the provision of more affordable or attainable built housing form. It is questioned how the City will evaluate “inappropriate built form” and it is likely that every multi-story building will have some amount of shadow impact. Also, it is not understood what the City means by identifying that development that “impacts local amenity” will not be supported.

11. **Sustainable and Resilient Design** – It is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document. For example, all development (including applications for minor variances) shall demonstrate i) passive energy design strategies, iii) use of environmentally preferable products, iv) enhancement of environmental quality, and vii) resource conservation through operational and maintenance practices, among others. It is requested that these policies be removed.
12. **Green Development Standards** – It is requested that policy 3.2.3.1 be removed. Several of the criteria are not land use related (e.g. demonstrating enhanced indoor air quality and use of various building products) and some can be provided for in the Urban Design Guidelines, such as the provision of permeable pavers and drought resistant landscaping.
13. **Tenure** – The policies speak about “tenure” throughout and should be removed.
14. **Design/Mobility Policies and Uses Within Buildings** – Policy 4.3.1.12.3 h) requires cycling storage lockers, racks, shower facilities, and repair apparatus in mixed-use buildings, residential apartment buildings, institutional, and office buildings. It is submitted that a land use plan should not be dictating uses interior to a building.
15. **Parking Solutions** – It is requested that in the suite of City considerations for reducing parking standards, that provision of affordable housing and neighbourhood level commercial be added [4.7 d)].
16. **Parks** - Please provide confirmation that the parks policies in 5.6 adhere to the Hewitt’s Landowners’ executed Master Parkland Agreement with the City; if not, please amend accordingly.
17. **Parkland Dedication** – For policies 5.9.1 c) and d), it is requested that reference to the 5% residential and 2% commercial cash-in-lieu rates be amended from “gross” to “net”. Also, please confirm that the site is not required to pay cash-in-lieu of parkland as it has been satisfied through the Master Parkland Agreement.
18. **Attainable Housing** – Policy 6.4.1 c) is worded such that housing to be provided within the City for the “entire population” is attainable. It is requested that this be removed. The policy can be re-characterized as supporting the provision of housing across the whole housing continuum.
19. **Affordable Housing** – Policy 6.4.2 d) requires ALL ground related housing to include options for purchasers to have two units in the main building, or an additional ancillary structure. With the OP policies providing hard maximum densities and requirements for parking per unit, it is requested that this policy identify the desire for optional second units, but that the option not be a requirement for every unit.

20. **Affordable Housing** – Policy 6.4.2 e) requires an Affordable Housing Report, by a qualified professional, for every development and redevelopment. It is requested that this be removed. This adds another layer on to applications, and suggests that a report would be required for an addition of a unit in a dwelling (redevelopment). The policy framework provides sufficient parameters for the City to work towards provision of affordable housing, as well as government initiatives such as the work of the City and the County of Simcoe for provision of affordable units. The City has a way to track this information and it is understood that the City is meeting, or close to meeting, various of its affordable housing targets. Also, much of the affordability price point lags by about 12 to 18 months and is thus potentially out of date when it is being considered.
21. **Affordable Housing** – Policies 6.4.2 e) iii) and iv) require all development with 40 residential units or larger to demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units, and that in certain classes of development, three bedroom units or larger are to meet the definition of affordable. These policies have the potential to result in these units being subsidized by the remainder of the units in a project and no guarantee can be provided that these units will remain affordable through resale (especially if large in size). The City has various other policies and mechanisms solely on for the provision of affordable housing units including using viable incentives. It is requested that these policies be removed.
22. **Public Art** – Policy 8.3.3 a) requires that development proposals shall identify opportunities for the inclusion of public art. It is submitted that the prescribed nature of this policy is not appropriate and would pertain to classes of development, such as minor variances, as well as others.
23. **Phasing** – Policy 9.5.2 a) i) states that a condition of Final Approval is occupancy. It is requested that this be removed. With a subdivision, for example, occupancy happens after issuance of a building permit, and a building permit is typically only issued after Final Approval. If the intention is to state that occupancy cannot occur until after Final Approval, it is suggested that the policy be re-worded.
24. **Subdivision Policies** – It is requested that the requirement in policy 9.5.3 to review impacts to the City tax base in relation to subdivisions, the requirement for traffic calming, and the requirement for vegetation removal only within 30 days of grading, be reconsidered. With respect to vegetation removal, the Migratory Bird Act, in effect, only allows tree removal during the fall and winter months, and grading normally cannot occur during that time period. Further, development of large sites typically cannot occur within 30 days of vegetation removal. It is requested that these policies be removed or, in the case of vegetation removal, that the policy be amended to provide for an alternative approach to the satisfaction of the City.
25. **Subdivision Policies** – In policy 9.5.3 i), the lapse date should include provision for extensions.
26. **Site Plan Control** – Policy 9.5.7 b) identifies that applications NOT subject to site plan control are required to provide elevations; it is assumed that elevations are required for applications which ARE subject to site plan control. Please amend or provide a rationale as to why non-Section 41 applications require elevations.

SITE SPECIFIC MAPPING

1. **Map 8 - Future Gathering Space** – A gathering space is proposed on the property. The approved Hewitt’s Secondary Plan policies provide for parks, open space areas, village squares and natural heritage areas secondary plan wide, and there has been a detailed and integrated collective landowner approach for these “common spaces”, including exchange of payment for these uses. The proposed OP should honour this long and detailed arrangement, and thus, the gathering space should be removed from the site. The policies identify that gathering spaces are to be provided in medium and high density areas [8.3.2] whereas this proposed gathering space is located in a Neighbourhood Area designation. The general location is also identified in the existing Secondary Plan for a stormwater management facility.
2. **Appendix 2 - Phasing** – As identified above, the legend does not appear to adhere to the phase naming on the Appendix itself, and it is assumed that north of the NHS area the site is identified as being in Phase 1 and Phase 2. The Appendix should be revised to reflect that the area north of the NHS area is in Phase 1 in accordance with the existing policy framework [Hewitt’s OP policy 9.7.3.2 e)]. It is noted that **NO** pumping station is required as per the policies of this section.

We thank you for your attention to this matter and we reserve the right to comment on the next draft and the Urban Design Guidelines.

Best Regards,

Sandy Creek Estates Inc.

K. Di Silvestro
President

Joanne Werth

From: Kelly1200
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 7:35 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: OP Feedback
Categories: Yellow Category

Thanks for the opportunity to once again provide feedback on the Official Plan, a very important document that will drive our future. I appreciate all of the incredible work and time that was put into this, it's no small feat!

OVERALL Feedback

The Plan is 210 pages long using language that is often jargon based - it is daunting and complex. The general public needs to see something that is clear and easy to understand. When we do provide feedback, that important feedback seems to have not been heard. We did not get a summary of the most recent concerns/feedback and have them addressed (2020). Barrie's 2019 engagement feedback was summarized but not linked to any changes made.

SOLUTION - I would look to the (Ottawa) New Official Plan FAQ's as an example of completing the feedback circle here. The questions are all answered, Barrie's community engagement questions and concerns have not been answered or is there any where to see that the changes have been implemented or at least addressed in the FAQ's for all of this process from the beginning.

https://engage.ottawa.ca/the-new-official-plan?tool=news_feed#tool_tab

Here the concerns and comments in Ottawa are all addressed **clearly and in plain language. They created one-pagers that are easy to read and interpret.** https://engage.ottawa.ca/the-new-official-plan/news_feed/one-pagers-and-feedback-forms

OTHER IRONS IN THE FIRE

Show us that all of the plans and documents that are currently in play or being worked on – GHG, Active Transportation Master Plan, Climate Action Plans, Stormwater Climate Action Fund etc. are all linked and connected to the OP – is there an overall matrix that shows these connections and how they feed each other and that they are not being worked on in isolation of the OP or visa versa.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

We need to be better at attracting true affordable housing developers and partnering with existing ones like Redwood Park Communities, this is a priority and needs to be addressed completely in the OP. Let's do better. Care for and house our homeless and ensure that rent is affordable for all.

GREEN CITY needs to be the overall driving force behind this plan, Barrie needs to be seen as the leader in sustainable development, caring for it's community in a healthy way that takes care of our beautiful Lake Simcoe, greenspace and attracts businesses and development that embrace that focus.

Green Development Standards need to be developed quickly using best practices that already exist. We need to be very clear and firm with new developments that the City will not entertain your development unless basic criteria are met.

Look to Passive House Canada.

In fact, GREEN STANDARDS need to be the driving force in all areas/departments of the City. Each department could have a very specific and clear matrix that guides

purchases, practices (Parks maintenance, transportation usage, idling, roads maintenance, fleet, greenhouse, native species etc.) and these GREEN standards need to be clear and shared with the residents to encourage similar behavior that enhance and care for our City's greenspace, lands and water.

Connecting with Community

We need to do better at engaging the public's feedback in this City. We need to look to other City's like Ottawa, and their best practices for engagement. What do they do differently to get the engagement level that they get?

VISION STATEMENT

The current community vision statement needs to be compelling, specific and clearly states who we are and our goals. Make it easy for residents to connect with it. It reads like a Planning Statement right now. It's long. Use words like inclusion, environmentally responsible, indigenous. We must think of our future generations.

Examples of clear, precise Vision statements:

City of North Vancouver will be a vibrant, diverse and highly livable community that is resilient to climate or other changes, and sustainable in its ability to prosper without sacrifice to future generations

Toronto:

- Toronto is a caring city
- Toronto is a clean, green and sustainable city
- Toronto is a dynamic city
- Toronto invests in quality of life

VAUGHN

A city of choice that promotes diversity, innovation and opportunity for all citizens, fostering a vibrant community life that is inclusive, progressive, environmentally responsible and sustainable.

Victoria:

Victoria is an urban sustainability leader inspiring innovation, pride and progress towards greater ecological integrity, livability, economic vitality, and community resiliency confronting the changes facing society and the planet today and for generations to come, while building on Victoria's strengths as a harbour-centred, historic, capital city that provides exceptional quality of life through a beautiful natural setting, walkable neighbourhoods of unique character, and a thriving Downtown that is the heart of the region.

ORILLIA

The City of Orillia's mission is to enrich the quality of life for all members of this community by providing professional and progressive services and programs that foster health and wellness, protect the environment, embrace diversity, honour culture and actively explore opportunities for the future.

Orillia is progressive and sustainable, offering an exceptional quality of life, vibrant culture, beautiful waterfronts and a compassionate, welcoming and inclusive community.

Here are some ideas

Barrie is an engaging, inclusive waterfront community that cares about environmentally sustainable growth and quality of life for all.

An inclusive, connected, prosperous city where we look after each other and our environment.

To enhance community and individual well being – social, economic, and physical. To protect and improve the environment. To provide quality service equitably.

Thanks

Kelly

Kelly Patterson McGrath

Joanne Werth

From: Leslie Warren
Sent: Monday, May 17, 2021 7:19 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Cc: Keenan Aylwin
Subject: 6.4.2 Affordable Housing

Categories: Yellow Category

Several inputs for future consideration.

[1]

I owned a 3B2B condo for 3.5 years on Greenwich Street.

I generally had a boarder for my third bedroom ~6 months a year.

The first boarder was an Afghan refugee (wonderful Fullbright Scholar lad).

As soon as my first boarder came in, wildfire gossip throughout the property and voila – a new rule announced from the Board:

No boarders will be permitted.

It's a pile of nonsense and I realized that I had nothing to worry about – but it is very meaningful to a city like Barrie.

Across the city, condo boards will try to block boarders.

And what did shock me, were all the lovely friends I had and knew in that building who were scandalized that I would take in a boarder and entirely of the belief that I was breaking a rule.

I tried to point out that the board could not legally enforce such a rule but that is not the point either: you have many residents in Barrie who believe it is wrong to have boarders and illegal to have them if there is a rule against it.

And you know why I took in boarders? Because I could. Because I had two extra bedrooms. I did not need to do that.

But the GRIEF because of it was sad and disappointing.

I sold my place... who wants to live amongst such a bunch of creeps?

I had four fabulous male boarders over my 3.5 years who could not afford anywhere else. Period. One of them was tapped out at my \$900 per month.

(\$900 per month included dedicated bathroom, underground parking spot, all utilities and internet, insuite laundry, dedicated refrigerator; not to mention, a stunningly gorgeous unit with beautiful views from every window.)

Everytime I advertised, I had loads of inquiries.

Every boarder told me they were disgusted at what was on offer between \$550 and \$1000. Nothing compared to what I offered.

[2]

I am watching many classic boarding houses disappear into this raging RE market.

It is very obvious to me that if these houses do continue as boarding houses, they will be at much great rent once the new owner makes his reno changes.

[3]

I am watching **'ancillary' units** go up and noticing that they are going to be charging **a pretty penny** for these.

Amongst the 3 noted above, there will be very little on offer within 2 years in Barrie for the employed who can only afford a boarding type option.

The city CAN play a role in communicating that boarding is NOT an evil. That it is legal per your current bylaws.

etc.

But your new ancillary permitting scenario is actually only going to load up on higher ticket rental dollars.

I see nothing on the horizon that actually addresses real people budgets of \$900 per month. Nothing. THAT is what is affordable to many EMPLOYED people.

Talk talk talk about affordable housing. But it is not defined. Anywhere.

As for these words:

shared accommodations, co-ownership housing, co-operative housing, community land trusts, land lease community homes, affordable housing, and inclusive and accessible housing for people with special needs

Only one question: when? and for how many?

And one final word. Above my current rental is a one bedroom with 2 old guys. One of them has to leave – the tenant has only been allowing him to share rent until he could find another place.

His budget is \$650. He will never find anything.

It is going to be a police mess one day when the tenant says enough and throws/tosses the other guy out on the street.

We will probably see a lot more on the street...

Leslie Warren

definition open-pit sewer: facebook

Joanne Werth

From: Luisa Di Iulio
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 5:09 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Cc: Tomasz Wierzba
Subject: Draft 2, Barrie's New Official Plan
Attachments: Letter-City of Barrie-May 28, 2021.pdf

Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Good afternoon.

Attached please find a letter from Allandale Centre Inc., dated May 28, 2021, in response to your request for comments regarding the City's Draft 2 of the new Official Plan.

I would appreciate your confirming receipt.

Regards, LUISA DI

IULIO

Allandale Centre Inc.

1858 Avenue Road, Suite 200
Toronto, ON, M5M 3Z5
Tel: (416) 739-7758
Fax: (416) 739-7756

May 23, 2021

Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner
City of Barrie, City Hall

new.barrieop@barrie.ca

70 Collier Street

PO Box 400

Barrie, ON
L4M 4T5

Re: Draft 2 (May 2021)
City of Barrie Official Plan
367-371, 375, 389, 393 Yonge Street

Allandale Centre Inc. owns 367-371, 389 & 393 Yonge Street and represents 375 Yonge Street for the purpose of comment on the City's planning documents.

As the City is aware, the site is currently in an Intensification Node and on an Intensification Corridor and designated 'General Commercial'. The site hosts several one-story commercial and office buildings.

The site is proposed in Draft 2 of the proposed new Official Plan to be designated "Neighbourhood Area" (see screen shot below - site is identified in the red "box")



The site is also on the Yonge Street Intensification Corridor within the proposed polices.

We would request that the properties be re-designated to "Medium Density" and that a higher height be provided for this site than the current proposed Medium Density policies for the following reasons:

- The site remains located on an Intensification Corridor,
- The site has a greater depth than is characteristic of many underutilized parcels of land on Intensification Corridors thus providing for appropriate depths for transition to the adjacent low density neighbourhood,
- The site is within walking distance of a school, commercial, parks and trails
- As a land assembly, the site provides ample opportunity to allow for at grade amenity space, commercial and landscaping.

Although we appreciate that the site remains on an Intensification Corridor within the new proposed policies, the policy context for the Intensification policies appears to limit development to what is permitted in the underlying designation (policy 2.3.6 c) which, in this case is six stories (2.6.1.3 c).

We are in the process of submitting an application for three mixed-use multi storey buildings on the site.

We would request the opportunity to review the policies in detail and retain our right to further comment and to comment on the Urban Design Guidelines.

We thank you in advance for consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

CENTRE INC.

Gubert

Joanne Werth

From: Mark B
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 7:53 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: 265 St Vincent St. Proposed land designation change
Categories: Yellow Category

Hello official planning committee,

I would like to formally provide a submission requesting my property at 265 St Vincent Street be designated Medium Density (orange) in the third draft of the City of Barrie's Official Plan (OP).

Factors supporting this reclassification from Neighbourhood Area (yellow) to Medium Density (orange) include:

- it is a large land parcel at the intersection of a 4 lane arterial road (St Vincent) and a collector road (Grove St), with frontage along both roads
- It is strategically located within 1.5 km of Georgian College & RVH, 2km from Downtown Barrie, & has easy and quick highway access, & bus routes servicing the property
- The intersection it is located in has a gas station, & a 4-story apartment building, with more 3-4 story apartment buildings within a block of this intersection on Grove Street going West, representing a transitioning area for density- appropriate growth
- Having a medium density designation that will allow 6+ stories instead of a limit of 4 stories, will facilitate the city's goal of increasing density-based housing supply quicker and sooner, as an increase in density designation will facilitate attracting interest in developing my property sooner, instead of continuing to operating it as a chiropractor office, which due to its valuable location and the lack of housing in Barrie, is no longer the highest and best use of this site.

I trust these comments suffice your requirements for consideration of medium density zoning for the third draft of the OP.

Please contact me by [REDACTED] and/or email if you have any questions. Thank you kindly,

Dr Mark Blair (property owner)

Joanne Werth

From: Mark Doherty
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 3:49 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: 521 Huronia

Categories: Yellow Category

I'm writing to you, as I understand this to be an opportunity to voice my opposition to the proposed development at 521Huron Rd. Ultimately my neighbors and I all share the same stance about this proposal and the destruction of – what we on [REDACTED] know to be - a very significant wetland. Perhaps unlike my neighbors though, I would like to only ask you why? Why is this a consideration?

This will be the last remnant of forested area in this neighborhood. The last of the greenspace. Both ends of Loon Ave along Lovers Creek, and all along Huronia between Mapleview and Big Bay Point are new developments. A gas station...medical center... we cannot keep track of what else is being proposed, as blue and white notices are going up on every lot along this corridor. It really should scare all of us how much of this wetland is being chipped away at to make room for...well... the same subdivision sprawling out from the Go Train since the parking lot there was first opened. And with all of the massive subdivisions less than a kilometer away, do we really need to sacrifice something so precious to allow more of the same? More stacked homes? More density?

Now – thanks to this proposal at 521 Huronia – the neighboring lot to the east is quickly getting ducks in a row to develop there as well. Obvious signs that the decisions you're making now are going to have repercussions that last until long after we are all gone. You are going to allow a foot in the door that will undo everything we all say we love about this city; everything that makes Barrie so special. Its trees, and parks, and a peaceful serenity that comes with allowing neighborhoods to have these beautiful community spaces. Once you allow a road to be built between the quiethouses on Loon, you are allowing access for developers to come in and chip it all away. Maybe this council won't allow that, but you will make it easy for future councils to. And we all know they will.

Please. Stand up for Barrie. Look further down the road, it only starts with 521 Huronia... it would not end there. Mark Doherty
[REDACTED]

Joanne Werth

From: Mark Resnick
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 4:00 PM
To: Michelle Banfield; Tomasz Wierzba; Anna Sajecki; NewBarrieOP
Subject: SmartCentres Submission on Barrie Official Plan (2nd Draft)
Attachments: SmartCentres Comments on 2nd draft Barrie OP - June 2-2021.pdf

Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

To the OP Team,

Attached please find our submission on the 2nd draft of the Barrie Official Plan. Thank You,

Mark

Mark Resnick, Director, Development

Phone • 647-362-3212

Mobile • 416-358-0822

Email • mresnick@smartcentres.com



3200 Highway 7, Vaughan, Ontario, L4K 5Z5

SmartCentres Disclaimer: The information contained in this communication is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the intended recipient please delete the email immediately. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or acting in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd. Thank You.



SMARTCENTRES
REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUST

3200 HIGHWAY 7 • VAUGHAN, ON • L4K 5Z5
T 905 326 6400 • F 905 326 0783

-Sent via email June 2, 2021-

To: Tomasz Wierzba

Policy Planner

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

Barrie, ON., L4M 4T5

RE: Review of City of Barrie's Draft Two of the Official Plan

Dear Mr. Wierzba,

SmartCentres is pleased to provide this letter regarding the second draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan (hereafter referred to as the Official Plan) that has been released to the public for comment. We provided comments on the first draft of the Official Plan and participated in multiple stakeholder sessions. We commend staff for establishing a very collaborative process to facilitate input, such as the comments provided in this letter, on this very important policy document. We look forward to staying engaged throughout the balance of this process.

This letter summarizes SmartCentres' collective comments for consideration by staff in finalizing the Official Plan. The comments that follow are presented thematically with specific policy # references (identified in **Bolded** text) embedded in the commentary to help guide staff.

We are available to discuss should staff have any questions about the contents of this letter. Finally, we would appreciate a response from staff on any requests for clarification identified in our comments.

Sincerely,

Mark Resnick, MCIP RPP
Director, Development

SECTION 1 - GENERAL COMMENTS

1. Cash-In-Lieu of Parking

The Official Plan speaks to the better utilization of land and a movement towards less reliance on the automobile, with the transition to a multi-modal transportation system. Reductions in parking are an important element in achieving this goal. Additionally, cash-in-lieu is an avoidable cost that can significantly impact the cost of housing, at a time when more affordable housing is needed in the City.

Policies 4.7 (e) and (f) appropriately permit parking reductions in all land use designations. This permission, however, is qualified as being in accordance with the City's cash-in-lieu of parking by-law. The same policies also require, at a minimum, that cash-in-lieu of parking be paid where a reduction is sought.

While requiring cash-in-lieu of parking is an appropriate tool in specific circumstances, it is not in our view, appropriate to require it in all circumstances and that is not how the City has historically, in practice, applied the cash-in-lieu of parking by-law. It is our understanding that the application of cash-in-lieu of parking is the opposite of what is proposed and only applied occasionally. To do otherwise, will serve as a disincentive to reduce parking, even where it is appropriate and justified by a parking justification report.

2. Cash-In-Lieu Parkland

Policy 5.9.1 establishes the cash-in-lieu of parkland policies. We seek clarification that these policies align with the City's cash-in-lieu of parkland by-law. As one example, **Policy 5.9.1(d)** states that a rate of 2% of total gross land area applies to all non-residential development but is silent on Institutional uses. If we are to assume **5.9.1(d)** includes Institutional uses then the policy does not align to the cash-in-lieu of parkland by-law which requires a rate of 5% for Institutional uses.

Further, **Policy 5.9.1 (k)** states, " *the City may consider alternative means for establishing new parkland and parkland improvements, including, but not limited to: iii) Seeking partnerships, conservation easements, and/or joint provision of land.*"

We seek clarification on the underlined phrasing. Are the underlined phrases in reference to what is also commonly known as Privately-Owned Publicly-accessible Space ('POPS')? If yes, we suggest using this term as it is a more commonly known description that would be appropriate to include in the policy.

3. Affordable Housing

The Official Plan contains numerous policies outlining the new requirements for provision of affordable housing. These policies include but are not limited to **Policies 2.3.2(e)(ii) & 2.3.4 (a)(iii) & 6.4.2(e)**. As we have commented to staff in meetings and prior submissions, policies

that mandate provision of affordable housing are in effect inclusionary zoning. It is our understanding that Provincial Policy (Bill 108) for inclusionary zoning mandates that it can only be applied in areas that have a Development Permit System in place or within a Major Transit Station Area~~s~~, and only once the pre-requisite studies have been completed. We are not aware

that these requirements are in place and thus the Official Plan Policies requiring affordable housing are not enforceable.

Staff have advised that the inclusion of these policies in the Official Plan is a first step towards meeting the Provincial requirements outlined above. In our view, the policies for affordable housing should be amended or removed.

Amendments could include addition of policy language to clarify that the affordable housing requirements of the Official Plan are not in force until such time as the pre-requisite studies and polices have been put in place. Or alternatively, remove the requirements entirely until a comprehensive Official Plan Amendment based on the required studies can be brought forwards.

4. Variance from Official Plan Policy

Policy 2.5(a) allows for slight variation from development standards, except for variation to height and density. Allowing minor variation to provisions without requiring an amendment to the plan is a reasonable approach. Unique site circumstances can also impact height and density calculations and in our view the policy allowing slight variation should be inclusive of height and density. The City could also consider formalizing the permitted variance to height and density by specifying a limit to the permitted variation, for example, allowing for a maximum variation of up to 5% or 10%, subject to the site circumstances.

4. Indigenous Engagement

Policy 2.4.2.1 (k) The planning process provides many opportunities for engagement and often landowners consult above and beyond the minimum requirements to better engage with local interests, neighbours, and community organizations. In some instances, such as with Indigenous interests, which are commonly engaged in relation to the archaeological study of a property, there are Provincial guidelines and regulations that must be followed to ensure appropriate engagement. We seek clarification on how the policy for additional engagement will be practically applied by staff during the planning process of site-specific development applications, in order to ensure that the appropriate Indigenous communities are consulted with.

5. Planning a Connected and Mobile City

The Polices of **Section 4** and other polices throughout the plan establish a clear direction to implement *Complete Streets*. The achievement of complete streets, in our view, must be balanced and flexible to respond the local and planned urban contexts. To that end, we encourage the City to make use of positive city-building policies, particularly the policies in section 4.0, which aim to “*transform how people move around and through Barrie*”. Further, **we strongly encourage the City to explore integrating the numerous policies that promote *Complete Streets*, resulting in new language that allows for right-of-way widths to be reduced in urban contexts.** For example, Policy 4.2 (b) requires streets in Barrie to be designed as “*Complete Streets*” to provide for all modes of travel including pedestrian zones, cycling zones,

and vehicular zones. For sites located within an *Urban Growth Centre*, we strongly feel we can meet these objectives within reduced right-of-ways, as demonstrated in other municipalities.

Widening of roads in order to achieve Complete Streets in urban areas planned for higher densities like the UGC, Intensification Corridors or SGAs may have the unintended consequence of creating a highly suburban condition in these areas planned for dense urban conditions. We ask that the City not take a “one size fits all approach” with respect to road widenings, and although this new maximum ROW width is protected for Arterial Roads in Map 5 of the Draft Official Plan Amendment, **we request that the OPA include allowances for reduced / alternative ranges on roads within the *Urban Growth Centres and the Strategic Growth Areas*** . This is further demonstrated in Policy 4.2(d) which states “*the City may establish sub-typologies for streets to respond to the community structure and different land uses and guidance will be provided in the Urban Design Guidelines.*”. While we are supportive of the general intent of this policy, **we request this policy be expanded to more explicitly permit reduced dimensions for protected right-of-way widths within *Urban Growth Centres***. The same principles should be reinforced in the Urban Design Guidelines when they are prepared.

Policy No. 4.3.1.2 (vii) states “If the City has identified a street a part of the complete street network, reconfiguration resulting in a reduced street pavement width (to facilitate wider sidewalks and/or the addition of cycling lanes and/or transit priority lanes) may be explored with the City’s Engineering Department.”. **We request that the City expand and prioritize this policy, emphasizing that in *Urban Growth Centres*, a smaller right-of-way width should be a priority in design and implementation of Complete Streets.** We encourage the City to explore best practices in other municipalities, which include portions of the pedestrian clearways being provided on private property, seamlessly incorporated within a redevelopment of a site. Based on the City’s current approach, the proposed (potential) land dedication requirements (by way of road widening protections) set forth in the Draft Official Plan Amendment would significantly impact the development potential of properties, resulting in less economic investment in the City of Barrie.

Overall, we request that the road widening policies for *Arterial Roads*, located in *Urban Growth Centres* in the Draft OPA be modified to reflect the intentions of the City’s policies for *Complete Streets*, and further, we would like to review appropriate road widths with Transportation Staff.

As a final comment on Section 4, **Policy 4.3(j)** states “*Approval of new industrial, commercial and institutional development including new educational facilities, or other public service facilities shall be subject to the provision of adequate transportation service for all modes of transportation including public transit, active transportation and automobiles....*”. We seek clarification how staff will assess ‘adequate transportation service’, especially for infill development where the roads and surrounding context are already established a may limit opportunities.

6. Human Scale Design

Policy 3.2.1., as we understand from staff has been included to provide specific guidance in the Official Plan as a reference point for what staff view as the characteristics of *over-development*

when evaluating development proposals. While the policy is intended for this purpose, we caution against its inclusion as the policy can also serve as a basis for appeals and objections to development that while appropriate pushes many of these boundaries as Barrie grows into a mid-size City. If the policy is to remain, we suggest **Policy 3.2.1 (b)** be revised as detailed below.

- In the 1st paragraph of **3.2.1 (b)**, the last sentence states, “Over-development is characterized, but not limited to the following...”. We suggest the following in its place, “Over-development may be characterized, but not limited to the following...”.
- The current wording of **Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii)** reads as a definitive statement against any Official Plan Amendments for height and density, which we do not believe is staff’s intent. We believe staff are merely raising a caution over excessive height or density, a small but important distinction. The Policy states, “Development that exceeds the maximum permitted height or density”. An example alternative wording is, “Development that proposes excessive height or density”.

7. Complete Neighbourhood Design

Policy 3.2.2(a) requires that “*all development applications shall demonstrate how the proposal contributes...*” to a list of 9 criteria set-out in the policy. The policy as written suggests that all applications need to meet all the criteria. We encourage staff to build more flexibility into this policy to reflect the reality that new development will contribute to complete communities by meeting “some or all of the criteria as applicable”.

8. Context Sensitive Intensification

Policy 9.5.6 b) states “*The distance between the existing lot lines in an infill situation shall be approximately 150.0 metres or less.* We seek clarification on the intent of this policy, why it is included, and how it will be applied.

SECTION 2 - SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The comment in this section of the letter while specific are made in respect SmartCentres property at 15 Harvie Road. The property is an 88-acre undeveloped parcel s.w. of Harvie Road and Highway 400 on which SmartCentres is pursuing residential and employment uses as discussed with staff on numerous occasions.

1. Land Use Designation

We request that the Land Use Designation on **Map 2 Land Use Designations** for the eastern portion of the property between future Bryne Drive extension and Highway 400 be changed from “Employment – Industrial” to “Employment – Non-Industrial”.

The change in designation is requested as the “Employment – Non-Industrial” designation affords greater flexibility of land uses which we desire, inclusive of a range of Employment uses including Office, major retail, and industrial uses such as distribution, manufacturing, and warehousing. This desired flexibility was not offered in Employment designations established in the first draft of the Official Plan.

2. Development Standards - Neighbourhoods

SmartCentres has met with staff to discuss the land uses and future development of the property on numerous occasions. In these discussions and written submissions, we have made

clear our intent to develop Low-Rise Residential Buildings (up to 6-storeys) along the west side of the future Bryne Drive extension (an Arterial Road) for which staff have indicated their support. **Policy 2.6.1.3(c)** as written would not permit development over 4-Storeys on the

property as Bryne Drive is not an “Intensification Corridor”. Development to a height of 6-storeys, as stated in **Policy 2.6.1.3(d)** is only permitted on Intensification corridors. We request the Policies be amended to permit development to 6-storey along Bryne Drive on the property.

Additionally, we do not believe that, incorporating 50% non-residential uses at grade in the proposed Low-Rise Buildings on the property is necessary or viable. Depending on the final layout of the development it is possible that placement of Low-Rise Buildings on the property would be further than 450 meters triggering this requirement as set out in **Policy 2.6.1.3 (d)**.

The min 50% non-residential gfa at grade does not make sense for the property given the proximity to the extensive retail and commercial offerings along Bryne Drive and Mapleview Drive in the Strategic Growth Area.

We understand the basis of **Policy 2.6.1.3 (d)** is contribute to building complete communities, where residents can access their most basic, day-to-day needs within a short walk from home, however, this policy is very restrictive as non-residential uses at grade may not be suitable or viable for all sites. In our view, the 450 meters requirement alone may not be the best criteria on which to determine the need for non-residential uses at grade.

In our view, the requirement for non-residential uses should be market-driven, and not arbitrarily required in the Draft Official Plan. Since the policy specifies the measurement is from “existing commercial and retail uses” and not for example “lands zoned for retail and commercial uses” there is a real risk of a lack of consistency as to when and where the policy applies at any given time.

Joanne Werth

From: Marla Tomlinson
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 11:48 AM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: Official Plan - Growth in Barrie
Categories: Yellow Category

Hello,

I am writing to ask if there is a plan in place to increase rentals in Barrie. I do not see much in the official plan, but not sure if there is something else I should be looking for. The prices of rent in Barrie are outrageous. Basement apartments are going for over \$1600 these days, and there aren't many to find. I am a single mother who has a very good job (RVH) and I almost can't afford the rent in my current home. With the lack of rental buildings, there is a huge lack of supply.

Landlords are taking advantage of this and asking for rent that is more than it should be.

Are there plans for more rental buildings to go up? We have a lot of condo buildings in the works, but we need straight rentals.

Thank you,

Marla

Marla Tomlinson

From: [Matthew Cory](#)
To: [cityclerks](#); [NewBarrieOP](#); [Tomasz Wierzba](#)
Cc:
Subject: Building Barrie - DIV (Barrie) Comments on Draft Two of the Official Plan 2051
Date: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 3:56:14 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[2021 06 02 Barrie Draft Official Plan 2 Comments - DIV Barrie.pdf](#)

Dear Mr. Wierzba,

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. ("MGP") are the planners for DIV Development (Barrie) Ltd. ("DIV"), who own approximately 80 hectares of land located north of Lockhart Road and west of Sideroad 20 (the "Subject Lands"), within the Hewitt's Secondary Plan in the City of Barrie. MGP has participated in the Hewitt's Secondary Plan process since 2012 and has been monitoring and providing input into the City's New Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review process, including prior letters and deputations to Council and by participating in the City's 2020 stakeholder consultation sessions. The attached letter provides our additional comments on the Draft City of Barrie Official Plan Draft 2 2051 ("Draft Official Plan 2051") and continues the direction of comments over this history of input to the City including our most recent submission in December 2020 on the Draft Official Plan 2041.

In review of the new Draft Official Plan, we note that staff have undertaken significant effort to constructively respond to many of our comments. We would like to thank you for achieving compliance with the Growth Plan 2051 planning horizon and the inclusion of our clients' land within the settlement boundary. We have noted an error in which a portion of our client's lands have been excluded from the Designated Greenfield Area ("DGA") in Map 1 of the Draft Official Plan and request this be corrected to include these lands as part of the DGA. As per our previous comments, we believe these lands are required to allow the City to meet its growth forecast and support their inclusion in the settlement area boundary and designation for residential development. In addition, the removal of prescriptive urban design policies from the Official Plan, in favour of the preparation of a separate urban design guideline document is a positive change that enhances the usability of the Official Plan. However, many of our major comments made in December 2020 on the first draft of the Official Plan remain. The letter provides a summary of the major issues we believe must be addressed prior to issuance of a final Official Plan document to the Province for approval.

This letter also forms an outline of the comments I will make tonight at the public meeting.

We thank you for the ongoing opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Official Plan 2051. We have attempted to suggest policy solutions in the Official Plan with regard to the Subject Lands to address our concerns and we ask for a stakeholder meeting with you to review the issues raised in our comments and work through our other concerns and policy suggestions with the intent of expediting a revised Official Plan. Please contact me at any time to discuss our comments or arrange a meeting.

Yours truly,

Matthew James Cory, MCIP, RPP, PLE, PMP (HE/HIM)

Principal, Planner, Land Economist, Project Manager

Malone Given Parsons Ltd



40 years of making great places.

140 Renfrew Drive, Suite 201, Markham, ON, L3R 6B3 Canada www.mgp.ca
T: 1.905.513.0170 x116 M: 1.647.202.3096

The information contained in this transmission may be privileged and confidential. It is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return email and delete it.

June 2, 2021

MGP File: 12-2089

City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

via email: newbarrieop@barrie.ca and cityclerks@barrie.ca

**Attention: Mr. Tomasz Wierzba, RPP
Policy Planner**

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

**RE: Comments on New Draft Barrie Official Plan Draft Two
DIV Development (Barrie) Ltd.
1080 Lockhart Road (Part Lot 20, Concession 11)**

1.0 Overview

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (“MGP”) are the planners for DIV Development (Barrie) Ltd. (“DIV”), who own approximately 80 hectares of land located north of Lockhart Road and west of Sideroad 20 (the “Subject Lands”), within the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan in the City of Barrie. MGP has participated in the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan process since 2012 and has been monitoring and providing input into the City’s New Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review process, including prior letters and deputations to Council and by participating in the City’s 2020 stakeholder consultation sessions. This letter provides our additional comments on the Draft City of Barrie Official Plan Draft 2 2051 (“Draft Official Plan 2051”) and continues the direction of comments over this history of input to the City including our most recent submission in December 2020 on the Draft Official Plan 2041.

1.1 City Response to Comments Made in December 2020

In review of the new Draft Official Plan, we note that staff have undertaken significant effort to constructively respond to many of our comments. We would like to thank you for achieving compliance with the Growth Plan 2051 planning horizon and the inclusion of our clients’ land within the settlement boundary. We have noted an error in which a portion of our client’s lands have been excluded from the Designated Greenfield Area (“DGA”) in Map 1 of the Draft Official Plan and request this be corrected to include these lands as part of the DGA. As per our previous comments, we believe these lands are required to allow the City to meet its growth forecast and support their inclusion in the settlement area boundary and designation for residential development. In addition, the removal of prescriptive urban design policies from

the Official Plan, in favour of the preparation of a separate urban design guideline document is a positive change that enhances the usability of the Official Plan.

However, many of our major comments made in December 2020 on the first draft of the Official Plan remain. This letter provides a summary of the major issues we believe must be addressed prior to issuance of a final Official Plan document to the Province for approval.

1.2 Overly Prescriptive Official Plan Policies

We are concerned that the wording of many of the policies in the Official Plan remains too prescriptive, which will have the negative impact of the Plan being difficult to implement. The tone of an Official Plan should be to provide permissions for land use and general guidance with regard to development. The Official Plan applies across the entire geography of the City, and therefore all policies must be generic enough to apply in all instances, or sufficient work should be undertaken to ensure that specific policies can be universally implemented without the need for an Official Plan Amendment to deal with area or site-specific exceptions. Typically, area specific policies are prepared through secondary or tertiary planning exercises, and site-specific development standards are more appropriately implemented through the City's zoning bylaw.

We request that the City remove overly prescriptive policy and development requirements from the Official Plan, and rather provide general guidance to make the intent of the Official Plan clear. Specifically, policies specifying setback requirements, locations of street trees, sidewalk widths, area or context driven height and density requirements, and similar policies should be simplified or removed in favour of more detailed planning process which will appropriately determine these requirements.

1.3 Maintaining the Planned Intent from the Hewitt Secondary Plan on the Subject Lands

It remains a major concern that the Hewitt Secondary Plan, added as a new Section 9 in the current Official Plan, has been omitted completely in the Draft Official Plan 2051. While policies throughout the Draft Official Plan speak to the potential need to create a secondary plan, there is no specific direction as to how existing or new secondary plans interact with the policies of the Draft Official Plan.

It is not appropriate, nor is it good planning to require the subject lands to undergo re-planning or new secondary or tertiary planning process when the Hewitt Secondary Plan provides land use designations and policies that are good planning for the subject lands. This would also result in a significant and unnecessary delay in the delivery of much needed housing, roads, and community facilities, with corresponding delays to the City in realizing a return on the various infrastructure and capital investments it has made to support growth.

The continuity of the planning from the Hewitt Secondary Plan and its area specific policies must be recognized in the Official Plan for the subject lands, either through the reinsertion of

a separate chapter like the City's current Official Plan or by including all Hewitt Secondary Plan policies in the areas specific policies in appropriate sections of the Draft Official Plan 2051. It is also unclear from growth management work prepared by the City what the overall housing mix will be to 2051, and to what extent the subject lands will be relied upon to provide the limited potential for new growth in single and semi-detached housing to allow the City to meet a market-based demand for housing to 2051.

A suggestion that could resolve these concerns would be to include in the Official Plan an area specific policy identifying that the subject lands should be developed primarily for single-detached housing with other medium density forms in appropriate locations to a minimum density of 16 units per gross developable hectare or 50 residents and jobs per hectare to allow the City to achieve its overall density targets. This would allow development to proceed to a density and scale anticipated under the Hewitt Secondary Plan policies, notwithstanding any new policy approaches the City is contemplating in other areas.

In addition, there are numerous references to Block Plans without any explanation as to what these are, or where the City intends to require them. We suggest this language be removed as these references are unnecessary given that all lands are either within the built-up area (and will be subject to demonstration plans as shown in Appendix 3) or have been comprehensively planned in the Greenfield area through the Salem and Hewitt Secondary Plan processes and therefore no Block Plan should be required prior to development.

To resolve this concern, we request that the City include a site-specific policy that states that the subject lands will not be required to undertake a Secondary or Block Plan prior to, as a requirement of, or condition of development approvals (draft plan of subdivision and zoning bylaw amendment).

1.4 Logical and Flexible Phasing Policies

The pace of development anticipated in the Salem and Hewitt Secondary Plan areas has not been realized, and the City continues to struggle with the financial implications of slower than expected growth rates. We believe that a solution to aid in expediting the pace of development and aiding the City in realizing a return on its infrastructure and capital investments is to advance the phasing of the subject lands and provide more flexibility in the progression from one phase of development to the next. With regard to the phase delineations on the subject lands, we have made numerous submissions and remind the City that key infrastructure is required on the Dorsay lands to allow for development and the creation of complete neighbourhoods on adjacent lands to the west. This includes a pumping station for servicing, the completion of collector roads for transportation connections, and the planned re-channelization of the current drainage channel. To ensure these infrastructures can be delivered in a timely and cost-effective way, and to minimize the disruption that future residents will endure from construction, we request that the City move the Dorsay Phase 3 lands into Phase 2 and that the Phase 4 lands become Phase 3. There does not appear to be a need for a fourth phase.

In addition, moving from one phase of development to the next should be expedited once appropriate growth management considerations have been met, which primarily should be focused on ensuring that the required infrastructure is available to support growth. It is our opinion that an official plan amendment should NOT be required to commence development in a new phase, once the required infrastructure is in place in a prior phase.

1.5 Other Policies

We are pleased to see the changes already implemented by the City from this first round of consultation. We do, however remain concerned regarding a number of policies that have yet to be addressed. Although it is our belief that the primary concerns we have presented in this letter are imperative to the implementation and practicality of this plan, we have further concerns with other supporting policies.

Thus, we remain firm in our opinion that the Official Plan document must be reassessed holistically with the following revisions considered:

1.5.1 NHS Boundaries

As previously requested, Section 2.7.4 Natural Heritage Protection: The Natural Heritage System limits identified on Map 2 and 3 of the Draft Official Plan do not reflect the detailed ground-truthed information that we currently have with respect to DIV's lands. We implore that the natural heritage mapping on the subject lands be revised to reflect our fieldwork – we will provide a plan for the City's use.

1.5.2 Minor Variance

Although Section 9.5.9 has been trimmed of several extraneous tests included in the first draft of the Official Plan, we remain adamant that the remaining test be removed as well. The conditions included in policy 9.5.9a) cannot reasonably be met as terms such as 'annoyance' are too broad and remain undefined. Tests which are not outlined and prescribed through the *Planning Act* cannot have a reasonable place in this document and so are not in keeping with legislative requirements.

1.5.3 Park Land Dedication

Section 5.9 of the draft Official Plan speaks to Parkland Dedication. Throughout this section, the total "gross" land area is referenced in the calculation of parkland rate. Parkland is not typically calculated with non-developable land (e.g., environmental features) included in the equation. Net calculations are the standard across the board, as natural heritage area and other non-developable features are just that: undevelopable and typically not used to generate parkland. Accordingly, we ask the City to amend this policy to clarify parkland calculations are made on developable land.

1.5.4 Affordable Housing

Affordable housing is mentioned in several sections of this draft of the Official Plan.

Further to the comments in our previous submission, housing affordability is both a pertinent and tremendously important initiative that must be included in good planning. We commend the City in their undertaking of this task, however more work must be done.

This draft has not considered the many supportive structures and background work which contribute to the successful implementation of such an initiative. There have been several local municipalities which have undertaken legislative processes which allow for the planning and structure of affordability models to ensure successful execution.

Affordability, though it has been formally defined in this draft of the Official Plan, requires support through policy for both the developer and consumer. Affordability has simply been prescribed in this draft as a percentage of new builds, but how this will be supported through appropriate housing mix, incentives, strategic location of housing, maintenance, time and terms of affordability, affordable ownership versus rental structures and supports, and building management has not been included. Without substantive provisions, affordable housing cannot be included in an Official Plan prescriptively.

Given the short timeframe for review of the new Draft of the Official Plan, we will have comments on other policies and request an opportunity to review these with staff and work through them to propose new wording or other solutions to improve the functioning of the plan.

1.6 Conclusion

We thank you for the ongoing opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Official Plan 2051. We have attempted to suggest policy solutions in the Official Plan with regard to the Subject Lands to address our concerns.

We ask for a stakeholder meeting with you to review the issues raised in our comments and work through our other concerns and policy suggestions with the intent of expediting a revised Official Plan. Please contact me at any time to discuss our comments or arrange a meeting.

Yours very truly,

Malone Given Parsons Ltd.



Matthew Cory, MCIP, RPP, PLE, PMP, Principal

cc. Amanda Santo, Dorsay Development Corp.

Susan Rosenthal, Davies Howe LLP

Councillor Mike McCann, Ward 10 Councillor of Barrie

December 22, 2020

MGP File: 12-2089

City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

via email: newbarrieop@barrie.ca

Attention: Ms. Kathy Suggit, RPP
Manager of Strategic Initiatives, Policy and Analysis

Dear Ms. Suggit:

RE: Comments on New Draft Barrie Official Plan 2020
DIV Development (Barrie) Ltd.
1080 Lockhart Road (Part Lot 20, Concession 11)

1.0 Overview

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (“MGP”) are the planners for DIV Development (Barrie) Ltd. (“DIV”), who own approximately 80 hectares of land located north of Lockhart Road and west of Sideroad 20 (the “Subject Lands”), within the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan in the City of Barrie. MGP has participated in the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan process since 2012 and has been monitoring and providing input into the City’s New Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review process, including prior letters and deputations to Council and by participating in the City’s 2020 stakeholder consultation sessions. This letter provides our initial comments on the Draft City of Barrie Official Plan 2041 (“Draft Official Plan”) and continues the direction of comments over this history of input to the City.

1.1 Growth Management

Your Growth Management analysis currently assesses needs only to 2041 and bases this analysis on an outdated land needs assessment. Provincial Direction mandates that your Municipal Comprehensive Review and resulting Official Plan must be updated to the 2051 planning horizon on the basis of the recently released provincial Land Needs Methodology 2020 and the A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2020 (“A Place to Grow”). As such, your assessment regarding urban boundary expansion needs and phasing is insufficient and contrary to current Provincial policy.

The Draft Official Plan does not utilize the recent Land Needs Assessment Methodology issued by the Province. In particular, the City’s growth management approach appears to be directly

in conflict with the 2020 Land Needs Assessment and A Place to Grow, where in the October 8, 2019 Report to City Building Committee, the following statement is made (page 8):

“In summary, the scenarios represent a shift towards a more comprehensive and sustainable approach to growth management. Specifically, the scenarios focus on creating more compact, complete, and desirable communities while satisfying provincial policy. As per Watson’s commentary, staff wish to reiterate that these scenarios represent an elevated level of growth than what has occurred in the past. This is because the city must plan to accommodate the long-term growth forecasts of the Growth Plan rather than plan based on market demand. This is an important consideration as staff do not anticipate growth to occur at the forecasted rate of 1,900 units per year at least in the short term. As such, the shift will occur over time and not take place immediately.”

An Official Plan only to the year 2041, which does not use the provincial Land Needs Assessment methodology, does not comply with A Place to Grow and cannot be approved. Furthermore, an assessment to 2041 does not represent good planning as it leaves small pieces of the Hewitt and Salem Secondary Plans areas (which have comprehensive infrastructure and land use planning completed for them) out of the Settlement Area Boundary and will not achieve a complete community in the next 20 years. This is not in the public interest and serves no practical purpose other than to frustrate development that is integral to the creation of a complete community.

There is an opportunity to update your work during the comment period, and we ask that you please confirm that the City will be undertaking this updated work to 2051 based on the 2020 Land Needs Assessment to ensure conformity with A Place to Grow prior to proceeding with the Draft Official Plan.

It is clear that updating the Official Plan to meet the mandated 2051 planning horizon will result in the inclusion of all remaining whitebelt lands in Barrie into the Settlement Area Boundary to meet projected growth needs. This will include DIV’s remaining lands in the Hewitt Secondary Plan area. Based on our own analysis, we fully expect that the remainder of DIV’s lands will be included in the Settlement Area, and that these lands will be designated in accordance with the Hewitt Secondary Plan and MESP – Appendix 9A Residential Area (Neighbourhood Area in the Draft Official Plan.)

With regard to Section 9.5.2, Phasing and the associated schedules, phases of development should result in the logical and cost-effective extension of infrastructure, the creation of complete neighbourhoods, and generally should be of a consistent size and area to other phases. The proposed phasing in the Draft Official Plan does not appear to result in the logical extension of services, the creation of complete neighbourhoods, nor are the phases consistent with the size and extent of Phases 1 and 2. We do not believe that having many small phases after Phase 1 and 2 is good planning, and to the contrary, will result in unnecessary delays in development and the completion of neighbourhoods. We therefore request that all lands outside of Phase 1 and 2 in the Hewitt Secondary Plan area be identified within Phase 3. This will make all three phases a comparable size and will allow for the logical progression of growth in this Secondary Plan area. In addition, in order to permit flexibility to respond to market and other changes, including timing of development, modifications to the

phasing plan should be permitted without the need for an amendment to the official plan. The policy should, accordingly, be amended.

With regard to DIV's lands, it was our understanding from prior discussions with City staff that the portion of the Subject Lands currently within the Settlement Area Boundary would be revised from Phase 4 to Phase 3 lands. As proposed on Appendix 2, the City is illustrating these lands as Phase 4 and Phase 6 lands. We request that this be corrected on the mapping to be Phase 3, and that the remainder of the Subject Lands also be identified as within Phase 3 when they are added to the Settlement Area Boundary.

Furthermore, we are concerned with Section 9.5.1 c) which does not allow development to proceed unless the City has a Development Charge By-law in force and effect and not subject to appeal. We fail to understand the basis for this clause, particularly where, notwithstanding an appeal, the City can continue to collect development charges at the rates set out in an appealed by-law, pending determination of the appeal. The City is not prejudiced in any way by allowing development to proceed while an appeal is pending. Such a clause only serves to prevent a fair assessment of Development Charges and prevents development to proceed in an orderly fashion.

We also have concerns with Section 2.4.2.1 i), which provides as follows:

All new development shall be planned to contribute to a housing mix of 13% low density, 24% medium density, and 63% high density to ensure a gradual transition towards more compact forms of development, to support the *intensification* and *Designated Greenfield Area* density targets, and meet future housing needs.

It is unclear as to how this mix of housing has been determined. Until the new Land Needs Assessment is complete, it is not possible to assess whether this mix is appropriate. Furthermore, the unit mix that was anticipated, approved, and planned in the Hewitt Secondary Plan should continue to apply in this secondary plan area.

In general, it is our opinion that the Official Plan should put forth a vision of how the City will develop that goes beyond the general intent of creating a medium sized city with a mix of uses and higher densities. The policy suggests that all development should be planned in accordance with the prescribed unit mix. This unit mix is considered an overall vision for the Official Plan and should not be considered on a site-by-site basis. The Draft Official Plan should, and could, identify area specific policies to guide development. This would result in an overall housing mix which delivers a market-based supply of housing to the extent possible. Without supporting detailed planning analysis through the Land Needs Assessment, it cannot be determined if this policy is appropriate, nor how it would impact on individual areas or development applications. Furthermore, with respect to Section 2.4.2.1 j) it is unclear how low, medium and high density is defined and how the City will 'encourage' applications for medium and high-density housing: through policy encouragement, financial incentives, or preferential treatment of some other kind?

The policies in Section 2.4.2.3 will need to be updated to reflect the inclusion of remaining lands into the Settlement Area Boundary. As previously mentioned, the pre-determination of a specific housing mix target without more detailed work supporting these numbers means that we are unable to determine whether Section 2.4.2.3b) is appropriate, nor is it clear how applications will be encouraged or discouraged to accommodate these targets. Moreover, the

analysis of whether this housing mix is providing a market-based supply of housing has not been completed.

Section 2.4.2.3c) should include an exception for intervening lands with no development intent nor interest and allow for the advancement of the completion of neighbourhoods in an efficient and effective manner, including the delivery of servicing infrastructure.

Section 2.4.2.3f) contains a target of 62 persons and jobs per hectare and it is unclear how this density implements an appropriate mix of housing and how it was determined. Sections 2.4.2.3g) through i) appear to require achievement of this density on a site or development application specific basis, as opposed to an average over the entire Greenfield. This is contrary to the policies within A Place to Grow and is unimplementable.

1.1.1 Official Plan Structure and Secondary Plans

It is unclear how the Draft Official Plan incorporates area specific policies, particularly those of the Hewitt Secondary Plan. The Hewitt Secondary Plan was added as a new Section 9 in the current Official Plan but appears to have been omitted completely in the Draft Official Plan. This omission is confusing as Section 9.5.2 i) refers to the Hewitt Secondary Plan. While policies throughout the Draft Official Plan speak to the potential need to create a secondary plan, there is no specific direction as to how existing or new secondary plans interact with the policies of the Draft Official Plan.

The continued status of the Hewitt Secondary Plan and its area specific policies must be recognized in the Official Plan, either through the reinsertion of a separate chapter, as in the City's current Official Plan or by including all Hewitt Secondary Plan policies in the relevant and appropriate sections of the Draft Official Plan.

Alternatively, if the Secondary Plan is intended to be retained as a stand-alone document, then a notwithstanding policy must be included in the Draft Official Plan that defers to the policies of the Secondary Plan.

Over 10 years of planning, public consultation, expertise and study led to the adoption of the Secondary Plan. To outright rescind/delete it undermines good planning and previously expended public resources, particularly as most of the Secondary Plan has not yet proceeded to development. This is not in the public interest. Moreover, the generic policies proposed on the Subject Lands in the Draft Official Plan do not result in improved or better planning for the Secondary Plan than the approved specific Hewitt Secondary Plan policies. These generic policies do not take into consideration the individual area circumstances and are not informed by the detailed planning analysis which was undertaken in connection with the approved Secondary Plan; nor are they based on an appropriate form of development for these lands. For example, the street network defined in the Hewitt Secondary Plan has undertaken extensive studies to approve the location and size of the roads. To omit the Hewitt Secondary

Plan would result in a requirement for additional studies for a road network that has been previously approved. Development should be allowed to proceed under the Hewitt Secondary

Plan policies, notwithstanding any new policy approaches the City is contemplating in other areas.

In addition, there are numerous references to Block Plans without any explanation as to what these are, or where the City intends to require them. We suggest this language be removed as these references are unnecessary given that all lands are either within the built-up area (and will be subject to demonstration plans as shown in Appendix 3) or have been comprehensively planned in the Greenfield area through the Salem and Hewitt Secondary Plan processes and therefore no Block Plan should be required prior to development.

1.1.2 General Land Use Policies

Section 2.5.1a) suggests that minor variances to height and density are not permitted without an official plan amendment. In our view, this prohibition against minor variance for height and density goes beyond the authority and the four tests which must be met under the *Planning Act* and should be deleted. With regard to Section 2.5.1 i), subsections iii) through v) are essentially inclusionary zoning provisions which under the *Planning Act*, requires a municipality to undertake an assessment report in conjunction with developing policies in their Official Plan. Further study is required prior to requiring blanket policies requiring 10% of all new units be affordable. Moreover, it is not clear how the City will implement the policies with regard to affordable housing, nor may it be appropriate for every development proposal (including medium and high-density development) over 40 units to provide affordable housing. In determining affordable housing, we strongly encourage that incentive tools be implemented, including financial incentives, to provide for affordable housing ownership.

Section 2.5.3 provides as follows:

Any lands shown on Appendix 1 as located within the boundary of a Conservation Authority are also subject to the relevant law and policies of those authorities and, in all instances, the policies of the authorities shall prevail.

While it is clear that lands within the boundary of a Conservation Authority are subject to the legislation governing those lands, and policies approved pursuant to this law by those authorities, it is not appropriate to, nor should an Official Plan or a municipality, defer all policy decision making to a commenting agency and their policies. As such, this policy should be removed from the Draft Official Plan.

Section 2.5.4 b) is too vague and it is unclear how the City will determine, on a site-specific basis, that the intensification target or Designated Greenfield Area target will be negatively impacted. There is no detailed planning analysis based on the achievement of a specific desired community form outcome that would provide guidance in this regard.

We strongly support Section 2.4.2.1 o) which promotes secondary suites, however, suggest the policy be strengthened to be an as-of-right permission.

1.1.3 Land Use Designations

The guide to reading and interpreting the land use designations in Section 2.6 is helpful and a good addition to make the plan more readable.

Regarding Neighbourhood Areas, the stated intent is to 'recognize new and existing low-density neighbourhoods and communities which are dominated by human scale built form.' With respect to Section 2.6.1.3 e), it is onerous to require all 50% of the ground floor of all low and mid-rise buildings to consist of non-residential uses, particularly without a retail and commercial needs assessment, to determine whether this would result in an appropriate amount of retail and commercial space.

Regarding Section 2.6.1.3 f), a minimum density of 50 units per hectare for development on lands for local streets and 60 units per hectare on lands fronting on street classified as collector or above is inappropriate and too high. Requiring this minimum density in the Neighbourhood designation would prevent the opportunity to develop a 'low density neighbourhood' and would not allow a mix and range of uses to develop as intended in this designation. This minimum density should be specified as 20 units per net hectare with an appropriate definition of net hectares.

In the Medium Density designation, Section 2.6.2.2 a) should include townhomes and low-rise buildings as permitted building types, as opposed to Section 2.6.2.2g) subsection i), which limits those building types only to locations within 70 metres of lands designated as Neighbourhood Area.

Furthermore, it is not appropriate nor in the public interest to require every development to have a mix of use. If this is the intent of Section 2.6.2.2c), it should be deleted. If the intent is to encourage a mix of uses in this designation, this policy should be clarified. Even though Section 2.6.2.2g) includes a specific set of criteria, we believe that these policies are too onerous and may not be applicable on a site-by-site basis, especially in areas already identified in a Secondary Plan where mixed use may not be appropriate.

In addition, for the reasons noted above in relation to the Neighbourhood designation, it is not appropriate to require all buildings facing an Arterial or Collector street to have 50% of the ground floor frontage as non-residential uses as set out in Section 2.6.2.2e), particularly when no market study has been completed supporting such need.

1.1.4 Planning an Attractive City

In general, there are significant concerns with the Urban Design policies in the Draft Official Plan (Sections 2.5.4.1, 3, 4 and 5). From a land use policy perspective, most of the standards are mandatory, where the language requires that things 'shall' be done, or 'will' occur, meaning that development must be in full conformity with the policies (see for example policies 3.1.2.1, 3.3.3, 3.3.4 and 3.3.5, 3.5). We strongly disagree with this intended application of Urban Design policies. The policies should be revised to provide for flexibility, rather than taking a prescriptive approach, and as such, urban design guidelines should be encouraged where appropriate to allow for consideration of site conditions and context.

In addition to the policies specifically contained in the Draft Official Plan, the Draft Official Plan also relies on an external document entitled *City Wide Urban Design Guidelines* (“Urban Design Guidelines”). Page 4 of the Urban Design Guidelines states the following:

The guidelines are phrased in the passive tone recognizing that they are guidelines rather than regulation. However, the guidelines are enabled by the Official Plan, which makes provision for the guidelines to essentially be mandatory, while offering flexibility for the guidelines to be adapted if a site is constrained (as long as the spirit and intent of the guidelines are maintained).

This external Urban Design Guidelines document can be changed without public input or opportunity for challenge. Such mandatory requirements should be subject to transparent review and opportunity for the same approval process applied to Official Plans, particularly since they are being “incorporated” and enforced through the Official Plan itself. Failing this, they should not be treated as “essentially mandatory” but should be dealt with and implemented with the flexibility inherent in the concept of guidelines themselves. Guidelines should set parameters and not rules, and the policy should be amended to reflect this.

Section 3.3.5.2.2 c) requires that outside of an Urban Growth Centre 20% of the lot area shall be provided as a semi-public open space for stacked townhouses and townhouses with a private driveway. This policy appears unreasonable, particularly in a Greenfield situation where the provision of a semi-private space would serve little utility to the larger community (particularly if they are just individual blocks) while being a significant burden and liability on new residents. Notwithstanding our comments, if this policy is to persist, then we believe any public open spaces should be counted towards parkland dedication credit. As a note, there is an image shown to illustrate this policy which is from the City of Toronto Official Plan and clearly applies to mid-rise buildings in a very dense urban area, not low-rise or townhouse developments.

1.1.5 Other Policies

Section 2.7.4 Natural Heritage Protection: The Natural Heritage System limits identified on Map 2 and 3 of the Draft Official Plan do not reflect the detailed ground-truthed information that we currently have with respect to DIV’s lands. We will be providing a supplemental package that has our refinements of the Natural Heritage System on the Subject Lands and will discuss further with staff on this matter.

Section 5.5 Ecological Offsetting: We believe that this policy is vague and it unclear how ecological offsetting is to be achieved. What is the basis for this policy and which legislative authority requires this?

Section 6.3.1 Climate Sensitive Design: We strongly support parks and public open spaces being used for stormwater storage and request the City permit and direct Low Impact Developments (LIDs) be permitted in all public rights-of-way and these are the best places to accommodate LIDs and ensure they are maintained over their lifetime by the City. Requiring private property owners to maintain these features is fraught with difficulties related to maintenance and enforcement.

Section 6.3.2 Urban Forests: We agree that urban forests are important and add to the social enjoyment of a community by providing nature areas for recreation. The policy should be modified to clarify that when such social woodlands are required to be retained or enhanced by the City, they will form part of the parkland contribution required under the *Planning Act*. With regard to requiring compensation under the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, we believe conversations respecting compensation should occur but should not be mandated by policy in the Official Plan.

Section 6.3.3 Food Security: This policy should recognize that the yards provided with grade related housing provide the opportunity for residents to grow their own food and thereby contribute to food security.

Section 6.4 Social and Economic Resilience: We strongly support as-of-right permission for secondary suites throughout the City. With regard to Section 6.4 c), is it unclear how conformity with this requirement to have a unit with an attached or detached secondary suite for every 40 ground-related housing units will be achieved through the approval of a draft plan of subdivision.

Section 9.5.9 Minor Variance: This policy contains onerous provisions for consideration of a minor variance application well beyond requirements within the *Planning Act*. It is our opinion that this policy be revised or removed to be more reasonable and in keeping with legislative requirements.

1.1.6 Conclusion

We thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Official Plan. These are our initial comments that address general matters in the Official Plan and we anticipate having additional, and likely more detailed comments, as other members of our team review the Official Plan with regard to the Subject Lands and the development concepts that are in process.

In the meantime, we ask that you please provide a response to us in writing (including the completion and provision of additional material and analysis referenced in this letter as necessary to understand the policies). We would be happy to meet with you over video conference or in person as appropriate to discuss our comments or answer any questions. We look forward to the next draft of the Official Plan, which addresses our comments in this letter.

Yours very truly,

Malone Given Parsons Ltd.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. Cory', enclosed within a blue oval scribble.

Matthew Cory, MCIP, RPP, PLE, PMP

Principal

cc. Amanda Santo, Dorsay Development Corp.

Susan Rosenthal, Davies Howe LLP

Councillor Mike McCann, Ward 10 Councillor of Barrie

Joanne Werth

From: Megan Pagonis
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 5:28 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: Resident Feedback

Categories: Yellow Category

I would like to comment, as has been requested for feedback by the City, on future development of Barrie.

Barrie is known for its connection to nature and for the quality of life that it affords. My main concerns with future plans for Barrie are environmental impact, green space, and limiting building height/housing density along the waterfront. I feel these need to be seriously considered as features to be preserved if we would like to continue to attract people and businesses to our City.

First and foremost, we have a few remaining densely wooded areas that run through the city. Many of these include environmentally protected wetlands as well as significant woodlands. One of the reasons many people are attracted to Barrie in the first place, as was I, was the connection and availability of nature within the city. We do not need to leave the city to feel that connection. These wooded areas allow for wildlife to continue to thrive as well as provide sanctuary for vulnerable species. There are a barrage of developments that continue to be proposed to cut as deeply as possible into these areas. Not only will this affect the amount of wooded and protected land in our city, it affects our ground re-charge and flood plain water management. A good example is the property south of Loon Ave. There is a request for development on a significant woodland edging the wetland. These have long been protected, and clearly the edge of the current neighborhood was designed with this in mind. The backyards of the houses along Loon Ave. are 30-31 meters away from the wetland - this is not a coincidence. The recommendations of the conservation authority in general state that there should be a minimum 30M buffer. So why are we allowing developers to buy these lands for a low price only to challenge and push the conservation authorities to bend these rules to push further and further into these areas? I do not understand why certain development locations are chosen when there are many other pockets that could be developed that don't involve massive tree cutting/de-forestation, and sucking all the ground water out around a wetland to make underground parking possible for 140 new town houses. I would like to see a City plan that stops this from cutting into what little we have left.

Second, the building heights around the waterfront should have cut offs. I don't want to see what happened in Toronto to happen in our city. I moved out of Toronto for a reason 10 years ago. I didn't like how tall every building kept getting. It makes it feel like the city towers over you, and it is not nearly as welcoming as our current building heights are around the water. I don't want to see the waterfront shaded out because they can build many units for a huge premium because they overlook the water. Let's not forget the shorter buildings that stayed within height restrictions at the time that were supposed to have those views. Let's not forget that it is not only the residents of the buildings surrounding the waterfront that should be able to enjoy that space. I have also lived in Vancouver for a few years and can assure you Barrie has a similar feel when you are near the water - the city limits on building height makes a difference to the ambience. It is not menacing, it is enjoyable.

I understand that there needs to be ongoing development for the city, and that means more buildings and more housing. I am not ok with development being at the expense of what makes Barrie better than other cities to live.

Sincerely,
Megan Wood Pagonis

Joanne Werth

From: Michelle Lackey
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 1:12 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: Feedback on the Draft OP

Hello,

I'm writing in regards to the Draft OP. I attended the neighbourhood presentation but unfortunately had to leave before I could ask my questions. My first question is in regards to EP land and the "levels" applied to them. I live on Loon Avenue and my property abuts EP lands with Level 1 designation (with existing development designation lands) (ie. known as 521 Huronia Road). This land is currently zoned for agricultural/light industrial use however, in the City's draft plan is slated for Residential. I do not think these lands are suitable for residential and that the City needs to consider converting them to Environmental Protected - completely.

Can you please explain to me what exactly "EP Level 1 - with existing development designation" means? How did these lands obtain the "existing development designation" when it has been identified as a Level 1 EP land? Why is it being considered for Residential when it has been identified as such a sensitive and highly protected area?

I'm very concerned that these lands are going to be converted to Residential. I strongly feel that this entire property (521 Huronia Rd) and the vacant lands to the east of it, should be designated Environmental Protected fully. It is a lush, diverse wetland and significant forest. It is home to so much nature and wildlife and I feel it needs to be protected and preserved. Not paved over.

Secondly, the City is booming with residential builds - should we not preserve whatever employment areas we have - such as this one (521 Huronia Road for example) even if it is for agricultural or light industrial uses?

My last question is in regards to zoning and "special provisions". The city takes so much time creating these plans, bylaws, rules and guidelines but yet, a developer can completely ignore them and apply for "special provisions" to the height and density of their developments for example. What's the point of making these plans and guidelines if they are just going to be broken. I believe these plans and bylaws are put into place protect the integrity of our neighbourhoods and the City - yet so often they get broken. It's unfair to existing residents.

I would like to see stronger bylaw enforcement for new development in next OP.

Thank you for hearing my concerns. I welcome a phone call to discuss.

Michelle Lackey

Joanne Werth

From: Peter Obradovich
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 1:38 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Cc: Jonathan Wheler; Sarah Verweij
Subject: OP Letter
Attachments: Talus Barrie OP Letter.pdf

Categories: Yellow Category

Good Afternoon,

Please find the enclosed letter regarding the 2nd draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment,

Peter Obradovich

VP Acquisitions & Development

Talus Capital Corp.

416-526-2022

peter@taluscc.com



356 Eastern Avenue
Toronto, Ontario

M4M 1B8
(416) 456-0005

taluscc.com

May 28th, 2021 VIA

EMAIL

Tomasz Wierzba, MCIP, RPP Policy

Planner

City of Barrie

70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400 Barrie,

ON L4M 4T5 new.barrieop@barrie.ca

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

Re: Comments Re. 2nd Draft of City of Barrie Official Plan

Property: 341 Maplevue Drive West

We are in the process of developing the lands known municipally as 341 Maplevue Drive West. A formal Site Plan Control application for the development of a self-storage facility on these has been submitted to the City of Barrie on May 11th, 2021.

We have reviewed the 2nd Draft of the City of Barrie Official Plans and remain concerned about the proposed designation on these lands and in particular the permitted uses in this designation.

The subject lands are currently designated General Industrial in the current Official Plan. The predominant use for lands designated General Industrial shall be for manufacturing, processing, servicing, storage of goods and raw materials, industrial warehousing and similar such uses. As such, a self-storage facility is permitted in the General Industrial designation.

The 1st Draft of the Official Plan proposed to designate the lands as Commercial District which we submitted a letter in response to this identifying our concern that the lands would no longer be considered industrial and that a self-storage use would no longer be permitted. As such, we are pleased to see that the proposed designation is now Employment Area: Non-Industrial, however, a self-storage facility continues to not be a permitted use. We purchased these lands to build a self-storage facility. In our opinion, Employment Area: Non-Industrial is a perfect designation for a self-storage facility being that this type of use does not function fully as an industrial use. A self-storage facility does not require manufacturing or processing, it is not harmful to people or the environment or have noxious effects, and typically there are commercial uses included such as an office and the sale of packing and moving supplies



as is the case in our proposed facility. Our request is that the City reconsider permitting self-storage facilities within the Employment Area: Non-Industrial designation on our subject site. This use would still be an appropriate permitted use within this designation, would create additional lands available for a much needed use in the City of Barrie and would focus the larger more industrial uses in the Employment Area: Industrial designation.

We look forward to your review and continuing to be involved in this process. Please also accept this letter as our formal request to be notified of all future meetings regarding the Official Plan Review process.

Yours truly, Peter

Obradovich

Vice President of Acquisitions and Development

Joanne Werth

From: Robert MacFarlane - Zelinka Priamo Ltd.
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 4:02 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba; NewBarrieOP
Cc: cityclerks
Subject: Draft 2 Barrie Official Plan: Comments on Behalf of Canadian Tire
Attachments: LETTER - Barrie New OP Second Draft - Comments on Behalf of Canadian Tir. pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Good afternoon, please find attached comments on behalf of Canadian Tire regarding the May 6, 2021 Draft Official Plan in advance of the June 2, 2021 Public Meeting.

As noted in the attached letter, Canadian Tire would welcome and appreciate the opportunity to meet with Staff to discuss their comments further. Once Staff have had an opportunity to review our preliminary comments, please advise as to the opportunity for a meeting of this nature, and as to Staff's availability.

Please let us know if you have any questions regarding the above or attached.

Thanks

Rob MacFarlane, MPL, MCIP, RPP
Planner

Zelinka Priamo Ltd.

Toronto Office

20 Maud Street, Suite 305
Toronto, ON M5V 2M5
(P) 416-622-6064 X 222

(F) 416-622-3463

robert.m@zpplan.com
www.zpplan.com

VIA EMAIL

June 2, 2021

City of Barrie
City Hall
70 Collier Street
Barrie, ON
L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Planner, Development Services Dear Mr.

Wierzba:

Re: Draft New Official Plan – Second Draft

**Preliminary Comments on Behalf of Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited
Various Properties**

Barrie, Ontario

Our File: CAT/BAR/19-01

We are the planning consultants for Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited (“Canadian Tire”) for the City of Barrie Official Plan Review. Canadian Tire owns the lands known municipally as 75 Mapleview Drive West, and is the tenant at 320 Bayfield Street in the City of Barrie.

On behalf of Canadian Tire, we have been monitoring the City of Barrie Official Plan Review process, and provided preliminary comments on December 16, 2020, and met with Staff March 18, 2021 to discuss the same. We have reviewed the second draft of the Official Plan dated May 6, 2021 and the associated Schedules/Maps in the context of the Canadian Tire Lands.

We are pleased that a number of Canadian Tire’s concerns have been addressed in the second Draft Official Plan. However, we do continue to have outstanding comments and concerns, and our preliminary comments are outlined below. We will continue to review the draft Official Plan in more detail and may provide further comments as required.

Proposed Redesignation of 75 Mapleview Drive West

Based upon our review of the second draft of the new Official Plan:

- According to Map 1 Community Structure, the Canadian Tire lands are identified as follows:
 - 75 Mapleview Drive West – Within the “Settlement Area Boundary” and “Employment Area”; and
 - 320 Bayfield Street – Within the “Settlement Area Boundary”, “Strategic Growth Area” and “Intensification Corridor”
- According to Map 2 Land Use Designations, the Canadian Tire lands are to be designated as follows:
 - 75 Mapleview Drive West – “Employment Area – Non Industrial”; and
 - 320 Bayfield Street – “Commercial District”.

As noted above, the Draft Official Plan proposes to designate 75 Mapleview Drive West as “Employment Area – Non Industrial”. This differs from the September 2020 draft Official

Plan which proposed to designate these lands as “Commercial District”. Canadian Tire does not support the general intent of the revised Draft Official Plan policies to facilitate the transition of 75 Mapleview Drive West into an Employment Area Designation, whereas the lands are currently designated “General Commercial” under the in-effect Official Plan, which is reflective of their existing commercial function. Accordingly, it is our position that the land use designation proposed by the September 2020 Draft Official Plan, being the “Commercial District” designation, is more appropriate for 75 Mapleview Drive West and is more consistent with the existing land use, which is for entirely commercial purposes including a Canadian Tire store, gas bar, and Beer Store.

It is our understanding that the City of Barrie Land Needs Assessment prepared by Watson dated May 21, 2019 is to inform decisions on the City Structure, including the Official Plan Review and policy structure. Importantly, the methodology used by the Land Needs Assessment does not consider 75 Mapleview Drive West as Employment for the purpose of evaluating the City’s existing employment land base, noting “that the employment land supply has been carried out in accordance to the guidelines in the Growth Plan, 2019 and the L.N.A. Methodology.” There is also no justification provided for the reallocation of existing Commercial lands to Employment lands within the Land Needs Assessment.

Our understanding of the “Employment Area – Non Industrial” designation is, in part, to buffer existing employment lands from encroachment of more sensitive land uses in the surrounding lands. Our submission is that this can be adequately achieved in the “Commercial District” designation, as the types of uses permitted by the “Commercial District” designation can continue to provide a transition to surrounding employment areas.

The City is proposing the redesignation of 75 Mapleview Drive West to an Employment Area, without any justification/rationale for the same. The proposed Employment Areas land use designation does not align with the current function of these lands, and would limit and restrict the uses that are existing on site, being Retail and Major Retail. Therefore, without justification for the need of this significant change in direction, and without any prior consultation of the landowner, we request that the City continue to identify 75 Mapleview Drive West as “Commercial District” and outside of the “Employment Areas.”

Additional Preliminary Comments on Draft City of Barrie Official Plan

As noted in our December 16, 2020 letter, at this time Canadian Tire does not have plans for the redevelopment of their sites, and is seeking to maintain existing operations while allowing for short and medium term modest infill or expansion to respond to the market demand. Further, it is also our intent to consider and protect for potential redevelopment scenarios, should this be contemplated in the future. Accordingly, our preliminary comments are outlined below. We note that we are particularly concerned with the policies that propose to restrict Major Retail and new retail uses within the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, which are in addition to our concern about the appropriateness of the proposed designation for 75 Mapleview Drive West:

- Policy 2.3.3 relates to Strategic Growth Areas, which includes numerous properties throughout the municipality and provides direction for future growth and redevelopment. Draft subsection c) acknowledges that redevelopment of the Strategic Growth Areas will be planned over the long term, and the evolution of the area will not be immediate, however Policy 2.3.3 is silent with respect to interim development permissions that would allow moderate infill or expansion to existing functions that would not otherwise conform with the intensification policies of the draft Official Plan, prior to comprehensive redevelopment. We continue to suggest

-
- that interim development policies be incorporated into the draft Official Plan in order to ensure the continued viability of existing land uses is maintained in advance of redevelopment;**
- 2.3.3e) states “The City will establish a minimum density target for the Strategic Growth Areas to support intensification and the development of complete communities”, however it is unclear what the density target is, and through what means that density target will be established (i.e. Secondary Plan or future OPA). We suggest revised language to clarify the minimum density targets applicable;
 - 2.3.5h) related to Employment Areas, noting that “a limited range of small-scale retail and commercial uses may be permitted”. Large scale commercial/retail uses, including Major Retail are permitted by certain Employment Areas designations, and therefore it would be appropriate to identify these as permitted under Section 2.3.5;
 - 2.3.6a)ii) related to intensification corridors, states “development or redevelopment must be oriented towards those street segments”. In our submission, flexibility should be incorporated and we suggest “must” be replaced with “should”;
 - Policy 2.4.2.1 states that “all new development shall be planned to contribute to a housing mix ...”. In our submission, this policy does not appropriately contemplate non-residential development, and would suggest that all new development incorporate a form of housing. We suggest revised language be considered to clarify that the housing mix target is applicable to new development that includes residential uses;
 - Policy 2.6.5.1 permits a range of uses in the Commercial District land use designation, however does not permit “Major Retail”, which is a defined term under the Official Plan. In our submission, the intended function of the Commercial District designation would suggest that it is appropriate for large scale commercial/retail uses to be permitted, including Major Retail, and we suggest Major Retail be added as a permitted use. Policy 2.6.5.2b) does permit “large format retail (i.e. big box) as well as shopping malls”. Understanding that Major Retail is a defined term, we suggest consistency with this defined term throughout the Official Plan for clarity;
 - Policy 2.6.9.2 indicates that Major Retail uses are to be “subject to the policies in Sections 2.6.10.2, 2.6.10.3, and 2.6.9.3”. Based on a review of those sections, it is unclear the applicability of the “Employment Area – Industrial” standards to the Major Retail permitted use, as sections 2.6.10.2 and 2.6.10.3 relate mainly to industrial employment type uses;
 - Policy 2.6.9.2d) would restrict any new retail uses as standalone, and new retail would be required to be in association with another use in the same building. In our submission, the requirements for new retail to be associated with another use is an inappropriate standard. We suggest revised policy be considered to allow for small scale retail uses, including infill type development, within the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation;
 - Policy 2.6.9.2e)i) provides criteria for the development of Major Retail uses in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, and proposes a cap to ‘contiguous clusters’ of Major Retail Uses. As the term ‘contiguous cluster’ is undefined and unclear, we are concerned of how this policy will be applied, interpreted and implemented, including under the Zoning By-law. In our experience, a combined cap that is applicable to multiple developments under separate ownership is difficult to track and implement consistently. We suggest that Policy 2.6.9.2e)i) be removed;

- Policy 2.6.9.2e)ii) provides criteria for the development of Major Retail uses in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, and proposes to cap individual major retail uses at 5,000 sq.m. In addition to our concerns with the appropriateness of the proposed “Employment Area – Non Industrial” designation for 75 Mapleview Drive West as noted above, the existing Canadian Tire store at 75 Mapleview Drive West has approximately 7,258 sq.m of retail space within the existing building, which exceeds the proposed maximum. In our submission, it would be appropriate to contemplate a revised maximum that is reflective of the needs of a Major Retail type use, or that policy be introduced to recognize existing Major Retail uses regardless of existing GFA, and which would permit expansion to such a Major Retail use, without need for amendment to the Official Plan;
- Policy 2.6.9.2h) provides direction for the provision of sensitive land uses within the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, however it is unclear what (if any) sensitive land uses are permitted within this designation. Clarification regarding the applicability of this policy would be welcomed;
- Policy 3.1.3.1 provides direction for application of the Urban Design Standards, stating “The Urban Design Standards are phrased with the terms “will” or “shall”, or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies.” Elsewhere, the draft Official Plan recognizes the importance of flexibility in design standards for successful and appropriate implementation, including Policy 2.5a), which states: “Slight variations from the development standards, with the exception of variations to height and density, may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City.” We suggest Policy 3.1.3.1 be revised to incorporate an appropriate level of flexibility;
- Policy 3.2.1 provides general urban design standards to evaluate development applications, and will require development applications demonstrate a number of aspects, including (but not limited to): improving the City’s legibility, navigability and sense of place; improving the existing urban fabric; and increasing overall connectivity. In our submission, it is not appropriate for all development applications to demonstrate the provision of certain city building elements, which may not be feasible to implement in a number of potential instances. We suggest revised wording as follows: “development applications, where appropriate, should demonstrate the following...”
- Policy 3.2.1b) specifies that the City will not support “over development”, which further goes on to define what may be considered as over-development including “development that exceeds the maximum permitted height or density”, or “unwarranted variances” where an alternative built form is appropriate. We continue to have significant concern regarding the implications of such a policy, for the reasons outlined in our December 2020 letter;
- Policy 3.2.2 provides standards to evaluate development applications, including that “all development applications shall demonstrate how the proposal contributes to...”, and goes on to outline a number of criteria that includes how an application “contributes to the diversity of housing types and tenures in the neighbourhood”, amongst several other aspects. In our submission, not all development applications would be appropriate to contribute towards a housing mix, or other specific criteria that this policy would require contribution towards. Flexibility should be incorporated, and we suggest revised language as follows:

-
- “Development applications, where appropriate, should demonstrate how the proposal contributes...”**;
- Policy 3.2.3a) states that “All development applications received by the City shall demonstrate how the City’s sustainable design priorities are achieved” and provides a range of priorities. In our submission flexibility should be provided, since demonstrating the achievement of the priorities may not be applicable or appropriate for all development applications;
 - Policy 3.2.4.5c) states that “Internal private streets will be used to divide large sites into a grid of blocks and roadways to facilitate safe pedestrian and vehicular movement and that frame appropriately sized development parcels. Internal private streets will be designed to interconnect with adjacent properties to create an overall cohesive and integrated circulation network wherever possible.” In our submission it is not clear as to the applicability of this policy, if the intention is for comprehensive redevelopment, and what may be considered “large sites”;
 - Policy 3.3.4.6a) states that “Amenity areas shall be consolidated and centrally located”. In our submission, flexibility should be afforded to the policy, such that it may be more appropriate for unconsolidated amenity space, or in a less centralized location due to specific circumstances. We suggest “shall” be replaced with “should”;
 - Policy 3.3.1c) states “Blank facades facing a street, open space or park shall not be permitted”. In our submission, flexibility should be afforded to this policy to consider site specific circumstances, and we suggest revised language as follows: “Blank facades facing a street, open space or park shall be discouraged”;
 - Policy 3.3.4a)ii) states that “where multiple towers are proposed on the same site, tower heights shall be staggered by a minimum of five storeys...” In our submission, this policy is overly prescriptive and may result in limitations to appropriate levels of intensification, or not permit good design. We suggest revised language as follows: “Development should be designed in a manner so as to provide variation in building mass, including but not limited to staggering of building heights where appropriate”;
 - Policy 3.3.5 states “The following urban design standards apply to Single Storey Employment Buildings: a) Single Storey Employment Buildings are those buildings exclusively located within Employment Areas and are generally low-rise in form, including but not limited to warehouses, distribution centres, and manufacturing or assembly facilities.” With the permissions for major retail in the Employment Area – **Non Industrial designation, clarity should be provided that the Policies are not applicable to Major Retail uses**;
 - Policy 3.3.6b) would require retail uses to provide a variety of building heights as part of the same building. In our submission, this policy provides an inappropriate standard for building design that would promote inefficient standards for development. We suggest that this draft policy be better suited as an urban design guidelines, or that revised wording be considered which allows for flexibility;
 - Policy 5.6.2.5c) identifies that “Urban Squares shall be between 0.2 hectares and 1.0 hectares...”. In our submission, it is unclear as to the need for such a rigid policy in the Official Plan for the size of Urban Squares. We suggest flexibility be incorporated to be able to respond to the needs of the community, and suggest the following revised language: “Urban Squares should be planned to be approximately 0.2 ha to 1.0 ha in size”;
 - Policy 6.4.2e) would require that all development applications be supported by an Affordable Housing Report. In our submission, the list of materials that would be

- considered appropriate to facilitate development should be refined through pre-consultation, as there are numerous types of development that would not warrant an Affordable Housing Report, such as those applications proposing strictly non-residential uses. We suggest revised policy be considered;
- Policy 6.4.2e)iii) would require that development applications that propose 40 dwelling units or more demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units. In our submission, the policy should introduce flexibility, and we suggest that the text “will be required to demonstrate” be replaced with “are encouraged to provide”;
 - Policy 9.4.2.2 outlines a list of studies that may be required to be submitted in support of an application, including subsection s), which states: “Urban design brief, including site context and block plan, in accordance with the demonstration plans (see the Appendix for example demonstration plans).” The meaning of the requirement for a submission to be “in accordance with” the demonstration plans is unclear. We suggest revised wording be considered. Further, in our submission it is not appropriate for demonstration plans to form a part of the Official Plan, and the demonstration plans may be better suited for inclusion in the Urban Design Guidelines;
 - Policy 9.4.2.2.1 identifies a list of submission materials that are requirements for mid-rise buildings, including a site context/block plan and pedestrian wind study. In our submission the submission materials required for a mid-rise building submission is overly extensive for this type of built form. We note that as identified by Policy 9.4.2.2.2, the specific submission materials required for mid-rise buildings are the same as what would be required for a tall building. We suggest that revised wording be considered as follows: “development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may require the following”, and that subsections a) and d) be removed;
 - Policy 9.5.6b) states that “The distance between the existing lot lines in an infill situation shall be approximately 150.0 metres or less”. It is not clear as to the meaning or intent of such a policy, and would request clarification as to applicability and interpretation;
 - Policy 9.5.9 states that “When reviewing an application for Minor Variance, the Committee of Adjustment will also consider the relevant policies of this Plan and all of the following criteria: a) That the variance would not cause substantial detriment, hazard, or annoyance that would detract from the character or amenity of nearby properties, and the resultant development would not adversely affect the traffic and parking conditions in the area”. In our submission, the policy should be revised to “all of the following relevant criteria”, since traffic and parking conditions may not be relevant for the particular variance (e.g., minimum setbacks); and
 - Map 4A of the Official Plan labels two features as “Commuter Cycling Network (On – Road)”. We seek clarification if the intent is for the separate features are to be labelled differently.

June 2, 2021

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with Staff to discuss our comments further.

In addition, please kindly ensure that the undersigned is notified of any further meetings with respect to this matters as well as Notice of the approval of the Official Plan.

Yours very truly,

ZELINKA PRIAMO LTD.



Rob MacFarlane, MPL, MCIP, RPP
Planner

cc. Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited (via email)
Cassels Brock & Blackwell LLP (via email)

Joanne Werth

From: Robert MacFarlane - Zelinka Priamo Ltd.
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 1:52 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Cc: Tomasz Wierzba; cityclerks
Subject: Draft 2 Barrie Official Plan: Comments on Behalf of Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited
Attachments: LETTER - Barrie New OP - Comments on Behalf of Choice Properties REIT an. pdf
Categories: Follow Up, Yellow Category

Good afternoon, please find attached comments on behalf of Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited regarding the May 6, 2021 Draft Official Plan in advance of the June 2, 2021 Public Meeting.

As noted in the attached letter, Choice and Loblaw would welcome and appreciate the opportunity to meet with Staff to discuss their comments further. Once Staff have had an opportunity to review our preliminary comments, please advise as to the opportunity for a meeting of this nature, and as to Staff's availability.

Please let us know if you have any questions regarding the above or attached.

Thanks

Rob MacFarlane, MPL, MCIP, RPP
Planner

Zelinka Priamo Ltd.

Toronto Office

20 Maud Street, Suite 305
Toronto, ON M5V 2M5
(P) 416-622-6064 X 222

(F) 416-622-3463

robert.m@zpplan.com

www.zpplan.com



VIA EMAIL

June 2, 2021

City of Barrie
City Hall
70 Collier Street
Barrie, ON
L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Planner, Development Services
Dear Mr,
Wierzba:

Re: Draft New Official Plan – Second Draft

Preliminary Comments on Behalf of Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited

**Various Properties
Barrie, Ontario**

Our File: CHO/LRE/BAR/19-01

We are the planning consultants for Choice Properties REIT (“Choice”) and Loblaw Companies Limited (“Loblaw”) for the City of Barrie Official Plan Review. Choice and Loblaw collectively are the landowner and/or leaseholder of a number of sites within the City of Barrie, including the following:

- 319 Blake Street;
- 620 Yonge Street;
- 472 Bayfield Street;
- 201-211 Cundles Road East;
- 547 Cundles Road East;
- 289 Yonge Street; and
- 380 Mapleview Drive West.

On behalf of Choice and Loblaw, we have been monitoring the City of Barrie Official Plan Review process, and provided preliminary comments on December 16, 2020, and met with Staff March 23, 2021 to discuss the same. We have reviewed the second draft of the Official Plan dated May 6, 2021 and the associated Schedules/Maps as well as the Urban Design Guidelines in the context of the Choice and Loblaw Lands and we have preliminary comments as outlined below.

We are pleased that a number of Choice and Loblaw’s concerns have been addressed in the second Draft Official Plan. However, we do continue to have outstanding comments and concerns, and our preliminary comments are outlined below. We will continue to review the draft Official Plan in more detail and may provide further comments as required.

Preliminary Comments on Draft City of Barrie Official Plan

As noted in our December 16, 2020 letter, at this time Choice and Loblaw do not have specific plans for the redevelopment of their sites, and are seeking to maintain existing operations while allowing for short and medium term modest infill or expansion to respond

to the market demand. Further, it is also our intent to consider and protect for potential redevelopment scenarios, should this be contemplated in the future.

Accordingly, we have the following preliminary comments:

- Policy 2.3.3 relates to Strategic Growth Areas, which includes numerous properties throughout the municipality and provides direction for future growth and redevelopment. Draft subsection c) acknowledges that redevelopment of the Strategic Growth Areas will be planned over the long term, and the evolution of the area will not be immediate, however Policy 2.3.3 is silent with respect to interim development permissions that would allow moderate infill or expansion to existing functions that would not otherwise conform with the intensification policies of the draft Official Plan, prior to comprehensive redevelopment. We continue to suggest that interim development policies be incorporated into the draft Official Plan in order to ensure the continued viability of existing land uses is maintained in advance of redevelopment;
- 2.3.3e) states “The City will establish a minimum density target for the Strategic Growth Areas to support intensification and the development of complete communities”, however it is unclear what the density target is, and through what means that density target will be established (i.e. Secondary Plan or future OPA). We suggest revised language to clarify the minimum density targets applicable;
- 2.3.6a)ii) related to intensification corridors, states “development or redevelopment must be oriented towards those street segments”. In our submission, flexibility should be incorporated and we suggest “must” be replaced with “should”;
- Policy 2.4.2.1 states that “all new development shall be planned to contribute to a housing mix ...”. In our submission, this policy does not appropriately contemplate non-residential development, and would suggest that all new development incorporate a form of housing. We suggest revised language be considered to clarify that the housing mix target is applicable to new development that includes residential uses;
- Policy 2.6.1.3f) applies to Neighbourhood Areas and states that “Commercial, retail, and office (excluding Major Office) uses shall be located on and oriented towards Intensification Corridors, Arterial or Collector streets, and shall be limited to a maximum of 2,000.0 square metres on the ground floor...” In our submission, flexibility should be introduced, and we suggest “shall” be replaced with “should”, in particular so that there is clarity that not every site along a Corridor, Arterial, or Collector street is required to provide commercial, retail and office uses, and to account for site specific circumstances;
- Policy 2.6.1.3g) states that “If a low-rise commercial plaza is being redeveloped as mixed use, then the new mixed use building shall have at least 75% of the original plaza’s commercial gross floor area on the ground floor.” As outlined in our December 16, 2020 letter, in our submission, revised wording should be considered that would require redevelopment to “strive to achieve, where possible, at least 75% of the original plaza’s gross floor area...” so as to allow for consideration of site-specific context and to provide flexibility and avoid the need for an Official Plan Amendment if the policy cannot be met. In particular, as in redevelopment scenarios of large commercial plazas, the existing GFA can be quite substantial to reproduce in consideration of modern built form objectives;
- Policy 2.6.5.1 permits a range of uses in the Commercial District land use designation, however does not permit “Major Retail”, which is a defined term under

-
- the Official Plan. In our submission, the intended function of the Commercial District designation would suggest that it is appropriate for large scale commercial/retail uses to be permitted, including Major Retail, and we suggest Major Retail be added as a permitted use. Policy 2.6.5.2b) does permit “large format retail (i.e. big box) as well as shopping malls”. Understanding that Major Retail is a defined term, we suggest consistency with this defined term throughout the Official Plan for clarity;
- Policy 2.6.8.1m) indicates that “Convenience Retail as part of a mixed-use development” is permitted. “Convenience Retail” uses are not referenced under any other land use designation, whereby Convenience Retail is only permitted on lands designated Strategic Employment and Economic District. We suggest removing the word “convenience” so that the use permitted is “Retail”, and also that “as part of a mixed-use development” be removed;
 - Policy 2.6.8.3b) notes that “the height of buildings should generally be limited to 6 storeys”, whereas the corresponding policy in the September 2020 draft OP indicated a maximum of 16 storeys would be permitted. The proposed building heights are a significant reduction from what was previously contemplated, and we seek clarity as to the appropriateness of such a substantial reduction. In particular, considering the SEED designation is part of a Strategic Growth Area, where significant redevelopment and growth is to be directed. Development beyond a 6 storey maximum may be appropriate to facilitate appropriate levels of growth within this node, and we suggest that revised policy be considered that would be reflective of the intent of the Strategic Growth Areas, such as directed by draft Policy 2.3.3c), which states: “Strategic Growth Areas shall accommodate higher levels of intensification, tall buildings, higher densities...” The policy does not currently permit tall buildings within the SEED designation;
 - Policy 2.6.8.3c) requires that at least 25% of ground floor uses for buildings with frontage along an arterial or collector street contain retail, commercial or other active uses. As outlined in our December 16, 2020 letter, flexibility should be afforded to this policy to account for site specific circumstances, and we suggest revised wording be considered as follows: “The ground floor of buildings with street frontage onto arterial or collector streets should consist of...”;
 - Policy 3.1.3.1 provides direction for application of the Urban Design Standards, stating “The Urban Design Standards are phrased with the terms “will” or “shall”, or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies.” Elsewhere, the draft Official Plan recognizes the importance of flexibility in design standards for successful and appropriate implementation, including Policy 2.5a), which states: “Slight variations from the development standards, with the exception of variations to height and density, may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City.” We suggest Policy 3.1.3.1 be revised to incorporate an appropriate level of flexibility;
 - Policy 3.2.1 provides general urban design standards to evaluate development applications, and will require development applications demonstrate a number of aspects, including (but not limited to) improving the City’s legibility, navigability and sense of place, improving the existing urban fabric, and increasing overall connectivity. In our submission, it is not appropriate for all development applications to demonstrate the provision of certain city building elements, which

-
- may not be feasible to implement in a number of potential instances. We suggest revised wording as follows: “development applications, where appropriate, should demonstrate the following...”
- Policy 3.2.1b) specifies that the City will not support “over development”, which further goes on to define what may be considered as over-development, including “development that exceeds the maximum permitted height or density”, or “unwarranted variances” where an alternative built form is appropriate. We continue to have significant concern regarding the implications of such a policy, for the reasons outlined in our December 2020 letter;
 - Policy 3.2.2 provides standards to evaluate development applications, including that “all development applications shall demonstrate how the proposal contributes to...”, and goes on to outline a number of criteria that includes how an application “contributes to the diversity of housing types and tenures in the neighbourhood”, amongst several other aspects. In our submission, not all development applications would be appropriate to contribute towards a housing mix, or other specific criteria that this policy would require contribution towards. Flexibility should be incorporated, and we suggest revised language as follows: “Development applications, where appropriate, should demonstrate how the proposal contributes...”;
 - Policy 3.2.3a) states that “All development applications received by the City shall demonstrate how the City’s sustainable design priorities are achieved” and provides a range of priorities. In our submission flexibility should be provided, since demonstrating the achievement of the priorities may not be applicable or appropriate for all development applications;
 - Policy 3.2.4.5c) states that “Internal private streets will be used to divide large sites into a grid of blocks and roadways to facilitate safe pedestrian and vehicular movement and that frame appropriately sized development parcels. Internal private streets will be designed to interconnect with adjacent properties to create an overall cohesive and integrated circulation network wherever possible.” In our submission it is not clear as to the applicability of this policy, if the intention is for comprehensive redevelopment, and what may be considered large sites;
 - Policy 3.2.4.6a) states that “Amenity areas shall be consolidated and centrally located”. In our submission, flexibility should be afforded to the policy, such that it may be more appropriate for unconsolidated amenity space, or in a less centralized location due to specific circumstances. We suggest “shall” be replaced with “should”;
 - Policy 3.3.1c) states “Blank facades facing a street, open space or park shall not be permitted”. In our submission, flexibility should be afforded to this policy to consider site specific circumstances, and we suggest revised language as follows: “Blank facades facing a street, open space or park shall be discouraged”;
 - Policy 3.3.4a)ii) states that “where multiple towers are proposed on the same site, tower heights shall be staggered by a minimum of five storeys...” In our submission, this policy is overly prescriptive and may result in limitations to appropriate levels of intensification, or not permit good design. We suggest revised language as follows: “Development should be designed in a manner so as to provide variation in building mass, including but not limited to staggering of building heights where appropriate”;
 - Policy 3.3.6b) would require retail uses to provide a variety of building heights as part of the same building. In our submission, this policy provides an inappropriate

- standard for building design that would promote inefficient standards for development. We suggest that this draft policy be better suited as an urban design guidelines, or that revised wording be considered which allows for flexibility;
- Policy 5.6.2.5c) identifies that “Urban Squares shall be between 0.2 hectares and 1.0 hectares...”. In our submission, it is unclear as to the need for such a rigid policy in the Official Plan for the size of Urban Squares. We suggest flexibility be incorporated to be able to respond to the needs of the community, and suggest the following revised language: “Urban Squares should be planned to be approximately 0.2 ha to 1.0 ha in size”
 - Policy 6.4.2e) would require that all development applications be supported by an Affordable Housing Report. In our submission, the list of materials that would be considered appropriate to facilitate development should be refined through pre-consultation, as there are numerous types of development that would not warrant an Affordable Housing Report, such as those applications proposing strictly non-residential uses. We suggest revised policy be considered;
 - Policy 6.4.2e)iii) would require that development applications that propose 40 dwelling units or more demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units. In our submission, the policy should introduce flexibility, and we suggest that the text “will be required to demonstrate” be replaced with “are encouraged to provide”;
 - Policy 8.4d) would require a Heritage Impact Assessment prior to development of lands identified on Map 8. Based on our review, the Historic Neighbourhoods do not appear to align with designated Heritage Conservation Districts or other Heritage assets as established by the Heritage Act. In our submission, it is inappropriate to require a heritage impact assessment for a broad area of lands that are not identified as having heritage value under the Heritage Act. We suggest that draft policy be revised to clarify that a heritage impact assessment will only be required for lands that are within or adjacent to properties designated under the Heritage Act, or that the draft policy be removed;
 - Policy 8.4.3 relates to Historic Neighbourhoods, which we understand are identified on Map 8 of the draft OP. Prior to development, Policy 8.4.3 would require a Historic Neighbourhood Character Impact Evaluation, in addition to the Heritage Impact Assessment according to draft Policy 8.4d). Based on our review, the Historic Neighbourhoods do not appear to align with designated Heritage Conservation Districts or other Heritage assets as established by the Heritage Act. We request clarification, and are unclear as to the need of such heritage evaluation for lands that are not recognized by the Heritage Act. We suggest revised policy be considered to clarify that heritage assessments would only be required for lands that are within or adjacent to properties or areas designated under the Heritage Act;
 - Policy 9.4.2.2 outlines a list of studies that may be required to be submitted in support of an application, including subsection s), which states: “Urban design brief, including site context and block plan, in accordance with the demonstration plans (see the Appendix for example demonstration plans).” The meaning of the requirement for a submission to be “in accordance with” the demonstration plans is unclear. We suggest revised wording be considered. Further, in our submission it is not appropriate for demonstration plans to form a part of the Official Plan, and the demonstration plans may be better suited for inclusion in the Urban Design Guidelines;

- Policy 9.4.2.2.1 identifies a list of submission materials that are requirements for mid-rise buildings, including a site context/block plan and pedestrian wind study. In our submission the submissions materials required for a mid-rise building submission is overly extensive for this type of built form. We note that as identified by Policy 9.4.2.2.2, the specific submission materials required for mid-rise buildings are the same as what would be required for a tall building. We suggest that revised wording be considered as follows: “development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may require the following”, and that subsections a) and d) be removed;
- Policy 9.5.6b) states that “The distance between the existing lot lines in an infill situation shall be approximately 150.0 metres or less”. It is not clear as to the meaning or intent of such a policy, and would request clarification as to applicability and interpretation;
- Policy 9.5.9 states that “When reviewing an application for Minor Variance, the Committee of Adjustment will also consider the relevant policies of this Plan and all of the following criteria: a) That the variance would not cause substantial detriment, hazard, or annoyance that would detract from the character or amenity of nearby properties, and the resultant development would not adversely affect the traffic and parking conditions in the area”. In our submission, the policy should be revised to “all of the following relevant criteria”, since traffic and parking conditions may not be relevant for the particular variance (e.g., minimum setbacks); and
- Map 4A of the Official Plan labels two features as “Commuter Cycling Network (On – Road)”. We seek clarification if the intent is for the separate features are to be labelled differently.

We would welcome the opportunity to meet with Staff to discuss our comments further.

Please kindly ensure that the undersigned is notified of any further meetings with respect to this matters as well as Notice of the approval of the Official Plan.

Yours very truly,

ZELINKA PRIAMO LTD.



Rob MacFarlane, MPL, MCIP, RPP
Planner

cc. **Choice Properties REIT (via email) Loblaw
Companies Limited (via email)**

Joanne Werth

From: Robert MacFarlane - Zelinka Priamo Ltd.
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 1:46 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Cc: Tomasz Wierzba; cityclerks
Subject: Draft 2 City of Barrie Official Plan: Preliminary Comments on Behalf of Maverick Developments
Attachments: LETTER - Barrie New OP - Comments on Behalf of Maverick Second Draft - (. pdf

Categories: Yellow Category

Good afternoon, please find attached comments on behalf of Maverick Developments regarding the May 6, 2021 Draft Official Plan.

As noted in the attached letter, Maverick would welcome and appreciate the opportunity to meet with Staff to discuss their comments further. Once Staff have had an opportunity to review our preliminary comments, please advise as to the opportunity for a meeting of this nature, and as to Staff's availability.

Please let us know if you have any questions regarding the above or attached.

Thanks

Rob MacFarlane, MPL, MCIP, RPP
Planner

Zelinka Priamo Ltd.

Toronto Office

20 Maud Street, Suite 305
Toronto, ON M5V 2M5
(P) 416-622-6064 X 222

(F) 416-622-3463

robert.m@zpplan.com
www.zpplan.com



VIA EMAIL

June 2, 2021

City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
Barrie, ON
L4M 4T5

Attention: Mr. Tomasz Wierzba, Planner, Development Services Dear Mr.
Wierzba:

Re: Draft New Official Plan – Second Draft

**Preliminary Comments on Behalf of Maverick Development Corporation
Various Properties (Generally Located at Bryne Drive & Caplan Avenue)
Barrie, Ontario**

Our File: MAV/BAR/21-01

We are the planning consultants for Maverick Development Corporation (“Maverick”) for the City of Barrie Official Plan Review. Maverick is the prospective purchaser of the following commercial properties in the City of Barrie:

- 406 and 436 Bryne Drive (Dollarama, Bank and former Home Outfitters);
- 42 Caplan Avenue (Commercial Plaza anchored by Sears Home and Bad Boy);
- 52 Caplan Avenue (The Brick);
- 60-70 Mapleview Drive (Wendy’s and Jack Astors restaurants, and TD Bank); and
- 36 Barrie View Drive (Staples).

The in-effect Official Plan currently designates all of the above Maverick Lands as “General Commercial” as shown on Schedule A., which permits large scale retail uses, supermarkets, and a range of other uses, generally consisting of retail commercial and service uses, office use, and allows for mixed-use development. In addition, the lands are all zoned General Commercial (C4) by By-law 2009-141.

Preliminary written comments for the First Draft Official Plan were provided on behalf of Maverick on April 12, 2021, and we met virtually with planning staff on April 29, 2021 to discuss the same. We have had the opportunity to review the Second Draft Official Plan dated May 6, 2021 and we wish to provide the following comments:

1. A fundamental aspect in the Second Draft Official Plan that Maverick does not support is the proposed “Employment Area – Non-Industrial” designation applied to the Maverick lands at 406 and 436 Bryne Drive, 52 Caplan Avenue, and 60-70 Mapleview Drive. The proposed designation is not consistent with the current or intended commercial function of these lands or general area, and reduces the range of land use permissions currently afforded to the lands under the in-effect

“General Commercial” land use designation. It is unclear to us why staff have determined that the lands located on the westerly side of Bryne Drive should be redesignated “Employment Area – Non-Industrial”. It appears to us that a more natural division between the existing commercial uses and the existing industrial area/uses (to the west) would be the westerly limits of the Maverick Lands, as per the in-effect OP and Zoning By-law mapping. It is our position that the Maverick Lands should be considered the same as the lands directly to the east (across Bryne Drive), which are proposed in the Second Draft to be designated as “Commercial District”, and within a “Strategic Growth Area”. The Maverick lands have comparable characteristics to these lands, including similar built form and range of existing commercial uses. It is our professional opinion that the Maverick Lands represent a logical expansion of the Strategic Growth Area, which would appropriately encompass, reflect and be compatible with the existing commercial node in the area. As such, we request the entirety of the Maverick lands be designated “Commercial District” and included within the “Strategic Growth Area”;

Further to this, it is our understanding that the City of Barrie Land Needs Assessment prepared by Watson dated May 21, 2019 is to inform decisions on the City Structure, including the Official Plan Review and policy structure. Importantly, the methodology used by the Land Needs Assessment does not consider any of the Maverick lands as Employment for the purpose of evaluating the City’s existing employment land base, noting “that the employment land supply has been carried out in accordance to the guidelines in the Growth Plan, 2019 and the L.N.A. Methodology.” There is also no justification provided for the reallocation of existing Commercial Lands to Employment lands within the Land Needs Assessment.

2. Draft Policy 2.3.3 relates to Strategic Growth Areas, and provides direction for future growth and redevelopment. Draft subsection c) acknowledges that redevelopment of the Strategic Growth Areas will be planned over the long term, and the evolution of the area will not be immediate. However, Draft Policy 2.3.3 is silent with respect to interim development permissions that would allow moderate infill or expansion to existing functions that would not otherwise conform with the intensification policies of the draft Official Plan, prior to comprehensive redevelopment. We request that interim development policies be incorporated into the draft Official Plan in order to ensure the continued viability of existing land uses is maintained in advance of comprehensive redevelopment;
3. Draft Policy 2.3.3e) states “The City will establish a minimum density target for the Strategic Growth Areas to support intensification and the development of complete communities”, however it is unclear what the density target is, and through what means that density target will be established (i.e. Secondary Plan or future OPA). We request clarification on the minimum density targets applicable;
4. Draft Policy 2.3.5h) relates to Employment Areas, and notes that “a limited range of small-scale retail and commercial uses may be permitted”. Large scale commercial/retail uses, including Major Retail are permitted by certain Employment Areas designation and should therefore be identified under Section 2.3.5;
5. Draft Policy 2.3.6a) ii) relates to Intensification Corridors, and states “development or redevelopment must be oriented towards those street segments”. In our

-
- submission greater flexibility could be afforded based on the context of the site, and that the word “must” could be replaced with “should”;**
6. Draft Policy 2.4.2.1 states that “all new development shall be planned to contribute to a housing mix ...”. It is our submission that this Draft Policy does not appropriately contemplate non-residential development, and could be interpreted to mean that all new development needs to incorporate a form of housing. We suggest revised language be considered to clarify that the housing mix target is applicable to new development that includes residential uses;
 7. Draft Policy 2.6.5.1 permits a range of uses in the Commercial District land use designation, however does not permit “Major Retail”, which is a defined term under the Official Plan. In our submission, the intended function of the Commercial District designation would suggest that it is appropriate for large scale commercial/retail uses to be permitted, including Major Retail. Major Retail should therefore be added as a permitted use.
 8. Draft Policy 2.6.5.2b) permits “large format retail (i.e. big box) as well as shopping malls”. Understanding that Major Retail is a defined term, we suggest consistency with this defined term throughout the Official Plan for clarity, including updating Policy 2.6.5.2b) to reference Major Retail;
 9. Draft Policy 2.6.9.2 indicates that Major Retail uses are to be “subject to the policies in Sections 2.6.10.2, 2.6.10.3, and 2.6.9.3”. Based on a review of those sections, it is unclear the applicability of the “Employment Area – Industrial” standards to the Major Retail permitted use, as sections 2.6.10.2 and 2.6.10.3 relate mainly to industrial employment type uses;
 10. Draft Policy 2.6.9.2d) would restrict any new retail uses as standalone, and new retail would be required to be in association with another use in the same building. In our submission, the requirements for new retail to be associated with another use is an inappropriate standard. We suggest revised Draft Policy be considered to allow for small scale standalone retail uses, including infill type development, within the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation;
 11. Policy 2.6.9.2e)i) provides criteria for the development of Major Retail uses in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, and proposes a cap to ‘contiguous clusters’ of Major Retail Uses. In addition to our concerns with the appropriateness of the proposed “Employment Area – Non Industrial” designation for 75 Mapleview Drive West as noted above and notwithstanding that ‘contiguous cluster’ is unclear, we are concerned with the implications for implementation including under the Zoning By-law. In our experience, a combined cap that is applicable to multiple developments under separate ownership is difficult to track. We suggest that Policy 2.6.9.2e)i) be removed.
 12. Draft Policy 2.6.9.2e) provides criteria for the development of Major Retail uses in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, and proposes to cap individual major retail uses at 5,000 sq. m. It is our submission that this cap is too small and should be increased to be more reflective of a Major Retail type use. Flexibility should also be included into the wording of this policy to ensure that expansions to existing a Major Retail use that result in a total GFA beyond the maximum cap, does not trigger the need for an Official Plan Amendment application;

13. Draft Policy 2.6.9.2h) provides direction for the provision of sensitive land uses within the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation. Clarification is requested as to what (if any) sensitive land uses are permitted within this designation that this policy is intended to guide;
14. Draft Policy 3.1.3.1 provides direction for application of the Urban Design Standards, stating “The Urban Design Standards are phrased with the terms “will” or “shall”, or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies.” Elsewhere, the draft Official Plan recognizes the importance of flexibility in design standards for successful and appropriate implementation, including Draft Policy 2.5 a), which states: “Slight variations from the development standards, with the exception of variations to height and density, may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City.” Draft Policy 3.1.3.1 should be revised to incorporate more flexibility;
15. Draft Policy 3.2.1 provides general urban design standards to evaluate development applications, and will require development applications demonstrate a number of aspects, including (but not limited to): improving the city’s legibility, navigability and sense of place; improving the existing urban fabric; and increasing overall connectivity. In our submission, it is not appropriate for all development applications to demonstrate the provision of certain city building elements, which may not be feasible to implement in a number of potential instances. To provide greater flexibility we suggest revised wording as follows: “development applications, where appropriate, should demonstrate the following...”
16. Draft Policy 3.2.1b) specifies that the City will not support “over development”, which further goes on to define what may be considered as over-development. Over-development includes a number of criteria, including “development that exceeds the maximum permitted height or density”, or “unwarranted variances” where an alternative built form is appropriate. We continue to have significant concern regarding the implications of such a Draft Policy, as there may be instances where it is appropriate to consider additional height or density beyond what is currently contemplated by Policy and which may not otherwise be considered as ‘over development’ and align with key objectives of the Official Plan, effectively restricting otherwise potential good planning practices;
17. Draft Policy 3.2.2 provides standards to evaluate applications, including that “all development applications shall demonstrate how the proposal contributes to...”, and goes on to outline a number of criteria that includes how an application “contributes to the diversity of housing types and tenures in the neighbourhood”, amongst a number of other aspects. In our submission, not all development applications would be appropriate to contribute towards a housing mix, or other specific criteria that this Draft Policy would require contribution towards. Therefore, we request flexibility be incorporated, and suggest revised language as follows: “Development applications, where appropriate, should demonstrate how the proposal contributes...”;
18. Draft Policy 3.2.3a) states that “All development applications received by the City shall demonstrate how the City’s sustainable design priorities are achieved” and provides a range of priorities. In our submission flexibility should be provided, since

-
- demonstrating the achievement of the priorities may not be applicable or appropriate for all development applications;**
19. Draft Policy 3.2.4.5c) states that “Internal private streets will be used to divide large sites into a grid of blocks and roadways to facilitate safe pedestrian and vehicular movement and that frame appropriately sized development parcels. Internal private streets will be designed to interconnect with adjacent properties to create an overall cohesive and integrated circulation network wherever possible.” Please clarify the applicability of the Draft Policy, and if the intention is for comprehensive redevelopment and what are considered large sites;
 20. Draft Policy 3.3.4.6a) states that “Amenity areas shall be consolidated and centrally located”. In our submission, flexibility should be afforded to the Draft Policy, such that it may be more appropriate for unconsolidated amenity space, or in a less centralized location due to specific circumstances. We suggest the word “shall” be replaced with “should”;
 21. Draft Policy 3.3.1c) states “Blank facades facing a street, open space or park shall not be permitted”. In our submission, flexibility should be afforded based on the context of the site, and we suggest revised wording as follows: “Blank facades facing a street, open space or park are discouraged”;
 22. Draft Policy 3.3.4a)ii) states that “where multiple towers are proposed on the same site, tower heights shall be staggered by a minimum of five storeys...” In our submission, this Draft Policy is overly prescriptive and may result in limitations to appropriate levels of intensification or good design. We suggest revised language as follows: “Development should be designed in a manner so as to provide variation in building mass, including but not limited to staggering of building heights where appropriate”;
 23. Draft Policy 3.3.5 states “The following urban design standards apply to Single Storey Employment Buildings: a) Single Storey Employment Buildings are those buildings exclusively located within Employment Areas and are generally low-rise in form, including but not limited to warehouses, distribution centres, and manufacturing or assembly facilities.” Given the permissions for major retail in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, please clarify that this policy is not applicable to Major Retail uses;
 24. Draft Policy 3.3.6b) would require retail uses to provide a variety of building heights as part of the same building. We suggest that this draft Policy be better suited as an urban design guideline, or that revised wording be considered which allows for flexibility given the size and nature of the proposed development;
 25. Draft Policy 5.6.2.5c) identifies that “Urban Squares shall be between 0.2 hectares and 1.0 hectares...”. It is unclear to us why there is a need for such a rigid Draft Policy in the Official Plan for the size of Urban Squares. We suggest flexibility be incorporated to be able to respond to the nature of the proposed development and the needs of the community, and suggest the following revised language: “Urban Squares should be planned to be approximately 0.2 ha to 1.0 ha in size”;
 26. Draft Policy 6.4.2e) would require that all development applications be supported by an Affordable Housing Report. In our submission, the list of materials that would be considered appropriate to facilitate development should be refined through pre-

- consultation, as there are numerous types of development that would not warrant an Affordable Housing Report, such as those applications proposing strictly non-residential uses. We suggest revised Draft Policy wording to reflect the nature of the proposed development;**
27. Draft Policy 6.4.2e)iii) would require that development applications that propose 40 dwelling units or more demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units. In our submission, the Draft Policy should introduce flexibility, and we suggest that the text “will be required to demonstrate” be replaced with “are encouraged to provide”;
 28. Draft Policy 9.4.2.2 outlines a list of studies that may be required to be submitted in support of an application, including subsection s), which states: “Urban design brief, including site context and block plan, in accordance with the demonstration plans (see the Appendix for example demonstration plans).” Clarification is requested on what is meant by the submittal being “in accordance with” the demonstration plans. It is our submission that it is not appropriate for demonstration plans to form a part of the Official Plan, and are better suited for inclusion in the Urban Design Guidelines;
 29. Draft Policy 9.4.2.2.1 identifies a list of submission materials that are requirements for mid-rise buildings, including a site context/block plan and pedestrian wind study. In our submission the submissions materials required for a mid-rise buildings submission is overly extensive for this type of built form. We note that as identified by Draft Policy 9.4.2.2.2, the specific submission materials required for mid-rise buildings are the same as what would be required for a tall building. We suggest that revised wording be considered as follows: “development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may require the following”, and that subsections a) and d) be removed;
 30. Draft Policy 9.5.6b) states that “The distance between the existing lot lines in an infill situation shall be approximately 150.0 metres or less”. Please clarify the intent for such a policy, and its applicability and interpretation; and
 31. Draft Policy 9.5.9 states that “When reviewing an application for Minor Variance, the Committee of Adjustment will also consider the relevant policies of this Plan and all of the following criteria: a) That the variance would not cause substantial detriment, hazard, or annoyance that would detract from the character or amenity of nearby properties, and the resultant development would not adversely affect the traffic and parking conditions in the area”. In our submission, that this policy is overreaching and unnecessary, given that the assessment of Minor Variance Application is governed by the prescribed tests in the Planning Act.

June 2, 2021

We appreciate your consideration of our comments, and we will continue to participate in the Official Plan review process. In light of the matters/concerns set out above, our client and ourselves would appreciate the opportunity to meet with City Staff at the earliest opportunity.

Should you have any questions, or require further information, please do not hesitate to call.

Yours very truly,

ZELINKA PRIAMO LTD.



Rob MacFarlane, MPL, MCIP, RPP Planner

cc. The Client (via email)

Joanne Werth

From: Sally Campbell
Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 9:39 AM
To: NewBarrieOP
Cc: Julia Zhang; Hao Zhang
Subject: Comments: 2nd Draft City of Barrie Official Plan
Attachments: 2021-05-31 JD letter Barrie 2nd Darft OP (sc).pdf

Importance: High

Categories: Yellow Category

Please find attached our comments on the City's second draft Official Plan as it relates to the proposed designation of land located at Lakeside Terrace.

Please let me know if there are any questions regarding these comments and we look forward to hearing from you shortly.

Regards,



SALLY CAMPBELL RPP. MCIP. MRTPI.

JD DEVELOPMENT GROUP CORP.

DIRECTOR, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT



M (647) 532-1374

E SALLY.CAMPBELL@JDDEVELOPMENT.CA



May 31st, 2021

Tomasz Wierzba, MCIP, RPP
Policy Planner

City of Barrie

70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5
new.barrieop@barrie.ca

VIA EMAIL

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

**Re: Comments on 2nd Draft of City of Barrie Official Plan
52, 56 & 58 Lakeside Terrace, City of Barrie
[Block B Plan 51M1023], (formerly 50 Lakeside Terrace)**

We are in the process of developing our lands at Lakeside Terrace in the City of Barrie. The lands were previously approved for three condominium buildings geared toward housing for older adults. An Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Condominium Exemption and Site Plan Control applications have all been approved to facilitate this development.

The lands are a total of 1.8 hectares in area. All three buildings will have a total of 479 units with two of the buildings a height of 12 storeys and one a height of 10 storeys. This results in a density of approximately 266 units per hectare. The Little Lake Seniors Community development, which these lands form part of, has been planned out to be developed as a campus type environment, including access to various medical practitioners in one location and assisted living facilities in another location of the site. As a result, the subject lands do not function as a typical residential or commercial development.

The subject lands are currently designated as 'General Commercial' within a defined Special Policy Area recognizing the various uses on the lands with a density that can exceed 54 units per hectare. In our opinion, any proposed designation must recognize the existing permissions on the property, including approved building heights and densities.

The designation proposed on the lands in the current draft Official Plan is 'Medium Density'. Regarding building height, this designation identifies a minimum height of 6 storeys with no indication of a maximum height provision. This is contrary to the first Official Plan draft, which noted that building height should be between 6 and 12 storeys. The proposed 'High Density' designation suggests a minimum height requirement of 12 storeys. As such, there seems to be no consideration given to which designation provides for heights between 6 and 12 storeys. Our preference is that

the language from the first draft be reinstated in the second draft with respect to height permissions in the 'Medium Density' designation.

Regarding density, the 'Medium Density' designation provides for a maximum density of 125 units per hectare, whereas the first draft proposed a density of 300 units per hectare. The 'High Density' designation provides for a minimum density of 300 units per hectare. Again, there seems to be no consideration given for densities between 125 and 300 units per hectare. If the intent is for the 'Medium Density' designation to allow densities between 125-300 units per hectare then in our opinion this should be clearly indicated.

Upon review of the policies of the draft Official Plan as proposed, the subject lands should be designated 'High Density' to recognize the current permissions, densities and building heights on the subject lands. Anything less than this would limit the development potential of our property.

We look forward to your review and continuing involvement in this process. Please also accept this letter as our formal request to be notified of all future meetings regarding the Official Plan Review process.

Sincerely,

Sally Campbell RPP., MCIP., MRTPI.

Director, Planning & Development

cc. Julia Zhang, President, JD Development
Hao Zhang, VP Planning, JD Development

Joanne Werth

From: Jennifer van Gennip
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 3:32 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: Comments on Draft 2 from SCATEH Barrie Chapter
Attachments: SCATEH Barrie Chapter OP Submission (Draft 2).pdf
Categories: Yellow Category

Good afternoon,

Please find attached the comments on Draft Two of the OP, from the SCATEH Barrie Chapter. We will make similar comments orally at tonight's Public Meeting.

Thank you for the opportunity to engage in this process. Jennifer van

Gennip
Director of Communications
Redwood Park Communities
Hope through Housing

www.redwoodparkcommunities.com





Barrie Official Plan Draft 2 Consultation

Submission from the Simcoe County Alliance to End Homelessness (SCATEH) Barrie Chapter

June 2021

The SCATEH Barrie Chapter wishes to thank City staff for their continued and open engagement on the Draft Official Plan (“Draft OP”) throughout the consultation process for this important piece of policy.

We have noted previously that as an alliance to end homelessness, our primary interest in the Official Plan is in the policies that will protect existing affordable housing stock, and incentivize/require additional affordable housing stock. But it would be more accurate to say, our primary interest is the people who call Barrie home, and their human right to safe and adequate housing that they can afford.

We appreciate that our recommendations from Draft One have been taken into consideration, and we are happy to see some of them reflected in Draft Two: affordable housing policies pulled into one section for easier reference, stronger wording around affordable housing targets as being required rather than encouraged, and stronger wording around the protection of affordable housing stock in condominium conversions.

We are also pleased to see the addition of a section on protecting vulnerable populations.

We do have some further recommendations to strengthen the Draft OP and make sure that as we look to the future, our planning is resident-centric rather than investor-centric.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Defined Terms

We recognize that the city cannot redefine affordable housing for the purposes of the OP. However, the province’s definition of *affordable housing* leaves many of our most marginalized citizens on the streets and leaves many low- to moderate-income households precariously housed or forced to move away.

In Draft Two, we see the addition of the term “attainable” but this is an undefined term that could be interpreted as either above or below “affordable.” For this reason, we again recommend *deeply affordable housing* as a sub-definition within the *affordable housing* targets. If this cannot be enforced for targets, we feel it would at minimum be an appropriate threshold to use to determine eligibility for the City’s incentive programs such as the CIP.

A suggested definition would be:

“a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for *low- to moderate-income households*, or 80% of average market rent, whichever is lower. Annual household income will be based upon the most recent Census of Canada statistics for the City of Barrie which is updated every five years, with *low- to moderate-income households* defined as an annual household income in the lowest 40th percentiles.” (As opposed to the 60th percentile.)

2. Affordable Housing Targets

In Draft One, we saw a target of 10% *affordable housing* city-wide, and 35% requirements in the Urban Growth Centres (UGC). Our recommendation was to maintain the UGC target at 35% and increase the citywide target to 30%.

Instead, in Draft Two we see the city-wide target stay at 10%, with a drop to a 20% target in the UGCs and the addition of a 20% target in the two Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA).

We recognize that much of the development will happen in the MTSAs and UGCs so this may be a net gain, but we question the reduction from 35% to 20%. Surely it was not in response to an outcry from the public. We strongly recommend reinstating the 35% target for UGCs.

The reason for our recommendation to increase to 35% is based on the fact that *affordable housing* is defined by the province as what is affordable for those with a household income at or below the 60th percentile. A target of 10-20% of new builds citywide as “affordable” for approximately 60% of the population of Barrie will always be a problem. Again, this OP should reflect the best interests of Barrie’s residents. The Draft OP sets ambitious targets to encourage social resilience and complete communities where everyone has access to trails, parks, and transit. But ensuring an adequate supply of housing that people across the income spectrum can afford should be the bedrock of any plan for a resilient community.

3. Vulnerable Populations

We are pleased to see this addition of section 6.4.1 Vulnerable Populations, with a commitment to partnering with non-profits and retrofitting land and buildings to support the housing needs across the housing continuum, as well as a commitment to support and establish warming and cooling centres. Those experiencing homelessness in our city are our neighbours, and city services must be designed with them in mind as well. To this end, we ask that you also add year-round, 24/7 public washroom and drinking water access. Our current public washrooms are limited, they are not winterized, and even in the summer months they close overnight. There is a growing awareness of the need for 24/7/365 public washroom access, for vulnerable populations and also as a best practice for designing accessible communities.

Once again, thank you to City staff for the opportunity to provide comments, and for your consideration of these and other comments related to affordable housing and people vulnerable to homelessness as you work to develop an Official Plan that centres and honours the rights and needs of the people who call Barrie home.

Joanne Werth

From: Shelagh Ois
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 3:23 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Subject: Fw: Resending corrected Comments regarding OP Draft 2
Attachments: Draft OP2 Comments Ois2.docx

Categories: Yellow Category

Hello. I am attaching a second corrected copy of our comments on the New Official Plan ("Draft OP2 Comments Ois2"). All of our personal information included in this email thread is the same. I apologize for the inconvenience. The year of an earlier Official Plan that was referenced was incorrect, and have included a reference to a map. It has been changed from 2009 to 2018. Thank you.

Shelagh Ois

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Shelagh Ois
To: new.barrieop@barrie.ca <new.barrieop@barrie.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021, 11:20:17 a.m. EDT
Subject: Comments regarding OP Draft 2

Hello. Our names are Shelagh and Harald Ois @ shelagh@barrie.ca @ 217 Spruce St. Barrie, L4N 4A9. We can be reached at 705-735-9732 or 705-321-1174. Attach are our comments on the OP Draft 2. If you have problems opening this file or have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Regards,

Shelagh and Harald Ois

June 1, 2021

From: Shelagh and Harald Ois

To: Planning/Build Barrie

Re: Comments Draft 2 Official Plan – Tiffin St. West Corridor/Natural Heritage

To Whom it May Concern:

We are small property owners, small business owners and residents of Barrie, and have live here and experienced the vast number of changes to the City since we moved here in 1998. It is only recently that we have become involved in municipal affairs and are happy to do so. Our comments regarding the Draft OP 2 concern the Tiffin St. West corridor and Natural Heritage properties on the North side of Tiffin St. (specifically 518-524). These properties have been zoned EP since at least the 1980s, they abut unevaluated treed wetland, which is zoned commercial, they have entrances along Tiffin St., they have municipal services at the road, and are situated, generally, within a commercial/industrial employment area, with some residential houses on EP land nearby. The properties used to have houses on them, but have long since become vacant lots, which have historically been left either vacant or used for storage, commercial, and/or other uses.

In the 2018 Official Plan, the area surrounding and including these properties were planned and were interpreted as Industrial (Schedule B, 2018). In the new Draft 2 Official Plan, the area is being planned and is interpreted as an Employment Area for Non-Industrial and Industrial Uses. In contrast to Schedule B of the 2018 Official Plan, there are several lots, including 518-524, that have been left out of the Tiffin St. W. DGA Employment area (Map 1, 2021, Land Use - Industrial, Map 2, 2021), and have been included strictly as part of the DGA Natural Heritage System and Greenspace (Map 1 and 2, 2021). At the same time, the properties are planned to abut a Freight Supportive Corridor along Tiffin St. West (Map 4B. 2021). Despite fielding questions at the OP Draft 2 Open House, talking to planners, and our councillor, nobody seems to be able to give us a rationale for why these properties, and a few others in the same vicinity,

need to remain exclusively EP and not part of the 2021 planned Employment Area that surrounds them. As our questions have gone unanswered, we wish to propose a change to the Draft 2 OP with a rationale.

We propose that the vacant lots (518-524) again be included in the planned DGA Employment Area, as it had been in the 2018 OP and as laid out in Schedule B, 2018. This would provide land use flexibility to these properties going forward consistent with the planned DGA Employment Area that they abut in this new OP draft 2. The inclusion of the lots in the DGA Employment area is also consistent with the development of a heavier transportation pathway along Tiffin St. W. It seems contradictory that approximately an acre of environmentally

protected land, which has been downgraded to EPA – level 1 with existing development designation and EPA - level 3 (Map 3, 2021) in this OP, is excluded from such a large, designated employment area. What will they be used for then, if not included, over the next 30 years?

It also seems contradictory that these properties, as they are interpreted in the Draft 2 OP, will abut a freight corridor and will be exposed to increased traffic and an increase in road salt.

Given the heavy regulations on land use and development for EP land, it will be a challenge for small landowners to actively participate in mitigation efforts necessary to reduce chloride (Map 7, 2021) to protect Barrie’s clean drinking water from the increased winter salt application (6.5.1.3, 6.5.1.4) from the proposed Tiffin St. freight corridor. In fact, any desirable future development in the surrounding area will be hampered by the EP designation of these properties, given the strict environmental regulations and by-laws imposed on them, if there is no flexibility and support by planning staff for reconsideration of land use amendments going forward.

However, our interest is in making these properties potential useable and contribute to the growth of the city in the future.

While we would agree that the Natural Heritage System and Green Space should be protected generally for the environmental, economic, social and cultural values and attributes they hold for the long term, we strongly feel that in this case and in this context, these properties do not generally fit into the description of the Natural Heritage characteristics and uses as laid out in the Draft 2 Official Plan (2.6.6.2c, 5.4.4.2a, 5.4.4.3a) and which are outlined by the provincial government. This is not to say that there are not ecological attributes, and any potential rezoning amendment and/or development proposal would require hydrological and environmental assessments, amongst others, environmental mediation, and be subject to site plan control as laid out in the OP draft. If future development should occur, as a result of being included in the employment area, there would be planned opportunity for the use of green infrastructure measures for such things as erosion control for the water course at the road and/or natural buffers between conservation regulated areas. Moreover, low impact development technologies/techniques could be used, as suggested in, for example 6.5.1.

(For what its worth, that the OP suggests that modifications and development can occur on EP land is a beneficial change. However, it might be worth elaborating on, in the section that applies to Environmental Protection, terms such as “Development”, “Minor Modifications” and “Environmental Assessment” for clarity so you don’t have to look all over the place in the OP. These actions and processes that these terms imply could have great potential or be greatly limiting. It would be beneficial to understand this in this section of the OP. There is more to be said here about the challenges of EP rezoning, development and modifications, especially for small landowners!)

We are not against the protection of the Natural Heritage System in Barrie. We appreciate its ecological, social, cultural, and economic value. We oppose, for example, any interference with the naturalize area that runs south of Big Bay Point Rd. east of Yonge St. Currently, on Map 1, 2021 it is designate DGA Natural Heritage System and Greenspace, but abuts a far to large an area allotted for the Barrie South Go station (or MTSA) and new housing development on

Mapleview Rd. E. There has been enough land scraping of naturalized areas and urbanized re-naturalization in this part of the city. This is the type of EP land that has the Natural Heritage land use characteristics as laid out in the OP Draft 2 that one thinks of as “Natural Heritage” and should be protected at all costs. It is difficult to tell if protecting this is part of the plan.

In contrast, given the location and characteristics of the Tiffin St. properties, we again suggest that subject Tiffin St. W. lots be included in the generalized DGA employment area so that there be flexibility in land use conversion over the long term, given intensification targets in this OP draft and the need to satisfy increased local business and employment metrics. If left as is, these properties will be useless and valueless in a largely industrial/non-industrial area. They will be left vacant and unsightly and be inconsistent with development in the area and transportation infrastructure. If you have other plans intended for these exclusively EP properties, including 518-524, on the North side of Tiffin St. West, that give reason for not including them as DGA employment lands, you should indicate them clearly at this time on Map 1 and 2, 2021.

Our interest is to make these lands potentially useful in the long term as part of a well thought out, reader-friendly, flexible official plan, which includes up-to-date green infrastructure and low impact development techniques and technologies as an imperative, that respects the interests and economic capacities of the small landowner and the economic, social and cultural needs of the people of Barrie, the context in which it these properties are situated, and the future growth requirements that may take place in the area. Given the binding nature of official plans and the by-laws that align with them, as well as the length of time The City of Barrie is planning into the future, we feel it is worth the risk of making the suggested changes to this Draft of the OP and opening avenues now for potential future land use, economic growth and employment opportunities within City limits that is consistent with the local planned employment area and transportation context.

We thank you in advance for your consideration of this proposal to include the exclusively EP properties on the north side of Tiffin St. W. (518-524) within the DGA Employment Area. We would be happy to discuss this further if you have questions.

Regards,

Shelagh and Harald Ois

Joanne Werth

From: Trevor Hawkins
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 6:17 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Cc: Rachel Martin; joel.doherty; Dave Aston
Subject: City of Barrie Official Plan Review - Second Draft - HIP Barrie Central Lands
Attachments: 1350L-June2020_Letter-BarrieOfficialPlanReview-Second Draft-HIP Barrie Central.pdf
Categories: Yellow Category

Please find attached our submission in response to the Second Draft of the Official Plan.Regards,

TREVOR HAWKINS M.PL, MCIP, RPP | Partner

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

540 Bingham Centre Drive, Suite 200 | Kitchener | ON | N2B 3X9 | T 519 576 3650 | C 226-750-9260 F 519 576 0121 | thawkins@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)

June 2, 2021

Tomasz Wierzba
Policy Planner, City of BarrieCity
Hall - 70 Collier Street
P.O Box 400
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

**RE: City of Barrie Official Plan Review
HIP Barrie Central Development**

**34-50 Bradford Street and a portion of 125 Dunlop Street West
OUR FILE 1350L**

As you are aware, HIP Barrie Central Inc. (HIP Developments Inc., 'HIP'), submitted a Zoning By-law Amendment application in July 2019 for the lands known municipally as 34-50 Bradford Street and a portion 125 Dunlop Street West (Red Story Field). The application has since been approved by Council and HIP is proceeding through the Site Plan approval process to realise the development of the lands.

While the Site Plan application proceeds through the process, the City of Barrie is undertaking a review of its Official Plan, which resulted in the release of a Draft Official Plan in the fall of 2020, and a Second Draft in Spring 2021. On behalf of HIP, MHBC has reviewed the Plan and the related mapping, as it relates to the subject lands, and the Council approved residential and community institutional development. While we understand the timing of the Official Plan review process and the future requirement for both Council and Ministry approval are unlikely to immediately impact the project, there are aspects of the Plan and mapping that we wanted to raise with staff for their consideration.

We note further that a submission was made in December 2021, however no response was provided and the requested revisions to the mapping have not been made.

Mapping

The proposed (revised) Map 5 identifies Bradford Street as having a 34 metre wide road allowance, whereas the current Official Plan (Schedule E) identifies this portion of Bradford as having a 31 metre wide road allowance. As part of the current Site Plan application, a road widening has been incorporated into the design in accordance with the current, in force Official Plan. HIP does not

anticipate that any changes to this road widening will be required or provided, despite the increase in the road allowance width.

The proposed Map 6 identifies two portions of the site as "Park." It is not clear why any portion of the lands is identified as Park, as the lands are approved for a residential development and a community institutional use (YMCA). We ask that the mapping be corrected to remove the "Park" designation from the lands. This request was previously made in our first submission, however the mapping has not been revised.

Similarly, Map 8 identifies what appears to be the former Red Story Field as a "Gathering Space." Given the approved zoning and the ongoing Site Plan application, we request that the lands be removed from Map 8.

Policies

Generally, the policies align with the proposed development. We note that the Official Plan requires mixed-use developments within the Urban Growth Centre, on an Arterial Street such as Bradford. As the Barrie Central development has an existing site specific zoning in place, and is already proceeding through the Site Plan approval process, we do not anticipate that the new policies will impact the development of the lands, or require changes to the land uses.

The Official Plan contains a number of new and detailed urban design policies, including policies that refer to specific measurements (e.g. step back from a podium). Accompanying the Draft Official Plan are new Draft City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines, which, amongst other direction will implement the new policies in the Official Plan. As the Barrie Central development has already submitted a Site Plan application and is in the process, confirmation should be provided to such applicants, in the form of transition policies that such applications will continue to be processed under the current policy and guideline framework notwithstanding the potential introduction of new guidelines and the policies in the Second Draft of the Official Plan.

We thank the City for the opportunity to engage in the Official Plan Review process and to provide comments. We request that we be kept informed of the future release of documents pertaining to the review of the Official Plan and any public notices regarding either the Official Plan or Urban Design Guidelines. We also ask that staff acknowledge receipt of these comments and that a response be provided regarding the requested changes to the Maps noted in this letter.

Yours truly,

MHBC



Trevor Hawkins, M.PL, MCIP, RPP Partner

cc. HIP Barrie Central Inc.

Dave Aston

Joanne Werth

From: Trish Elliott
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 12:06 PM
To: NewBarrieOP
Cc: Katy Schofield
Subject: Comments on the City of Barrie's 2nd Official Plan Draft
Attachments: 2021 06 02 - Barrie OP Comment Letter.pdf
Categories: Yellow Category

Hi Tomasz,

Please accept the attached letter as our submission on the City's second draft Official Plan.

Please let us know if you need any clarification on our comments, and in particular, we would like to be updated on the specific mapping updates requested on our lands.

We look forward to working with the City on updating and refining the Official Plan. Regards,

Trish Elliott, MCIP, RPP

Manager, Planning
Land Development



351 King Street East, 13th Floor
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5A 0L6
T 416 774 2124

C 437 241 3952

Live Greatly

www.greatgulf.com

Kindly submit all invoices to gglanddev.invoices@greatgulf.com for payment



June 2, 2021

[VIA EMAIL]

City of Barrie

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400

Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner
(new.barrieop@barrie.ca)

**RE: New Official Plan – Draft Two
Review and Feedback**

We are the owners of over 150 hectares of land within both the Hewitt's and Salem Secondary Plan areas. On December 21, 2020 we submitted comments on the City's first draft of the new Official Plan (OP) and draft Urban Design Guidelines. We hope that the City found these comments helpful and appreciate that the new draft OP includes a number of positive updates to the OP as a result. Please accept this letter as our formal comments on the second draft OP.

Community Hub

- In the Salem Secondary Plan, the Land Use Map (Schedule 8C) identifies a future school site on the Ruby Red Maple lands with an asterisk. The Land Use Map on the new Draft OP now identifies this school as a specific area with the Community Hub designation. While we do not object to identifying this general location for a potential future school, there should be acknowledgement that the subdivision layout and best location for this school has not yet been determined and a guarantee that no OPA will be required to adjust the location or size of the Community Hub area.
- The Community Hub land use designation has been applied to the potential future school and community centre locations in the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary plans. While updates were made to the Community Hub policies since the last draft OP, the new draft policies still do not provide adequate flexibility or appropriate transitioning in circumstances where the School Board or City decide to not construct said school or community centre. The lands should be permitted to develop in accordance with the adjacent land use designation to ensure that the development is appropriate for the community. In particular, requiring non-residential uses or a mixed-use development with a residential density of 125-300 units per hectare (i.e. between medium and high density development) may not be compatible with the surrounding area and land use designation, particularly in the Neighbourhood Area. We request that the underlying designation on this school site remain as low and/or medium density consistent with the immediate adjacent designation.

Mapping Issues

- On the Rainsong Phase 2 lands (i.e. NW corner of Lockhart and Yonge), the street

network on all maps and appendices does not match the layout on the Conformity Plan that was approved by the City in 2020. While these are still proposed streets, the OP

3751 Victoria Park Avenue
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M1W 3Z4

Telephone 1 416 449 1340
Fax 1 416 449 6438

Live Greatly
www.greatgulf.com

should reflect the most updated information.

Affordable Housing

- Additional details are needed on how the City's affordable housing policies will be implemented and interpreted, for example, how targets will be monitored and evaluated through the development process.
- The boundary of the Barrie South GO MTSA includes lands that are identified on the Land Use Schedule as Neighbourhood Area. It is unclear how the 20% affordable housing target (policy 2.3.4.a.iii) will be applied in this area, which has been identified for low-rise development and unit types where the definition of an affordable unit may be more challenging to accommodate.
- It is unclear how the requirements of policy 6.4.2.d (i.e. builder options for second dwelling units) will be applied. Specifically, this will need to be transitioned and/or only required for new development applications to account for existing development plans that may not have included lot sizes or home model packages to accommodate safe and attractive second suites (e.g. side yard setbacks for discrete entryways, space in the floor plan for a separated entryway, etc.)

Existing Hewitt's/Salem Secondary Plans

- We appreciate the City's vision that the Hewitt's and Salem Secondary Plan areas be unified with the entire City under the new OP. However, it is disappointing that the structure and existing policies/designations of these areas is being changed before the resulting development can occur and be evaluated.
- Specific policies requiring landowners within these Secondary Plan areas to join the associated cost sharing agreements prior to approval of a subdivision, condominium plan or rezoning have been removed. While policy 9.5.11.d identifies entering into a cost sharing agreement as a potential condition for a Holding Symbol, this does not require such a condition to be applied and comes too late in the process. The OP must include a policy that landowners must be members in good standing with the respective landowner group as a condition of the pre-consultation or conformity exercise, i.e. prior to accepting/processing any development applications.

Other Issues

- Numerous policies within the OP are very detailed and prescriptive (e.g. 4.2.3.1 identifies details like minimum street tree planting distances, or the number of houses on a street before dual sidewalks are required). This level of detail is not appropriate at the OP level and should be directed towards the City's engineering standards and/or zoning by-law. Implementation is an issue as an OPA would be required if the standard could not be achieved, regardless of how minor the deviation may be.
- The calculation of minimum density in the Neighbourhood Area (2.6.1.3.e, i.e. density based on the type of street frontage) seems overly complex at the OP level. Instead, minimum density targets for the Neighbourhood Area should be paired with policies that encourage a denser built form/lot fabric along higher-order roads.
- Section 2.6.1.3.d identifies mid-rise buildings as a permitted use within the Neighbourhood Area; however, this conflicts with the definition of mid-rise buildings (7-12 storeys, per Section 3.3.3) and the maximum 6 storey height restriction within the Neighbourhood Area.
- The Urban Design Standards in Section 3 should be removed from the OP and consolidated with the future City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines document. The standards/guidelines seem duplicative and per policy 3.1.3.2, the difference in their status is nuanced – essentially still requiring applications to evaluate and apply all guidelines subject to City approval.
- Section 3.3.1.d is in direct conflict with the City's Engineering Standards. In particular, Transportation Planning requires that setbacks to driveways on corner lots be so far

away from the intersection that it is not possible to put a ground-related building in close proximity to the intersection. While we support this policy (as-is) in the OP, this needs to be fully communicated and updated in the Engineering Standards.

- Section 4.3.1.4.d requires that sidewalks in certain areas be “substantially widened beyond the City standard”. This is very open ended and may not be suitable in all locations, e.g. sidewalks in front of ground-related housing in Neighbourhood Areas within the MTSA. This policy should be revised to speak to the potential need for wider sidewalks in this area, and rely on updated City standards that provide an acceptable range of widths to be used based on the circumstance. And perhaps this is more appropriate to be included in Urban Design Guidelines.
- The policy references in 5.3.2.c, 5.3.2.g and 5.5.2.5.d appear to be incorrect.

In addition to the comments in our letter, we understand that submissions have been made on the new draft OP by both the Hewitt’s and Salem Landowners Groups. We have reviewed these letters and are generally supportive of the comments and insights that they provide.

We look forward to working with the City to resolve and work through the various issues that have been identified. Should you have any questions or require clarification on any of our comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

GG (9 Mile) Limited.,

**Rainsong Land Development Inc. and
Ruby Red Maple Development Inc.**



Kathleen Schofield

Executive Vice President, Land Development

Joanne Werth

From: Wes Crown
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 3:44 PM
To: cityclerks; NewBarrieOP
Cc: John Di Flaviano
Subject: New City of Barrie Official Plan (2nd Draft) re 220 Mapleview Drive East, o/b JohnMark Holdings Inc.
MHBC File 20371B
Attachments: L to City - 220 Mapleview Drive East & new OP - May 27, 2021.pdf
Categories: Yellow Category

See attached letter.

Wes

WESLEY R. CROWN, BES, RPP, MCIP | Associate

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at wcrown@mhbcplan.com or 705-534-4635

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 235 | F 705 728 2010 | wcrown@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

May 27, 2021

City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

cityclerks@barrie.ca

newbarrieop@barrie.ca

Attention: Mayor Lehman and Members of Council

Dear Mayor Lehman and Council:

RE: New City of Barrie Official Plan (2nd Draft)

220 Mapleview Drive East, o/b JohnMark Holdings Inc.

Our File 20371B

MHBC Planning has been retained by JohnMark Holdings Inc. to provide them planning advice and guidance with respect to their property at 200 Mapleview Drive East and to provide comments on their behalf to the City regarding the new Official Plan and how it proposes to address the unique development issues of the property.

Our Clients property is strategically located north of Mapleview Drive in a major employment area in the City of Barrie, approximately 1.6 kilometres east of Provincial Highway 400. The property is a corner lot located northwest of the intersection of Mapleview Drive and Huronia Road and abutting the railway line.

The area is comprised of commercial and office uses on the southwest corner of the intersection and light industrial uses on the other three corners as transitional land uses to the conservation land and residential neighbourhoods further to the east along Mapleview Drive. Further to the west and along Welham Road are more traditional major office and industrial employment uses. The subject property has an approximate frontage of 265 metres on Mapleview Drive, a frontage of approximately 159 metres on Huronia Road and an approximate area of 6.4 hectares (15.8 acres).

The location of the property is identified in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1 – Location Map



As the City and Council are aware, the property supports a significant portion of the Lover's Creek Marsh, a Provincially Significant Wetland. With this feature, and the required minimum 30 metre buffer, the effective developable area of the property is broken into two areas with a total remaining developable area at the intersection of Mapleview and Huronia Road being approximately only 1 hectare in size. Moreover, the planned widenings of both Mapleview Drive and Huronia Road will further reduce the developable portion of the subject lands. These development constraints and design imperatives will make it difficult, if not impossible, for our Client to achieve the planned land use and "Employment Area - Industrial" functions as set out in the draft New Official Plan as shown on Figure 1 attached.

It is our opinion that in light of these significant environmental constraints, the City's goal of protecting and designating all Level 1 NHS resources, creating a planning framework that achieves the employment goals for the City, and being consistent and in conformity with the PPS and Growth Plan, that the best planned use for the subject property would be the "Employment Area - Non-Industrial" designation. Changes to Map 2 of the Draft new Official Plan would be required.

Please accept this request and comments on behalf of our Clients. We look forward to continuing to work with City Staff in the consideration of this request and making the changes to the new Official Plan to further ground truth its land use structure, designations and policy approach to city building.

We look forward to your review and response. Yours truly,

MHBC


Wesley R. Crown, BES, MCIP, RPP
Associate

Attachment

c. John Di Flaviano

2 Re: 220 Mapleview Drive East, Barrie
Our File No: 20371B

Figure 1 **F**



LAND USE

CITY OF BARRIE
 OFFICIAL PLAN 2nd DRAFT - MAY 2021
 MAP 2 - LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

220 Maplevie Drive East


Part Lot 10, Concession 12
 Geographic Township of Innisfil
 City of Barrie
 County of Simcoe

LEGEND

- Subject Property
- Neighbourhood Area
- Employment Area - Industrial
- Commercial District
- Natural Heritage System
- Greenspace

DATE May 27, 2021

SOURCES
 City of Barrie - Official Plan 2nd Draft - May 2021



20371B - Planning Letter



Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:09 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Draft OP Comments
Attachments: 17 Jacobs Terrace - Draft2OP-Comment Letter_June2021.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Darren Vella <dvella@ipsconsultinginc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 2:44 PM
To: Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>; Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Cc: Isabel Bercasio; TJ Rinomato; Kyle Galvin; Darren Vella
Subject: Re: Draft OP CommentsGood

Afternoon

On behalf of Tonlu Holdings, please find attached our comments on the draft Official Plan. We would like an opportunity to meet and discuss these comments upon your review.

Thank you



Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP

PRESIDENT & DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

647 Welham Road, Unit 9, Barrie, ON L4N 0B7
Tel: 705 – 812 - 3281 Ext. 22 Fax: 705 – 812 - 3438

E-Mail: davidvella@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com

PLEASE NOTE WE HAVE MOVED

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

NOTE: This e-mail message and attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

June 2nd, 2021

City of Barrie
70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400 Barrie, ON
L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

Re: Draft Official Plan Comments – Draft Two
17 Jacobs Terrace
City File: D28-009-2021

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On behalf of Tonlu Holdings Ltd., owners of lands known as 17-27 Jacobs Street in the City of Barrie (herein referred to as the 'subject site'), Innovative Planning Solutions (IPS) is providing the following correspondence relative to the City of Barrie Draft Official Plan (Version Two – May 6, 2021).

Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, please accept the following comments for consideration. For the reasons outlined below, we are requesting that the subject be included in the *'High Density' designation or that additional language be added to the 'Medium Density' designation to support development to its full potential.*

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION & SURROUNDING LAND USES

The subject lands are located at 17-27 Jacobs Terrace in the Allandale neighbourhood of the City of Barrie. The lands possess a total area of 9,146.8m² with approximately 100 metres of frontage along Jacobs Terrace. The lands are relatively flat and are mostly free of vegetation with limited tree coverage along the borders of the property. The lands are trapezoidal in shape and are in proximity (approximately 350m) to the Allandale Waterfront Go station.

The lands to the north, east and west of the property are primarily developed with industrial uses. The neighbouring property to the east at 272 Innisfil Street has recently received approval for a Zoning By-law amendment for a 17-storey residential tower. Located across the street along the frontage of Jacobs Terrace exists the Bayview Spur rail line that connects into the Barrie Collingwood Railway (BCRY). The lands to the south of the subject lands are designated City Centre and currently contain low-rise residential uses. The lands to the south are designated medium density in the proposed Official Plan and are within the MTSA. Access is taken from Jacobs Terrace with a large curb cut located relatively central to the frontage of the property.

Figure 1 illustrates the subject lands.



3.0 DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENTS

The Draft Official Plan identifies the following designations for the subject lands:

Map 1: *'Major Transit Station Area (MTSA)'*

Map 2: *'Medium Density'*

Map 7: *'WHPA – C (5-10 Year Capture Zone)'*

Map 8: *'Historic Neighbourhood Boundary'*

Map 9: *'Lake Simcoe Regional Conservation Authority'* – within authority boundary.

The general direction of the draft Official Plan identifies the subject lands as being within a Major Transit Station Area (MTSA), within 500m of the Major Transit Station. This is supported and welcomed by my client. Section 2.3.4 states that Major Transit Station Areas are to function as Strategic Growth Areas and development within the Allandale Major Transit Station Area are to achieve a minimum density target of 70 units per hectare and conform to Section 8 – Planning a Cultural City. Section 2.3.3(c) provides that “Strategic Growth Areas shall accommodate higher levels of intensification, tall buildings, higher densities, and will be planned to evolve over the long-term as distinct places of major activity around planned transit facilities, primary gateways into the City, and existing regional shopping destinations.”

Although the density target of 70 units per hectare is a minimum value, it is well below the minimum 150 residents and jobs combined per hectare for Transit corridors and station areas listed in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. It is also unclear why the Allandale Station possesses a minimum density target of 70 units per hectare while the Barrie South Major Transit Station Area has a minimum density target of 150 units per hectare. The Allandale station is located adjacent to the Urban Growth Centre and not only contains the Go Station but also the future Barrie Transit Hub. This collection of transit supportive activities deserves policies to support densities at the high levels within the City. It is recommended that the minimum density target be revised to be more aligned with the Growth Plan to achieve the goal of becoming a medium-sized city.

In accordance with Section 2.4.2.2(b) the Growth Management Strategy, all built-up areas will “be planned to accommodate new development with a housing mix that is at least 74% high density,...” and “shall be directed toward Strategic Growth Areas including the Urban Growth Centre and the Allandale Major Transit Station Area...”

Under Section 2.6.2.2 - Medium Density Designation the following policy states:

- a) Lands within the Urban Growth Centre (shown on Map 1) that are designated Medium Density may be considered for development in accordance with the policies of the High Density designation in Section 2.6.3 of this Plan and without requiring an amendment to this Plan, but only if the lands designated Medium Density abut (i.e., share a common lot line with) lands designated High Density.

We herein request a subtle modification to this policy to address the need for high density development on the subject property.

- a) Lands within the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area (shown on Map 1) that are designated Medium Density may be considered for development in accordance with the policies of the High Density designation in Section 2.6.3 of this Plan and without requiring an amendment to this Plan, but only if the lands designated Medium Density abut (i.e., share a common lot line with) lands designated High Density.

This revision results in a select number of additional properties being considered for high density development. Other than the subject property, the other parcels would require a property consolidation to accomplish a high density development given their overall size. It is our opinion that this policy language provides consideration for both medium and high density developments given the importance of building transit supportive densities.

The '*High Density*' land use designation aims to provide for buildings with a minimum height of twelve (12) storeys and a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare (2.6.3.3). Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, there appears to be a significant gap in the density permitted between Medium and High Density and we encourage the City to review the maximum density permitted for the Medium Density designation, as this will greatly limit development and restrict the provision of residential units in the City.

It is our opinion that based on the location of the subject site relative to the Major Transit Station and the unique characteristics of the subject lands make it more suitable for the High-Density Designation for several reasons.

1. The subject site is in an important location to support growth and will play a pivotal role in intensification initiatives for the City and the ability to strive towards creating a more complete community. In this case, the subject site lies within walking distance from the Allandale Major Transit Station and planned Barrie Transit Hub and is immediately adjacent to the High Density designation.
2. The subject site is near Essa Road. Essa Road is a main arterial road and transit priority location. This is a location in which high density development should be considered.
3. The subject lands are in close proximity to Highway 400/Essa Interchange.
4. It is understood that among others, the Medium Density designation is to provide a transition area from the High Density Areas to Neighbourhood Area Designated lands in accordance with the applicable transition policies of Section 3. The subject site is located approximately 62m from the nearest Neighbourhood Area designated lands which allows for ample transition from High Density to Neighbourhood Area Designation. The development of high density residential is appropriately buffered from Neighborhood Areas where transition and lower densities would be considered more appropriate.
5. Placing high density in this location is not viewed as negatively impacting abutting developments and would permit a built form that is similar to the land uses that have been recently approved adjacent to the site.
6. Section 1.3 Founding Principles states that "Planning for the complete and more urban city, as envisioned in this Plan, means directing growth to appropriate locations that can support that growth. This also means implementing a shift in how we accommodate growth by directing more growth to intensification areas, where infrastructure and services such as transit already exist, and where a wider range of housing choices and community services/amenities can be more easily provided." The subject lands can accommodate growth and provide residential units to the market, in an area with existing transit.

7. High density development on the subject site can be serviced by existing municipal services and represents a better use of underutilized lands within the MTSA. Jacobs Terrace will be a fully reconstructed road allowance which can support high density growth.
8. The lands are near the downtown (UGC), where an abundant amount of commercial and retail uses, and employment opportunities exist. These uses can effectively service a residential use at a higher density. In addition, a high density development would provide residents and an increased population near the downtown, encouraging investment in the downtown area.
9. Permitting high density in this location has the effect of protecting the valuable heritage and architectural resources of the Allandale Community by achieving the necessary density targets and redeveloping in an area that possesses no apparent cultural heritage value.

We would like an opportunity to discuss the other benefits of this site upon staff's review of this correspondence.

4.0 BUILT FORM TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA COMMENTS

As part of the Draft Official Plan, the City has included built form types and development criteria for each type (Section 3.3). It provides a level of detail not commonly found within an Official Plan and would be more appropriately located in an Urban Design Guideline document. This level of detail will result in significant barriers to development and ultimately unnecessary amendments to the Official Plan to resolve. This has the effect of slowing down the development approval process and slowing intensification efforts. It also restricts the artistic aspects of architects, urban designers, and landscape architects to create engaging and unique spaces that may not fit into the "box" that is being created by these Official Plan Policies.

For example, Policy 3.3.4.ii.c. states that *"The tower will be setback a minimum of 15.0 metres from: (1) the side property line; (2) the rear property line, and; (3) the centre line of an abutting right-of-way;"*. This policy will restrict potential development opportunities within the City where a site may be appropriate for tower placement however the site constraints are such that a tower does not meet one of the setback criteria triggering an OPA. It is reasonable for a development to proceed with a tower that is sited closer to a property line without an OPA where it is demonstrable that the impacts of a reduced tower setback are mitigated (such as along a rail corridor or highway).

5.0 CONCLUSION

On behalf of Tonlu Holdings Ltd., Innovative Planning Solutions is requesting a meeting with staff to review these comments. We believe that a subtle policy change which impacts very few properties has great benefits to the Major Transit Station Area. This change provides the flexibility needed in Major Transit Station Areas to meet the main objectives of the Official Plan, which is to provide more affordable or attainable housing options in the City of Barrie, which will ultimately result in increased densities. This designation would also facilitate a more efficient use of the subject lands and a compact built form, supported by all levels of planning policy and legislature.

Respectfully submitted, Innovative
Planning Solutions

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Vella', written over a horizontal line.

Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP
President and Director of Planning

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:11 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: 61 Big Bay Pt. Rd. - CW Bellrose GP Inc.
Attachments: Draft OP comment letter May 28, 2021.pdf

Importance: High

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Ronald Richards
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:40 AM
To: Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Cc: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>; Kyle Braithwaite
Subject: 61 Big Bay Pt. Rd. - CW Bellrose GP Inc.
Importance: High

Michelle/Tom, please see our attached comments, on behalf of CW Bellrose GP Inc, regarding the draft official plan.

Ron Richards





R.G. Richards & Associates

May 28, 2021

Michelle Banfield, RPP
Director of Development Services
The City of Barrie
70 Collier Street
Barrie, Ontario L4M 4T5

Dear:

Ms. Banfield

Re: Draft City of Barrie Official Plan

We represent CW Bellrose GP Inc. the beneficial owners of 61 Big Bay Point Road located at the SW corner of Big Bay Point Road and Bayview Road (the Site).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this latest version of the draft Official Plan.

The designation proposed for the Site in the draft official plan is Non-Industrial Employment. The size (8,451 msq.) and location of the Site does not, in our opinion, readily lend itself to development under these proposed policies. **We are of the view that the site should be designated as Commercial District to allow for development as planned and permitted under the existing OP designation and zoning.**

As you may know our client has filed a pre-consultation application for this Site. Current plans envisage a modern car wash and convenience retail development. We would like to ensure that this Site retains its currently permitted uses.

We would welcome an opportunity to meet and discuss this matter prior to Council's consideration of the new OP.

Regards,

Ron Richards, President

R.G. Richards & Associates

cc. Kyle Braithwaite, Forum Properties

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:07 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Draft OP Comments
Attachments: 571 Huronia Road - OP Comment Letter_June2021.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Kyle Galvin
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 4:01 PM
To: Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>; Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Cc: Tejveer Thind
Subject: Draft OP Comments

Good Afternoon Tomasz and Michelle

On behalf of 2462520 Ontario Limited owners of lands known as 571 Huronia Road, please find attached comments on Draft 2 of the Official Plan.

Thank you,



Kyle Galvin, H.BCD, MCIP, RPP

Senior Planner

647 Welham Road, Unit 9A, Barrie, ON L4N 0B7

Tel: 705 - 812 - 3281 extension 27 | Fax: 705 - 812 - 3438

E-Mail: kgalvin@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

June 2, 2021

City of Barrie
70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400 Barrie, ON
L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

Re: Draft Official Plan Comments – Draft Two571
Huronion Road
City File: D28-050-2019

On behalf of 2462520 Ontario Limited owners of lands known as 571 Huronia Road, in the City of Barrie (herein referred to as the 'subject site'), Innovative Planning Solutions (IPS) is providing the following correspondence relative to the City of Barrie Draft Official Plan (Version Two – May 6, 2021).

It is noted that the Applicant and IPS are working towards a Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) application to facilitate the development of a gas station complete with a convenience store, drive-through restaurant and car wash on the southwest corner of the property. A formal pre-consultation meeting was held on November 14, 2019.

Based on our review of draft 2 of the Official Plan, please accept the following comments for consideration.

MAPPING REVIEW

The Draft Official Plan identifies the following designations for the subject lands: Map 1:

'Employment Area'

Map 2: *'Employment Area – Industrial'*

Map 3: *'Map 3 EPA – Level 3, EPA – Level 1, EPA – Level 1 with Existing Development Designation Subject to 5.4.2.1.d'*

647 WELHAM ROAD, UNIT 9, BARRIE ONTARIO L4N 0B7

Map 4B: *'Arterial (Mapleview and Huronia)'*

Map 9: *'Lake Simcoe Regional Conservation Authority'* – within authority boundary.

LAND USE DESIGNATION MODIFICATION

Upon review of the Official Plan framework, we would respectfully request that the subject lands be considered for the Employment Area – Non-Industrial Designation. The subject lands are located on the periphery of the employment area and are not located on a Freight Supportive Corridor. The location of the subject lands can serve as a buffer along with the existing commercial plaza across the street to the south west from heavier industrial uses.

Section 2.6.9.2(c) Employment Area – Non-Industrial designation states that this designation shall be located on the periphery of Employment Areas shown on Map 1 and preferably near lands designated Commercial District. Based on Map 1, the subject lands fit this characterization and provide an excellent opportunity to achieve this designation's objective.

It is also important to note that with the changes to the Official Plan that now brings the remainder of the municipal boundary into the Settlement Area, the City of Barrie possesses significant lands designated Employment Area – Industrial. It would appear that the employment land supply exceeds the employment targets to the year 2051. This modification provides further justification for this request.

CONCLUSION

We look forward to the forthcoming Zoning By-law Amendment application for the subject lands and further discussions with staff throughout the process. We are available to discuss should you have any questions or comments. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted, Innovative
Planning Solutions



Kyle Galvin, MCIP, RPP Senior
Planner

CC. 2779246 Ontario Inc.

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:10 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: City of Barrie New Official Plan - A.G.C. Developments re 545 Dunlop St. West
Attachments: 20210531 -Letter to T.Wierzba (Policy Planner) re City of Barrie New OP_AGC Developments.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Jenny Gillegean **On Behalf Of** David White

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 3:35 PM

To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>; Wendy Cooke <Wendy.Cooke@barrie.ca> **Cc:** David White Jenny Gillegean **Subject:** City of Barrie New Official Plan - A.G.C. Developments re 545 Dunlop St. West

Good afternoon Mr. Wierzba and Ms. Cooke,

Re: Our client: A.G.C. Developments

Attached please find Mr. David White's correspondence of May 31, 2021 together with enclosure, in connection with the above matter.

Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail.

Thank you.

** Due to the circumstances surrounding Covid-19, our temporary office hours in Toronto are Monday – Friday, 10 am to 4 pm*

Regards,

Jenny Gillegan

Devry Smith Frank LLP

Lawyers & Mediators

95 Barber Greene Road, Suite 100
Toronto, ON M3C 3E9

[Toronto](#) | [Barrie](#) | [Whitby](#)
[Independent Member of GGI](#)

This email is intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain privileged or confidential information. The sender does not waive any privilege, copyright or other rights. If you have received this email in error, please delete it and notify the sender of the error by reply email or otherwise.



DEVRY SMITH FRANK *LLP*

Lawyers & Mediators

david.white@devrylaw.ca
416.446.3330

BY E-MAIL

May 31, 2021

City of Barrie

City Hall, 1st Floor
70 Collier Street

Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Attention: Mr. Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

E-mail: Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

Re: A.G.C. Developments

City of Barrie New Official Plan

Subject Land: 545 Dunlop Street West

We represent A.G.C. Developments (“AGC”) in connection with their 20 acre parcel of land south of Dunlop Street West as shown on the attached air photo. I am writing to express our client’s objection to the new proposed Official Plan.

Our objections are as follows:

EMPLOYMENT NON-INDUSTRIAL DESIGNATION

- 1) The Dunlop Street frontage is currently designated General Commercial in the existing Official Plan and zoned C4 by By-law 2009-141. This commercial designation is proposed to be eliminated for my client’s lands and replaced by an Employment Non-Industrial designation. This proposed designation is effectively a down designation which removes a number of critical uses.
- 2) The existing General Commercial designation provides for a broad range of uses of which are appropriate for this site.
- 3) The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation permits a number of uses that are not appropriate for the site.

95 Barber Greene Rd., Suite 100, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M3C 3E9 Tel: 416.449.1400 Fax:
416.449.7071 www.devrylaw.ca

- 4) The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation has a strange assortment of permitted uses that would appear to be out of character for the site and surrounding area.
- 5) The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation will not permit the appropriate development of the site with uses that are realistic and practical and which represent good planning for a “gateway” to the City.
- 6) We request that the existing Commercial designation continue on this site or in the alternative the site receive a special site specific designation that permits all of the existing commercial uses.

Please ensure that this letter is put in the record as part of the public meeting.

Yours truly,

Devry Smith Frank LLP



David S. White, Q.C.

DSW/jrg

Encl.

c.c. Wendy Cooke, City Clerk

E-mail: Wendy.Cooke@barrie.ca



Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2021 2:21 PM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Updated Comments on second draft of new Barrie Official Plan June 2 2021
Attachments: Draft OP review suggested revisions to Map 8 001.jpg

Comments from Al McNair. Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Alan McNair
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 5:15 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Cc: Cath Mercer
Subject: Updated Comments on second draft of new Barrie Official Plan June 2 2021

Tomasz Wierzba
Policy Planner City
of Barrie

Tomasz:

These comments on the Official Plan Review Draft # 2 follow from our telephone conversation this morning.

I have included my original submission on Draft # 1 below, as it is not clear to me how my previous comments have been considered in the preparation of Draft # 2. There are more reasons in my previous submission to support these comments in your further review of Draft # 2.

1. Street Designations and intensification

Apparently the street designations flow from the 2010 Transportation Master Plan, which staff now acknowledge is seriously out of date and is intended to be updated in the 2022 to 2025 time period. **Due to this long time line, I suggest that the new Official Plan policies should NOT permit greater intensification on properties based on the road classification as arterial or collector versus local streets.** My earlier submission asked the City to consider reviewing these classifications based on how they actually serve their local neighbourhoods rather than just on how much vehicle traffic they do or can carry.

In the interim, intensification should only be directed to those major streets which will be designated as intensification corridors in the new Official Plan.

Let us always remember that we are planning for a city that works for people and their neighbourhoods at a human scale, including natural heritage areas.

2. Definitions of Low, Mid and High-Rise buildings

These definitions of building forms should be included in the definitions section of the OP, if they are to be used in this document.

3. Mid-Rise and High-Rise buildings should not be permitted in the designated Neighbourhood Areas

4. Historic Neighbourhood Areas

Historic Neighbourhood areas should not allow development greater than 3 storeys, in order to maintain compatibility with abutting existing dwellings and their surrounding neighbourhoods. Barrie's East End shows many examples of historically compatible intensification which does not exceed 3 storeys in height.

Also, there should not be a required minimum density for redevelopment in Historic Neighbourhood Areas. This would only encourage grossly out-of-scale proposals for redevelopment.

5. Expand the boundary of the Historic East End Neighbourhood

I suggested previously that this neighbourhood should extend northerly to the designated Strategic Growth Area along Bell Farm Road and Georgian Drive. A suggested map of this boundary is attached to my earlier submission.

6. Redevelopment of existing Institutional & Commercial sites in Neighbourhood Areas

An Official Plan amendment should be required for any redevelopment or expansion of any such sites in Neighbourhood Areas.

7. Site Plan Control

Site Plan Control should be required for any residential expansion on an existing lot where the building footprint is increased by more than 20% or where landscaping provisions or protection of natural heritage features/functions are required.

8. Natural Heritage Mapping and Overlays (Maps 2 and 3)

This mapping needs to be thoroughly re-examined to ensure that the small but important parcels of natural heritage lands in older Barrie are protected to the maximum. The recently annexed lands have much better protection and are much more robust than the more fragmented natural heritage system in the older city.

For example, **the ravine areas southeast and southwest of Vine Crescent should be designated Natural Heritage System, NOT Neighbourhood Area or Medium Density.**

Also, what is the rationale for extending the intensification corridor north of Hwy. 400 on Anne St. to Edgehill Drive when there is already a busy intersection here at the bottom of the Anne St. hill and the bottom of the overpass? This does not appear to be an area where creating additional traffic is a sound idea.

9. The Nature of Work and Residential Areas

In the face of our present existential challenges of both Climate Change and the COVID-19 Pandemic, the nature of our urban residential areas may need to be rethought. There will be much more likelihood of

residents working-from-home and telecommuting in the longer term. This could be hugely beneficial for our individual health as an alternative to long hours spent, physically inactive, sitting in traffic behind the wheel of a car. It will allow more time each day for our personal lives and for community involvement. It also has the potential to substantially reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by reducing commuting, as was illustrated during the first wave pandemic lockdown in the spring and summer of 2020.

The long-term success of such life/work changes will also require many of us to create room in our homes for pleasant, functional work and learning spaces for all family members. This will likely increase the demand for our present housing stock at its' existing scale, rather than trying to work on laptops on the kitchen table of a small condo or rental apartment. It will likely cause us to rethink constant growth and the idea of work/life balance. **That is all the more reason why we need to ensure protection of our residential neighbourhoods.**

As before, I would be happy to discuss these comments more fully at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Alan McNair

From: Alan McNair
Sent: December 22, 2020 3:50 PM
To: Kathy Suggitt (Kathy.Suggitt@barrie.ca) <Kathy.Suggitt@barrie.ca>
Cc: Cath Mercer
Subject: Comments on draft Barrie Official Plan December 22, 2020

Mrs. Kathy Suggitt

Manager of Strategic Initiatives, Policy and Analysis

City of Barrie

Dear Kathy:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft of the City's new Official Plan. My recommended changes to the draft are shown in bold italics below.

Here are my comments:

- 1) Street Designations and Intensification

The intensification policies are now more focussed. Only certain arterial roads are shown as intensification corridors on Map 1. I note that Duckworth St./Penetang St. is no longer classed as an intensification corridor. I believe this is helpful and supportive of the built-up neighbourhoods that have a more “single-family feel”.

While Duckworth St. and St. Vincent St. are currently designated as arterial streets, they do not, in my opinion, function in that capacity. Only the portion of Duckworth St. north from Steel St./Wellington St. to Hwy. 400 is 4 lanes. Duckworth St. south of Steel is being/has been rebuilt as a 2 lane road, apparently with room for parking on one side. St. Vincent St. is 4 lanes only from the Hwy. 400 overpass to Wellington St., then narrows to 2 lanes. Also, Duckworth St. and St. Vincent St. do not have good functional connections at the south end to another major street. St. Vincent St. north from Blake St. is 2 lanes and has a long hill with a 12% grade, causing problems for winter use as well as for heavy trucks and higher traffic volumes. Both Duckworth and St. Vincent Streets are lined with detached dwellings on both sides. These are in large part well-kept homes that will not easily be redeveloped for more intense uses. These roads would be more appropriately classed as collector streets, at least anywhere south from Bell Farm Rd.

Similarly, Wellington St., east from Bayfield St. to St. Vincent St., has reduced sight lines due to hills and curves and has a narrow 2 lane cross section. It also does not function like an arterial, and again is lined with well-kept detached dwellings along both sides. It would more appropriately be designated as a collector street, as is presently the case for its eastern extension, Steel St.

In effect, the street grid in the east end functions (and functions well) with a mix of local streets and collectors rather than arterials, other than the Blake St./Penetanguishene Rd. route below the glacial Lake Algonquin bluff. This route was formerly a connecting link for Hwy. 11 in the provincial highway system. It is not an intensification corridor in the present Official Plan and this is not proposed to change in the draft 2020 OP. The stretch of this roadway north-east of Johnson Street, which already has considerable multi-family residential, might be an area where more intensification of a residential nature could take place.

Section 3.4.2 Historic Neighbourhoods applies to the “East End” historic neighbourhood as shown on Map 8. The Area Specific Urban Design Policies in Section 3.4.2 appear to generally be supportive of protecting existing historic neighbourhoods.

However, 3.4.2 e) appears to allow a semi or a townhouse to replace an existing detached dwelling. It seems that this policy could allow a group of semis or townhouses to replace several adjoining detached homes, if the parcel abuts an arterial street.

The problem for established neighbourhoods is that a site being located on an Arterial street would allow a more dense built form (townhouses) in Historic Neighbourhoods and would allow more height in Neighbourhood Areas (up to 6 storeys) than would otherwise be the case. The East End Neighbourhood, for one, is undergoing major renovations to many of the existing single-family

homes. This should be encouraged. The possibility that the home next door might be demolished for townhousing does not encourage this upgrading of existing housing stock.

There may be other City policies and/or procedures which go along with an arterial road designation, aside from land use planning. However, I do believe that this approach does more accurately reflect how these roads actually function than the present designations.

I am therefore suggesting that the City:

a) Change Duckworth St and St. Vincent St. (both south of Bell Farm Rd.) and Wellington St. east of Bayfield St. from Arterial to Collector streets on all Maps.

b) Consider Livingstone St., Hanmer St., Anne St. N., and Cundles Rd. for similar designation changes to Collectors as they are mainly flanked by detached residential uses along their length (Cundles Rd. at Bayfield St. and again east of St. Vincent St. being the obvious exception to this re-designation) on all Maps.

2) Definitions of Low, Mid and High-Rise Buildings

The definitions of Low-Rise, Mid-Rise and High-Rise buildings should also be in the Definitions section. As they now appear only within Sections 3.5.4, 3.5.5 and 3.5.6, they may be missed by readers, and their individual importance is not stressed enough.

3) Section 2.6.1: Land Use policies for Neighbourhood Areas

The policies listed in 2.6.1.1 appear generally supportive of established local neighbourhoods. These neighbourhoods are desirable areas to live, and intensification is taking place in these areas over time by expansion of existing dwellings, which may include accessory apartments. Many dwellings have been upgraded with extensive renovations, including the conversion of a bungalow to a two storey home. This incentive to invest in this solid residential building stock should be rewarded with protection from the threat of intense redevelopment that might occur next door.

However, Section 2.6.1.3 a) vi) permits Mid-Rise buildings (this is 7 to 12 storeys), which I believe is excessive and unlikely to be compatible with existing homes in Neighbourhood Areas. This will not encourage the kind of investment in the existing stock which is making this area of the City so desirable. ***I feel that Mid-Rise buildings should not be permitted in Neighbourhood Areas.*** This change would limit building height to a maximum of 6 storeys in all Neighbourhood areas, which should assist in intensification while still offering protection for the existing building stock.

Section 2.6.1.3 b) is good, generally not allowing over 3 storeys on local streets in Historic Neighbourhoods. However, ***I feel this should be stronger, not allowing over 3 storeys to ensure compatibility with existing stable residential neighbourhoods (i.e. drop the word “generally”).*** There is existing low rise multi-family development in the East End which consists mainly of single storey seniors’ townhousing (like Martin Luther Court on Steel St.) and small 3 to 6 unit walk-up apartments scattered throughout the East End. Historically, these small “intrusions” seem to have worked well on the lots that they have occupied. Most townhouse development and some older apartment buildings (mostly low-rise) have been in close proximity to Blake St./Penetanguishene Rd.

However, 2.6.1.3 c) allows up to 4 storeys if the proposed development fronts onto and is oriented towards the highest class of street, excluding local streets. As noted in my first comment, this repeats the bias towards over-intensification on designated arterial streets, even where the street function is primarily serving the local residential area.

Also, 2.6.1.3 f) requires a minimum density of 50 or 60 units per hectare, depending on the classification of the fronting street. Read with the other policies, this suggests that, even if we can limit height, these density levels may still be implanted into what are now very stable single-family residential areas of significant merit and importance to the City. ***I feel that this blanket policy contradicts the neighbourhood supportive policies of Section 3.4.2, as noted above. I see this as a problem for any of the Historic Neighbourhoods of the City.***

4) The Historic East End Neighbourhood boundary should be expanded

The “East End” of the City, where I have lived (and worked from home) since 1983, is now shown on Map 8 as one of the historic neighbourhoods of Barrie. This is an excellent proposal. As mentioned above, the East End is seeing significant investment in renovation and upgrading of the existing post-war housing stock. However, I believe this boundary needs to be expanded, possibly as far as Hwy. 400, but at least going so far as to include the residential areas which abut the Industrial /Commercial areas west of St. Vincent St, along Bell Farm Rd. and east of Duckworth St. including homes up to Georgian College and RVH. ***I have included a map showing one possibility for this extended boundary, shown in red.***

Arguments could be made to take it only as far as the north side of Grove St. or the north side of Steel St. as an absolute minimum. The problem with choosing an intermediate boundary is the relative lack of change from one block to the next. The lands within the suggested boundary are mainly a grid or slightly modified grid street system which is very walkable and considered one of the most desirable areas of Barrie in which to live. Thus there has been significant investment by these home-owners in their houses.

5) Redevelopment of existing Institutional and Commercial sites in neighbourhoods

An Official Plan amendment should be required for redevelopment or expansion of any such sites in Neighbourhood Areas.

6) Site Plan Control

Site Plan Control should be required for any residential expansion on an existing lot where the building footprint is increased by more than 20% or where landscaping provisions or protection of natural heritage features are required.

7) The Nature of Work and Residential Areas

In the face of our present existential challenges of both Climate Change and the COVID-19 Pandemic, the nature of our urban residential areas may need to be rethought. There will be much more likelihood of residents working-from-home and telecommuting in the longer term. This could be hugely beneficial for our individual health as an alternative to long hours spent, physically inactive, sitting in

traffic behind the wheel of a car. It will allow more time each day for our personal lives and for community involvement. It also has the potential to substantially reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by reducing commuting, as was illustrated during the first wave pandemic lockdown in the spring and summer of 2020.

The long-term success of such life/work changes will also require many of us to create room in our homes for pleasant, functional work and learning spaces for all family members. This will likely increase the demand for our present housing stock at its' existing scale, rather than trying to work on laptops on the kitchen table of a small condo or rental apartment. It will likely cause us to rethink constant growth and the idea of work/life balance. That is all the more reason why we need to ensure protection of our residential neighbourhoods.

This has been a lengthy review process for such a substantial document. I confess that I have not yet been able to review the proposed City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines. I hope to do this shortly and may have more comments for you to consider.

I would also like to discuss with you my earlier request, on behalf of Nature Barrie, to include Bird Friendly Design Guidelines (BFDG) in the Official Plan. The City of Toronto has had these in effect for some dozen years now. I did not see any reference to these BFDG in this draft OP or in the index to the Design Guidelines. ***Can you please advise where I might find these guidelines?***


As well, I would like more explanation of the overlapping designations and overlays on the valley lands on Bunkers Creek, west of Hwy. 400 and below Vine Crescent. These ravine lands constitute a small but important piece of limited high quality Natural Heritage lands within the older City boundary. ***The underlying designation should, I believe, be Natural Heritage System rather than Neighbourhood Area.*** There was substantial controversy a couple of years ago over an ill-advised and expensive drainage scheme which was almost approved and which would have destroyed the natural heritage values of this ravine.

I would be happy to discuss these comments more fully at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Alan McNair

IGHBOURH - MAP 8





64 Jardin Drive, Unit 1B
Concord, Ontario
L4K 3P3
T. 905.669.4055
F. 905.669.0097
klmplanning.com

SENT VIA EMAIL

P – 190

June 2, 2021

Planning and Building Services
City of Barrie

70 Collier Street
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Attention: Ms. Michelle Banfield, RPP
Director of Development Services

Re: Draft City of Barrie Official Plan
May 6, 2021 Draft

**Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments and Perthshire
Developments Inc. c/o DG Group**

City of Barrie

Dear Ms. Banfield,

On behalf of Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments and Perthshire Developments c/o DG Group, we are pleased to provide you with comments related to the May 6, 2021 draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan. Our concerns noted are similar to those submitted by the Salem Landowners Group Inc., which includes the following:

- Overall, policies continue to be very prescriptive with lots of “shall” and very difficult to read and interpret. Official Plans are supposed to be guiding documents with “motherhood policies” and use more of “should” and “may”.
- The Official Plan has now been changed to require 79 persons and jobs per hectare whereas it was 62 persons and jobs in the previous version. We noted previously that 62 was much too high and now it has been increased. In our opinion, the density should continue to mirror that as set out in the Growth Plan.
- As noted previously, the Salem and Hewitt’s Secondary Plan areas are not that old and are currently being implemented after being approved in 2016 by the OMB (now LPAT).

Why remove all of these policies when only one current landowner has applied for an Official Plan Amendment in the Hewitt's Secondary Plan area? All other landowners have complied with the policies in the plan to seek their current approvals

- Section 2.4.2.3.c) – requires 52% of the housing mix to be high density within designated greenfield areas. What is the rationale behind this? Is the City working to no longer offer single detached, semi-detached and street townhouse dwelling units as a housing option within the Salem Secondary Plan area?
- Section 2.5.j) – requires a minimum of 10% of all new housing units to be affordable. In our view, this continues to be too high to achieve. A more achievable approach would be 5% of the total units across the city as a whole.
- Section 2.6.1.3.d) continues to require a min of 50% ground floor in low rise buildings to be non-res. The Watersand Draft Approved plan accommodates an 11 acre commercial block that will more than satisfy the commercial needs within the area. This should not apply to the Salem area.
- Section 2.6.1.3.e) i) and ii) – as noted previously, the minimum densities of 50 and 60 units per hectare are very high, especially compared to the current density ranges in the Salem and Hewitt’s Secondary Plans. The densities within the respective Secondary Plans should continue to be respected.
- 6.4.2.iii) – this policy should encourage the demonstration of affordable housing as opposed to requiring it.
- 6.4.2.iv) – min target of 10% of affordable units within medium and high-density residential designations continues to be too high. The standard should be 5% within these designations across the city.

As it relates to the draft maps, we are pleased to provide the following issues as it relates to the Watersand, Wormwood and Perthshire lands:

- Watersand Commercial Block is now designated as a Network Hub. Section 4.4.2.2.a advises the City Shall direct medium and high density development around these hubs. The commercial block does not have medium or high density residential uses nor does the surrounding land uses. As a result, and noted previously, this should be located on the east side of Veterans Drive along the Employment blocks. (Map 4A)
- As noted previously, Exell Avenue which is a proposed collector Road extending into the Watersand Phase 2 area (north of McKay Road West, west of Reid Drive), is not required as does not go anywhere. This should be shown as a local road in its place. (all maps)
- As noted previously, all maps have road configurations for the future employment (Watersand) and residential (Watersand) lands, with street names, that do not make sense in their makeup and should not be shown as the lands will not be developed in that format.
- A park is shown on the southside of Walker Street, immediately east of the NHS system which is not consistent with the draft approved plan of subdivision. (All maps)
- A park is not shown on the Watersand Phase 2 lands, north of McKay, west of Reid Drive (all maps).

We look forward to seeing the above noted changes reflected in the revised Official Plan. We also wish to be notified of any decisions of Council and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and

Housing related to the Official Plan. Lastly, we would be pleased to discuss this with you further, if required.

Yours truly,

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'KM', is written over the company name.

Keith MacKinnon BA, MCIP, RPP
Partner

- cc. Paolo Sacilotto – DG Group
- cc. Alexa-Rae Valente – DG Group

Joanne Werth

From: Keith MacKinnon
Sent: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 9:49 AM
To: Tomasz Wierzba; Michelle Banfield
Cc: Sharon Dionne; Ray Duhamel
Subject: Ballymore Official Plan Comments
Attachments: 3006DES14_.pdf; KLM Letter on OP Update June 2, 2021.pdf

Categories: Follow Up

Hi Tomasz and Michelle,

On behalf of Ballymore Building (Barrie) Corp., kindly find attached our comments related to the second draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan for your consideration. We would be pleased to discuss these with you further. Thanks,

Keith.

Keith MacKinnon BA, MCIP, RPP

PARTNER

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.

Planning | Design | Development

64 Jardin Drive, Unit 1B Concord, Ontario L4K 3P3

T 905.669.4055 (ext. 234) F 905.669.0097 E kmackinnon@klmplanning.com

 Please consider the environment before printing this email



64 Jardin Drive, Unit 1B
Concord, Ontario
L4K 3P3
T. 905.669.4055
F. 905.669.0097
klmplanning.com

SENT VIA EMAIL

P – 3006

June 2, 2021

Planning and Building Services
City of Barrie

70 Collier Street
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Attention: Ms. Michelle Banfield, RPP
Director of Development Services

Re: Draft City of Barrie Official Plan
May 6, 2021 Version

Ballymore Building (Barrie) Corp.
750 Lockhart Road

South Half of Lot 16, Concession 11
City of Barrie

Dear Ms. Banfield,

On behalf of Ballymore (Barrie) Building Corp., KLM Planning Partners Inc. is pleased to provide you with comments related to the May 2021 draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan.

Ballymore is a member in good standing with the Hewitt's Landowners Group for which Mr. Ray Duhamel of Jones Consulting has provided comments to the City, and we ask that the City accept the following comments in addition to those on behalf of the Hewitt's Landowners Group as they pertain more specifically to the Ballymore lands.

The Ballymore lands are located north of Lockhart Road, immediately east of the Metrolinx rail line. The Ballymore lands have been draft approved, with 87 townhouse dwelling units (Phase 1) and which also includes the extension of Kneeshaw through the Ballymore lands and connects to

Lockhart Road. Kneeshaw is a collector road which, in the fullness of time, will extend from Mapleview Drive through to Lockhart Road.

At the same time, the City has granted draft plan approval including a stormwater management pond and four (4) future development blocks, which are currently located within Phase 3, as

noted in the current Hewitt's Secondary Plan. The stormwater management pond will not only service the Ballymore lands, but will also service Phase 1 and 2 lands both east and west of Yonge Street. Furthermore, a watermain and sanitary sewer is required within the Kneeshaw Drive right of way to also accommodate the Phase 1 and 2 lands, both east and west of Yonge Street.

Map 1 identifies the Ballymore lands as part of the Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA). The policies related to the MTSA state it is for all lands that are within a 10-minute walking distance to the GO Train Station located north of Mapleview Drive, east of Yonge Street. Given the Ballymore location, we believe these lands do not meet the 10-minute walkable criteria and should be removed from the MTSA hatching.

We are very appreciative that our comments dated December 22, 2020 as it specifically relates to the phasing lines were taken into account and which now show the whole of the Ballymore lands being within Phase 1 East. We are in agreement with this change, which will now allow Ballymore to appropriately plan the higher density blocks in order to create an important critical mass of units in order to construct Kneeshaw and the stormwater management pond, which service not only the Ballymore lands, but also those that are east and west of Yonge Street.

In the event that the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies are replaced with new City-wide land use designations and policies, we ask that Blocks 1-16, 22, 23 and 32, all-inclusive on the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan should be designated Neighbourhood Area. Only Block 24 which is located on the south side of Kneeshaw Drive in the south portion of the property should be designated Medium density. Additionally, ALL figures and/or maps in the new Official Plan should be revised to show the alignment for Collector Road Kneeshaw Drive (including the roundabouts) as per the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan. A copy of the Draft Approved Plan is attached for ease of reference.

For additional context, these future development blocks were designed and based on the existing Hewitt's Secondary Plan as they are designated as Medium/High Density Residential which permits stacked townhouses and apartments (high density) and townhouses, quadraplexes and walk-up apartments (medium density). The Medium/High Density designation provides a density range of 40 to 100 units per hectare with a minimum height of 3 storeys.

In conclusion, we respectfully request the following:

1. That Map 1 be revised to remove the Ballymore lands from the MTSA designation.
2. That Map 2 be revised to redesignate the draft approved blocks on the north side of Kneeshaw from Medium Density to Neighbourhood Area while leaving the larger block with frontage onto Lockhart designated as Medium Density. This will allow Ballymore to provide a range of heights, housing types and densities.
3. All of the proposed mapping be revised to be reflect the approved location of Kneeshaw Drive along with the roundabout locations.

We look forward to seeing the above noted changes reflected in the revised Official Plan, and as always, we would be pleased to discuss this with you further, if required.

Yours truly,

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'KM', is written over the company name.

Keith MacKinnon BA, MCIP, RPP
Partner


- cc. Sharon Dionne – Ballymore
- cc. Ray Duhamel – Hewitt’s Landowners Group
- cc. Tomasz Wierzba – City of Barrie

DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION PART OF THE SOUTH HALF OF LOT 16, CONCESSION 11

GEOGRAPHIC TOWNSHIP OF INNISFIL
CTY OF BARRIE
COUNTY OF SIMCOE

SCALE 1:1500

DRAFT PLAN T-



KEY PLAN N.T.S. SECTION 51, PLANNING ACT, ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- A. AS SHOWN ON DRAFT PLAN
- B. AS SHOWN ON DRAFT PLAN
- C. AS SHOWN ON DRAFT PLAN
- D. SEE SCHEDULE OF LAND USE
- E. AS SHOWN ON DRAFT PLAN

- G. AS SHOWN ON DRAFT PLAN
- H. MUNICIPAL PIPED WATER AVAILABLE AT TIME OF DEVELOPMENT

- I. CLAY-LOAM

- J. AS SHOWN ON DRAFT PLAN
- K. SANITARY AND STORM SEWERS, GARBAGE COLLECTION, FIRE PROTECTION
- L. AS SHOWN ON DRAFT PLAN

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE LAND TO BE
SUBDIVIDED AS SHOWN ON THIS PLAN, AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO
THE ADJACENT LAND ARE ACCURATELY AND CORRECTLY SHOWN.

DATE -----, 2019 PIER DE ROSA o.l.s.
J.D. BARNES LTD.

OWNER'S CERTIFICATE

I AUTHORIZE KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC. TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT

THIS DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION TO THE CITY OF BARRIE FOR APPROVAL.

OWNER
BALLYMORE BUILDING

(BARRIE) CORP.

12840 YONGE STREET
SUITE 200 LOUIE MORRA A.s.o.
RICHMOND HILL, ON
L4E 4H1

SCHEDULE OF LAND USE
TOTAL AREA OF LAND = 26.416±Ha. (65.275±Acs)

STREET TOWNHOUSES

BLOCKS T-16	16	87	1.639	4.051
1st. UNIT FRONTAGE	5.5m			

FUTURE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

BLOCKS	Mapleview Drive	Area (sqm)	Area (sqft)	Units
BLOCKS 22-24 and 32	4	382*	4.043	9.990
SUBTOTAL	20	469*	5.682	14.041
BLOCKS 25-27 - NATURAL HERITAGE BUFFER	3	2.461	6.081	
BLOCK 28 - SWM POND	1	1.988	4.912	
BLOCK 29 - ROAD WIDENING	1	0.626	1.547	
BLOCK 30 - NATURAL HERITAGE AREA	1	12.324	30.453	

STREETS AND LANEWAYS

Width	Total Length	Area (sqm)	Area (sqft)
24.0m WIDE	1128m	AREA=2.719Ha	
18.0m WIDE	98m	AREA=0.173Ha	
12.0m WIDE	369m	AREA=0.443Ha	
TOTAL	1595m	AREA=3.335Ha	65.275

NOTE ELEVATIONS RELATED TO CANADIAN GEODETIC DATUM

NOTE *SUBJECT TO FINAL CALCULATION

NOTE BLOCKS 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 OMITTED

NOTE

PROJECT No. P-3006

SCALE 1:1500 NOV. 8, 2019

---: (3006DES13) X, REF: (3006MAS1)

DWG. No. - 19:6

64 JARDIN DRIVE-UNIT 18, CONCORD ONTARIO L4K 3P3

PLANNING PARTNERS INC. TEL: (905) 669-4055 FAX: (905) 669-0097 design@kimplanning.com


Planning • Design • Development

AGRICULTURAL

0'-0" 0a-0
c.0 <c.S

Ga-0-G

PART 3. PLA



Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:10 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Official Plan Comment Letters
Attachments: 520-526 Big Bay Point Road - OP Comment Letter_May2021_Final.pdf; 19 Dundonald - OP Comment Letter_May2021_Final.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: James Hunter
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 1:56 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>; Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Cc: Darren Vella
Subject: Official Plan Comment LettersGood

Afternoon Tomasz and Michelle,

Please find attached two comment letters pertaining to the draft Official Plan, Version 2.

1. On behalf of Morriello Construction Ltd., we are providing the attached letter to provide comments on the draft Official Plan and other related matters for the ZBA application under review for 520-526 Big Bay Point Road.
2. On behalf of the Hargreaves, we are providing the attached letter to provide comments on the draft Official Plan and other comments related to the pending ZBA application for 19 Dundonald street, aimed for July 2021.

We look forward to further discussions with the City as you work towards the next draft Official Plan. Please reach out to me with any questions or if there is anything you wish to discuss.

Thank you,



James Hunter, BURPI.

SENIOR PLANNER

647 Welham Road, Unit 9A, Barrie, ON L4N 0B7
Tel: 705 – 812 – 3281 ext.29 Fax: 705 – 812 - 3438

E-Mail: jhunter@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

NOTE: This e-mail message and attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

City of Barrie 70
Collier Street L4M
4T5

May 31, 2021

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

Re: City of Barrie Draft Official Plan – Version Two

520-526 Big Bay Point Road City
File: D30-006-2021

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On behalf of Morriello Construction Ltd., owner of lands known as 520 & 526 Big Bay Point Road in the City of Barrie, Innovative Planning Solutions (IPS) is providing the following correspondence relative to the City of Barrie Draft Official Plan (Version Two – May 6, 2021).

Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, please accept the following comments for consideration.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION & SURROUNDING LAND USES

The subject lands contain 65.4 metres of frontage along Big Bay Point Road and a combined area of 3,500 m² (0.35 ha. / 0.86 ac.). The lands are designated '*Residential*' by the current City of Barrie Official Plan (Schedule A), where all forms of housing is permitted. The lands are also located within the Big Bay Point Road / Yonge Street '*Primary Intensification Node*' (Schedule I), where high-density residential development is directed and encouraged by the City.

It is noted that a Zoning By-law Amendment application was submitted in April 2021 to the City of Barrie, to rezone the subject lands to the '*Residential Apartment Dwelling First Density - 2 (RA1-2)*' zone, with site-specific provisions. The subject ZBA application would facilitate the development of a 6-storey, 46-unit apartment building, with a density of 131 units per hectare. A notice of complete application was received on May 25, 2021.

647 WELHAM ROAD, UNIT 9, BARRIE ONTARIO L4N 0B7

TEL: (705) 812-3281 FAX: (705) 812-3438 EMAIL: INFO@IPSCONSULTINGINC.COM

3.0 CITY OF BARRIE DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN

The draft Official Plan identifies the following designations for the subject lands: Map 1:

'Strategic Growth Area'

Map 2: *'Medium Density'*

Map 4B: *'Arterial' road*

Given the Medium Density land use designation and identification within a Strategic Growth Area, this is supported by IPS and the Applicant.

3.1 Strategic Growth Areas (SGA's)

According to Map 1, Community Structure, the subject lands are located within a *'Strategic Growth Area'*.

The draft Official Plan states that the Strategic Growth Areas are intended as *focal points and long-term centres of residential growth, commerce, jobs and social interaction*. The goal of these areas are to *become complete communities*.

Policy 2.3.3.c. states that the Strategic Growth Areas shall accommodate *higher levels of intensification, tall buildings and higher densities*. Further, policy 2.3.3.g. states that development in *Strategic Growth Areas will be planned to be transit-oriented, shall maximize the use of existing and planned transit infrastructure with appropriate transit supportive densities and mix of uses, and be pedestrian-friendly to support active transportation*. Additionally, policy 2.3.3.i. states that *higher densities and taller built form will be encouraged within Strategic Growth Areas and particularly at major intersections of intensification corridors*.

In order to achieve the goals of the SGA's and develop the built form intended, significant densities will be required. Similar to the policies within sections 2.3.2 (UGC) and 2.3.4 (MTSA's), the SGA policies should provide density provisions or minimum targets for SGA's that separate them from other areas of the City, as these areas are directed for high levels of development and intensification.

3.2 Medium Density Designation

On Map 2, Land Use Designations, the subject lands are designated as *'Medium Density'*.

The Medium Density land use designation is intended to facilitate an increase of densities and built form in the City (2.6.2). Buildings are directed to have a minimum height of six (6) storeys along the Arterial streets (2.6.2.3.c), such as Big Bay Point Road, however, the designation limits developments to a maximum density of 125 units per net hectare (2.6.2.3.d).

Given the direction from the Province to meet the growth and intensification targets, and to accommodate attainable housing for an increasing population, a density of 125 uph is viewed as a restricted amount of permitted density.

With lands identified within the Strategic Growth Areas and designated Medium Density, there is a conflict of density desired by the City and permitted by the draft Official Plan. To bring the policies into conformity with one another, the City should examine the areas where the SGA's are identified, and include more specific or targeted policies. To achieve the built form directed by the City, the permitted density should be increased for the Medium density designation, and minimum targets should be established for the SGA's, to guide development applications and avoid Official Plan Amendments for minor increases to density; as currently permitted.

4.0 CONCLUSION

On behalf of Morriello Construction Ltd., Innovative Planning Solutions is requesting confirmation from the City that the current Official Plan (January 2018), in effect on the date of the application, will continue to apply to the subject ZBA application under review, notwithstanding the future date the new Official Plan is implemented.

In addition to this, based on our review of the Draft City of Barrie Official Plan, we encourage the City to consider our comments provided.

We look forward to the Zoning By-law Amendment application under review for the subject lands and further discussions with staff throughout the process on the draft Official Plan.

Respectfully submitted,
Innovative Planning Solutions



Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP
President & Director of Planning



James Hunter, BURPI.
Senior Planner



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

May 31, 2021

City of Barrie 70
Collier Street L4M
4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

Re: **City of Barrie Draft Official Plan – Version Two**

19 Dundonald Street
City Files: D28-055-2019

1.0 INTRODUCTION

On behalf of the Hargreaves, owners of lands known as 19 Dundonald Street in the City of Barrie, Innovative Planning Solutions (IPS) is providing the following correspondence relative to the City of Barrie Draft Official Plan (Version Two – May 6, 2021).

Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, please accept the following comments for consideration. For the reasons outlined below, we are requesting that the subject be included in the 'Medium Density' designation.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION & SURROUNDING LAND USES

The subject lands have approximately 99 metres of frontage along Dundonald Street and an approximate area of 0.96 ac. (0.39 ha). The northern portion of the lands contain a single detached dwelling and accessory uses. The southern portion of the lands are vacant, with sparse trees and vegetation.

Surrounding land uses include St. Mary's Church and senior's residence to the north, the Duckworth Street right-of-way to the east, residential apartment buildings to the south, and a residential apartment building and low-density residential uses to the west.

Figure 1 illustrates the subject lands.

It is noted that the Applicant and IPS are working towards a Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) application, targeted for submission in July 2021, to facilitate the development of a nine (9) storey residential condominium on the subject lands.



LEGEND


 Subject Lands

Figure 1

SUBJECT LANDS

Source: opengis.simcoe.ca

Drawn By: JH

File: 874



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS
 PLANNERS - PROJECT MANAGERS - LAND DEVELOPERS

3.0 CITY OF BARRIE DRAFT NEW OFFICIAL PLAN

The Draft Official Plan identifies the following designations for the subject lands: Map 1:

'Built-up Area'

Map 2: *'Neighbourhood Area'*

Map 3: *'EPA – Level 3'*

Map 4B: *'Local Road'*

Map 7: *'WHPA – D (25 Year Capture Zone)'*

Map 8: *'Historic Neighbourhood Boundary'*

Map 9: *'Lake Simcoe Regional Conservation Authority'* – within authority boundary.

The general direction of the draft Official Plan identifies the subject lands as being within the Built-up Area and within the Neighbourhood Area land use designation.

The Built-up Area includes neighbourhoods which are directed *to accommodate appropriate levels of intensification and re-development*, in accordance with the applicable land use designation. Further, the area is to support a mix of land use and is planned to *accommodate new developments with a housing mix that is at least 74% high density, plus a substantial proportion of medium density and limited low-density development (2.4.2.2)*.

3.1 Neighbourhood Area Designation

In the draft Official Plan, the subject lands are designated as *'Neighbourhood Area'*. The Plan states that the designation is to provide most of the City's low-rise housing stock (2.6.1.2.a) and the lands within the designation are considered established neighbourhoods that are not intended to experience significant physical change that would alter their general character (2.6.1.2.c).

Blake Street is adjacent to the subject lands and is identified by the Official Plan as an *'Arterial Street'*, where up to four (4) storeys of height is permitted under the Neighbourhood Area designation. However, a site located at 1 Blake Street to the south of the subject lands has been included in this designation, despite an existing building height of eight (8) storeys. We encourage the City to closely examine the surrounding area and accurately reflect the land use designations, based on existing built forms.

As overviewed under Section 1.0, we are requesting the City consider applying an alternative designation on the subject lands to align with the proposed application and intended land use for this location, more specifically the *'Medium Density'* designation. Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, this letter will speak to the Medium Density designation as this is the most appropriate designation for the subject lands, as discussed in the following section.

The proposed designation by the draft Official Plan is shown on *Figure 2*.



LEGEND

- Subject Lands
- Neighbourhood Area

Figure 2

PROPOSED DESIGNATION

Source: City of Barrie Official Plan, May 2021, Map 2

Drawn By: JH

File: 874



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS
 PLANNERS • PROJECT MANAGERS • LAND DEVELOPERS

3.2 Medium Density Designation

The '*Medium Density*' land use designation is intended to facilitate an increase of densities and built form in the City (2.6.2). The designation permits a maximum density of 125 units per net hectare (2.6.2.3.d). Given the direction from the Province to meet the growth and intensification targets, and to accommodate attainable housing for an increasing population, a density of 125 uph is too restrictive and should be reconsidered.

The '*High Density*' land use designation aims to provide for buildings with a minimum height of twelve (12) storeys and a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare (2.6.3.3). Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, there appears to be a significant gap in the density permitted between Medium and High Density designations. We encourage the City to review the maximum density permitted for the Medium Density designation, as this will lead in a significant number of Official Plan Amendment applications given that the majority of medium density developments are greater than 125 uph.

The unique characteristics of the subject lands and location make it more suitable for the Medium Density land use designation for several reasons, as outlined below.

1. The subject lands are located at the intersection of Blake Street and Collier Street. Collier Street is identified as a '*Major Collector*' and Blake Street is identified as an '*Arterial*' road by Map 4B of the Plan, where higher-density land uses are supported. The Medium Density designation would permit a built form that is similar to the land uses that exist and are forecasted/permited along the adjacent streets.
2. The proposed Urban Growth Centre (UGC), as illustrated on Map 1, is located approx. 300 m. or two blocks to the west of the subject lands, where the boundary is drawn at Berczy Street. Within the UGC, the lands are largely designated as '*High Density*', where developments are instructed to have a minimum height of twelve (12) storeys and a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare (2.6.3.3). Given the existing medium to high-density land uses located and designated between the UGC and the subject lands, the Medium Density designation would permit reasonable development to transition the more established residential areas to the east, to the height and density permitted within the UGC. As demonstrated by planning application's under review by the City or approved, the UGC is seeing increased heights, well over 20-30 storeys. With the development anticipated and encouraged by the City in the UGC, there needs to be developments at reasonable heights and density to provide transition to the older residential areas.
3. Placing a Medium Density designation on the lands is not viewed as negatively impacting the abutting, diverse land uses. The property to the west contains a 4- storey condominium building and separation is provided to low-density residential uses, to the south is the Blake Street/Collier Street intersection surrounded by high-density land uses, to the east is the Duckworth Street right-of-way providing a 20 m. buffer to residential land uses, and to the north is the St. Mary's Church and seniors residence.
4. The draft Official Plan states that the Medium Density designation *is intended to facilitate an increase of densities and built form in the City*. The lands can accommodate this built form through an appropriate type of development, and

could provide residential units to the market, where it is essential in the City of Barrie to address the housing crisis and provide more attainable housing options.

5. Development on the subject lands can be serviced by existing municipal services, without uneconomic need for expansion or significant upgrades.
6. The lands are in close proximity to the downtown (UGC), where an abundant amount of commercial and retail uses, and employment opportunities exist. These uses can effectively service a residential use at a higher density. In addition, a medium density development would provide residents and an increased population in close proximity to the downtown, encouraging investment in the downtown area.
7. The Official Plan encourages all forms of new residential units and the provision of housing, especially since the Plan aims to guide Barrie into a *medium-sized city*. The topography of the site limits the development capability of a larger parcel of land; therefore, a compact built form would be a more appropriate and efficient use of the lands to utilize existing infrastructure/services and reduce land consumption.
8. The City speaks to a balanced approach to growth management and directs 50% of annual residential growth to be within the Built-up Area (2.4.2.2.a). The Official Plan further states that the *Built-up Area will be planned to accommodate new development with a housing mix that is at least 74% high density plus a substantial proportion of medium density housing with limited low density development (2.4.2.2.b)*. The Medium Density land use designation will contribute to the City meeting these housing targets, as land will be required to accommodate medium and high-density housing.

We would like an opportunity to discuss the other benefits of this site for Medium Density residential upon staff's review of this correspondence.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMENTS

On Map 3 (Natural Heritage Protection Overlays), the subject lands include a 'EPA – Level 3' classification. These resources are identified as being more regionally or locally significant features and supporting components of the Natural Heritage Resource network.

The subject lands have benefited from extensive environmental work being completed for a pending Zoning By-law Amendment application on the lands. As part of the assessments, it has been concluded that the subject lands can be developed without negligible impacts on the existing features or abutting features.

Through the pending ZBA application, justification will be provided through environmental studies/assessments to support removal of the Level 3 overlay on the subject lands.

5.0 CONCLUSION

We formally request the subject lands located at 19 Dundonald Street be considered for the 'Medium Density' land use designation. We believe the Medium Density designation is most appropriate for the reason set out in this letter. We look forward to the forthcoming Zoning By-law Amendment application for the subject lands and further discussions with staff throughout the process.

Respectfully submitted,
Innovative Planning Solutions

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Vella', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP
President & Director of Planning

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'J. Hunter', with a stylized flourish at the end.

James Hunter, BURPI.
Senior Planner

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:11 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Re: Official Plan Comment Letter
Attachments: Draft2OPCommentLetter(May28,2021).pdf; 12246sketch OCT5.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Darren Vella
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 8:49 AM
To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>; Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Cc: Darren Vella <dvella@ipsconsultinginc.com>
Subject: RE: Re: Official Plan Comment Letter

Good Afternoon Tomasz and Michelle

On behalf of Cedar Links Golf Course, please find attached comments on Draft 2 of the Official Plan.

Regards

Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP

PRESIDENT & DIRECTOR OF PLANNING



647 Welham Road, Unit 9, Barrie, ON L4N 0B7
Tel: 705 – 812 - 3281 Ext. 22 Fax: 705 – 812 - 3438

E-Mail: dvella@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com

PLEASE NOTE WE HAVE MOVED

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

NOTE: This e-mail message and attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

May 28, 2021

City of Barrie
70 Collier Street Barrie,
ON L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba,
Policy Planner

Re: Draft 2 - New Official Plan
Cedar Links Golf Course
611 Huronia Road

On behalf of Cedar Links Golf Course., Innovative Planning Solutions is pleased to submit the following comments on Draft 2 of the New Official Plan. The subject lands are municipally known as 611 Huronia Road and are currently being used as a golf course. Based on our review on Draft 2, we have the following comments for your consideration.

Mapping Review

- | | |
|--------|---|
| Map 1 | Employment Area |
| Map 2 | Employment Area – Industrial |
| Map 3 | EPA – Level 3, EPA – Level 1, EPA – Level 1 with Existing Development Designation
Subject to 5.4.2.1.d |
| Map 4B | Arterial (Mapleview and Huronia) |

Land Use Designation Modification

Upon review of the Official Plan framework, we would respectfully request that the subject lands be considered for the Employment Area – Non-Industrial Designation. The subject lands are located on the periphery of the employment area and are not located on a Freight Supportive Corridor. The location of

the subject lands can serve as a buffer along with the existing commercial plaza to the west from heavier industrial uses.

647 WELHAM ROAD, UNIT 9A, BARRIE ONTARIO L4N 0B7
TEL: (705) 812-3281

EMAIL: INFO@IPSCONSULTINGINC.COM

Section 2.6.9.2(c) Employment Area – Non-Industrial designation states that this designation shall be located on the periphery of Employment Areas shown on Map 1 and preferably near lands designated Commercial District. Based on Map 1, the subject lands fit this characterization and provide an excellent opportunity to achieve this designation’s objective.

It is also important to note that with the changes to the Official Plan that now brings the remainder of the municipal boundary into the Settlement Area, the City of Barrie possesses significant lands designated Employment Area – Industrial. It would appear that the employment land supply exceeds the employment targets to the year 2051. This modification provides further justification for this request.

Natural Heritage Designation

Through the development process associated with the previous employment conversion request, the Natural Heritage features on site were walked with MNRF and LSRCA and ultimately surveyed to delineate their boundaries. The attached survey outlines the extent of this boundary. We would request that Map 3 be revised to reflect these boundaries in the next draft of the Official Plan.

Conclusion

Thank you for your consideration of the above noted comments. We are available to discuss should you have any questions or comments. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Innovative Planning Solutions



**Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP President &
Director of Planning**

CC: H. Eisses -Cedar Links Golf Course

PART
PLAN 51p-28739

MARKED [P L]N

P./N. 58727-0084(1,1)

1.000
1.000

PART 1' PLAN 51R-18752

58727-0313 (LT)

P. J. N.



FIRST ISSUE	REVISION	DATE
		11 OCT. 2016

89 BIG BAY POINT ROAD
BARRIE, ONTARIO L4N 8M5 (905) 722-3845
E-MAIL: MAIL@MAKSURVEYING.COM

DRAWN BY: RJH CHECK BY: RM FILE No. 12359



--	--	--

Joanne Werth

From: Richard K. Hayes
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2021 1:42 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba
Subject: City of Barrie Letter May 18, 2021
Attachments: Official Plan 2051 Letter.pdf

To: Tomasz Wierzba

Please see attached letter of concern specific to the City of Barrie Official Plan 2051, Draft 2, Section 5.7.2 Cemeteries. Please confirm your receipt of this e-mail/letter.

Thank you

Richard K. Hayes
President & CEO



CATHOLIC & CEMETERIES

FUNERAL SERVICES

ARCHDIOCESE OF TORONTO

CENTRAL BUSINESS OFFICE
4950 YONGE STREET, SUITE 206
TORONTO, ONTARIO M2N 6K1

TEL 416-733-8544

FAX 416-733-9944

catholiccemeteries.com

May 18, 2021

Deliver by email

Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca

Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner
City of Barrie

City Hall,

70 Collier Street, PO Box 400
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Re: City of Barrie Official Plan 2051, Draft 2, Section 5.7.2 Cemeteries

Catholic Cemeteries & Funeral Services - Archdiocese of Toronto (**CCFS**) is the owner and operator of St. Mary's Catholic Cemetery on Sunnisdale Road along with other holdings for potential cemetery development in Barrie. CCFS has been providing a place of quiet solitude, reflection and prayer for interment rights holders and their families in the Barrie community since 1867. A Catholic Cemetery is a sacred place blessed by the Church for the burial of the Catholic Faithful.

The City of Barrie Official Plan 2051, Draft 2 suggests that *"Cemeteries, when they are in a location to provide connection to the open space network, greater mobility network and/or active transportation network may be acknowledged by the City as opportunities for passive recreation trails for pedestrians or cyclists"* This proposed planning principle is incompatible with the requirements of cemetery operators under the Funeral Burial Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSAJ *that "quiet and good order are maintained in the cemetery at all times"* Further, CCFS in its operating By-laws expressly forbids all sporting and recreational activities within the property including, but not limited to cycling, skateboarding, roller blading, running and dog walking.

Cemeteries are acknowledged by the Bereavement Authority of Ontario, the body responsible for administration of the FBCSA, as private property where operators are responsible for the control and access to the cemetery grounds. The proposed planning principle suggesting that cemeteries form part of open space, greater mobility and/or active transportation networks fails to recognize the private property nature of cemeteries and should not be considered by the City of Barrie Official Plan 2051 for recreational purposes.

Yours truly,
JP-.,4. fr

...

Richard K. Hay

President and CEO

ASSUMPTION
CATHOLIC CEMETERY
/1.USS.ISS-AUGA

CATHOLIC
CREMATION SERVICES
MISSISSAUGA

CHRISTTHE KING
CATHOLIC CEMETERY &
RECEPTION CENTRE
MARKHAM

HOLY CROSS
CATHOLIC CEMETERY &
FUNERAL HOME
JHON HILL

MOUNT HOPE
CATHOLIC CEMETERY
TOLLWOOD

QUEEN OF HEAVEN
CATHOLIC CEMETERY
WOODBRIE

RESURRECTION
CATHOLIC CEMETERY
WHBY

ST. MARY'S
CATHOLIC CEMETERY
BARRIE



Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:08 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of Artenosi Developments Group
Attachments: MHBC_FINAL 2nd Draft Barrie OP Review Letter 284 Dunlop - 02June2021.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Andrew Edwards
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 2:04 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Subject: FW: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of Artenosi Developments Group **Apologies, forwarding again.**

ANDREW EDWARDS, BES | Planner

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 236 | F 705 728 2010 |
aedwards@mhbcpplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at aedwards@mhbcpplan.com or 705-309-1668. Thank you.

From: Andrew Edwards

Sent: June 2, 2021 2:02 PM

To: new.barrieop@barrie.ca <new.barrieop@barrie.ca>; Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca

Cc: Kory Chisholm

Subject: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of Artenosi Developments GroupHi Tomasz,

On behalf of our client, Artenosi Developments Group, please find attached comment letter regarding the second draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan.

Regards,

ANDREW EDWARDS, BES | Planner

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 236 | F 705 728 2010 |
aedwards@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at aedwards@mhbcplan.com or 705-309-1668. Thank you.



KITCHENER
WOODBRIDGE
LONDON
KINGSTON
BARRIE
BURLINGTON

June 2, 2021

Tomasz Wierzba, RPP
Policy Planner

City of Barrie

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

RE: Mccowan Ardagh Road Property
City of Barrie Official Plan 2nd Draft (May 2021)

In a letter dated December 22, 2020, we provided comment on the first draft of the Official Plan. The purpose of this letter is to provide comments on the second draft of the City of Barrie Draft Official Plan on behalf of our Client Artenosi Developments Group, dated May 6, 2021, as they relate to landholdings known as 284 and 286 Dunlop Street West, and 119 and 121 Henry Street. The following comments are respectfully submitted. Words/sentences in red font are suggested edits to policies.

Overall there are 5 fundamental concerns with the 2nd Draft of the City of Barrie OP and the process to date:

1. Rushed Comment Period - Comment period for the 2nd Draft is far too short for a document of this importance and magnitude. The Public and Stakeholders were provided 3 months to review the 1st Draft in late 2020 which is a more appropriate timeframe. Only having a 1 month window to review the 2nd Draft which has had substantial changes and no formal response to comments is a challenge. It is critical the Public and Stakeholders be provided additional time to review the next Draft with the revised Urban Design Guidelines and a compiled comment response table provided by the City.
2. Importance and Weight of New OP - Importance of getting the New Official Plan right the first time as there is no appeal rights for the Public and Stakeholders and the Planning Act includes a two year moratorium on amending New Official Plans unless this is waived by Council.
3. Lack of Transition Regulations - The 2nd Draft contains no transition regulations as an implementation tool. It is therefore unclear how ongoing development applications at various stages of the development approval process will be impacted when the New Official Plan comes into force and effect.

113 COLLIER STREET/ BARRIE/ ONTARIO/ L4M 1H2 / T 705 728 0045 / F 705 728 2010 / WWW.MHBCPLAN.COM

4. Urban Design Focus - The 2nd Draft is very much an Urban Design based and focused document, however we do not have the key implementation document (the revised Urban Design Guidelines) for many of these policies within the 2nd Draft. In the absence of this it is impossible to complete a comprehensive review. Additionally the 2nd Draft contains a lot of challenging urban design verbiage/terminology that is unclear and undefined which leaves a lot of room for varying interpretation of these policies. For example **Section 3.2.1 (i)(c)** requires all development applications to demonstrate it will improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place.
5. Prescriptive nature of the Official Plan - Many policies throughout the 2nd Draft are written in an absolute and prescriptive manner with no flexibility, very much like a Zoning By-law. An Official Plan is meant to provide broad long term policy direction and provide room for flexible interpretation of policies and goals. As written most development applications moving forward would likely require an Official Plan Amendment to proceed. For example **Section 2.6.3.3 d)** requires High Density development with a residential component shall have a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare. Many sites will not be able to achieve this density on a site by site basis while others will be able to far exceed it. This should be written as a general target and not an absolute requirement. This also would remove flexibility for mixed-use buildings that are primarily commercial/office to incorporate a small residential component.

All Prescriptive design related policies through the New OP should be written as "should generally" or "are encouraged to provide," etc.

Since the City is proposing a number of substantial changes from the Current Official Plan to the Draft New Official Plan it is imperative that transition regulations be included in the City's Official Plan. As you know, there are several substantial development proposals currently in progress based on the City's existing Official Plan designations and policies. Many of these applications are at significant risk given the revised OP policies. Including strong transition regulations within the New Official Plan will allow current development applications to continue through the process without having to potentially restart the development approval process or make substantial changes to their design and generally reduce potential confusion in the processing of applications when the New Official Plan comes into effect as well as provide certainty to the development industry to understand which document and policy context they are dealing with moving forward.

Draft Official Plan

1. Affordable housing - There is no question that the provision of affordable housing is a basic human right/requirement and a critical component of inclusive community. However, the mandatory provision for affordable housing in all new developments is not practical or achievable. All developments are not conducive to the provision of truly affordable housing due to building type, location, proximity to supportive amenities, and financial feasibility. We are concerned with the implications of these policies and request they not be prescriptive for all developments. We recommend the City establish policies which enable the collection of revenues for the provision of City sponsored affordable housing.

There are various affordable housing target policies in the Plan including but not limited to policies 2.5.0), and Section 6.4.2. Policy 2.5 UI requires 10% of all new housing in the City to be affordable, policy 6.4.2 (e)(iii) requires development with more than 40 dwelling units to demonstrate the provision of affordable units and policy (iv) requires all new medium and high-density land use designations to provide 10% affordable units across a range of unit sizes including 3 bedroom

units or larger, and policy 2.3.2 (e) (iii) requires at least 20% of housing units developed in the UGC satisfy the criteria for affordable. It is suggested that this policy does not recognize that various projects, in their totality, are being developed as affordable housing projects and thus contributing to the City wide mix of 10%. These policies have the potential to contribute to a lower amount of attainable units if affordable housing units are required on a project by project basis. Further with an owner occupied product, it is not understood how the City can guarantee that the unit will remain affordable to the second buyer once sold as affordable to the first buyer.

2. 2.3.3 (f) - Confirm SGA at Dunlop and Anne St still enables a tall building built form with ground floor non-residential use that will achieve the planned economic function. This is not clear based on the SEED policies as they state the primary use must be non-residential, whereas by the nature of a mixed use building if all the upper floors are residential the residential component will have far more floor area than that of the non-residential ground floor component.
3. 2.6.8 - Strategic Employment and Economic District (SEED) - Our Client submitted a ZBA application for a mixed use building in May 2021. We request confirmation the proposed built form would be deemed to conform with the proposed SEED policy framework. We would request a meeting with City staff to review this further.
4. 2.3.6 (c) what if conflict with underlying land use designation?
5. 2.3.6 (d) public transit infrastructure should not be the onus of the developer as this is operated by the City. Suggest this should be removed, an OPA should not be required if City does not have public transit or active transit infrastructure in place.
6. Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) - this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.
7. Policy 3.3.4(a)(ii)(g) - this should be a general policy and if it cannot be achieved other provisions to apply a buffer/transition can be applied.
8. Section 2.6.8 Strategic Employment and Economic District (SEED): We understand and appreciate the rationale for the SEEDs; however, we have concerns with the implementation of these policies and the restricted range of permitted uses and development standards. Further detailed discussion with City Staff is required.
 - a. 2.6.8.1 Permitted Uses - Can City staff confirm the permitted uses presented are in addition to the underlying/existing designation and not exclusive. PBM's properties at 364 St. Vincent Street and 30 Alliance Boulevard have existing industrial use permissions and have tenants using the properties for industrial purposes and we request these existing permissions be carried forward.
 - b. 2.6.8.2 h) Land Use Policies - Can City staff confirm the intent of this policy? It does not appear any SEED designated lands are also designated Employment Areas.
 - c. 2.6.8.3 b) Development Standards- Can City staff confirm the intent of generally requiring buildings to be limited to 6 storeys in height is meant to be flexible and if lands are located in other areas (along intensification corridors or higher order streets that consideration for increased heights will be considered without the need for an Official Plan Amendment?

9. Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) - this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.
10. Section 2.7.1 - Historic Neighbourhoods: There should be acknowledgement that a significant amount of intensification is expected within the Historic Neighbourhoods along identified Intensification Corridors, Strategic Growth Areas and lands with higher density permissions.
11. Policy 3.3.4 a) ii) c) - This should be written to generally apply, some sites may be appropriate for a reduced rear yard setback such as if a site backs onto a natural area, highway or other use where it is appropriate to site the building closer to the rear lot line.
12. Section 3.3.4 - High Rise buildings
 - (a)(ii)(d) *Any tower, including its balconies, -5-Rel-1 should be setback from the podium by a minimum of 3.0 metres along all public street frontages to ensure an appropriate human-scaled pedestrian environment and mitigate wind impacts at street level;*
 - (a)(ii)(f) *Where more than one High-Rise Building is located on the same lot, the distance between the towers at the twelfth storey and above shall be at least 38 25.0 metres,*
 - (a)(ii)(c) *The tower of a High-Rise Building wi-1-1 should be setback a minimum of B 12.5 metres from: (1) the side property line; (2) the rear property line, and; (3) the centre line of an abutting right-of-way.*
 - (a) (ii)(g) *In order to provide appropriate transitions, towers wi-1-1-should generally be setback at least 70.0 metres from low rise residential built form on lands designated Neighbourhood Areas on Map 2; however, this does not apply to those towers located within the Urban Growth Centre which will be instead be setback at least 30.0 metres.*
13. Policy 3.3.4(a)(ii)(c) - this should be a general policy and if it cannot be achieved other provisions to apply a buffer/transition can be applied.
14. Policy 4.7 (e)(f)- Parking Solutions- Please confirm if a ZBA or MV is achieved for a reduced parking requirement, that the City is in support of cash-in-lieu is not required. It is our understanding cash in lieu of parking is only required where the requested reduction is beyond what the City is willing to support.
15. Placemaking brief - policy 8.3.2 may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required and the brief is to identify or map connections to planned or existing community gathering places and activities and opportunities for enhancing these gathering places and provide improved connections; it is submitted that these places may not be on the proposed development lands, no criteria is provided and this provides for additional study and cost to development proposals.
16. Infill - the policies of 9.5.6 (Context Sensitive Development) appear to state that infill is a form of intensification and shall be on a lot created between two existing lots that are approximately 150 metres or less apart and that the parcel of land should be in keeping with the existing and anticipated development in the area. It is submitted that the policy could be interpreted that higher order intensification cannot take place as infill development.

17. Section 10.1 e) Interpretation: We appreciate this caveat and interpretative clause, however, the use of discrete bulleted permitted uses within a land use designation is a very specific way of listing uses and must be utilized properly. Additional expansion of the permitted use lists is recommended. It is suggested that the OP is acting like a zoning by-law and this is restrictive and would require undue process (an OPA) if a building type that meets the policy context is not permitted in the OP.

The following are comments regarding the Urban Design policies:

18. Section 3.1.3.2 Application of Urban Design Guidelines - Must be clear that there is flexibility in not achieving every specific guideline due to site specific circumstance but the intent of the guideline can be demonstrated through other means and that should a relevant guidelines not be achieved that it does not trigger an Official Plan Amendment.
19. Placemaking brief- policy 9.4.2.2(t) may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required.
20. Human Scale Design - policy 3.2.1 (a)(i)(c) It is not understood how a development proposal "shall" "improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place".
21. Sustainable and Resilient Design - it is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document for example, all development (which would include, for example, minor variances shall demonstrate passive design strategies, use of environmentally preferable products, enhancement of environmental quality, and optimization of operational and maintenance practices, among others.
22. Green Development Standards - A Sustainable Development Report is a new requirement for specific development applications. For a development application to demonstrate conformity to the Official Plan, it is unknown how these policies are to be addressed and their appropriateness in a land use planning document is questioned.

Your consideration of the above noted comments is appreciated.

Yours truly,

MHBC

W&il

Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP
Partner

cc. *Dean Arsenosi | Arsenosi Developments Group*

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:08 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of McCowan & Associates Ltd.
Attachments: MHBC_Barrie OP 2nd Draft Review-McCowan-Ardagh Road - 02June2021.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Andrew Edwards
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 1:51 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Subject: FW: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of McCowan & Associates Ltd. **Hi Tomasz,**

I'm re-forwarding the message below as the address came back as undeliverable. Regards,

ANDREW EDWARDS, BES | Planner

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 236 | F 705 728 2010 |
aedwards@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at aedwards@mhbcpplan.com or 705-309-1668. Thank you.

From: Andrew Edwards

Sent: June 2, 2021 1:46 PM

To: new.barrieop@barrie.ca <new.barrieop@barrie.ca>; Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca

Cc: Kory Chisholm

Subject: Official Plan 2nd Draft - Comments on Behalf of McCowan & Associates Ltd.Hi Tomasz,

On behalf of our client, McCowan and Associates Ltd., please find attached comment letter regarding the second draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan.

Regards,

ANDREW EDWARDS, BES | Planner

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

113 Collier Street | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | T 705 728 0045 x 236 | F 705 728 2010 |
aedwards@mhbcplan.com

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me at aedwards@mhbcplan.com or 705-309-1668. Thank you.



KITCHENER
WOODBRIDGE
LONDON
KINGSTON
BARRIE
BURLINGTON

June 2, 2021

Tomasz Wierzba, RPP
Policy Planner

City of Barrie

City Hall, 70 Collier Street

P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

RE: Mccowan Ardagh Road Property
City of Barrie Official Plan 2nd Draft (May 2021)

In a letter dated December 22, 2020, we provided comment on the first draft of the Official Plan. The purpose of this letter is to provide comments on the second draft of the City of Barrie Draft Official Plan, dated May 6, 2021 as they relate to landholdings on the north side of Ardagh Road (NE of Ardagh Road and County Rd 27) as generally outlined in the figure below. The property currently has no municipal address. The following comments are respectfully submitted.

Overall there are 5 fundamental concerns with the 2nd Draft of the City of Barre OP and the process to date:

1. Rushed Comment Period - Comment period for the 2nd Draft is far too short for a document of this importance and magnitude. The Public and Stakeholders were provided 3 months to review the 1st Draft in late 2020 which is a more appropriate timeframe. Only having a 1 month window to review the 2nd Draft which has had substantial changes and no formal response to comments is a challenge. It is critical the Public and Stakeholders be provided additional time to review the next Draft with the revised Urban Design Guidelines and a compiled comment response table provided by the City.
2. Importance and Weight of New OP - Importance of getting the New Official Plan right the first time as there is no appeal rights for the Public and Stakeholders and the Planning Act includes a two year moratorium on amending New Official Plans unless this is waived by Council.
3. Lack of Transition Regulations - The 2nd Draft contains no transition regulations as an implementation tool. It is therefore unclear how ongoing development applications at various stages of the development approval process will be impacted when the New Official Plan comes into force and effect.

113 COLLIER STREET/ BARRIE/ ONTARIO/ L4M 1H2 / T 705 728 0045 / F 705 728 2010 / WWW.MHBCPLAN.COM

4. Urban Design Focus - The 2nd Draft is very much an Urban Design based and focused document, however we do not have the key implementation document (the revised Urban Design Guidelines) for many of these policies within the 2nd Draft. In the absence of this it is impossible to complete a comprehensive review. Additionally the 2nd Draft contains a lot of challenging urban design verbiage/terminology that is unclear and undefined which leaves a lot of room for varying interpretation of these policies. For example **Section 3.2.1 (i)(c)** requires all development applications to demonstrate it will improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place.


5. Prescriptive nature of the Official Plan – Many policies throughout the 2nd Draft are written in an absolute and prescriptive manner with no flexibility, very much like a Zoning By-law. An Official Plan is meant to provide broad long term policy direction and provide room for flexible interpretation of policies and goals. As written most development applications moving forward would likely require an Official Plan Amendment to proceed. For example **Section 2.6.3.3 d)** requires High Density development with a residential component shall have a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare. Many sites will not be able to achieve this density on a site by site basis while others will be able to far exceed it. This should be written as a general target and not an absolute requirement. This also would remove flexibility for mixed-use buildings that are primarily commercial/office to incorporate a small residential component.

All Prescriptive design related policies through the New OP should be written as “should generally” or “are encouraged to provide,” etc.

Notwithstanding these comments, we reserve the right to comment on the future draft that is provided with responses to the comments submitted as well as the revised draft Urban Design Guidelines when they are released to the public.

As shown on the excerpt below, the site (outlined in the red box) is proposed to be to be designated both “Neighbourhood Area” (yellow area) and Natural Heritage System (green area) on Map 2.

Excerpt of Map 2:



The following are general comments on the Draft Official Plan:

1. We have previously had discussions with City staff regarding the intended built form for the developable area of this parcel and had discussed concepts identifying medium density low to mid-rise built form being appropriate as this Site fronts onto an Arterial and can take advantage of existing infrastructure.

It is requested the lands on the Site identified as Neighbourhood Area be designated Medium Density on Map 2 in order to reflect this intended built form. This request was included in letter to City dated December 22, 2020.

We believe Medium Density would be a more appropriate designation for the site as the site has a constrained developable area, is not immediately adjacent to any other built form and is somewhat isolated. Maximizing the density on the site in the context of the surround area would make efficient use of the site and allow for a greater variety of built form in this area of the City which predominately consists of single detached dwellings on the south side of Ardagh Rd and further to the east.

We would request the opportunity to have a meeting to discuss this further with City Staff.

2. Subdivision policies- it is requested that the requirement in policy 9.5.3 to review the City tax base in relation to subdivisions, requirement for traffic calming, and requirement for vegetation removal only within 30 days of grading be reconsidered. Further, the lapse date policies of 9.5.3 (i) should include provision for extensions.
3. Affordable housing - There is no question that the provision of affordable housing is a basic human right/requirement and a critical component of inclusive community. However, the mandatory provision for affordable housing in all new developments is not practical or achievable. All developments are not conducive to the provision of truly affordable housing due to building type, location, proximity to supportive amenities, and financial feasibility. We are concerned with the implications of these policies and request they not be prescriptive for all developments. We recommend the City establish policies which enable the collection of revenues for the provision of City sponsored affordable housing.

There are various affordable housing target policies in the Plan including but not limited to policies 2.5 U), and Section 6.4.2. Policy 2.5 U) requires 10% of all new housing in the City to be affordable, policy 6.4.2 (e)(iii) requires development with more than 40 dwelling units to demonstrate the provision of affordable units and policy (iv) requires all new medium and high-density land use designations to provide 10% affordable units across a range of unit sizes including 3 bedroom units or larger, and policy 2.3.2 (e) (iii) requires at least 20% of housing units developed in the UGC satisfy the criteria for affordable. It is suggested that this policy does not recognize that various projects, in their totality, are being developed as affordable housing projects and thus contributing to the City wide mix of 10%. These policies have the potential to contribute to a lower amount of attainable units if affordable housing units are required on a project by project basis. Further with an owner occupied product, it is not understood how the City can guarantee that the unit will remain affordable to the second buyer once sold as affordable to the first buyer.

4. Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) - this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.

The following are comments regarding the Medium Density Designation and associated policies:

5. In the Medium Density designation, a development, as long as it is not on an intensification corridor and is within 70 metres of an NA designation (among other matters) may be permitted to have townhouses (2.6.2.2 i) and those townhouses are required to have ground floor commercial or retail if the building is on a Collector or Arterial road (2.6.2.2 e) and a mix of residential and non-residential uses is required (2.6.2.2 c) in all circumstances. However the development can be exempt from requiring commercial if it meets one of a handful of tests; mostly related to whether there is commercial close by and the site is not on an Arterial road (2.6.2.2 g) and notwithstanding policy (g) the commercial exemption policies don't apply in some areas. It is not known what the "townhouse" built form therefore is if it is required to have a mix of uses and might require ground floor commercial or retail depending on what type of street it is on; it is assumed that it is a live/work unit. It is suggested that if townhouses (without commercial) are permitted, that this be stated and it is also suggested that the commercial policies be simplified.

The following are comments regarding the Designated Greenfield Area policies:

6. Designated Greenfield Area and tenure - Policy 2.4.2.3 i) identifies that to meet the DGA density target, among other matters, new development is to provide for a range of unit types, tenures, and built form; "tenure" is not related to density and this should be removed.

The following are comments regarding the Urban Design policies:

7. Section 3.1.3.2 Application of Urban Design Guidelines- Must be clear that there is flexibility in not achieving every specific guideline due to site specific circumstance but the intent of the guideline can be demonstrated through other means and that should a relevant guideline not be achieved that it does not trigger an Official Plan Amendment.
8. Placemaking brief- policy 9.4.2.2(t) may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required.
9. Human Scale Design- policy 3.2.1 (a)(i)(c) It is not understood how a development proposal "shall" "improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place".
10. Sustainable and Resilient Design - it is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document for example, all development (which would include, for example, minor variances shall demonstrate passive design strategies, use of environmentally preferable products, enhancement of environmental quality, and optimization of operational and maintenance practices, among others.
11. Green Development Standards - A Sustainable Development Report is a new requirement for specific development applications. For a development application to demonstrate conformity to the Official Plan, it is unknown how these policies are to be addressed and their appropriateness in a land use planning document is questioned.

We thank you for consideration of these comments. We reserve the right to comment on any future drafts of the Official Plan and Urban Design Guidelines.

Yours truly,

MHBC

W&i

Kory Chisholm, BES, M.Sc, MCIP, RPP
Partner

cc. *Ron Mccowan | Mccowan & Associates Ltd.*

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:11 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Official Plan Comment Letter
Attachments: Draft2-OfficialPlanCommentLetter.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Darren Vella
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 4:13 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>; Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Subject: Re: Official Plan Comment LetterGood

Afternoon Tomasz and Michelle

Please find attached comments on Draft 2 of the Official Plan.

Regards



Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP

PRESIDENT & DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

647 Welham Road, Unit 9, Barrie, ON L4N 0B7
Tel: 705 – 812 - 3281 Ext. 22 Fax: 705 – 812 - 3438

E-Mail: dvella@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com

PLEASE NOTE WE HAVE MOVED

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

NOTE: This e-mail message and attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

May 26, 2021

City of Barrie
70 Collier Street Barrie, ON
L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba

Policy Planner

Re: Draft 2 - New Official Plan
Site Specific Official Plan Amendments

On behalf of several clients that have recently completed Official Plan Amendments in the City of Barrie, IPS has completed a review of Draft 2 – Official Plan and has the following comments and concerns. Section 2.8 Defined Policy Areas includes several properties that possess special policy direction based on site specific approvals granted by an approval authority. Based on a review of these parcels, several projects completed by IPS are missing from Section 2.8 or require further revised policy language under their proposed designations to ensure their approved developments can proceed.

70 & 76 Edgehill Drive

The subject lands are designated Medium Density (76 Edgehill) and Neighborhood Area (70 Edgehill). Within the existing Official Plan, and the approval of OPA No. 32, the subject lands have development permissions for a maximum density of 255 units per hectare. Section 2.6.2.3(d) of the proposed Official Plan permits a maximum density of 125 units per hectare which is not consistent with this previous approval. An excerpt from the existing Official Plan is noted below:

4.8.23 DEFINED POLICY AREA (HH) (OPA NO. 32, By-law 2014-143) Lands shown on Schedule C known municipally as 76 Edgehill Drive and is located on the north side of Edgehill Drive, east of Anne Street North, within the Sunnidale Planning Area, shall permit a twelve-storey residential apartment building with a maximum density of 255 units per hectare, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.2.2.3 (c) of the Official Plan.

647 WELHAM ROAD, UNIT 9A, BARRIE ONTARIO L4N 0B7
TEL: (705) 812-3281

EMAIL: INFO@IPSCONSULTINGINC.COM

There are two potential options to resolve this matter. Option 1 would include an addition to Section 2.8 (2.8.7 – 76 Edgehill) to include the subject lands as a defined policy area with the language of Section 4.8.23 in the existing Official Plan inserted. Option 2 could include a revision to Section 2.6.2.3(d) of the draft Official Plan to permit a maximum density equal to or greater than 255 units per hectare within the proposed Medium density designation. My client is also not opposed to the high density residential designation in this location and would be happy to discuss this in more detail with staff.

In addition to this matter, an active application is being processed to develop both 70 and 76 Edgehill comprehensively. The current application is being amended based on discussions with staff and would see the development of two high-rise towers occupying both sites. Given that 70 Edgehill is directly abutting 76 Edgehill, and is the last property along Edgehill Drive, it is respectfully requested that 70 Edgehill possess the same designation as 76 Edgehill. This will ensure a comprehensive plan can be developed for both parcels without the need for further amendments to the Official Plan. 70 Edgehill is an excellent candidate for medium or high density development based on its buffer from surrounding low density residential uses and its adjacency to other high density approvals and structures. Furthermore, Edgehill Drive contains a number of medium and high density developments which are currently incorrectly designated Neighborhood Area in this Draft of the Official Plan. These existing buildings should be placed in the medium or high density category in the next draft of the Official Plan.

390 Essa Road

According to Draft 2 the subject lands are located along an Intensification Corridor (Map 1) and designated Medium Density (Map 2). Similar to 76 Edgehill, the subject lands possess a site specific special policy area in the approved Official Plan which reads as follows:

- A) Defined Policy Area (LL) – lands shown on Schedule ‘C’ – Defined Policy Areas legally described as Part Lot 6, Concession 13, Part Park Lot 19, Registered Plan 67, known municipally as 390 Essa Road, shall be permitted a maximum density of 220 units per net hectare, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.2.2.3(d) of the Official Plan.
- B) Schedule “C” – Defined Policy Areas is hereby amended by designating the lands legally described as Part Lot 6, Concession 13, Part Park Lot 19, Registered Plan 67 in the City of Barrie, known municipally as 390 Essa Road, as “Defined Policy Area LL”, as shown on Schedule “A” attached hereto and forming part of this amendment.

We herein request that this recognition for 390 Essa Road be added to Section 2.8 – Defined Policy Areas or alternatively the maximum density permissions in the Medium Density designation be increased to accommodate the approval granted for this site.

Hi-Way Pentecostal Church

According to Draft 2 the subject lands are located along an Intensification Corridor and in a Strategic Growth Area (Map 1) and designated Commercial District and Natural Heritage System (Map 2). Similar to both sites above, the subject lands possess a site specific special policy area in the approved Official Plan which reads as follows:

New Section 4.8.X – Defined Policy Area (XX) is added as follows: The following policies shall apply to the lands shown on Schedule C, municipally known as 40, 42, 44 & 50 Anne Street North and 124, 128 & 130 Henry Street. a) In addition to the uses permitted in the Environmental Protection Area designation the following uses shall be permitted; i) A Bioretention Cell and associated stormwater management controls. b) In addition to the Site Plan Control Policies in Section 6.3 of this Plan, the lands which are designated Environmental Protection Area are subject to the following policy; i) A scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) (restoration plan for watercourse corridor, SAR, ELC) is required to be completed, to LSRCA satisfaction, prior to site plan approval

This policy is extremely important given the permitted uses within the Natural Heritage System do not permit the uses outlined in the approved OPA. We would request that this defined policy area be inserted into the Official Plan to ensure that this development can proceed as proposed.

Conclusion

Thank you for your consideration of the above noted comments. We are available to discuss should you have any questions or comments. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted, Innovative
Planning Solutions



Darren Vella
President & Director of Planning



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
 City Of Barrie Official Plan July
 16, 2021

#	Report/ Drawing	Section	Pg#	LSRCA COMMENT (December 21, 2020)	LSRCA COMMENT (JULY 16, 2021)
Documents Reviewed: DRAFT – City of Barrie Official Plan 2041 (September 24, 2020) Jul. 9th, 2021 – Comparison Review of Sept. 24th Draft OP with May 25th Draft OP – Comments in RED					
1		General		Please ensure the final document is an accessible document and a navigable PDF with a clickable table of contents and bookmarks.	Not addressed
2		General		<p>It would provide greater clarity if several terms used throughout the document were better defined. Consider including definitions for the following terms:</p> <p>Public utilities Environmental Impact Study Watercourse Vegetation Protection Zone Hydrological features Valley lands Riparian area Infrastructure Hydrogeological Report</p>	Those highlighted terms not included in the May 25 th update
3		General		<p>The terms Environmental Impact Study and Natural Heritage Evaluation are interchangeable; however, it's recommended that only one of these terms be used throughout the document to prevent any confusion.</p> <p>For example, if Environmental Impact Study is used throughout, a definition for this term should be included which specifies that this document may also be referred to</p>	Not addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
City Of Barrie Official Plan July
16, 2021


				as a Natural Heritage Evaluation.	
4		Foundation of this Plan	4	Expand on Lake Simcoe Protection Plan section. Describe LSPP's role within the watershed with regard to natural heritage and natural hazards. Also could include LSPP's vision within this section.	Not addressed
5		Community Vision		The Vision statement should speak not only to a premiere waterfront, but also to Lake Simcoe and the numerous resources that it provides for the community as well as the health and sustainability of the watershed. Suggested wording: "...with linkages to a premiere waterfront and access to Lake Simcoe and the many resources it provides for the community. New and old blend..."	Not addressed
6		Founding Principles	11	Mentions that policies aim to accommodate unpredictable change and recover quickly after "major shocks to the system". It is unclear what shocks to the system refers to (storm events?).	Not addressed
7		1.3	11	Please replace the photo for the "Green and Resilient" section to show something more reflective of the natural heritage system. The current photo shows an unnatural landscape with hardened edges and non-native annual plantings. A photo from Ardagh Bluffs or the Bear Creek Eco Park would be much more appropriate. We'd be happy to provide the one below of the Bear Creek Eco Park, if needed.	Photo not changed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW

City Of Barrie Official Plan July

16, 2021

					
8		2.3		This section speaks to “minor adjustment to the boundaries” not requiring an OPA – What will be considered minor? What will be the trigger for an OPA?	“minor adjustment to the boundaries” appears removed. What will be the trigger for an OPA?
9		2.3.1	16	<p>The importance of the Natural Heritage System to the community should be better captured in this section.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>“Natural heritage features and areas are essential to the landscape and the community – they contribute to the overall environmental and social...”</p> <p>“...policies to ensure the features and functions are protected to so that they can continue to perform their ecological functions, providing ecosystem services to the City, such as flood attenuation, carbon sequestration, pollination, infiltration, recreational opportunities, and so much more. These services are all vital to the health and well-being of the community.”</p> <p>The terms “Water Systems” and “Tablelands” are used in this section, are they defined? Perhaps “Fluvial System” would be more appropriate than “Water Systems”.</p>	Not addressed
10		2.3.2	17	The UGC is an area of focused growth... it is also an area with constraint associated with identified flood and erosion hazard areas. It would be helpful to have direction	Not addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
City Of Barrie Official Plan July
16, 2021

				in this section speaking to opportunities for flood attenuation and also the protection/improvement and restoration of the watercourses within the UGC. Additionally, the UGC is adjacent to the shoreline of Lake Simcoe – recognizing the need to protect the shoreline through policy in this section would be helpful.	
11		2.3.2 I) ii)	18	Thank you for including the requirement for pre-submission design review process!!	
12		2.4.2.1 f)	25	Please include a policy that recognizes the importance of protecting natural heritage features when settlement area boundaries are being adjusted. Suggested wording: v) the protection of natural heritage features is addressed.	Not addressed
13		2.4.2.3 e) vi)	28	Provide examples of measures that will be utilized to maintain the natural hydrologic cycle, etc.	Not addressed
14		2.6.6.1	43	Consider updating this section to describe more clearly the uses permitted in the natural heritage system. Suggested wording: a) Environmental conservation and preservation; b) Environmental stewardship, restoration and enhancement; c) Flood or erosion control mechanisms, if demonstrated to be in the public interest; d) Hazard management, if demonstrated to be in the public interest; e) Naturalized trails, boardwalks and interpretive/wayfinding signage installed by a public authority; and, "Low intensity" active transportation infrastructure installed by a public authority.	Not addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW

City Of Barrie Official Plan July

16, 2021

15		2.6.6.2 b)	43	<p>Several features that also make up the natural heritage system are currently excluded from the list, such as natural areas abutting Lake Simcoe, watercourses, woodlands, cultural thickets, cultural meadows, corridors and linkages, and natural areas of local significance. Also, note that coastal wetlands are specific to the Great Lakes and their connecting channels (as per PPS definition) and should not be referenced in the City's OP since there are none in the area.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>b) The natural heritage system includes: provincially significant wetlands, other wetlands, significant woodlands, other woodlands, significant valleylands, significant wildlife habitat, habitat of endangered and threatened species, watercourses, fish habitat, natural areas abutting Lake Simcoe, areas of natural and significant interest, cultural thickets, cultural meadows, natural areas of local significance and natural corridors and linkages as well as natural hazard lands, which include floodplains, erosion hazard areas, steep slopes and unstable soils.</p>	Not addressed
16		2.6.6.2 c)	44	<p>Please add "flood control in the public interest" to iii) Erosion control</p>	Not addressed
17		2.6.7.2 c)	45	<p>Trees are a more sustainable, cost efficient and environmentally friendly way to generate shade in public spaces. It's recommended that this policy be revised to include the provision of trees as well.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>c) The City shall install trees and shade structures along the waterfront to provide relief from the sun.</p>	Not addressed
18		2.7.3 b)	57	<p>This policy includes a reference to Conservation Authority Plans. Please provide clarification for what this is referring</p>	Plans not clarified



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
City Of Barrie Official Plan July
16, 2021

				to. Applicable regulations under <i>the Conservation Authorities Act</i> ?	
19		2.7.5 c) v)	58	Please include reference to the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan “where applicable”.	Not addressed
20		3.2.2	64	Part of designing for excellence requires consideration for an inclusion of natural elements. It’s recommended that an additional sub-objective be included that speaks to this. Suggested wording: f) Respect the environment: incorporate natural elements and features to promote a sustainable and robust natural environment.	Not addressed
21		3.3.3	69	It’s recommended that a policy be included that requires development of all greenfield areas be designed in a way that provides residents access to parks, open spaces or natural areas within a reasonable walking distance. i.e. 500 m. The City should also strive to meet this objective in already built areas or areas proposed for redevelopment.	Not addressed
22		3.3.4 e)	70	It’s not clear what is meant by “enhancement environmental quality”. Enhancement of the natural environment?	Changed to 3.2.3 v), has not been clarified
23		3.3.4.1	70	Green Development Standards should also include the requirement for Low Impact Development as well as maximizing the use of native plants for landscaping, to the greatest extent possible. Suggested wording: m) Incorporate low impact development; and, n) Maximize the use native plant material in landscape design.	Changed to 3.2.3.1, suggested wording not included



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
City Of Barrie Official Plan July
16, 2021

24		3.3.4.5	72	<p>The City should commit to providing educational resources to the community in the form of interpretive signage. Consider including an additional policy in this section that speaks to this.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>b) The City is committed to providing residents with opportunities for meaningful connections to public spaces and will provide interpretive signage along trails and in parks with information on the cultural and natural heritage in the area.</p>	Not addressed
25		3.3.5	72	<p>Part of creating a connected and vibrant public realm involves building community appreciation for these spaces. The City should consider committing to providing educational resources, such as nature interpretation.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>To design and develop a connected and vibrant public realm, the City will:</p> <p>i) create resources, such as interpretive signage, to better connect residents with natural spaces and build communal appreciation for these natural assets.</p>	Changed to 3.2.4.1, suggested wording not included
26		3.3.5 h)	73	<p>Consider revising this statement to be more in-line with ecological terms and language.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>h) Encourage sustainable development practices and enhancement or restoration of degraded natural heritage features (e.g. sustainable forest management, etc.)</p>	Changed to 3.2.4.1 viii, suggested wording not included
27		3.3.5.2.1 b) vii)	74	<p>Please consider the inclusion of direction pertaining to SWM storage facilities beneath park space (i.e. tanks under soccer fields)</p>	Not addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
City Of Barrie Official Plan July
16, 2021

28		4.2.1	98	<p>The use of Low Impact Design should be included with the design principles for the mobility network.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>f) Incorporate Low Impact Design elements into the road right of way, wherever feasible.</p>	
29		4.2.3.2 b)	103	<p>The amount of compaction required to facilitate sidewalks has a negative impact on street trees and their ability to establish and reach maturity. Maintaining sidewalks is also costly for the City (i.e. snow clearing, repairs, etc.). Consider opportunities to reduce the amount of sidewalk in residential areas.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>b) ii) Residential streets with less than 50 dwelling units along the entire length of street or for streets that terminate in a dead-end.</p>	Not addressed
30		4.2.3.2 f)	103	<p>To better support the urban forest canopy, a policy should be included that requires street trees for all new streets as well as existing streets.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>m) Ensure that street trees are incorporated into the design of any new streets and also planted along existing streets where space allows.</p>	4.3.2.1 'Public Streets and Rights-of-Way', suggested wording not included
31		4.3.1.12.3	118	<p>To ensure that trails through natural areas do not negatively impact sensitive features, a policy should be included that requires a Trail Impact Study to inform the design and installation of trails in these areas.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>l) Where trails are proposed in or adjacent to natural heritage features or the natural heritage system, a Trail</p>	Included in 4.3.1.6 j)



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
City Of Barrie Official Plan July
16, 2021

				Impact Study will be required to inform trail alignment, surface material, and installation so as to avoid and/or minimizes impacts to these sensitive areas.	
32		4.7.1 l)	129	<p>Parking areas should be designed in a way that reduces the need for salt application in the winter months. Consider including a policy that speaks to this.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>l) The City will require that all parking lots and structures be developed in as high-quality examples of good urban design and sustainability, with emphasis on salt reduction, permeability and safety for pedestrians...</p> <p>For additional guidance, please see: https://www.lsrca.on.ca/parking-lot-guidelines</p>	4.7 j), suggested wording is included
33		5.3	135	This section references the natural heritage system and describes it as being identified as Environmental Protection areas on map 3, but also as identified within the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. It's not clear what's meant by "as identified within the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan", please clarify.	Not addressed
34		5.3.1 c)	135	<p>Consider being more specific about naturalizing piped watercourses.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>The City will seek to restore and naturalize watercourses that have been piped or other wise altered by employing the principles of natural channel design.</p>	Comment addressed
35		5.3.1 d)	135	Protecting the natural heritage system and maintaining or creating linkages between features have similar but	Comment addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
 City Of Barrie Official Plan July
 16, 2021

				<p>different objectives. Consider breaking this into two separate policies.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>d) The City will seek to maintain, restore and, where possible, enhance natural heritage features and the overall biodiversity and ecological function of the natural heritage system.</p> <p>e) The City will seek to maintain and enhance ecological linkages between natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features to ensure a connected and resilient natural heritage system.</p>	
36		5.3.1 f)	135	<p>A goal of 20% tree canopy cover is too low.</p> <p>Literature suggests that the minimum forest cover at a watershed scale should be no less than 30% (How Much Habitat is Enough?, Environment Canada). Considering that tree canopy cover also includes non-forest areas (street trees, park trees, private trees), the goal should be increased to at least 30% if the City's objective of protecting and enhancing the natural heritage system is to be realized.</p> <p>While a 30% goal may seem daunting, there is much that can be accomplished by engaging private landowners to assist with meeting this goal.</p>	Not addressed, policy with target figure appears removed
37		5.3.1 h)	135	<p>The natural heritage system and natural heritage features are not the same, although they often overlap. Please be mindful of the difference between the two and consider revising the wording for this policy.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>Where, through a development application of site alteration, a natural heritage feature is identified on lands</p>	Comment addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
 City Of Barrie Official Plan July
 16, 2021

				designated other than natural heritage system and greenspace, the natural heritage system policies...	
38		5.3.1 j)	136	<p>To better discourage the preemptive removal of natural heritage features in advance of a development application, the City should consider including an additional policy that would address and prevent this from happening.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>o) Development and site alteration shall be prohibited prior to the approval of a development application. Where a natural heritage feature has been altered or removed by unauthorized development or site alteration, the feature will be conservatively classified, treated as though it was still in place and be subject to the polies of this Plan. Impacted areas shall be restored to the satisfaction of the City, in consultation with the applicable Conservation Authority.</p> <p>Neighbouring Municipalities (i.e. York Region) have a similar policy and it is a very useful tool.</p>	Not addressed
39		5.4.1	138	There should be an introduction for this section that provides some explanation for why there are two separate overlays for the natural heritage system in the City.	Not addressed
40		5.4.1 d)	138	<p>Any increases to the natural heritage system would be based on incorporating features that warrant being protected. Increases may also support the City’s goal of growing the urban canopy copy. It’s recommended that wording be revised to not restrict increases to the natural heritage system.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>“... Authority, nor shall such minor modifications result in any significant decrease in the size of the Natural Heritage</p>	Not addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
City Of Barrie Official Plan July
16, 2021

				System.”	
41		5.4.2.1	138	<p>As the EP Areas – Level 1 resources represent the most valuable components of the natural heritage system, consider including a policy that dictates minimum vegetation protection zones (VPZ) for specific features.</p> <p>Recommended minimum VPZs include:</p> <p>Provincially Significant Wetland – 30 m</p> <p>Non-PSW or unevaluated wetland – 15 m</p> <p>Woodland – 10 m</p> <p>Watercourse – 30 m</p> <p>Lake Simcoe Shoreline – 30 m</p> <p>Cultural meadows and cultural thickets within the natural heritage system or abutting protected features – 5 m</p> <p>It would also be helpful to provide guidance with respect to green infrastructure within the outer 50% of the larger VPZs.</p>	Vegetation Protection Zones noted, however minimum distances have not been included
42		5.4.2.1 a)	138	<p>In order to capture all features considered Level 1, an additional policy should be included to provide the same level of protection, even if features have not been mapped as Level 1.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>Where feature may exist on the landscape, outside of the Environmental Protection Areas shown on Map 3, they must be identified through a site-specific Environmental Impact Study and the policies of section 5.4.2 shall apply.</p>	Comment addressed
43		5.4.2.1 a)	138	It should be clarified that unevaluated wetlands are	Comment addressed, suggested wording included



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
 City Of Barrie Official Plan July
 16, 2021

				<p>considered Level 1 features as well.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>“...These areas include: Provincially Significant Wetlands, Non-Provincially Significant Wetlands and unevaluated wetlands greater than 0.5 hectares in size, Significant Woodlands....”</p>	
44		5.4.2.1 a)	138	<p>Considering the growth projected for the City and the continued loss of natural features within urban areas, consideration should be given to reevaluating which natural heritage features warrant being included as Level 1.</p> <p>It’s recommended that the following critical features of the natural heritage system be included as Level 1 (some of these would need to shift from Level 2 to Level 1 protection):</p> <p>Significant Woodlands greater than 4 ha</p> <p>Natural Areas Abutting Lake Simcoe</p> <p>Significant Valleyland</p>	Comment addressed
45		5.4.2.2 a)	139	<p>Based on the above comment and the need to provide stronger protection to natural areas still remaining in urban areas, Level 2 features should also be revised to include the following:</p> <p>Provincially Significant life science Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest</p> <p>Significant Wildlife Habitat</p> <p>Woodlands 0.5 ha > 4 ha</p> <p>Woodlands within 30 m of a Level 1 or other Level 2 feature</p> <p>Locally significant natural areas</p>	Comment not addressed, only those highlighted features are included as ‘Level 2’ from this list.



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
 City Of Barrie Official Plan July
 16, 2021

				Minimum vegetation protection zones and connectivity linkages	
46		5.4.2.2 a)	139	<p>Please clarify what is meant by “other watercourses”.</p> <p>Permanent and intermittent watercourses should be considered Level 1 features. Does “other watercourse” refer to ephemeral watercourses? Headwater drainage features?</p>	Not addressed
47		5.4.2.2 b)	139	<p>In order to maintain the natural heritage system, breaks and disconnect between features should not be supported. Consider including an additional policy that would prevent this from happening.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>Development shall not be permitted if the resulting development would create a disconnect or break in the natural heritage system.</p>	Not addressed
48		5.4.2.2 b)	139	<p>In order to maintain the natural heritage system, development that would result in features being down classified should not be supported. Consider including an additional policy that would prevent this from happening.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>Development shall not be permitted if the development would result in a feature no longer being considered significant or no longer being able to maintain its current Environmental Protection Areas level classification.</p>	Not addressed
49		5.4.2.3 a)	139	<p>Based on the above comments regarding feature classification (Level 1, 2 or 3), Level 3 features would also need to be revised to include the following:</p> <p>Regionally significant life science areas of Natural and Scientific</p>	Comment address, highlighted areas included in text



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW

City Of Barrie Official Plan July

16, 2021

				<p>Locally significant natural areas</p> <p>Cultural thicket or cultural meadow communities contiguous with woodland and wetland patches</p> <p><i>Note that Map 3 does not currently include the cultural thicket or cultural meadow communities and should be updated to conservatively show these areas. LSRCA has general mapping for these types of features in the Lake Simcoe watershed, available upon request.</i></p>	
50		5.4.2. 1	139	<p>Consider including policies that provide direction for any relocation of watercourses.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>e) Watercourses shall generally be maintained in their existing locations. Where a development proposal seeks to relocate a watercourse, it must be demonstrated that the relocation will maintain the existing function of the watercourse, will result in a net ecological gain and will not negatively impact the natural heritage system.</p> <p>f) Any relocation or significant alteration of a watercourse must incorporate natural channel design and be supported by a Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment.</p> <p>g) Any relocation of a watercourse must be in compliance with Conservation Authority regulations, and any other applicable Provincial or Federal regulations.</p> <p><i>The above policy suggestions may also belong in Section 5.5.2</i></p>	Not addressed
51		5.4.3 b)	140	<p>Note that a 30 m vegetation protection zone (VPZ) (buffer) applies to woodlands within the Lake Simcoe watershed in the “annexed lands”. A 10 m VPZ applies to woodlands outside of the watershed (i.e. NVCA jurisdiction). Please revise this policy to reflect this.</p>	Not addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
 City Of Barrie Official Plan July
 16, 2021

52		5.5	144	<p>This section would benefit from additional details and direction regarding which types, sizes, quality, etc. of features offsetting requirements would apply to.</p> <p>Additional clarification should be provided for where features must be replaced (i.e. elsewhere in the City) and at what ratio (i.e. 2:1 area for woodland, 3:1 area for wetland). Clarification should be provided for whether offsetting applies to the loss of vegetation protection zones and buffers. Clarification should be provided for whether cash-in-lieu would be accepted. If yes, how would this value be determined?</p> <p>Further discussion with LSRCA regarding how the City is envisioning the implementation of policies in this section would be welcome and beneficial to both parties.</p> <p>Please note: the LSRCA Ecological Offsetting Policy is applicable to through Planning Instruments such as Official Plan Amendments, Consents, Minor Variances and Zoning By-law Amendments as well as applications for Plan of Subdivision and Site Plan approval.</p>	
53		5.5.1 g)	145	<p>Note that Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority Ecological Offsetting Policy (not Plan) applies only to the Lake Simcoe watershed. The policies in the Official Plan should clarify that offsetting would apply to features within the City, regardless of watershed.</p>	Reference to 'Plan' or 'Policy' does not appear; comment not addressed.
54		5.5.2	145	<p>Consider including a policy commitment to not support the piping of watercourses and to seek out opportunities for daylighting any that are currently piped, as well as restoring degraded and disconnected systems.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>g) Not permit the piping of any watercourses or headwater areas.</p>	Not addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW

City Of Barrie Official Plan July

16, 2021

				<p>h) Seek out opportunities to restore existing piped watercourses at the surface.</p> <p>i) Seek out opportunities to restore degraded systems and remove barriers to fish passage.</p>	
55		5.5.3	145	<p>Consider revising the wording slightly to better reflect the objective of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>As a way to ensure the long-term ecological health of Lake Simcoe and its watershed, the Province....</p>	Comment addressed
56		5.5.3.1 d) ii)	146	<p>The date should be June 1, 2009 (not June 2, 2009). The LSPP came into force on June 2, 2009 and existing uses in place on the day before the LSPP came into effect are still permitted.</p>	Comment addressed
57		5.5.3.1 d) iv) c)	147	<p>This policy needs to move up a level. It should be 5.5.3.1 d)v)</p>	5.5.3.1 d) v) has been removed/changed
58		5.5.3.2	147	<p>To better align with the policies and text of the LSPP, consider revising the wording for this policy.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>Where, in accordance with the policies of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, a proposal for development or site alteration is permitted within 30 metres of the Lake Simcoe shoreline, structures shall only be permitted if:</p>	Comment addressed
59		5.5.3.5	149	<p>New Section Required</p> <p>Thank you for including policies speaking to LSRCA's Ecological Offsetting Policy and Phosphorus Offsetting Policy.</p> <p>Please include a section speaking to the Groundwater Recharge Offsetting Policy.</p> <p>https://www.lsrca.on.ca/Shared%20Documents/lssp-</p>	Groundwater Recharge Areas included as section 6.5.1.2



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW

City Of Barrie Official Plan July

16, 2021

				water-budget-policy.pdf LSRCA Staff will provide recommended wording under separate cover.	
		5.5.3.6	150	Note that the City is comprised of several subwatersheds that drain into Lake Simcoe or the Nottawasaga Valley . The areas that drain to Lake Simcoe are subject to the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan.	Comment addressed
60		5.5.3.6 d) ii)	150	This policy speaks to a requirement for a Sub-watershed Plan Conformity Report. Assuming the conservation authority would be asked to review and comment on these reports, further discussion with LSRCA would be beneficial to understand what the City's expectations are for this.	Noted, policy changed to section 5.5.2.6 e) ii)
61		5.7.1 a)	154	Consider including some additional points that speak to the importance and function of the waterfront as part of the City's natural heritage system. Suggested wording: xiii) The waterfront is in an important component of the natural heritage system and will be managed in an environmentally responsible manner. xiv) Opportunities to naturalize portions of the shoreline along the waterfront will be pursued in balance with providing visual and physical access to the water.	Comment not addressed
62		5.8 c)	156	Note that opportunities to enhance connectivity of the natural heritage system are not currently shown on Map 6. Is the intention to revise this map in the near future to identify these locations? It's recommended that opportunities to reconnect the natural heritage system where there are breaks and gaps be pursued and that these locations/areas also be shown on Map 3.	Comment not addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW

City Of Barrie Official Plan July

16, 2021

63		5.8 d)	156	<p>This policy should be expanded to also include arterial and connector roads.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>During the planning of infrastructure projects, the City will enhance connectivity between Natural Heritage Systems across Highway 400, arterial and collector roads to accommodate the movement of animals and native plants across....</p>	
64		5.9.1 g)	158	<p>In additional to a requirement for parkland to be conveyed to the City, there should be a policy that also requires the conveyance of lands that contain the natural heritage system. It should speak to the requirement for land to be conveyed in good condition. This may involve the removal of refuse and debris, management of invasive species, ecological restoration, etc. The City should not be liable for existing management issues/challenges that exist in the natural heritage system currently in private ownership.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>The City shall seek to acquire lands on which the natural heritage system is located, as a condition of development approval.</p> <p>Any land containing natural heritage features that is required to be conveyed to the City shall be in good ecological condition and be free of all encumbrances.</p>	Comment not addressed
65		6.3.1 a)	161	<p>Opportunities to also mitigate the impacts of climate change should also be pursued.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>...the use of design elements that help to minimize and/or mitigate the impacts of climate change...</p>	Comment addressed



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW

City Of Barrie Official Plan July

16, 2021

		6.3.2	162	This section should identify the current tree canopy in the City and also speak to the goal for tree canopy cover (recommend 30% for the goal instead of 20% - see comment above).	
66		6.3.2 a)	162	Privately owned trees make up a large portion of the City's tree canopy. Consider including some direction for developing a private tree bylaw for that would restrict the removal of large trees from private lands without good cause or justification. Funds gathered through this type of permitting process can then be redirected to tree planting initiatives elsewhere that would help bolster the urban canopy. Suggested wording: The City may pass a by-law under the <i>Municipal Act</i> that would restrict the removal of large trees from private property.	Comment not addressed
67		6.3.2 e)	162	This policy should clarify that where an Ecological Offsetting Strategy is required for the loss of woodland, additional tree compensation will not also be required.	Comment not addressed
68		6.5.1.2	168	This section should also reference Ecological Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (ESGRAs) as they follow the same policy regime. This section should also reference LSRCA's Water Budget Offsetting Policy.	6.5.1.2 a) iii) notes ESGRAs, but does not appear to reference the LSRCA's Water Budget Offsetting Policy
69		6.6	171	The description of municipal infrastructure should also include green infrastructure (i.e. street trees, landscaped strips, open space, natural heritage features, LIDs, etc).	Not addressed, infrastructure and green infrastructure are defined separately in the definitions
70		6.6.1 b)	172	This policy should clarify that public utilities will not be placed in the natural heritage system unless there is no feasible alternative. It should also be a requirement that it first be demonstrated that proposed utilities will not negatively impact natural heritage features or the natural	Comment addressed, suggested wording included



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW


City Of Barrie Official Plan July

16, 2021

				<p>heritage system.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>Where the location of public utilities on lands designated Natural Heritage System and Greenspace is the only feasible option and is shown to be efficient, cost effective and in the public interest, an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) will be required as part of the development application if the proposal is ...</p>	
71		6.6.5 c)	175	<p>This should also reference the MECP Guidelines as well as applicable Conservation Authority Guidelines (i.e. LSRCA Technical Guidelines for Stormwater Management Submissions)</p>	<p>MECP Guidelines not directly referenced, but LSRCA Technical Guidelines have been noted</p>
72		6.6.5 l)	177	<p>Where existing storm water management ponds were originally designed as online systems, a commitment should be made by the City to take these facilities offline.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>Where existing stormwater ponds are online, they shall be retrofitted to separate the facility from the watercourse, where feasible.</p>	<p>Not addressed</p>
73		9.4.2.2	200	<p>The following studies should be included in this list as well:</p> <p>Landscape plan</p> <p>Trail Impact Study</p> <p>Edge Management Plan</p>	<p>Comment addressed, studies included</p>
74		10.2	232	<p>The following definitions would benefit from additional clarification. Suggested wording provided below.</p> <p>Natural Heritage Features and Areas – include wetlands (non-PSW and unevaluated), woodlands (non-significant), locally significant natural areas, cultural thickets and</p>	<p>Comments not addressed</p>



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW
City Of Barrie Official Plan July
16, 2021

			<p>cultural meadows.</p> <p>Woodlands: treed area, woodlot or forested area, other than a cultivated fruit or nut orchard or a plantation established for the purpose of producing Christmas trees (ORMCP).</p> <p><i>By using the ELC definition of "Forest", it would restrict woodlands to treed areas with >60% cover. Many of the woodlands in the natural heritage system are not this dense. Many are woodlands with 35 – 60% cover.</i></p>	
75		Map 3	<p>Consider using the watercourse GIS layer available from the Conservation Authorities. The location of watercourses currently shown on map 3 are not all reflective of their location on the ground.</p> <p>For example, Hotchkiss Creek, show in the snippet below, is piped through some areas (under the roads) and does not exist at the surface where the map suggests.</p> 	<p>Map 3 does appear updated; the example provided was changed to show the piped areas of Hotchkiss Creek</p>



LSRCA SECOND SUBMISSION PLANNING REVIEW

City Of Barrie Official Plan July

16, 2021

76		Maps - General		It would be useful to compare the COB GIS layers with LSRCA's NHS layers. Please contact LSRCA staff to discuss further.	
77		Definitions		Please provide a definition for Stormwater Management Facilities. This will assist with conversations during the approval process regarding what is or is not accepted within the outer 50% of a VPZ to a natural heritage feature.	Definition not included

MCDERMOTT & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

LAND USE & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

1550 KINGSTON ROAD, BOX 1408
PICKERING, ONTARIO L1V 6W9
TELEPHONE: (905) 509-5150
e-mail: mcdplan@bell.net

May 10, 2021

Corporation of the City of **Barrie**
Development Services Department
70 Collier Street

P.O. Box400
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 4T5

Attention: Mr. Tomasz Wierzba
Policy Planner

————— CITY OF BARRIE —————
RECEIVED
MAY 17 2021
PLANNING
SERVICES —————
—————

**Re: Proposed New Official Plan for the City of Barrie
Notice of Public Open House & Public Meetings**

Our File: PN 5139

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

We have been retained by 1287363 Ontario Limited, owner of the Dunlop Village Plaza, municipal address of 304 Dunlop Street West, to assist in the review and consideration of the proposed new Official Plan for the City of Barrie. In accordance with the directions set out in the Notice of the Open House and Statutory Public Meeting, we have registered to attend the virtual meetings on May 19, 2021, and June 2, 2021, on behalf of our Client.

On behalf of our Client and in accordance with the provisions of Section 17(23) of the Planning Act, R.S.O.1990, c. P.13 as amended, we further request Notice of Adoption of the new Official Plan for the City of Barrie. By way of copy of this letter, the request for Notice of Adoption is also being provided to the Clerk of the City of Barrie as required in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act.

Sincerely yours,

McDermott & Associates Limited

/o/44'<dJuJ.

Mr. Clifford Cole
Gowling WLG

John McDermott, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.

Principal Planner

copy to: Clerk's Department

City of Barrie

Mr. Keith Lahey
1287363 Ontario Limited

Mr. Clifford Cole
Gowling WLG

MCDERMOTT & ASSOCIATES LIMITED

1550 KINGSTON ROAD, BOX 1408

LAND USE & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS

PICKERING, ONTARIO L1V 6W9

TELEPHONE: (905) 509-5150

e-mail: mcdplan@bell.net

May 10, 2021

Corporation of the City of **Barrie**
Development Services Department
70 Collier Street

P.O. Box400
Barrie, Ontario
L4M 4T5

COPY

Attention: Mr. Tomasz Wierzba
Policy Planner

Re: Proposed New Official Plan for the City of Barrie
Notice of Public Open House & Public Meetings

Our File: PN 5139

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

We have been retained by 1287363 Ontario Limited, owner of the Dunlop Village Plaza, municipal address of 304 Dunlop Street West, to assist in the review and consideration of the proposed new Official Plan for the City of Barrie. In accordance with the directions set out in the Notice of the Open House and Statutory Public Meeting, we have registered to attend the virtual meetings on May 19, 2021, and June 2, 2021, on behalf of our Client.

On behalf of our Client and in accordance with the provisions of Section 17(23) of the Planning Act, R.S.O.1990, c. P.13 as amended, we further request Notice of Adoption of the new Official Plan for the City of Barrie. By way of copy of this letter, the request for Notice of Adoption is also being provided to the Clerk of the City of Barrie as required in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act.

Sincerely yours,

McDermott & Associates Limited

Mr. Clifford Cole
Gowling WLG

vl'f_,f/)b,ff;r

John McDermott, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.

Principal Planner

copy to: Clerk's Department

City of Barrie

Mr. Keith Lahey
1287363 Ontario Limited



Mr. Clifford Cole
Gowling WLG

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:07 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Barrie OP Review Letter - Melchior Management
Attachments: Barrie OP Review Letter - Melchior Management.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Janet Foster
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2021 6:12 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Cc: Dino Melchior; Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Subject: Barrie OP Review Letter - Melchior Management

Hello Tomasz, the OP presentation was well done. Very professional! Congratulations. I hope you are doing well. I do hope all Barrie Planning staff are doing well in this crazy time of ours. I agree, it would have been so much better to meet in person. Hopefully again, very soon.

Due to time constraints, you were unable to answer my questions. It was identified that I should send my questions to you directly for answers. Thank you.

I had sent a letter on behalf of my Client, Melchior Management, regarding the first draft of the OP. I am looking for answers to the general comments/questions at the beginning of my letter. Letter is attached.

If you would kindly answer those questions, that would be appreciated.

We may have additional comments regarding the specific properties, however, I will advise under a separate inquiry. Thank you.

Janet

Sent from my iPad

December 18, 2020

Kathy Suggitt
Manager of Strategic Initiatives, Policy and Analysis
City Hall
70 Collier Street, Box 400
Barrie, On. L4M4T5

Re: General Comments regarding the Draft City of Barrie Official Plan Policies & Specific Comments and Consideration of Land Use Designations for Properties owned by Melchior Management

Dear Kathy:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide comment on the City's draft Official Plan. Melchior Management retained my services to provide a review of the Official Plan policies, identify how the policies would affect their land holdings and provide recommendations. Certain of the recommendations include amendments to the City's proposed land use designations with rationale for such amendments. Also included are some general observations and recommendations.

General Comments

1. It is noted that boundary revisions to the Urban Growth Centre established by the Growth Plan are proposed. Please identify the rationale for such revisions.
2. The policies identify that minor revisions to the Plan may be considered without an Official Plan amendment; however, increases to height and density will not be considered. Will an Official Plan amendment be required in instances where increases are contemplated? Also, will an Official Plan amendment be required if minimum requirements cannot be satisfied, for example minimum densities or building storeys?
3. Please explain the rationale for the Boundary expansion of the Historic Neighbourhoods from those recognized in the Historic Neighbourhoods Strategy that introduce the Kempenfelt and East End Neighbourhoods where there is no overlap with the Urban Growth Centre. Please consider development objectives to be discussed at the presubmission stage in order that the applicant understands what is expected in the built form, or exemption from the requirements.
4. It is recommended that the City consider implementing pockets of Medium or High density designations to be scattered throughout the City in the Neighbourhood Areas and other areas, where intensified uses, taller buildings/higher densities, already exist and are considered compatible with adjacent uses. By including the existing medium and high density residential uses in the Neighbourhood Area designation appears to downgrade their land use intensification

ability and renders their existing uses non-conforming (given Neighbourhood Area maximum building heights of 3 and 4 storeys.) Designating these sites/pockets of Medium or High density land uses would recognize their current existing higher density uses, allow for greater intensification potential, possibility to introduce non-residential uses, and recognize their underlying permitted zoning of apartment dwellings, zoned, RA1 and RA2. The Neighbourhood Area land use designation does not allow for the recognition of existing higher density uses and does not distinguish future high and low density residential uses.

5. The Plan identifies that the High Density land use designation is to be used in growth areas, Urban Growth Centre and the Strategic Growth Areas; however, on Map 2, Land Use, the only area where the High Density designation is identified is the Urban Growth Centre, the Osmingtonsite at Hwy 400 and Essa Road and at Essa Road and Mapleview. The City should consider more High Density land uses in other areas of the City that can support taller buildings and higher densities such as the Major Transit Station Areas and near Commercial Districts.
6. Has the City envisioned what the implementing zoning bylaw will look like when recognizing and permitting mixed uses? How will the existing zoning permissions currently afforded to properties be maintained? Will the City pre-zone lands or is rezoning to be applied on an individual site basis.
7. The Parking solutions identified in Section 4.7 identify that as a minimum, request for a reduction in parking spaces will be in accordance with the City's Cash-in-lieu of Parking Bylaw. It is difficult to find this Bylaw on the City Website. The policies regarding parking should explain the Cash-in-Lieu of Parking Bylaw or identify a link that can be used to view the Bylaw.
8. Condo Conversion policies identified in Section 9.5.4.1 are not consistent with Section 2.5.1 where conversion of rental units to ownership require replacement at a ratio of 1:1. If there is a healthy rental market and has been healthy for preceding years, replacement of rental units maybe considered onerous.

Specific Property Comments

1. The property at 11 Lakeside Terrace is recognized with an Environmental Protection Area Level 1 (with existing Development Designation). This property has been developed, where an Environmental Impact Study would have been undertaken to support development of the site.
➤ Seeking the City's consideration of removing the EPA Level 1 Overlay on this property.
2. The property at 299 Lakeshore Drive forms part of a commercial/office intersection at Lakeshore and Minet's Point Road, which extends to the Yonge Street corridor. Both Lakeshore and Minet's Point are classed as Arterial Roads, having the highest order of traffic volume capacity and recognition of a strategic growth area. The lands are in close proximity, across Lakeshore Road, of the Strategic Growth Area. In addition, the lands are in close proximity to the Rail corridor and the Allandale GO station.

The proposed land use designation for the lands is Neighbourhood Area which would diminish redevelopment potential and does not recognize the existing office uses and potential for future expansion of mixed uses on the site.

- **Seeking City's consideration of expanding the Strategic Growth Area boundary to include the lands located at 299 Lakeshore Drive and to designate them Commercial District, therefore recognizing their potential for creating future strategic growth in this area.**

3. The property at 99/110 Anne Street South functions as a commercial plaza. The current land use designation is General Commercial and the existing zoning is C4-SP9 (no residential uses permitted).

The proposed designation is Non-Industrial Employment, where retail uses require a primary use, ie. office. However, the existing zoning of C4 allows a wide range of commercial uses not limited by requiring a primary use. Tenant turnover is frequent which makes it difficult to monitor primary users when negotiating leases.

- **Because this property is already zoned for commercial uses, the owner is seeking assurances that the range of commercial uses currently permitted will be taken into consideration when the new zoning bylaw is reviewed. Further discussion and clarification on allowing commercial permissions without primary uses is requested, or broadening the range of primary uses.**

4. The property at 259 Dunlop Street West is in behind the commercial uses that front onto Dunlop Street. The current use of the property is an 8 storey residential building currently designated Residential and zoned Residential Apartment RA1. While potential exists for redevelopment with possible assembly of properties, the subject property currently does not include employment uses and given its secondary location behind the employment uses on Dunlop Street, may not be well positioned to include employment uses.

The site is within the Strategic Growth Area and proposed to be designated SEED. While recognizing employment uses, it is also in an area proposed to support the surrounding residential population.

- **Seeking consideration that not every building should support employment uses. The designation of Medium or High Density would recognize its location in the Strategic Growth Area and would recognize taller buildings and higher residential densities without necessitating employment uses given its proximity within the SGA.**

5. The property at 81 Mulcaster Street forms part of a larger court, registry, taxation complex. Individually or collectively this is a large parcel of land located in Downtown Barrie, currently designated City Centre and located within the designated Urban Growth Centre for Barrie. This designated recognition would afford the highest densities and tallest buildings in the City, supported by easy access to downtown services and amenities, municipal parking and the waterfront. This real estate offers opportunities for intensified redevelopment.

The City's proposal is to recognize the subject lands as Neighbourhood Area, allowing limited physical and population growth and reducing potential for intensification. The

proposed land use is Community Hub. While recognizing its current use, it does not recognize the potential for redevelopment at the highest densities and building height, located in the context of downtown and the Urban Growth Centre.

In addition, the OP is currently proposing an amendment to the UGC boundary which removes the subject lands and adds lands in the Innisfil/Bradford/Tiffin/Dunlop area. This area includes 2 Waste Assessment Areas and is further removed from Downtown services and amenities. Soil conditions may limit the amount of redevelopment potential anticipated/expected in this area.

- **Seeking City's consideration of maintaining the potential for future growth and intensification at 81 Mulcaster Street, and other surrounding lands, to remain within the designated Urban Growth Centre and designated High Density, maintaining its current and designated status and planning for future, supported and serviced growth.**

6. The lands at 125, 135 and 139 Wellington Street East are currently occupied with 6 and 8 storey buildings. The lands are currently designated Residential and zoned RA1. The proposal is to designate these lands Neighbourhood Area, for limited growth to 4 storeys, thereby rendering the lands non-conforming.

The surrounding land uses are commercial, known as the Wellington Commercial Plaza, which is proposed to be designated Commercial District. Although an employment use, this Commercial District land is not recognized to be within the close proximity of the Strategic Growth Area at Dunlop and Anne Streets, nor within an Employment Area.

The subject lands are located on Wellington Street, which is an arterial road, is currently built with mid-rise buildings and has land area available for potential to be redeveloped and intensified at higher densities. The lands are surrounded by commercial uses and have easy access to Hwy 400. The lands would have greater potential for redevelopment than that allowed under the Neighbourhood Area designation and where the existing buildings would be considered non-conforming.

- **Seeking consideration of Medium or High Density designation to recognize the existing uses and potential for high density redevelopment given the sites location and surrounding services and amenities.**

7. The property at 181 Collier Street is proposed to be recognized in the Neighbourhood Area designation and therefore limited redevelopment potential. The lands are currently designated Residential and zoned RA2-2 permitting a building height of 45m. The lands are currently developed with a 15 storey building. The new NA designation would render the site non-conforming and would not recognize their current use or their potential for growth, given their existence in the neighbourhood as an existing taller building.

- **Seeking consideration of medium or high density designation to recognize existing use and zoning permissions and potential for higher density redevelopment.**

8. The sites at 35 Blake Street and 7 & 15 Vancouver Street are currently occupied by 3 and 4 storey buildings designated Residential and zoned RA1-2 and RA1. However, the proposal is to designate the lands as Neighbourhood Area, limiting their growth potential with easy and desirable waterfront location and access.

- **Seeking Medium Density designation to recognize existing uses and potential for future intensification on sites that are already built at higher densities and heights than that envisioned by the Neighbourhood Area designation.**
- 9. The property at 329 Blake Street is currently designated Residential and zoned RA1-3 (30m). The current built form is a 6 storey residential building. The Neighbourhood Area designation is proposed and would reduce the permissions currently available to the site through permitted zoning. To maintain redevelopment potential and recognize the current use, consideration of a Medium Density land use designation is requested.
- **Seeking a Medium Density land use designation for the potential of redevelopment and future growth.**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the City's draft Official Plan. Should you have comments or require additional information, please contact me at your convenience.

Yours truly,

Janet Foster, RPP

Cc. Dino Melchior, Melchior Management

Joanne Werth

From: Matthew Cory
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 3:56 PM
To: cityclerks; NewBarrieOP; Tomasz Wierzba
Cc: Amanda Santo - - Dorsay Development Corp; Berta Haikin - Dorsay Development Corporation; Mike McCann; Susan Rosenthal; Catalina Cardenas
Subject: Building Barrie - DIV (Barrie) Comments on Draft Two of the Official Plan 2051
Attachments: 2021 06 02 Barrie Draft Official Plan 2 Comments - DIV Barrie.pdf
Categories: Follow Up

Dear Mr. Wierzba,

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. ("MGP") are the planners for DIV Development (Barrie) Ltd. ("DIV"), who own approximately 80 hectares of land located north of Lockhart Road and west of Sideroad 20 (the "Subject Lands"), within the Hewitt's Secondary Plan in the City of Barrie. MGP has participated in the Hewitt's Secondary Plan process since 2012 and has been monitoring and providing input into the City's New Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review process, including prior letters and deputations to Council and by participating in the City's 2020 stakeholder consultation sessions. The attached letter provides our additional comments on the Draft City of Barrie Official Plan Draft 2 2051 ("Draft Official Plan 2051") and continues the direction of comments over this history of input to the City including our most recent submission in December 2020 on the Draft Official Plan 2041.

In review of the new Draft Official Plan, we note that staff have undertaken significant effort to constructively respond to many of our comments. We would like to thank you for achieving compliance with the Growth Plan 2051 planning horizon and the inclusion of our clients' land within the settlement boundary. We have noted an error in which a portion of our client's lands have been excluded from the Designated Greenfield Area ("DGA") in Map 1 of the Draft Official Plan and request this be corrected to include these lands as part of the DGA. As per our previous comments, we believe these lands are required to allow the City to meet its growth forecast and support their inclusion in the settlement area boundary and designation for residential development. In addition, the removal of prescriptive urban design policies from the Official Plan, in favour of the preparation of a separate urban design guideline document is a positive change that enhances the usability of the Official Plan. However, many of our major comments made in December 2020 on the first draft of the Official Plan remain. The letter provides a summary of the major issues we believe must be addressed prior to issuance of a final Official Plan document to the Province for approval.

This letter also forms an outline of the comments I will make tonight at the public meeting.

We thank you for the ongoing opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Official Plan 2051. We have attempted to suggest policy solutions in the Official Plan with regard to the Subject Lands to address our concerns and we ask for a stakeholder meeting with you to review the issues raised in our comments and work through our other concerns and policy suggestions with the intent of expediting a revised Official Plan. Please contact me at any time to discuss our comments or arrange a meeting.

Yours truly,

#

P d wkhz #M p hv#F rul #P FIS #JSS #SOH #SP S #K H2K IP ,#

SulqfLsdo/#Sodqghu/#Odog#Hfrqrp lw/#Sur hfw#P dqdjhu#

#



40 years of making great places.

#

473#Jhqihz #G ulyh.#/xLh#534 #P dunkdp #R Q #D6U #DE6 #F dqdgd#z z z p j s lfd#
W=#41<381846134:3#{449 #P =#4197:1535163<9 #

#

Wkh#lqirup dvlrq#frqdlqhg#lq#wklv#wudyp lwlrq#p dL#eh#sulylchjhg#dqg#frqilghqilcbl#lv#lv#lqwhggh#rxpl#inu#wkh#xv#ri#wkh#in#flslhg#wv,#qpp hg#deryhl#Li#Lrx#duh#qrv#wkh
lqwhggh#in#flslhgw/#Lrx#duh#knuhel#qzwlilhg#wkdw#dqL#glv#p lqvlrq/#glvwulesvlrq#ru#frslqj#ri#wklv#frp p xqlfowlrq#ru#lw#awwBq hqW#lv#wulfwal#surklelwhglLi#Lrx#
kdyh#hfhlyhg#wklv#frp p xqlfowlrq#q#nur u#s dcvh#pr wll#kv#p p hg lvhd#e1#hwuq#p dL#lqg#ghdwh#v#

June 2, 2021

MGP File: 12-2089

City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

via email: newbarrieop@barrie.ca and cityclerks@barrie.ca

**Attention: Mr. Tomasz Wierzba, RPP
Policy Planner**

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

**RE: Comments on New Draft Barrie Official Plan Draft Two
DIV Development (Barrie) Ltd.
1080 Lockhart Road (Part Lot 20, Concession 11)**

1.0 Overview

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (“MGP”) are the planners for DIV Development (Barrie) Ltd. (“DIV”), who own approximately 80 hectares of land located north of Lockhart Road and west of Sideroad 20 (the “Subject Lands”), within the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan in the City of Barrie. MGP has participated in the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan process since 2012 and has been monitoring and providing input into the City’s New Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review process, including prior letters and deputations to Council and by participating in the City’s 2020 stakeholder consultation sessions. This letter provides our additional comments on the Draft City of Barrie Official Plan Draft 2 2051 (“Draft Official Plan 2051”) and continues the direction of comments over this history of input to the City including our most recent submission in December 2020 on the Draft Official Plan 2041.

1.1 City Response to Comments Made in December 2020

In review of the new Draft Official Plan, we note that staff have undertaken significant effort to constructively respond to many of our comments. We would like to thank you for achieving compliance with the Growth Plan 2051 planning horizon and the inclusion of our clients’ land within the settlement boundary. We have noted an error in which a portion of our client’s lands have been excluded from the Designated Greenfield Area (“DGA”) in Map 1 of the Draft Official Plan and request this be corrected to include these lands as part of the DGA. As per our previous comments, we believe these lands are required to allow the City to meet its growth forecast and support their inclusion in the settlement area boundary and designation for residential development. In addition, the removal of prescriptive urban design policies from

the Official Plan, in favour of the preparation of a separate urban design guideline document is a positive change that enhances the usability of the Official Plan.

However, many of our major comments made in December 2020 on the first draft of the Official Plan remain. This letter provides a summary of the major issues we believe must be addressed prior to issuance of a final Official Plan document to the Province for approval.

1.2 Overly Prescriptive Official Plan Policies

We are concerned that the wording of many of the policies in the Official Plan remains too prescriptive, which will have the negative impact of the Plan being difficult to implement. The tone of an Official Plan should be to provide permissions for land use and general guidance with regard to development. The Official Plan applies across the entire geography of the City, and therefore all policies must be generic enough to apply in all instances, or sufficient work should be undertaken to ensure that specific policies can be universally implemented without the need for an Official Plan Amendment to deal with area or site-specific exceptions. Typically, area specific policies are prepared through secondary or tertiary planning exercises, and site-specific development standards are more appropriately implemented through the City's zoning bylaw.

We request that the City remove overly prescriptive policy and development requirements from the Official Plan, and rather provide general guidance to make the intent of the Official Plan clear. Specifically, policies specifying setback requirements, locations of street trees, sidewalk widths, area or context driven height and density requirements, and similar policies should be simplified or removed in favour of more detailed planning process which will appropriately determine these requirements.

1.3 Maintaining the Planned Intent from the Hewitt Secondary Plan on the Subject Lands

It remains a major concern that the Hewitt Secondary Plan, added as a new Section 9 in the current Official Plan, has been omitted completely in the Draft Official Plan 2051. While policies throughout the Draft Official Plan speak to the potential need to create a secondary plan, there is no specific direction as to how existing or new secondary plans interact with the policies of the Draft Official Plan.

It is not appropriate, nor is it good planning to require the subject lands to undergo re-planning or new secondary or tertiary planning process when the Hewitt Secondary Plan provides land use designations and policies that are good planning for the subject lands. This would also result in a significant and unnecessary delay in the delivery of much needed housing, roads, and community facilities, with corresponding delays to the City in realizing a return on the various infrastructure and capital investments it has made to support growth.

The continuity of the planning from the Hewitt Secondary Plan and its area specific policies must be recognized in the Official Plan for the subject lands, either through the reinsertion of

a separate chapter like the City's current Official Plan or by including all Hewitt Secondary Plan policies in the areas specific policies in appropriate sections of the Draft Official Plan 2051. It is also unclear from growth management work prepared by the City what the overall housing mix will be to 2051, and to what extent the subject lands will be relied upon to provide the limited potential for new growth in single and semi-detached housing to allow the City to meet a market-based demand for housing to 2051.

A suggestion that could resolve these concerns would be to include in the Official Plan an area specific policy identifying that the subject lands should be developed primarily for single-detached housing with other medium density forms in appropriate locations to a minimum density of 16 units per gross developable hectare or 50 residents and jobs per hectare to allow the City to achieve its overall density targets. This would allow development to proceed to a density and scale anticipated under the Hewitt Secondary Plan policies, notwithstanding any new policy approaches the City is contemplating in other areas.

In addition, there are numerous references to Block Plans without any explanation as to what these are, or where the City intends to require them. We suggest this language be removed as these references are unnecessary given that all lands are either within the built-up area (and will be subject to demonstration plans as shown in Appendix 3) or have been comprehensively planned in the Greenfield area through the Salem and Hewitt Secondary Plan processes and therefore no Block Plan should be required prior to development.

To resolve this concern, we request that the City include a site-specific policy that states that the subject lands will not be required to undertake a Secondary or Block Plan prior to, as a requirement of, or condition of development approvals (draft plan of subdivision and zoning bylaw amendment).

1.4 Logical and Flexible Phasing Policies

The pace of development anticipated in the Salem and Hewitt Secondary Plan areas has not been realized, and the City continues to struggle with the financial implications of slower than expected growth rates. We believe that a solution to aid in expediting the pace of development and aiding the City in realizing a return on its infrastructure and capital investments is to advance the phasing of the subject lands and provide more flexibility in the progression from one phase of development to the next. With regard to the phase delineations on the subject lands, we have made numerous submissions and remind the City that key infrastructure is required on the Dorsay lands to allow for development and the creation of complete neighbourhoods on adjacent lands to the west. This includes a pumping station for servicing, the completion of collector roads for transportation connections, and the planned re-channelization of the current drainage channel. To ensure these infrastructures can be delivered in a timely and cost-effective way, and to minimize the disruption that future residents will endure from construction, we request that the City move the Dorsay Phase 3 lands into Phase 2 and that the Phase 4 lands become Phase 3. There does not appear to be a need for a fourth phase.

In addition, moving from one phase of development to the next should be expedited once appropriate growth management considerations have been met, which primarily should be focused on ensuring that the required infrastructure is available to support growth. It is our opinion that an official plan amendment should NOT be required to commence development in a new phase, once the required infrastructure is in place in a prior phase.

1.5 Other Policies

We are pleased to see the changes already implemented by the City from this first round of consultation. We do, however remain concerned regarding a number of policies that have yet to be addressed. Although it is our belief that the primary concerns we have presented in this letter are imperative to the implementation and practicality of this plan, we have further concerns with other supporting policies.

Thus, we remain firm in our opinion that the Official Plan document must be reassessed holistically with the following revisions considered:

1.5.1 NHS Boundaries

As previously requested, Section 2.7.4 Natural Heritage Protection: The Natural Heritage System limits identified on Map 2 and 3 of the Draft Official Plan do not reflect the detailed ground-truthed information that we currently have with respect to DIV's lands. We implore that the natural heritage mapping on the subject lands be revised to reflect our fieldwork – we will provide a plan for the City's use.

1.5.2 Minor Variance

Although Section 9.5.9 has been trimmed of several extraneous tests included in the first draft of the Official Plan, we remain adamant that the remaining test be removed as well. The conditions included in policy 9.5.9a) cannot reasonably be met as terms such as 'annoyance' are too broad and remain undefined. Tests which are not outlined and prescribed through the *Planning Act* cannot have a reasonable place in this document and so are not in keeping with legislative requirements.

1.5.3 Park Land Dedication

Section 5.9 of the draft Official Plan speaks to Parkland Dedication. Throughout this section, the total "gross" land area is referenced in the calculation of parkland rate. Parkland is not typically calculated with non-developable land (e.g., environmental features) included in the equation. Net calculations are the standard across the board, as natural heritage area and other non-developable features are just that: undevelopable and typically not used to generate parkland. Accordingly, we ask the City to amend this policy to clarify parkland calculations are made on developable land.

1.5.4 Affordable Housing

Affordable housing is mentioned in several sections of this draft of the Official Plan.

Further to the comments in our previous submission, housing affordability is both a pertinent and tremendously important initiative that must be included in good planning. We commend the City in their undertaking of this task, however more work must be done.

This draft has not considered the many supportive structures and background work which contribute to the successful implementation of such an initiative. There have been several local municipalities which have undertaken legislative processes which allow for the planning and structure of affordability models to ensure successful execution.

Affordability, though it has been formally defined in this draft of the Official Plan, requires support through policy for both the developer and consumer. Affordability has simply been prescribed in this draft as a percentage of new builds, but how this will be supported through appropriate housing mix, incentives, strategic location of housing, maintenance, time and terms of affordability, affordable ownership versus rental structures and supports, and building management has not been included. Without substantive provisions, affordable housing cannot be included in an Official Plan prescriptively.

Given the short timeframe for review of the new Draft of the Official Plan, we will have comments on other policies and request an opportunity to review these with staff and work through them to propose new wording or other solutions to improve the functioning of the plan.

1.6 Conclusion

We thank you for the ongoing opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Official Plan 2051. We have attempted to suggest policy solutions in the Official Plan with regard to the Subject Lands to address our concerns.

We ask for a stakeholder meeting with you to review the issues raised in our comments and work through our other concerns and policy suggestions with the intent of expediting a revised Official Plan. Please contact me at any time to discuss our comments or arrange a meeting.

Yours very truly,

Malone Given Parsons Ltd.



Matthew Cory, MCIP, RPP, PLE, PMP, Principal

cc. Amanda Santo, Dorsay Development Corp.

Susan Rosenthal, Davies Howe LLP

Councillor Mike McCann, Ward 10 Councillor of Barrie

December 22, 2020

MGP File: 12-2089

City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

via email: newbarrieop@barrie.ca

Attention: Ms. Kathy Suggit, RPP
Manager of Strategic Initiatives, Policy and Analysis

Dear Ms. Suggit:

RE: Comments on New Draft Barrie Official Plan 2020
DIV Development (Barrie) Ltd.
1080 Lockhart Road (Part Lot 20, Concession 11)

1.0 Overview

Malone Given Parsons Ltd. (“MGP”) are the planners for DIV Development (Barrie) Ltd. (“DIV”), who own approximately 80 hectares of land located north of Lockhart Road and west of Sideroad 20 (the “Subject Lands”), within the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan in the City of Barrie. MGP has participated in the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan process since 2012 and has been monitoring and providing input into the City’s New Official Plan Municipal Comprehensive Review process, including prior letters and deputations to Council and by participating in the City’s 2020 stakeholder consultation sessions. This letter provides our initial comments on the Draft City of Barrie Official Plan 2041 (“Draft Official Plan”) and continues the direction of comments over this history of input to the City.

1.1 Growth Management

Your Growth Management analysis currently assesses needs only to 2041 and bases this analysis on an outdated land needs assessment. Provincial Direction mandates that your Municipal Comprehensive Review and resulting Official Plan must be updated to the 2051 planning horizon on the basis of the recently released provincial Land Needs Methodology 2020 and the A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2020 (“A Place to Grow”). As such, your assessment regarding urban boundary expansion needs and phasing is insufficient and contrary to current Provincial policy.

The Draft Official Plan does not utilize the recent Land Needs Assessment Methodology issued by the Province. In particular, the City’s growth management approach appears to be directly

in conflict with the 2020 Land Needs Assessment and A Place to Grow, where in the October 8, 2019 Report to City Building Committee, the following statement is made (page 8):

“In summary, the scenarios represent a shift towards a more comprehensive and sustainable approach to growth management. Specifically, the scenarios focus on creating more compact, complete, and desirable communities while satisfying provincial policy. As per Watson’s commentary, staff wish to reiterate that these scenarios represent an elevated level of growth than what has occurred in the past. This is because the city must plan to accommodate the long-term growth forecasts of the Growth Plan rather than plan based on market demand. This is an important consideration as staff do not anticipate growth to occur at the forecasted rate of 1,900 units per year at least in the short term. As such, the shift will occur over time and not take place immediately.”

An Official Plan only to the year 2041, which does not use the provincial Land Needs Assessment methodology, does not comply with A Place to Grow and cannot be approved. Furthermore, an assessment to 2041 does not represent good planning as it leaves small pieces of the Hewitt and Salem Secondary Plans areas (which have comprehensive infrastructure and land use planning completed for them) out of the Settlement Area Boundary and will not achieve a complete community in the next 20 years. This is not in the public interest and serves no practical purpose other than to frustrate development that is integral to the creation of a complete community.

There is an opportunity to update your work during the comment period, and we ask that you please confirm that the City will be undertaking this updated work to 2051 based on the 2020 Land Needs Assessment to ensure conformity with A Place to Grow prior to proceeding with the Draft Official Plan.

It is clear that updating the Official Plan to meet the mandated 2051 planning horizon will result in the inclusion of all remaining whitebelt lands in Barrie into the Settlement Area Boundary to meet projected growth needs. This will include DIV’s remaining lands in the Hewitt Secondary Plan area. Based on our own analysis, we fully expect that the remainder of DIV’s lands will be included in the Settlement Area, and that these lands will be designated in accordance with the Hewitt Secondary Plan and MESP – Appendix 9A Residential Area (Neighbourhood Area in the Draft Official Plan.)

With regard to Section 9.5.2, Phasing and the associated schedules, phases of development should result in the logical and cost-effective extension of infrastructure, the creation of complete neighbourhoods, and generally should be of a consistent size and area to other phases. The proposed phasing in the Draft Official Plan does not appear to result in the logical extension of services, the creation of complete neighbourhoods, nor are the phases consistent with the size and extent of Phases 1 and 2. We do not believe that having many small phases after Phase 1 and 2 is good planning, and to the contrary, will result in unnecessary delays in development and the completion of neighbourhoods. We therefore request that all lands outside of Phase 1 and 2 in the Hewitt Secondary Plan area be identified within Phase 3. This will make all three phases a comparable size and will allow for the logical progression of growth in this Secondary Plan area. In addition, in order to permit flexibility to respond to market and other changes, including timing of development, modifications to the

phasing plan should be permitted without the need for an amendment to the official plan. The policy should, accordingly, be amended.

With regard to DIV's lands, it was our understanding from prior discussions with City staff that the portion of the Subject Lands currently within the Settlement Area Boundary would be revised from Phase 4 to Phase 3 lands. As proposed on Appendix 2, the City is illustrating these lands as Phase 4 and Phase 6 lands. We request that this be corrected on the mapping to be Phase 3, and that the remainder of the Subject Lands also be identified as within Phase 3 when they are added to the Settlement Area Boundary.

Furthermore, we are concerned with Section 9.5.1 c) which does not allow development to proceed unless the City has a Development Charge By-law in force and effect and not subject to appeal. We fail to understand the basis for this clause, particularly where, notwithstanding an appeal, the City can continue to collect development charges at the rates set out in an appealed by-law, pending determination of the appeal. The City is not prejudiced in any way by allowing development to proceed while an appeal is pending. Such a clause only serves to prevent a fair assessment of Development Charges and prevents development to proceed in an orderly fashion.

We also have concerns with Section 2.4.2.1 i), which provides as follows:

All new development shall be planned to contribute to a housing mix of 13% low density, 24% medium density, and 63% high density to ensure a gradual transition towards more compact forms of development, to support the *intensification* and *Designated Greenfield Area* density targets, and meet future housing needs.

It is unclear as to how this mix of housing has been determined. Until the new Land Needs Assessment is complete, it is not possible to assess whether this mix is appropriate. Furthermore, the unit mix that was anticipated, approved, and planned in the Hewitt Secondary Plan should continue to apply in this secondary plan area.

In general, it is our opinion that the Official Plan should put forth a vision of how the City will develop that goes beyond the general intent of creating a medium sized city with a mix of uses and higher densities. The policy suggests that all development should be planned in accordance with the prescribed unit mix. This unit mix is considered an overall vision for the Official Plan and should not be considered on a site-by-site basis. The Draft Official Plan should, and could, identify area specific policies to guide development. This would result in an overall housing mix which delivers a market-based supply of housing to the extent possible. Without supporting detailed planning analysis through the Land Needs Assessment, it cannot be determined if this policy is appropriate, nor how it would impact on individual areas or development applications. Furthermore, with respect to Section 2.4.2.1 j) it is unclear how low, medium and high density is defined and how the City will 'encourage' applications for medium and high-density housing: through policy encouragement, financial incentives, or preferential treatment of some other kind?

The policies in Section 2.4.2.3 will need to be updated to reflect the inclusion of remaining lands into the Settlement Area Boundary. As previously mentioned, the pre-determination of a specific housing mix target without more detailed work supporting these numbers means that we are unable to determine whether Section 2.4.2.3b) is appropriate, nor is it clear how applications will be encouraged or discouraged to accommodate these targets. Moreover, the

analysis of whether this housing mix is providing a market-based supply of housing has not been completed.

Section 2.4.2.3c) should include an exception for intervening lands with no development intent nor interest and allow for the advancement of the completion of neighbourhoods in an efficient and effective manner, including the delivery of servicing infrastructure.

Section 2.4.2.3f) contains a target of 62 persons and jobs per hectare and it is unclear how this density implements an appropriate mix of housing and how it was determined. Sections 2.4.2.3g) through i) appear to require achievement of this density on a site or development application specific basis, as opposed to an average over the entire Greenfield. This is contrary to the policies within A Place to Grow and is unimplementable.

1.1.1 Official Plan Structure and Secondary Plans

It is unclear how the Draft Official Plan incorporates area specific policies, particularly those of the Hewitt Secondary Plan. The Hewitt Secondary Plan was added as a new Section 9 in the current Official Plan but appears to have been omitted completely in the Draft Official Plan. This omission is confusing as Section 9.5.2 i) refers to the Hewitt Secondary Plan. While policies throughout the Draft Official Plan speak to the potential need to create a secondary plan, there is no specific direction as to how existing or new secondary plans interact with the policies of the Draft Official Plan.

The continued status of the Hewitt Secondary Plan and its area specific policies must be recognized in the Official Plan, either through the reinsertion of a separate chapter, as in the City's current Official Plan or by including all Hewitt Secondary Plan policies in the relevant and appropriate sections of the Draft Official Plan.

Alternatively, if the Secondary Plan is intended to be retained as a stand-alone document, then a notwithstanding policy must be included in the Draft Official Plan that defers to the policies of the Secondary Plan.

Over 10 years of planning, public consultation, expertise and study led to the adoption of the Secondary Plan. To outright rescind/delete it undermines good planning and previously expended public resources, particularly as most of the Secondary Plan has not yet proceeded to development. This is not in the public interest. Moreover, the generic policies proposed on the Subject Lands in the Draft Official Plan do not result in improved or better planning for the Secondary Plan than the approved specific Hewitt Secondary Plan policies. These generic policies do not take into consideration the individual area circumstances and are not informed by the detailed planning analysis which was undertaken in connection with the approved Secondary Plan; nor are they based on an appropriate form of development for these lands. For example, the street network defined in the Hewitt Secondary Plan has undertaken extensive studies to approve the location and size of the roads. To omit the Hewitt Secondary

Plan would result in a requirement for additional studies for a road network that has been previously approved. Development should be allowed to proceed under the Hewitt Secondary

Plan policies, notwithstanding any new policy approaches the City is contemplating in other areas.

In addition, there are numerous references to Block Plans without any explanation as to what these are, or where the City intends to require them. We suggest this language be removed as these references are unnecessary given that all lands are either within the built-up area (and will be subject to demonstration plans as shown in Appendix 3) or have been comprehensively planned in the Greenfield area through the Salem and Hewitt Secondary Plan processes and therefore no Block Plan should be required prior to development.

1.1.2 General Land Use Policies

Section 2.5.1a) suggests that minor variances to height and density are not permitted without an official plan amendment. In our view, this prohibition against minor variance for height and density goes beyond the authority and the four tests which must be met under the *Planning Act* and should be deleted. With regard to Section 2.5.1 i), subsections iii) through v) are essentially inclusionary zoning provisions which under the *Planning Act*, requires a municipality to undertake an assessment report in conjunction with developing policies in their Official Plan. Further study is required prior to requiring blanket policies requiring 10% of all new units be affordable. Moreover, it is not clear how the City will implement the policies with regard to affordable housing, nor may it be appropriate for every development proposal (including medium and high-density development) over 40 units to provide affordable housing. In determining affordable housing, we strongly encourage that incentive tools be implemented, including financial incentives, to provide for affordable housing ownership.

Section 2.5.3 provides as follows:

Any lands shown on Appendix 1 as located within the boundary of a Conservation Authority are also subject to the relevant law and policies of those authorities and, in all instances, the policies of the authorities shall prevail.

While it is clear that lands within the boundary of a Conservation Authority are subject to the legislation governing those lands, and policies approved pursuant to this law by those authorities, it is not appropriate to, nor should an Official Plan or a municipality, defer all policy decision making to a commenting agency and their policies. As such, this policy should be removed from the Draft Official Plan.

Section 2.5.4 b) is too vague and it is unclear how the City will determine, on a site-specific basis, that the intensification target or Designated Greenfield Area target will be negatively impacted. There is no detailed planning analysis based on the achievement of a specific desired community form outcome that would provide guidance in this regard.

We strongly support Section 2.4.2.1 o) which promotes secondary suites, however, suggest the policy be strengthened to be an as-of-right permission.

1.1.3 Land Use Designations

The guide to reading and interpreting the land use designations in Section 2.6 is helpful and a good addition to make the plan more readable.

Regarding Neighbourhood Areas, the stated intent is to ‘recognize new and existing low-density neighbourhoods and communities which are dominated by human scale built form.’ With respect to Section 2.6.1.3 e), it is onerous to require all 50% of the ground floor of all low and mid-rise buildings to consist of non-residential uses, particularly without a retail and commercial needs assessment, to determine whether this would result in an appropriate amount of retail and commercial space.

Regarding Section 2.6.1.3 f), a minimum density of 50 units per hectare for development on lands for local streets and 60 units per hectare on lands fronting on street classified as collector or above is inappropriate and too high. Requiring this minimum density in the Neighbourhood designation would prevent the opportunity to develop a ‘low density neighbourhood’ and would not allow a mix and range of uses to develop as intended in this designation. This minimum density should be specified as 20 units per net hectare with an appropriate definition of net hectares.

In the Medium Density designation, Section 2.6.2.2 a) should include townhomes and low-rise buildings as permitted building types, as opposed to Section 2.6.2.2g) subsection i), which limits those building types only to locations within 70 metres of lands designated as Neighbourhood Area.

Furthermore, it is not appropriate nor in the public interest to require every development to have a mix of use. If this is the intent of Section 2.6.2.2c), it should be deleted. If the intent is to encourage a mix of uses in this designation, this policy should be clarified. Even though Section 2.6.2.2g) includes a specific set of criteria, we believe that these policies are too onerous and may not be applicable on a site-by-site basis, especially in areas already identified in a Secondary Plan where mixed use may not be appropriate.

In addition, for the reasons noted above in relation to the Neighbourhood designation, it is not appropriate to require all buildings facing an Arterial or Collector street to have 50% of the ground floor frontage as non-residential uses as set out in Section 2.6.2.2e), particularly when no market study has been completed supporting such need.

1.1.4 Planning an Attractive City

In general, there are significant concerns with the Urban Design policies in the Draft Official Plan (Sections 2.5.4.1, 3, 4 and 5). From a land use policy perspective, most of the standards are mandatory, where the language requires that things ‘shall’ be done, or ‘will’ occur, meaning that development must be in full conformity with the policies (see for example policies 3.1.2.1, 3.3.3, 3.3.4 and 3.3.5, 3.5). We strongly disagree with this intended application of Urban Design policies. The policies should be revised to provide for flexibility, rather than taking a prescriptive approach, and as such, urban design guidelines should be encouraged where appropriate to allow for consideration of site conditions and context.

In addition to the policies specifically contained in the Draft Official Plan, the Draft Official Plan also relies on an external document entitled *City Wide Urban Design Guidelines* (“Urban Design Guidelines”). Page 4 of the Urban Design Guidelines states the following:

The guidelines are phrased in the passive tone recognizing that they are guidelines rather than regulation. However, the guidelines are enabled by the Official Plan, which makes provision for the guidelines to essentially be mandatory, while offering flexibility for the guidelines to be adapted if a site is constrained (as long as the spirit and intent of the guidelines are maintained).

This external Urban Design Guidelines document can be changed without public input or opportunity for challenge. Such mandatory requirements should be subject to transparent review and opportunity for the same approval process applied to Official Plans, particularly since they are being “incorporated” and enforced through the Official Plan itself. Failing this, they should not be treated as “essentially mandatory” but should be dealt with and implemented with the flexibility inherent in the concept of guidelines themselves. Guidelines should set parameters and not rules, and the policy should be amended to reflect this.

Section 3.3.5.2.2 c) requires that outside of an Urban Growth Centre 20% of the lot area shall be provided as a semi-public open space for stacked townhouses and townhouses with a private driveway. This policy appears unreasonable, particularly in a Greenfield situation where the provision of a semi-private space would serve little utility to the larger community (particularly if they are just individual blocks) while being a significant burden and liability on new residents. Notwithstanding our comments, if this policy is to persist, then we believe any public open spaces should be counted towards parkland dedication credit. As a note, there is an image shown to illustrate this policy which is from the City of Toronto Official Plan and clearly applies to mid-rise buildings in a very dense urban area, not low-rise or townhouse developments.

1.1.5 Other Policies

Section 2.7.4 Natural Heritage Protection: The Natural Heritage System limits identified on Map 2 and 3 of the Draft Official Plan do not reflect the detailed ground-truthed information that we currently have with respect to DIV’s lands. We will be providing a supplemental package that has our refinements of the Natural Heritage System on the Subject Lands and will discuss further with staff on this matter.

Section 5.5 Ecological Offsetting: We believe that this policy is vague and it unclear how ecological offsetting is to be achieved. What is the basis for this policy and which legislative authority requires this?

Section 6.3.1 Climate Sensitive Design: We strongly support parks and public open spaces being used for stormwater storage and request the City permit and direct Low Impact Developments (LIDs) be permitted in all public rights-of-way and these are the best places to accommodate LIDs and ensure they are maintained over their lifetime by the City. Requiring private property owners to maintain these features is fraught with difficulties related to maintenance and enforcement.

Section 6.3.2 Urban Forests: We agree that urban forests are important and add to the social enjoyment of a community by providing nature areas for recreation. The policy should be modified to clarify that when such social woodlands are required to be retained or enhanced by the City, they will form part of the parkland contribution required under the *Planning Act*. With regard to requiring compensation under the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, we believe conversations respecting compensation should occur but should not be mandated by policy in the Official Plan.

Section 6.3.3 Food Security: This policy should recognize that the yards provided with grade related housing provide the opportunity for residents to grow their own food and thereby contribute to food security.

Section 6.4 Social and Economic Resilience: We strongly support as-of-right permission for secondary suites throughout the City. With regard to Section 6.4 c), is it unclear how conformity with this requirement to have a unit with an attached or detached secondary suite for every 40 ground-related housing units will be achieved through the approval of a draft plan of subdivision.

Section 9.5.9 Minor Variance: This policy contains onerous provisions for consideration of a minor variance application well beyond requirements within the *Planning Act*. It is our opinion that this policy be revised or removed to be more reasonable and in keeping with legislative requirements.

1.1.6 Conclusion

We thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Official Plan. These are our initial comments that address general matters in the Official Plan and we anticipate having additional, and likely more detailed comments, as other members of our team review the Official Plan with regard to the Subject Lands and the development concepts that are in process.

In the meantime, we ask that you please provide a response to us in writing (including the completion and provision of additional material and analysis referenced in this letter as necessary to understand the policies). We would be happy to meet with you over video conference or in person as appropriate to discuss our comments or answer any questions. We look forward to the next draft of the Official Plan, which addresses our comments in this letter.

Yours very truly,

Malone Given Parsons Ltd.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. Cory', enclosed within a blue oval scribble.

Matthew Cory, MCIP, RPP, PLE, PMP

Principal

cc. Amanda Santo, Dorsay Development Corp.

Susan Rosenthal, Davies Howe LLP

Councillor Mike McCann, Ward 10 Councillor of Barrie

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:06 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: New OP Comment Letter (Hewitt's)
Attachments: Hewitt's New OP Draft 2 Comment Letter (sub. June 8 2021).pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Ray Duhamel
Sent: Tuesday, June 8, 2021 5:12 PM
To: Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>; Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Cc: Keith MacKinnon
Subject: New OP Comment Letter (Hewitt's)Hi Michelle

and Tomasz,

On behalf of the Hewitt's Landowners Group, see attached comment letter on the 2nd draft of the new Barrie OP. We look forward to meeting with you to discuss these comments in detail.

Thanks.

Ray

Ray Duhamel, MCP, MCIP, RPP

Partner

The Jones Consulting Group Ltd.

229 Mapleview Drive East, Barrie, ON, L4N 0W5
Phone (705) 734-2538 ext 226 Cell (705) 790-8928

Email rduhamel@jonesconsulting.com
www.jonesconsulting.com



Please note that The Jones Consulting Group will be blocking all emails containing compressed attachments with file extensions such as .zip or .rar. When sending a .zip file please rename the extension to .zi_ or use an FTP site.

RESTRICTED ACCESS BUSINESS OPERATIONS

As the health and safety of our clients, suppliers, staff and families is our top priority during this period of uncertainty, commencing April 5th 2020, and until further notice, the Jones Consulting Group Ltd. office will be closed.

We are closely monitoring the situation and are following the practices recommended by local and international authorities to minimize the risk of exposure to the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) while doing everything in our power to ensure that our services continue uninterrupted.

Therefore, please note, until further notice, the Jones Consulting Group staff will be working remotely and will respond by e-mail and/or phone only. The office access will be closed.

We remain committed to providing the service you have come to expect from us, however, during this time, the Jones Consulting Group Ltd. may be rescheduling non-essential or non-urgent services as deemed appropriate in order to reduce exposure to the virus and protect everyone's health.



June 8, 2021 (Via Email)

Ms. Michelle Banfield

Director of Development Services
City of Barrie

70 Collier Street, Barrie, ON, L4M 4T5

Dear Ms. Banfield:

**Re: Draft New Official Plan Comments
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group Inc.**

On behalf of the Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group Inc., we are writing to provide comments on the draft City of Barrie Official Plan 2020. I am the Group Manager and Group Planner for the Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group, who represent the vast majority of landowners in the Hewitt's Creek Secondary Plan Area.

I would like to thank you for taking the time to have numerous virtual meetings to discuss the City's draft new Official Plan. We appreciate your commitment to continue to work through and understand areas of concern.

Please accept this letter as the Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group Inc. formal comments on the draft Official Plan. We have not yet completed our review of the draft Urban Design Guidelines, and we will work to provide you with comments in a separate submission at a later date. As we discussed, this submission has been broken down into the following 4 headings:

- A. General Observations
- B. Major Policy Concerns
- C. Detailed Policy Comments/Concerns
- D. Detailed Mapping Comments/Concerns

We look forward to meeting with you to discuss the technical comments provided. In addition, it would be helpful if Staff hosted a dedicated meeting with the Hewitt's Landowners to discuss the new Official Plan.

If you have any questions or require anything further, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Ray Duhamel, M.C.P., MCIP, RPP
Partner

c. Tomasz Wierzba, Planner, City of Barrie
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group Inc.

A. General Observations:

This Section contains my overall observations relating to the ability to read and use the document.

- A1. **Overly Prescriptive/Detailed:** While improvements have been made since the first draft, we continue to feel that the Official Plan contains many numerical, overly detailed, and prescriptive (i.e., shall be) policies that eliminate the interpretive flexibility needed to successfully implement this new Official Plan. Unless changed, the nature of these prescriptive policies would lead to regular Official Plan Amendment applications to accompany future development proposals.
- A2. **Request for a 2nd Statutory Public Meeting:** The Hewitt's Landowners request that Council and Staff consider and support the scheduling of a 2nd Statutory Public Meeting for the fall of 2021. This request is made for the following reasons:
- i. This is an all-new Official Plan for Barrie, and everyone benefits when the proposed new policies are fully understood and everyone has considered the implementation implications. The hosing of a 2nd public meeting would be consistent with staff's presentation to Planning Committee in September 2020 that they would be undertaking "*unparalleled community engagement*".
 - ii. We had made a request for an extended comment period to provide sufficient time to review this revised draft. In the absence of a tracked changes version and a comment matrix, we feel that providing less than a month to comment provided insufficient time to properly review the document.
 - iii. This is not appealable. We would like to work together to discuss our detailed comments so as to avoid an inappropriate number of OPA's starting 2 years after the Plan is approved.
- A3. **Urban Design Guidelines:** Request that these be provided in tandem with the release of the 3rd draft of the Official Plan. There is a **mandatory requirement** to implement the Guidelines and a lack of clarity at what, if any, flexibility will be afforded in implementing the UDG (Policy 3.1.3.1a).

B. Major Policy Concerns

This Section summarizes the identifies the major concerns with the draft new Official Plan:

- B1. **Hewitt's & Salem Secondary Plans:** The bulk of the Hewitt's and Salem Secondary Plans and associated designations and policies have been removed from the new Official Plan. We understand that this was done to avoid creating separate policy frameworks for different areas of the City; however, this approach does not recognize that the Hewitt's Landowners have been working to develop their land in accordance with this Secondary Plan framework. This includes hundreds of millions of investments in the land (i.e., grading, site alteration), funding of external infrastructure (InnPower, Transmission Watermain, Sanitary Sewers), and front funding Environmental Assessments for City of Barrie.

The Hewitt's Landowners feel that the implementation of an entirely new policy framework at this time is inappropriate, and request that the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policy framework be maintained and included as a distinct Section in the new OP. The Landowners support updating the Secondary Plan policies, where appropriate, to implement the visual, goals and objectives of this new Official Plan.

B2. Density & Built Form: We request that you reconsider the attainability and built form implications of the densities noted in the Official Plan. We also note that units per hectare is an ineffective planning tool when assessing density on sites that are small, infill or are medium/high density. Accordingly, we recommend that you consider using Floor Space Index as a more precise tool to understand and implement the intended built form. Consider the points below:

- a. **Neighbourhood Area (2.6.1.3 e):** States that new development should be planned to a minimum of 50 uph on local streets and 60 uph for collector roads. These densities would preclude singles, semi's and some street townhouse development.

While I appreciate that the change to 'should' from 'shall' from the 1st draft, I'm not clear what criteria would be used to evaluate when it is appropriate to develop at a lower density. The language should be clarified, because there will be many sites in the Neighbourhood Area that will not be suitable for that density.

- b. **MTSA's (2.3.4d):** Requires development in the Barrie South MTSA to achieve an average minimum density target of 150 uph. This policy needs to be clarified for the following reasons:
 - i. I have reviewed all of the properties within that MTSA and I can confidently state that there is no likelihood that 150 uph will be achieved. Most of that area is planned and approved for densities vastly lower than 150 uph.
 - ii. There are Neighbourhood Area lands designated MTSA in Barrie South. Are those lands to be planned to achieve 150 uph, or the 50/60 uph noted in point B2a) above. I do not see how Neighbourhood Areas can help achieve 150 uph.
- c. **Designated Greenfield Areas (2.4.2.3c & f):** States that DGA will be planned to achieve 52% high density, and all new development will be evaluated to determine how it contributes to achieving this target. I recommend that you clarify the intent of this policy for the following reasons:
 - i. The City's MCR defines High Density differently from the High Density Designation which requires a minimum of 300 uph. For example, the MCR included second suites in the calculation of High Density.
 - ii. In the case where staff is recommending that 52% of the DGA develop in accordance with the High Density designation (300 uph), then this density is inappropriate, particularly given that many of the DGA sites are already draft plan approved at densities closer to 35 uph. That would put an incredible and unrealistic burden of developing the balance of the unapproved DGA lands at unsupported densities to average out to 300 uph.

B3. Servicing/Utility Implications: Please provide the master servicing and utility analysis that demonstrates that there is servicing capacity to support the densities noted in B2. Tens of millions of dollars of infrastructure have and are continuing to be constructed to support the Hewitt's Secondary Plans and the Landowners are concerned that widespread replacements/upgrades of brand-new infrastructure would be required to support development at the proposed required densities.

B4. Mapping Concerns: I have identified mapping errors/inconsistencies in Part D of this letter.

B5. Ecological Offsetting: The Hewitt's Landowners request that the ecological offsetting policies found in Section 5.5 be removed from the Official Plan. We understand that these policies were included at the request of the LSRCA. In consideration of the changes through Bill 229 that

alters the powers of the Conservation Authority, the Hewitt's Landowners do not feel that an LSRCA offsetting program is appropriate for inclusion in an Official Plan.

B6. Mapping: As detailed in Section D of this letter, there are mapping errors/inconsistencies that the Hewitt's Landowners request be revised in the next draft.

B7. Requiring Landowner Membership: The Hewitt's and Salem Secondary Plans contain policies that require landowners to be signatories to the respective Cost Sharing Agreement prior to development approvals. The only related policy that appears in the new OP is in Section 9.5.11d) that allows the use of a holding provision until the developer enters into a Cost Sharing Agreement.

Consistent with current practice, the Landowners request that a new policy be included in Section 9.5.1 of the new Official Plan that requires landowners to be a member in good standing of the respective Landowners Groups **prior** to the City accepting/processing any development applications.

B8. Phasing: Policy 9.5.2i)iii) requires that 60% of Phase 2 East to be registered prior to approvals proceeding in Phase 3 East and then Phase 4 East. Long before the 60% registration timeline is achieved, the vast majority of infrastructure will have already been constructed to support development across all of the East phases. The Hewitt's Landowners believe that this policy will result in delaying the approvals/construction in Phases 3 and 4 East that will be relying in part on already constructed infrastructure.

The Landowners request that the phasing requirements noted in 9.5.2i)ii) apply to all Phases.

C. Detailed Policy Comments/Concerns

	Policy	Overview/Summary	Comment/Request
Urban Growth Centre			
C1	2.3.2e)ii)	Requires "at least" 20% of housing units in the UGC to be affordable.	The Landowners are concerned that this target is much too high and will discourage growth in the UGC, which in turn could restrict growth in the designated greenfield areas.
Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA)			
C2	2.3.4a)	Lands in Hewitt's are designated within the Barrie South MTSA which is required to provide 20% affordable housing units.	The Landowners wish to point out that the vast majority of the MTSA area has approved draft plans and site plans ranging from singles to higher built forms, none of which provide 20% affordable housing. Based on those approvals, the Landowners feel that 20% is an unrealistic target that is unattainable during the planning horizon.
C3	2.3.4d)	The central portion of Hewitt's is within the Barrie South MTSA, that requires a <u>minimum</u> of 150 uph.	Refer to B2b) of this letter. The Landowners recommend that lands designated Neighbourhood Area be removed from the MTSA.
Designated Greenfield Area			
C4	2.4.2.3c)	States that the housing target will be 'at least' 52% high density, and that <u>all new</u> development will be evaluated to determine how it contributes to the achievement of this housing mix, with low density	Refer to B2c.

		housing forms being discouraged (if beyond 48%).	
C5a	2.4.2.3f)	Requires 79 persons and jobs per hectare throughout the DGA.	We understand that staff had intended to identify 62 people and jobs per hectare to 2041 and 79 persons and jobs per hectare from 2041 to 2051. Please confirm. Also, this policy should clearly state that the persons and jobs per hectare target is measured across the entire DGA area (as required by the Growth Plan), and not on a site-by-site basis.
C5b	2.4.2.3h)	Requires an evaluation whether existing approved development can meet the new density target on vacant blocks, future development blocks, or future phases of the subdivision.	The Landowners would like existing draft plan and zoning approvals, based on the existing Secondary Plan densities, to be recognized.
C6	2.4.2.3j)	Requires all neighbourhoods in the DGA to be designed to support resource conservation and environmental stewardship "to the greatest extent feasible" and to include be practices in the use of district energy.	The Landowners do not feel that the words 'to the greatest extent feasible' are appropriate and ask how this would be evaluated at the application stage. The Landowners also question why this policy refers to district energy where the City is not proposing the development of a district energy plant.
Neighbourhood Area Designation			
C7	2.5d	Requires development on condominium roads only if access to a public street is provided.	Please clarify the assumed intent, is that a network of connected condominium streets can be developed provided that at acceptable points, direct access to a public street is provided.
Neighbourhood Area Designation			
C8a	2.6.1.2	Neighbourhood Areas.	Refer to comment B2.
C8b	2.6.1.3a)	Generally, restricts development to 3 storeys' on a local road.	Recommend that the words "only" before "onto" because several mixed use/medium density blocks in the DGA have multiple frontages on both arterial/collector and local roads.
C9a	2.6.1.3b) & c)	This policy restricts development to a maximum of 4 storeys if oriented towards the collector road/arterial street. Heights exceeding 4 storeys are not permitted unless on an intensification corridor.	In order to achieve the higher density targets there may be instances in newly planned DGA subdivisions, where higher density blocks on a collector road would be appropriate. Recommend additional text and the end of 1.6.1.3c)i) which reads "or in an appropriate block in a DGA subdivision fronting onto a Collector Road or Arterial Street.
C9b	2.6.1.3d)	Requires commercial uses on ground floor of low and mid-rise buildings where there are no existing commercial and retail uses within 450 metres.	According to Section 3.3.2, low rise includes singles, semi's and townhouses. We request that this policy be revised to exclude ground related housing from the commercial requirement. IN our opinion, it is inappropriate to require singles/townhouses to have commercial uses along interior Collector Roads. Furthermore, the Hewitt's Secondary Plan was designed, draft plan approvals granted, and construction commenced on the basis that Yonge

			Street would provide the primary commercial uses, and that 5 interspersed arterial road neighbourhood mixed use areas would provide the balance. Those areas exceed 450 metres in distance to every house. We request that the distance be increased to 800 metres.
C10	2.6.1.3e)	Requires 50/60 uph	Refer to B2.
C11	2.6.1.3f)	Limits commercial GFA to 2,000m2 and states that 'additional floor area is permitted up to the applicable maximum building height'.	Please explain the basis for the 2,000m2 size threshold because this is not consistent with the City's current comments on large mixed-use sites. Please also add the word "commercial" after "Additional" and in front of "floor area" to clarify the intent of the policy.
Medium Density			
C12	2.6.2.3b)	Criteria for non-residential	Most of the land proposed to be designated Medium Density in Hewitt's, was previously designated in the Secondary Plan as Mixed Use that permitted stand-alone residential or stand-alone commercial. The Landowners request that stand-alone residential or commercial be permitted in all Medium Density sites in Hewitt's. At a minimum, the Landowners request that the criteria in b) apply to any Medium Density site regardless whether it fronts onto an Arterial Street or Intensification Corridor. The Landowners also request that planned and existing commercial uses be recognized in evaluating compliance with the criteria. At present, the policy in bi) is limited to 'existing'.
C13	2.6.2.3c)	Minimum height of 6 storey's along arterial streets or Intensification Corridor and MTSA.	The MTSA includes areas designated Neighbourhood Area where 6 storey's may be inappropriate. The Landowners also request that the minimum height be reduced to 3 storeys.
C14	2.6.2.3d)	Maximum density is 125 uph.	What category do projects ranging in density from 126-299 uph fall under? They are neither medium nor high density.
Community Hub			
C15	2.6.4.1	Residential is only permitted as part of a mixed-use development.	Within the DGA, the Community Hub designation applies to recreation centre lands, fire station lands, and school sites. The inclusion of these land use blocks within subdivisions were made as a result of requests from the City or Agencies and accordingly, if the City or Agency chooses not to purchase those sites, then the landowner should be able to develop according to the surrounding land use designations. We question the planning merits of requiring mixed use development on interior sites, which may abut a local road.

			The Hewitt's Secondary Plan requires that the site be planned and zoned to permit residential use in the event the school boards choose not to purchase the land. The new OP should be amended accordingly.
Natural Heritage System			
C16	2.6.6.1 e)	Permits boardwalks or trails 'installed' by government or public authority.	As per current draft approvals in Hewitt's, the City requires the developers (not the City) to install the trails and receive DC credits. This policy should be revised to state "installed by or on behalf of...".
Greenspace			
C17	2.6.7.1b)	Permits low impact development stormwater management facilities.	Stormwater ponds across Hewitt's are proposed to be designated Greenspace. Accordingly, the permitted uses should read "Low Impact development Facilities" and "Stormwater Management Ponds/Facilities".
Application and Interpretation of the Plan's Urban Design Standards			
C18	3.1.2.2	Urban Design <u>Guidelines</u>	<p>1) This Section refers to a City-Wide Urban Design document but then states in a policy how the guidelines are to be read. Please consider that a <u>policy</u> referring to a <u>guideline</u> which then speaks to mandatory conformity lacks clarity and flexibility.</p> <p>2) The Landowners recommend that the OP refer to the UDG document and the policies could provide high level guidance as to the goals of that document. 3) The text of a)-c) is confusing. a) requires mandatory conformity if any guideline can be achieved; however, b) states that if a guideline can be achieved with minor adjustments, then it 'must' be achieved. Finally, c) states that if it cannot be achieved then an Urban Design Brief is required. A 'policy' cannot be mandatory if the subsequent policies allow for variations.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is not clear what 'can be achieved' means. What is the test for which 'can be achieved' is being measured against that automatically requires mandatory compliance?</p>
General Urban Design Standards			
C19	3.2.1a)i)c)	Legibility	How are development applications to demonstrate that they 'improve the city's legibility'? What does this even mean?
C20	3.2.1b)iii)	Over-development height/density	Request adding the words 'in the Official Plan' otherwise applications for rezoning to increase height would be automatically considered over-development.
Sustainable and Resilient Design			
C21	3.2.3a)	This policy states that all development application must demonstrate how the City will achieve sustainable design priorities	Request that the prescriptive language "shall" be replaced with 'area encouraged'. There is no practical way that most typical development applications can demonstrate the use of environmentally sensitive products or adapting to Barrie's seasonal changes. Please explain how

			every development application is supposed to respond to this policy?
C22	3.2.3.1a).	Green Development Standards	<p>It is not appropriate to require a review of many of the items listed (i.e., air quality) when dealing with applications for OPA and ZBLA. Accordingly, the Sustainable Development Report, if it must be provided, should only be provided for Site Plan applications.</p> <p>Please consider the objective of this policy. The Landowners feel that it is inappropriate to require every new development to provide a Sustainable Development Report and instead, ask that you consider changing the policy to state that the Planning or Urban Design Report in support of an application will contain a section detailing sustainability in consideration of the items stated in i-ix), where appropriate and applicable.</p> <p>Please consider that the word 'shall' does not provide suitable Official Plan flexibility to deal with the range and scale of development applications. Not every application will achieve policies i)-xii).</p> <p>We fail to understand how you expect these features to be considered as part of most OPA/ZBLA applications or how providing/not these measures will be evaluated by staff.</p>
Public Realm Design			
C23	3.2.4.5b)	Private streets shall be designed similar to public streets	The Landowners request that this policy be revised to maintain the intent (i.e. allow for pedestrian circulation, etc.). This OP policy should not prescribe curb types (inappropriate OP level detail) and it needs to recognize that are narrower and are designed to a different, not similar, design standard.
C24	3.2.4.6	Requires consolidation of amenity areas.	<p>Significant progress and flexibility has been made in Hewitt's/Salem and in Mixed Policy areas in Barrie to recognize that consolidating amenity spaces can negatively impact site design, particularly on smaller parcels.</p> <p>At a minimum, please change the prescriptive text 'shall be' to 'encouraged to be'.</p>
General Built Form Development Criteria			
C25	3.3.1d)	Intersections of major streets shall be emphasized by placing buildings in close proximity to intersections and building entrances are visible from that intersection.	This is a notable and agreeable policy; however, in our experience, the City's Transportation Design Manual standards are continually changing, particularly relating to intersections. The most recent example being the requirement for very large setbacks for driveways to ground oriented housing. Discussions with City Engineering are needed to ensure this policy will be properly implemented.
Low-Rise Residential Development			
C26	3.3.2c)	Requires new development to respect and reinforce the scale,	Request the policy be revised to add the words "in older established neighbourhoods in the built-up

		massing and setback and orientation in the immediate area.	area". This policy would be inappropriately applied in DGA, MTSA, Intensification Corridors etc.
C27	3.3.2f)	Requires development be setback 7.5m from a property line.	The Landowners request that the setback be removed from the OP. This is another example of overly prescriptive policy. Barrie's Zoning By-law has not required a 7m (not 7.5m) rear yard setback going back at least to 1985, and more current standards in place in Hewitt's permit a 5m rear yard setback. Policy 1.1.3.4 of the PPS states that appropriate development standards should be promoted which facilitate intensification and redevelopment and compact form.
C28	3.3.2l)	Generally, incorporate rear lanes along arterial and mixed use areas.	Request that this policy be removed as there are numerous design treatments/options for development, with rear lanes being only one suitable option.
Mid-Rise Buildings			
C29	3.3.3b)i)	Requires the podium on mid-rise buildings to be 3-6 storeys in height.	Please explain why a 1 or 2 storey podium is inappropriate?
C30	3.3.3c)	Buildings should generally be setback 7.5m from the property line	Please provide the rationale for this detailed policy. In many examples in Barrie mid-rise buildings have been constructed 5 metres from the property line.
C31	3.3.4h)	States that the rooftop of mid-rise building should include landscape green space, private outdoor amenity, or environmental sustainability features. .	The Landowners request that this policy be revised to state that the City encourages these design features.
Parking Design for Developments of All Types and Areas			
C32	3.4h)	Pervious surfaces in surface parking lots to the "greatest extent possible.	Please replace the word "shall" with "encouraged to". Also, the words 'greatest extent possible' are inappropriate. Who decides what is possible and using what criteria?
Designing Complete Streets			
C33	4.2.1a)ii)&iii)	80-100m block depth,	The Landowners feel that artificially restricting block depth 80-100m will unnecessarily reduce development opportunities in the Secondary Plan area. 150 metres is more appropriate. Please consider removing the 80-100m depth requirement in its entirety, or at least move it to the Urban Design Guidelines document.
C34	4.2.1a)v)	Avoid 'window streets'.	Window streets have been an acceptable design option throughout the design of Hewitt's/Salem. Please explain why this is to be avoided. The Landowners request that the words "Window Streets" be removed from this policy.
Public Streets and Rights-of-Way			

C35	4.2.3.1.b)	Requires sidewalks on 2 sides of the street in most areas.	<p>This matter was discussed at length during the preparation of the Hewitt's/Salem Secondary Plans and Council established policies in those Plans that detail the dual sidewalk requirement.</p> <p>The decision on dual sidewalk requirements are reviewed during the Conformity Submission where dual/single sidewalk streets are illustrated on the Pedestrian Circulation Plan.</p> <p>The Landowners request that the current process continue and that the words "generally be" at the beginning of this policy.</p> <p>It is important to avoid a policy interpretation that would result in dual sidewalks on most local streets, as this would require large budget increases to the City for snow clearing/maintenance, and asset management (replacement). Adding dual sidewalks on most local streets also reduces off-street parking, creates additional servicing/utility conflicts, and significantly adds significant hard surfaces/runoff from an environmental and stormwater management perspective.</p>
Private Streets			
C36	4.2.3.2a)	Private condo streets will generally incorporate the same standards as public streets.	<p>The Landowners request that this policy be removed because it is unreasonable to require private roads to be developed to the same standard as public roads. This policy will lead to less efficient design, and worse, to the complete elimination of condominium roads.</p> <p>We understand that this policy was developed in response to complaints from condominium homeowners. Please consider alternative responses such as requiring the preparation of a 'Condominium Information Map' that educates condo buyers. This would be similar to the 'Community Information Map' prepared for each subdivision to education purchasers.</p>
Collector Streets			
C37	4.3.1.3d) & e)	Requires development to have direct street frontage, and only where this is not feasible, that side yards can face a street.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Policies d) and e) have duplicate elements. 2) Please clarify the 'feasibility' criteria? 3) The intention of this policy is not clear as it would appear to require more driveways (rather than side lots) on a collector road which is contrary to the direction provided by the City's traffic Department. 4) This policy would also reduce lotting efficiency. 5) The Landowners request removal of these two policies.
Local Streets			
C38	4.3.1.4a)i)	Require grid street patterns while recognizing constraints.	The Landowners request that the word 'grid' be replaced with 'modified grid' which is appropriate

			and consistent with the policies in the Hewitt's and Salem Secondary Plans.
C39	4.3.1.4d)	Local street sidewalks shall be substantially widened beyond City standard in SGA's, UGC, MTSA's and around transit stops.	The Landowners request that this policy be removed because there is no apparently flexibility (hence the language 'shall be') and there are local street locations where widened sidewalks would be unnecessary and would not meaningfully enhance pedestrian movement (i.e. local ground related housing within Neighbourhood Areas that are within an MTSA). If this policy remains, the words "shall be" should be changed to "may be" and the criteria for considering same should be included.
Laneways			
C40	4.3.1.5	Laneway policies	The Landowners request that the word 'Public or Private' be placed in front of "Laneway" and rewritten to include public laneway policies. The cross section in this section should match the public laneway standards developed and approved for use in Hewitt's and Salem. The Landowners object to any laneway policy (private or public) that requires dual sidewalks as illustrated in Figure 8.
C41	4.3.1.5	Figure 7 Laneway Streetscape	Request that the Laneway figure be revised to show one, not two, pedestrian zones. Dual pedestrian sidewalks are unnecessary in private developments, increase condominium maintenance fees, and reduce design efficiency.
Active Transportation			
C42	4.3.1.6.3h)	Requires cycling facilities such as lockers, shower facilities and tire repair apparatus in mixed use buildings, residential apartments, etc.	These matters can be encouraged; however, please advise what section of the Planning Act you are relying on to <u>require</u> internal uses within a building.
Transportation Demand Management			
C43	4.6.1f)	Requires a Transportation Demand Management Program for all Site Plan applications consisting of more than 50 units or 2000m2 of office space.	1) This policy would lead to the inappropriate development of hundreds of different Transportation Demand Management Programs. 2) The Landowners request that this policy be removed as it exceeds the statutory authority under Section 41 of the Planning Act.
Parking Solutions			
C44	4.7e)	Requires payment of CIL to reduce parking requirements.	Request that this policy be limited to the UGC.
Ecological & Phosphorus Offsetting			
C45	5.5	Ecological and Phosphorus Offsetting	Refer to B6. The Landowners request that this Section be removed from the Official Plan because there is no enabling statutory authority.
Parks and Open Spaces			
C46	5.6	Parks policies	1) The policies do not reflect the executed Master Parkland Agreement between the City and the Hewitt's landowners.

			2) Please clarify if additional Parkland is being request for the Post-2031 settlement area lands.
Parkland Dedication			
C47	5.9	Parkland dedication	Please clarify if additional parkland dedication will be requested by the City for the expanded settlement area lands. The mapping does not show any additional requirement, and the Master Parkland Agreement extends only to the 2031 settlement boundary limits.
C48	5.9.1c)	Parkland Calculation <u>shall</u> be at the rate of 5% of the total gross land area.	The Landowners request that the words “gross’ be replaced with ‘net’. Parkland is not given for natural heritage lands or on lands that cannot be developed for other reasons such as gas pipelines (TransCanada) or where significant archaeological resources remain on-site. There is no statutory authority under the Planning Act to require the calculation on ‘gross’ land area.
Community Resilience			
C49	6.3.1d)	Encourages the use of district energy systems.	To our knowledge the City is not planning on developing same. The Landowners request that this reference be removed.
Social and Economic Resilience			
C50	6.4.2d)	All ground related development shall include design options that provide purchasers the ability to have two residential units.	The Landowners request the modification of this policy to require a condition in all draft plan approvals containing more than 40 single detached units, to require the Builder to offer turn-key second suite packages in some of their units. This approach is in place in Hewitt’s and there has been significant uptake of Second Suites as a result.
C51	6.4.2e)	Requires an affordable housing report.	Request the words ‘shall’ be replaced with ‘may’ which provides flexibility depending on the nature of the application or, more importantly, if the applicant is proposing the required amount of affordable housing – which would render a study unnecessary.
Archaeological Resources			
C52	8.4.2k)	Requires that archaeological artifacts be ‘deeded’ at no cost to the appropriate public authority.	The Landowners ask that this policy be deleted because it cannot be implemented. Specifically, artifacts cannot be deeded, and in the case of archaeological resources, there are Ministry licensing requirements associated with cataloging and storing same.
Required Studies in Support of Development Applications			
C53	9.4.2.2.1	Every mid-rise application must be accompanied by a Pedestrian Wind Study and Sun/Shadow Study	The Landowners ask that the word “must’ be replaced with ‘may’ because not every 6-storey application should require a wind study or sun/shadow study, particularly in greenfield areas.
Phasing			
C54	9.5.2)i)iii)	Phasing release requires registration.	Refer to B8.
Plans of Subdivision			
C55	9.5.3)ii)	Restricts removal of vegetation outside of 30 days prior to grading/construction.	The Landowners request that this policy be removed because it is already contained in the LSPP (S.4.20-DP), and that policy intends to prevent erosion.

			Given tree removal restrictions under the Migratory Birds Act, there is no practical way to develop large greenfield sites within 30 days of tree removal; however, conformity with the LSPP policy can be maintained by preventing stump removal until closer to earthworks commencing.
Plan of Condominium			
C56	9.5.4	Lists 3 plan of condominium types.	The Landowners request that the types of condominiums not be referenced, and a single set of policies be developed. Alternatively, the City should then reference every condominium type, including Vacant Land Condominium's which have been successfully developed in Barrie.
Site Plan Control			
C57	9.5.7b)	Requires elevations for buildings not subject to site plan control.	Elevations should be required for buildings subject to SPC. Request removal of the word 'not'.
Minor Variance			
C58	9.5.9a)	New test a: cause a substantial detriment, hazard or annoyance that would detract from the character or amenity of nearby properties.	The Landowners request removal of this policy because 'detriment' and 'annoyance' are inappropriate OP policies.

D. Detailed Mapping Comments/Concerns

D1. Map 1 – Community Structure:

- a. Please explain how you arrived at the limits of the Barrie South Major Transit Station Area.
- b. DGA hatching is missing from the south-east corner of Hewitt's.
- c. The MTSA overlaps with Neighbourhood Area lands which have vastly different density expectations.

D2. Map 2 – Land Use Designations

- a. Mapleview Drive East (Crisdawn/Pratt Hansen) (D12-426):
 - i. The neighbourhood Park boundary on the Pratt subdivision (Hewitt's Gate Subdivision) at Prince William Way/Lally Terrace, is not consistent with the Master Parkland Agreement. It is correctly shown on Map 8.
 - ii. A Village Square is missing as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement east of the NHS area on Winery Way. It is correctly shown on Map 8.
 - iii. A park is missing on the south portions of the lands closer to Lockhart as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement. It is correctly shown on Map 8.
- b. 515 Mapleview Drive East (BEMP Property)(D12-431): The 'medium density' block on the BEMP property (Mapleview Drive and Madeline) does not reflect the approved draft plan and zoning.
- c. 989 Yonge Street (ASA Development): The north-east corner of Lockhart Road and Yonge Street is designated "Neighbourhood Area". This area should be designated "Medium Density".
- d. 883 Mapleview Drive East (Bulut): There are no 'Natural Heritage System' lands on this property, which is draft plan approved.

- e. 953 Mapleview Drive East (Mapleview South): The limits of the Sandy Cove Creek are in the final stages of realignment approval and tendering for construction has been released. Please update the NHS mapping to reflect the new channel alignment.
- f. 979 Mapleview Drive East (Sandy Creek Estates): Parkland missing as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement. It is correctly shown on Map 8.
- g. 620 Lockhart (Mattamy Homes): A park missing on the south portions of the lands closer to Lockhart as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement. It is conceptually correct on Map 8, but the configuration does not reflect the approved Conformity Plan. Please update and revise.
- h. 750 Lockhart (Ballymore): In the event that the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies are replaced with new City-wide land use designations and policies, Ballymore requests that Blocks 1-16, 22, 23 and 32, all inclusive on the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan should be designated Neighbourhood Area. Only Block 24 which is located on the south side of Kneeshaw Drive in the south portion of the property should be designated Medium density. Additionally, ALL figures and/or maps in the new OP should be revised to show the alignment for Collector Road Kneeshaw Drive (including the roundabouts) as per the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan.

D3. Map 3 – Natural Heritage Protection Overlays

- a. Refer to Points D2.e above.

D4. Map 5 – Road Widening

- a. Fenchurch west of Ball Gate should be 24m, not 27m as per the approved draft plan and existing Hewitt's Secondary Plan.
- b. Sheppard Drive east of Madeline Drive is a local street, not a 27 m collector as per the approved draft plan of subdivision and existing Hewitt's Secondary Plan.
- c. Lockhart Road is identified as having a maximum road width of 34 metres. The Landowners request that the widening reflect the approved Environmental Assessment and negotiations with the City concurrent with draft plan applications. This includes 34 metre width west of Yonge Street and 34 metres in width tapering to 27 metres in width east of Yonge Street.
- d. Mapleview Drive is shown as being 41 metres in width to the 20th Side road. Similar to point D4.a above, the widening of Mapleview tapers to 34 metres.

D5. Map 6 – Parks and Open Space Network

- a. Note points D2a, d, e, f, and g.

D6. Appendix 2 – Phasing Plan

- a. The Phasing numbers do not match the colours in the legend.

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:11 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Re: Official Plan Comment Letter
Attachments: Draft2-OP Comment letter May 28 2021(final).pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Darren Vella
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 11:34 AM
To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>; Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Cc: Steve Bishop >; Ronald Richards; Marisa Kay; DarrenVella
Subject: RE: Re: Official Plan Comment Letter

Good Morning Tomasz and Michelle

On behalf of Park Place, please find attached comments on Draft 2 of the Official Plan.

Regards



Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP

PRESIDENT & DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

647 Welham Road, Unit 9, Barrie, ON L4N 0B7
Tel: 705 – 812 - 3281 Ext. 22 Fax: 705 – 812 - 3438

E-Mail: dvella@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com

PLEASE NOTE WE HAVE MOVED

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

NOTE: This e-mail message and attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message



May 28, 2021

Michelle Banfield, RPP
Director of Development Services
The City of Barrie
70 Collier Street
Barrie, Ontario L4M 4T5

Dear:

Ms. Banfield

Re: Draft City of Barrie Official Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this latest version of the draft Official Plan. First, I would like to acknowledge the numerous modifications to the initial draft that, in our opinion, make for a better plan. At this time we have only a few remaining concerns and set these out below. Sections in italics are direct quotes from the draft official plan.

1. S2.6.9.2 d) ii) and iii) Employment Area – Non-Industrial

ii) A new retail use may be permitted as an accessory use to a primary permitted use listed in Section 2.6.9.1 of this Plan, but it shall be within the same building or structure as the primary use, and it shall be no larger than 25% of the gross floor area of the building/structure within which it exists; and,
iii) A new retail use may be permitted as a secondary use in a multi-tenanted building, but it shall only be permitted once the primary use has been established, and it shall be no larger than 25% of the gross floor area of the building/structure within which it exists

Based upon our recent experience, including current discussions with large scale users for our north lands we believe that the maximum accessory retail component should be set out as “generally in the order of 30%” so as not to preclude minor variances in appropriate circumstances.

2. S3.3.4 ii) f. High-Rise Buildings

Where more than one High-Rise Building is located on the same lot, the distance between the towers at the twelfth storey and above shall be at least 30.0 metres...

From our recent experience in designing and developing multi tower sites we suggest that the minimum distance between towers should be 25m. This requirement is in place within several large urban centres throughout the Golden Greater Horseshoe and creates a desirable built form. We would also request consideration within the Plan that any deviation from these requirements could be supported by an in depth Urban Design Study.

3. S2.6.5 Commercial District:

We request:

- a. **that permitted uses in this designation be expanded to include hotels and motels. (The only reference to hotels and motels right now appears to be in Section 8.3.1 –Celebration Spaces.)**
 - b. **discussion/definition of “Commercial”**
 - c. **clarification of whether gas bars/car washes fall under retail or commercial?**
4. The designation proposed for the SW corner of Bayview/Harvie Rd. is Non-Industrial Employment. The size, 8,451 msq. and location of the site does not readily lend itself to development under these policies. **We are of the view that the site should be designated as Commercial District to allow for development as planned and permitted under the existing OP designation and zoning.**

As you may know our client has entered into an agreement of purchase and sale for these lands and the beneficial owner has filed a pre-consultation application. Current plans envisage a modern car wash and convenience retail development. We would like to ensure that this project does not have any future policy obstacles.

5. For the lands adjacent to the north side of Lover’s Creek **we would like to explore with you whether some further flexibility in uses could be considered.** For example could a hotel/motel become a permitted use in the Non Industrial and Industrial Employment areas?

We would welcome an opportunity to meet and discuss these few matters prior to Council’s consideration of the OP.

Regards,



Ron Richards

R.G. Richards & Associates



Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP
Innovative Planning Solutions

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:06 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Salem Landowners Group Comment Letter
Attachments: Official Plan Comment Letter June 2, 2021.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Keith MacKinnon
Sent: Friday, June 4, 2021 3:58 PM
To: Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>; Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Subject: Salem Landowners Group Comment LetterHi Michelle

and Tomasz,

On behalf of the Salem Landowners Group Inc., kindly find attached our comment letter on the second draft of the Official Plan for you review. We would be happy to discuss these with you further. Thanks,

Keith.

Keith MacKinnon BA, MCIP, RPP

PARTNER

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.

Planning | Design | Development

64 Jardin Drive, Unit 1B Concord, Ontario L4K 3P3

T 905.669.4055 (ext. 234) F 905.669.0097 E kmackinnon@klmplanning.com

Please consider the environment before printing this email



64 Jardin Drive, Unit 1B
Concord, Ontario
L4K 3P3
T. 905.669.4055
F. 905.669.0097
klmplanning.com

SENT VIA EMAIL

P – 2442

June 2, 2021

Planning and Building Services
City of Barrie

70 Collier Street
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Attention: Ms. Michelle Banfield, RPP
Director of Development Services

Re: City of Barrie Official Plan
May 6, 2021 Draft
Salem Landowners Group Inc.
City of Barrie

Dear Ms. Banfield,

On behalf of the Salem Landowners Group Inc., KLM Planning Partners Inc. is pleased to provide you with comments related to the draft City of Barrie Official Plan 2020.

We are disappointed that our detailed submission dated December 22, 2020 has not been acknowledged either through a comment matrix or a track change version of the Official Plan. This would have been helpful with our review of the second draft dated May 6, 2021.

As mentioned in our previous submission, we have characterized the issues under four headings for consistency:

Planning • Design • Development

- 1. General Observations**
- 2. Major Policy Concerns**
- 3. Detailed Policy Comments/Concerns**
- 4. Detailed Mapping Comments/Concerns**

- 1. General Observations**

The Salem Secondary Plan was approved by the then Ontario Municipal Board in 2016. Since that time five residential draft plans of subdivision and one industrial draft plan of subdivision has been approved with one of them being registered and under construction.

As noted previously all of the approved plans did not require an amendment to the Secondary Plan and given that development is still proceeding, the landowners feel it is important to keep the Secondary Plan largely intact.

As you know, an Official Plan is a guiding document that provides flexibility and interpretation with policies which generally direct how and where the City should grow. The draft Official Plan is completely opposite wherein it is very prescriptive and removes any flexibility inherent within the plan. The issue with such a prescriptive document is it will ultimately require private developments to amend the document regularly. In our view, when a document leads to regular amendments being filed, it is a sign the policies are not effective.

As noted in the previous submission, the document remains very difficult and cumbersome to read and interpret. There continues to be too many sections and sub sections that it is confusing. In addition, there is a substantial amount of urban design terminology used within the document, which are better suited to be included in the Urban Design Guidelines. Based on this, the Salem landowners are of the opinion the document should continue to be simplified.

2. Major Policy Concerns

Just to reiterate what has been noted above, wherein the Salem landowners wish to see the Salem Secondary Plan remain largely intact moving forward. Development applications have been approved, a significant investment in infrastructure is being planned/installed and as such, the existing Salem Secondary Plan should remain largely in place.

A critical policy that is found within the Salem Secondary Plan but has been left out of the draft document is one that advises prospective developers whom are non-participating landowners that they must become a member in good standing with the group, prior to the submission of a development application. The Salem landowners respectfully request this policy remain.

The draft Official Plan seeks to achieve a minimum of 79 persons and jobs per hectare whereas the Growth Plan sets out a minimum of 50 persons and jobs per hectare and lastly the current Salem Secondary Plan sets out a minimum of 52 persons and jobs per hectare. The Salem Landowners wish to maintain this minimum moving forward.

The Neighbourhood Area designation and policies sets out a minimum of 50 and 60 units per hectare depending on the fronting situation of the development which is much too high. The current Salem Secondary Plan sets out the range of low density residential from 20 to 40 units

per hectare, which is a reasonable range of density. The Salem Landowners wish to continue using this density range.

As noted previously, the Salem Landowners request that Section 5.5, ecological offsetting policies, be removed from the document. Any required offsetting will be undertaken by the LSRCA and as such, there is not a need for policies related to this in the Official Plan.

3. Detailed Policy Comments/Concerns

Policy	Summary	Comment/Request
1.2	This policy states a “Cultural richness amongst a backdrop of flourishing natural areas”	We are not sure what this actually means
1.3	This policy states “hard and soft infrastructure (e.g., stormwater management and affordable housing respectively) Also, “creating stronger synergies across the City”	What does this mean and what is the objective in which it is trying to achieve?
2.3.2		The policies begin at “b” as opposed to “a”.
2.3.2.e.ii	Requires at least 20% of housing units in the UGC to be affordable.	This target continues to be too high which will discourage growth from occurring in the UGC.
2.3.2.f.ii	Speak to winter city design elements?	What is this and this would be better served to be included in the urban design guidelines rather than the Official Plan.
2.3.4.a).iii)	Requires at least 20% of the housing units within the MTSA be affordable	This policy was not included in the first draft and in our opinion, given a significant amount of land is already draft plan approved or underconstruction, this policy is not achievable.
2.4.2.3.c	Requires at least 52% of new housing being high density with the DGA.	This housing mix target does not seem reasonable, especially for the Salem Secondary Plan area that was designed to have a greater mix than what is being proposed. Again, we request the current Salem Secondary Plan target mix remain.
2.4.2.3.f)	Designated Greenfield Areas require a minimum density of 79 persons and jobs per hectare.	We understand this is an error. As noted previously, the persons and jobs per hectare calculation should conform to the Growth Plan.
2.5.j)	Requires a minimum 10% of all new housing units in each year to be affordable.	Again, this target is much too high and is not sustainable. In our view, the

		requirement should be 5% across the city as a whole.
2.6.1.3.d	Requires a min of 50% ground floor in low rise buildings to be non-residential where there is no existing commercial within 450 metres.	As noted previously, this would continue to include singles with the way it is currently written and interpreted, which is not logical.
2.6.1.3.e.i) and ii)	Requires minimum densities of 50 and 60 units per hectare depending on the frontage of either a local or collector road.	As noted above, these minimum densities are very high, especially compared to the current density ranges in the Salem Secondary Plan. The densities within the respective Secondary Plans should continue to be respected. Also, how is the density calculated given the density applying to local and collector roads? This is a very confusing and convoluted way to calculate density.
2.6.2.3.c	Only permits buildings with a minimum height of six storeys.	As noted previously, we continue to request that townhouse dwelling units in various forms be permitted as of right within the Medium Density designation, in accordance with the Salem Secondary Plan.
2.6.4.1.	Residential uses are only permitted as part of a mixed-use development.	The Salem Landowners request that standalone residential uses also be permitted within elementary and secondary schools along with recreation centres. This was a fundamental item within the Salem Secondary Plan that not only permits residential uses but these blocks are also dual zoned in order to provide residents that will live beside these uses a clear understanding what would be permitted should those uses not ultimately be constructed. and included as permitted uses.
3.1.2	Speaks to Urban Design Standards and Guidelines, both of which being mandatory.	The Salem Landowners request urban design guidelines not being a mandatory policy but changed to being an encouraged policy as is typical with municipal Official Plans.

3.2.2.a)	Requires all development applications “shall demonstrate” a number of criteria.	Again, a policy that is much too prescriptive and is not achievable for each and every application. Suggest this policy be revised to be more general in nature.
3.2.3.1	Requires a sustainable development report, including an ability to enhance indoor air quality.	As noted previously, what is this and why is it required? How is a sustainable report or development for that matter able to enhance indoor air quality? Again, the use of “required” and “shall” make this policy nearly impossible to achieve and again, more flexible language should be utilized.
3.3.2.e)	Requires stacked townhouses to be designed to resemble a traditional street townhouse.	The Salem Landowners request this policy be amended as stacked townhouses by their very nature of completely different than a traditional townhouse dwelling.
4.2.1.a) v)	Requires avoiding the use of window streets.	Why are window streets to be avoided? Engineering standards will preclude multiple connection points to collector or arterial roads which is where this condition is typically utilized. This means you are looking for reverse frontage, through lot or flankage conditions, which are not desirable. This policy should not be included in the Official Plan.
4.2.3.2	Requires private roads to have the same standard as a public road.	As noted previously, this defeats the purpose of having condominium tenure. The Salem Landowners request this policy be removed. If the issue is related to a homeowner not understanding the difference between a condo road and a public road, we suggest that a home buyers map would help to educate the purchaser on the differences.
4.3.1.2	Sets out a number of standards for arterial roads.	As noted above, this policy will seek to restrict access which will limit the ability to create a flankage situation thereby requiring either through lots or reverse frontage (also discouraged).
4.3.1.3	Speaks to collector roads.	Same comment as above.

4.3.2.c)	Speaks to the street system being coordinated with Block Plan and Plan of Subdivision approvals.	Is the City intending to implement a Block Plan process?
5.5	Speaks to ecological offsetting	As noted earlier, the landowners wish to have this section removed as any offsetting would be coordinated through the LSRCA.
5.9.1.c) & d)	Speaks to calculating parkland based on 5% & 2% of the total gross land area.	As noted previously, this should be on a net basis as natural heritage features or other major infrastructure would not be included in the calculation. Furthermore, there is no definition of "gross land area" in the Official Plan in which to determine what is included and excluded from the calculation.
6.3.1.d)	Encourages the use of district energy systems.	As noted previously, is the City of Barrie constructing a district energy system?
6.4.2	This section sets out some very restrictive affordable housing policies.	The Salem Landowners request the affordable housing policies be revised to encourage the addition of affordable housing units rather than being so prescriptive.
8.4.2.b) and i)	Speaks to archaeological resources.	This Ministry of Culture looks after archaeological resources and therefore any policy suggesting the deeding of artifacts and the development of lands containing resources, should all be deferred to the Ministry as they are the approval authority for such things.
9.4.2.2.1 and 9.4.2.2.2	Speaks to "at a minimum" and "must", the studies required for a mid-rise building.	A mid-rise building in the Salem Secondary Plan lands is different than within the built boundary and these studies may not be necessary. Perhaps this should be revised to reflect the difference.
9.5.2.h	Requires Sub-Watershed Impact Studies be completed prior to the next phase of development.	The SIS for the Salem Secondary Plan encompassed all of the Phase 1, 2 and 3 lands within the current Salem Secondary Plan. The SIS should only be required for those identified as Phase 4 in the Salem area.

9.5.3.j	Requires vegetation removal not occurring more than 30 days prior to grading.	This is not achievable and should be removed.
9.5.4	Provides various condominium tenures	As noted previously, why is vacant land condominium not noted? This is another viable option which has been used successfully elsewhere.
9.5.9	Sets out policies related to Minor Variance applications.	The Planning Act sets out the four tests in which an application has to be examined. This section should be amended to be reflect the Planning Act and not create new test within this draft document.
9.5.11.d	Requires the use of a hold symbol for the requirement of entering into a cost share agreement.	In our view, landowners should be required to be a member in good standing with the Salem Landowners Group prior to the submission of development applications to the city. We request this be included in the Official Plan.

4. Detailed Mapping Comments/Concerns

Many of the detailed mapping comments/concerns that are noted below have been provided to staff via a meeting on June 3, 2021. These are being reiterated for the public record.

Map 1

- The natural heritage system limits between the Crisdawn and Unilock lands south of Salem, west of Essa do not reflect the approved limits. The natural heritage limits have been reflected on the natural heritage plans provided previously. As noted to staff, we will provide the approved limits.
- A park is missing on the Watersand Phase 2 lands at the terminus of Exell Avenue. This is consistent across many of the schedules.
- As noted previously, we request the streets and street names for the Phase 4 and employment lands east of Highway 400 be removed as they are not consistent with what will be ultimately shown in future draft plan of subdivision applications.

Map 2

- Exell Avenue is shown as a collector road west of Reid Drive. Given that it does not go anywhere, this section should be removed and should be shown as a local road only.

- A road pattern with street names for the lands on the south side of McKay Road West and County Road 27 are not accurate and should be removed.
- The street pattern and street names for the lands on the south side of McKay Road East and should be removed.
- The NHS limits are not correct on the Crisdawn lands south of Salem, west of Essa Road.

Map 3

- The Natural Linkage Area shown between the Crisdawn and Unilock lands south of Salem, west of Essa Road are not correct.

Map 4A

- A Future Salem Mobility Hub is identified at the SW corner of McKay Road West and Veterans Drive. This parcel is draft plan approved with commercial uses at that corner. This should be located on the east side of Veterans Drive along the employment lands.
- The road pattern and street names as noted above, should be removed on the south side of McKay Road West and County Road 27 and on the south side of McKay Road East.
- All trails shown should be identified as conceptual only.

Map 4B

- Reid Drive south of Salem and McKay Road between Reid Drive and Veterans Drive should not be identified as a "Freight Supportive Corridor".

Map 5

- Exell Avenue, west of Reid Drive, is shown as a 24m collector road. Given it terminates at a neighbourhood park, it is our opinion this should be identified as a local road.

Map 6

- The neighbourhood Park, which terminates at Exell Avenue is not shown.
- The Stormwater Management Pond on the south side of Walker Street, immediately east of the NHS does not exist and should be removed. This should be consistent across all of the schedules.

Appendix 2

- Similar to above, the lands identified as Phase 4 West should have the road pattern and street names removed.

We look forward to seeing the above noted changes reflected in the revised Official Plan, and as always, we would be pleased to discuss this with you further.

Yours truly,

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.

Keith MacKinnon BA, MCIP, RPP
Partner

- cc. Salem Landowners
- cc. Tomasz Wierzba – City of Barrie

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:09 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Barrie OP
Attachments: Draft2OP Letter _ Sean Mason.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Darren Vella
Sent: Tuesday, June 1, 2021 7:23 PM
To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>; Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Cc: Sean Mason; Vanessa Simpson; Darren Vella
Subject: Re: Barrie OP

Good Afternoon Tomasz and Michelle

On behalf of Sean Homes, please find attached comments on Draft 2 of the City Official Plan.

Regards



Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP

PRESIDENT & DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

647 Welham Road, Unit 9, Barrie, ON L4N 0B7
Tel: 705 – 812 - 3281 Ext. 22 Fax: 705 – 812 - 3438

E-Mail: dvella@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com

PLEASE NOTE WE HAVE MOVED

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

NOTE: This e-mail message and attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

May 27th, 2021

City of Barrie 70
Collier Street
P.O. Box 400
Barrie, ON L4M
4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba
Policy Planner

Re: Official Plan Draft 2 Comments

Sean Mason Homes Holdings Inc.

INTRODUCTION

Innovative Planning Solutions (IPS) is providing the following comments on behalf of Sean Mason Homes Holdings Inc. ("sean.ca") whose interest pertains to a number of infill landholdings throughout the City of Barrie. The following parcels are at various stages in the process of being developed:

1. 405 Essa Road
2. 474 & 490 Essa Road and 235 Harvie Road
3. 570 - 586 Yonge Street
4. 429 & 431 Little Avenue
5. 341 Veterans Lane and 339 Veterans Drive

Sean.ca is interested in the new City of Barrie Official Plan and would like to take an active role in the evolution of this document. Based on a review of the second draft we have the following comments for your consideration.

SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS

The following section will provide site specific comments:

405 Essa Road

The subject lands are located along an Intensification Corridor (Map 1), within the Neighborhood Area designation (Map 2) and on an Arterial Road (Map 4B).

Under the current policy framework, it is our opinion that the subject property should be considered for medium density with new policy considerations under this designation. It is our opinion that a greater extent of the Essa Road corridor should be marked for greater levels of intensification. There are many examples of recent approvals that have not been adequately identified on Map 2. 440 and 390 Essa Road are two examples with recent approvals that should be designated more appropriately in the medium or high-density designations (i.e. densities greater than 125 uph). The subject lands lie directly across the street from 390 Essa Road. A pre-consultation meeting has already taken place for a proposed mixed-use building that would not align with the Neighborhood Area designation. A Neighborhood meeting has also been scheduled and this application is planned to be deemed complete in advance of the new Official Plan being adopted. The medium density designation would allow for a greater opportunity for the City to accomplish intensification goals, develop transit supportive densities and offer opportunities to create more attainable housing in areas where services are within walking distance. The subject lands also lie within a 10-minute walk to an underutilized municipal park (Harvie Park) and Trillium Woods Elementary School.

474 & 490 Essa Road and 235 Harvie Road

The subject lands are located at the southeast corner of Essa Road and Harvie Drive. The lands are considered a Designated Greenfield Area and along an Intensification Corridor (Map 1), designated Medium Density (Map 2), and located at the intersection of two arterial roads (Map 4B).

Our plans include developing mid rise buildings along Essa Road and apply the transition policies in Section 3 to deal with the interface to abutting single detached and townhouse dwellings. One issue of great importance relates to Section 2.6.2.3 (d) which notes the maximum residential density for a development shall be 125 units per net hectare.

The '*Medium Density*' land use designation is intended to facilitate an increase of densities and built form in the City (2.6.2). The designation permits a maximum density of 125 units per net hectare (2.6.2.3.d). Given the direction from the Province to meet the growth and intensification

targets, and to accommodate attainable housing for an increasing population, a density of 125 uph is viewed as a restricted amount of permitted density and will leave sites such as this underutilized. In this instance, it could also result in a less desirable built form along an intensification corridor (townhouse versus mid-rise). The 'High Density' land use designation aims to provide for buildings with a minimum height of twelve (12) storeys and a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare (2.6.3.3). Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, there appears to be a significant gap in the density permitted between the Medium and High Density designations. The medium density is capped at 125 uph whereas the High Density designation requires a minimum 300 uph. We encourage the City to review the maximum density permitted for the Medium Density designation based on recent staff approvals (390 and 440 Essa Road), to propose a density that is consistent with the planned function particularly along intensification corridors. The only designation in which a density between 125-300 uph is permitted under the proposed Official Plan is within the Community Hub designation. This range would be more appropriate in the medium density designation given the context within which the community hub designation exists within existing low rise stable neighborhoods versus medium density being predominantly located along Arterial Roads, Strategic Growth Areas, the UGC and MTSA.

570 - 586 Yonge

The subject lands are located within a Strategic Growth Area, Built Up Area and Intensification Corridor (Map 1), and are designated Medium Density (Map 2). The rear of 586 Yonge St has been left out of the Strategic Growth Area on Map 1 and should be modified to include these lands with the remainder of the property. In addition, the rear of 586 Yonge St is incorrectly designated Natural Heritage System, EPA-Level 2, on Map 3 which should be modified to align with the Natural Heritage System mapping on Maps 1 and 2, and recognize the previous approvals granted which established the development limits to the extent that the Natural Heritage lands were dedicated to the Conservation Authority.

The subject lands have recently completed a pre-consultation application with the City of Barrie. The development proposes 3-8 storey condominium buildings along Yonge Street which is consistent with the proposed Medium Density designation. The rear portion of the property is proposed with standard and rear lane townhouses.

Section 2.6.2.3 c) Buildings shall have a minimum height of six storeys along the Arterial Street or Intensification Corridor frontage except on lands designated Medium Density within the UrbanGrowth Centre and Major Transit Station Area, or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan.

Comment: Based on this provision, it is interpreted that the built form along the frontage of the intensification corridor will have a minimum height of six storeys and that as the property moves to the rear of the site, adjacent to the natural heritage system, the height of the built form can be reduced. Currently, as noted above, three-storey townhouses are proposed along the rear of the site which would be permitted under this proposed designation. We are requesting a meeting with staff to better understand the implementation of these policies.

Section 2.6.2.3 (d) notes the maximum residential density for a development shall be 125 units per net hectare.

Comment: The '*Medium Density*' land use designation is intended to facilitate an increase of densities and built form in the City (2.6.2). The designation permits a maximum density of 125 units per net hectare (2.6.2.3.d). Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, there appears to be a significant gap in the density permitted and we encourage the City to review the maximum density permitted for the Medium Density designation, as this will greatly limit development and restrict the provision of residential units in the City, which are severely needed at this time due to an affordability crisis.

429 & 431 Little Avenue

The subject lands are located at the intersection of Little Avenue and Hurst Drive. The Metrolinx Railway Corridor runs between the east property line and Hurst Drive. The lands are within the Neighborhood Area (Map 2) and on a local road (Map 4B) (Little Avenue). This would permit residential development that would be generally kept to three storeys or less (2.6.1.3 (a)).

The current Official Plan, Schedule D Roads Plan, identifies this stretch of Little Ave, from Yonge Street to Hurst Drive, as an arterial road. On Schedule E Road Widening Plan, it is identified as having a road right of way width of 27m, which is consistent with the draft Official Plan Map 5. Little Ave is a significant connection corridor from Yonge Street to Hurst Drive. It is our opinion that this stretch of Little Ave should remain an arterial road as the planned road

widths are greater than just a local street. We are requesting that this modification be made to 4B.

Given its location at the intersection of Hurst Drive (arterial road) and along the railway corridor, the property lends itself to medium density residential development along the railway corridor. The lands slope toward the railway corridor and based on preliminary site design concepts, a six-storey building could be placed into the slope providing a six-storey height profile on the east(Hurst Drive/Rail Line) with a four or five storey profile on the west. The remainder of the site will transition with a lower density built form (i.e. townhouses) toward the rear of the site adjacent to the existing neighborhood. Tollendale Village, located along Hurst Drive just north of the site, possesses a dense built form that can be complemented by this proposal. We respectfully request that this site be a candidate for the medium density designation.

GENERAL OFFICIAL PLAN COMMENTS

Section 2.6 Land Use Designations

2.6.1 Neighbourhood Area

The Neighborhood Area designation applies to lands located along currently identified intensification corridors. This designation applies to the majority of lands within the City of Barrie with the focus on recognizing new and existing low-density neighborhoods and communities.

Section 2.6.1.3 (c) permits development up to a maximum of six storeys in the Neighborhood designation where:

- i) The proposed development fronts onto and is oriented toward the Intensification Corridor;
- ii) the transition policies in Section 3 of this Plan can be satisfied; and,
- iii) Servicing availability can be confirmed by the City.

Comment: This is really the only policy within this designation that applies to Intensification Corridors. The existing Official Plan policy framework for intensification corridors is working well with the transformation of these areas into more densely populated mixed-use communities. Buildings currently under construction or approved for development along Yonge Street and Essa Road range from 4 to 8 storeys in height with ground related commercial or stand-alone

residential. What is the rationale for deviating from this policy approach? This policy set is accomplishing the intended function that these corridors are planned to achieve.

Section 3.2 General Urban Design Standards

3.2.1 Human Scale Design

(b) The City will not support over-development. The policies of this Plan and the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines provide direction to ensure high quality urban design is achieved without over-development occurring on any given property. Over-development is characterized by, but not limited to, the following:

- i. Development that is excessive in its demands on city infrastructure and services;
- ii. Development that negatively impacts local amenity and character;
- iii. Development that exceeds the maximum permitted height or density;
- iv. Inappropriate built form requiring unwarranted variances to the City's development standards, and where another built form solution is more appropriate;
- v. Undesirable building separation distances resulting in shadow impacts, inappropriate over-look conditions, or which significantly negatively impacts access to daylight; and,
- vi. Development that results in other impacts to a site's functionality or that limits the redevelopment potential of the remaining block or adjacent sites, such as site access or circulation issues.

Comment: We agree that over development does not result in good planning; however, with the current density permissions, particularly the maximum within the Medium Density designation, developers will be required to submit Official Plan Amendment applications to increase densities in order to meet the other objectives of this plan. It is recommended that subsection (iii) be deleted as good planning relates to the overall functionality of the site highlighted in (vi), not the developments proposed height and density given all the policies in this Plan related to transition and neighborhood impact.

3.2.3 Sustainable and Resilient Design

3.2.3.1 Green Development Standards

- a) The City will establish Green Development Standards in consultation with the building and construction industry, and until such time as Green Development Standards are adopted by Council, all applications for an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law

Amendment, Plan of Subdivision, and/or Site Plan Approval are required to submit a Sustainable Development Report, indicating how sustainable design best practices are being addressed.

Comments: This comment was not addressed in our previous submission. What qualifications would the reviewers of the Sustainability Development Report hold and how much influence will they have to alter proposals? The green standards being developed should focus on those already successfully implemented by the industry rather than a Council or staff directive with no expertise. Is the City willing to have flat roofs facing south onto main roads to maximize solar?

Passive housing designs can be encouraged with advanced building technologies have unintended consequences. For example, do staff have a level of knowledge to ensure that increased sunlight will not overheat residents, as this approach has been shown to be erroneous in many jurisdictions across Canada, despite good intentions of Passive Haus certifications. Rapidly changing technology and building science should not be captured in an Official Plan document.

Section 3.3 Built Form Types and Development Criteria

3.3.2 Low-Rise Residential Development

d) Where a Townhouse end unit does not front a public street but flanks a public street, the flanking unit(s) shall provide a front-yard and front-door pedestrian entrance facing the public street.

Comment: We do not agree that this should be a mandatory requirement. Enhanced architectural elements can be recommended along flanking units. Front Door Entrances for townhouse units that are 4.5 metres in width is impossible to achieve on the flanking frontage.

f) To provide appropriate privacy and daylight/sunlight conditions for any adjacent lower scale housing forms, Low-Rise Buildings on a lot that abuts the rear yards of a lot with a Detached House, Semi-Detached House or Townhouse shall generally be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from the property line and shall be designed with the appropriate transitions to consider a high quality of urban design per the policies of Section 3.2 of this Plan and the City-wide Urban Design Guidelines.

Comment: While this policy provides a specific setback requirement, which is often more suited for a Zoning By-law, we interpret this policy to have flexibility with the minimum setback as the word “generally” has been used and the policy reinforces design that provides for an appropriate transition with high quality urban design. Based on this, if appropriate the rear yard setback could be less than 7.5m.

3.3.3 Mid-Rise Buildings

h) The rooftop of Mid-Rise Buildings should include landscaped green space, private outdoor amenity space, or environmental sustainability features such as solar panels.

Comment: This level of commitment for a developer to achieve is too restrictive and must include some flexibility in building design and construction.

Section 6.4.2 Affordable Housing

The Official Plan provides a greater emphasis on the need for affordable housing which is supported by Sean Homes. Within the OP, ranges of 10 to 20 percent of affordable housing is required depending on site specific locations. All developments in excess of 40 units are required to provide affordable housing. Given the changes to property value and rental rates over the last 5 years, it is recommended that through this Official Plan process the City update their affordable housing benchmark to provide a clear understanding to the development industry what will be deemed affordable. It is also our recommendation that in order to accomplish this ultimate goal, particularly for those required to supply 20 percent affordable housing within their developments, that public/private partnerships will be necessary. The challenge in accomplishing this goal will be the fact that the greatest percentage of affordable housing units are planned to be provided in built forms that have the highest construction cost value. It is recommended that Section 6.4.2 be amended to include additional language as follows:

b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, private developers, as well as community groups, to provide innovative affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing.

Lastly, if the municipality is looking for 20% affordable housing, then incentives should be created to make this requirement more palatable for the development industry. The City of Barrie has traditionally not supported these initiatives at the development level, and hence costs to implement can be unachievable. This is the opportune time to revisit this important issue.

CONCLUSION

We look forward to working with staff on the next draft Official Plan and would welcome a discussion regarding the comments noted above.

Respectfully submitted,

Innovative Planning Solutions

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Darren Vella', written over a horizontal line.

Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP

President and Director of Planning

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:10 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: City of Barrie New Official Plan; Our client: St. Joseph Developments Inc.
Attachments: 20210531 - Letter to T.Wierzba (Policy Planner) re City of Barrie New OP. pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Jenny Gillegean **On Behalf Of** David White

Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 12:37 PM

To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>; David White; Cc: Wendy Cooke <Wendy.Cooke@barrie.ca>; Jenny Gillegean

Subject: City of Barrie New Official Plan; Our client: St. Joseph Developments Inc.

Good afternoon Mr. Wierzba,

Attached please find Mr. David White's correspondence of May 31, 2021 together with enclosure.

Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail.

Thank you.

(our file #STJOS850)

** Due to the circumstances surrounding Covid-19, our temporary office hours in Toronto are Monday – Friday, 10 am to 4 pm*

Regards,

Jenny Gillegan

Legal Assistant on behalf
of David S. White, Q.C.
Phone/Fax: 416 446-5811

E-mail: jenny.gillegan@devrylaw.ca

Devry Smith Frank *LLP*

Lawyers & Mediators

95 Barber Greene Road, Suite 100

Toronto, ON M3C 3E9
[Toronto](#) | [Barrie](#) | [Whitby](#)
[Independent Member of GGI](#)

This email is intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain privileged or confidential information. The sender does not waive any privilege, copyright or other rights. If you have received this email in error, please delete it and notify the sender of the error by reply email or otherwise.



DEVRY SMITH FRANK *LLP*

Lawyers & Mediators

david.white@devrylaw.ca
416.446.3330

BY E-MAIL

Our File No.: STJOS850

May 31, 2021

City of Barrie

City Hall, 1st Floor
70 Collier Street

Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Attention: Mr. Tomasz Wierzba, Policy Planner

E-mail: Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca

Dear Mr. Wierzba:

Re: St. Joseph Developments Inc.

City of Barrie New Official Plan

North of Dunlop Street West, East of Miller Drive

We represent St. Joseph Developments Inc. (“St. Joseph”) in connection with their 45 acre parcel of land north of Dunlop Street West and east of Miller Drive as shown on the attached air photo. I am writing to express our client’s objection to the new proposed Official Plan.

Our objections are as follows:

EMPLOYMENT NON-INDUSTRIAL DESIGNATION

- 1) The Dunlop Street frontage is currently designated General Commercial in the existing Official Plan and zoned C4 by By-law 2009-141. This commercial designation is proposed to be eliminated for my client’s lands and replaced by an Employment Non-Industrial designation. This proposed designation is effectively a down designation which removes a number of critical uses.
- 2) The existing General Commercial designation provides for a broad range of uses of which are appropriate for this site.
- 3) The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation permits a number of uses that are not appropriate for the site.

95 Barber Greene Rd., Suite 100, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M3C 3E9 Tel: 416.449.1400 Fax:
416.449.7071 www.devrylaw.ca

- 4) The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation has a strange assortment of permitted uses that would appear to be out of character for the site and surrounding area.
- 5) The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation will not permit the appropriate development of the site with uses that are realistic and practical and which represent good planning for a “gateway” to the City.
- 6) We request that the existing Commercial designation continue on this site or in the alternative the site receive a special site specific designation that permits all of the existing commercial uses.

NATURAL HERITAGE SYSTEM DESIGNATION

- 1) The City has been provided with correspondence from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry indicating that the Provincially Significant Wetland designation previously shown on part of the St. Joseph’s property has been removed. We are therefore requesting that the Natural Heritage System designation be replaced with an appropriate development designation.

Please ensure that this letter is put in the record as part of the public meeting.

Yours truly,

Devry Smith Frank LLP



David S. White, Q.C.

DSW/jrg

Encl.

c.c. Wendy Cooke, City Clerk

E-mail: Wendy.Cooke@barrie.ca

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:10 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Official Plan Comment Letter
Attachments: Draft2CommentLetter(Final)(May27,2021).pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Darren Vella
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2021 10:09 AM
To: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>; Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Cc: 'richard@transcanadagroup.on.ca'; Neil Clark; AndrewHay; Darren Vella
Subject: Re: Official Plan Comment LetterGood

Morning Tomasz and Michelle

On behalf of Trans Canada Pole, please find attached correspondence relating to Draft 2 of the proposed City of Barrie Official Plan.

Regards



Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP

PRESIDENT & DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

647 Welham Road, Unit 9, Barrie, ON L4N 0B7
Tel: 705 – 812 - 3281 Ext. 22 Fax: 705 – 812 - 3438

E-Mail: dvella@ipsconsultinginc.com URL: www.ipsconsultinginc.com

PLEASE NOTE WE HAVE MOVED

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

NOTE: This e-mail message and attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this e-mail message



INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

May 27, 2021

City of Barrie
70 Collier Street Barrie,
ON L4M 4T5

Attention: Tomasz Wierzba,
Policy Planner

Re: Draft 2 - New Official PlanTrans
Canada Pole Ltd.
7735 County Road 27


On behalf of Trans Canada Pole Ltd., Innovative Planning Solutions is pleased to submit the following comments on Draft 2 of the New Official Plan. The subject lands are municipally known as 7735 County Road 27. We would like to thank the City for their efforts in resolving our concerns with the previous draft. Based on our review on Draft 2, there are a few remaining issues which warrant consideration.

Natural Heritage Mapping Error

A review of the revised mapping Schedules reveals that on Maps 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 the natural heritage/hazard features have been removed in Draft 2 based on Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Case Number PL140770, 140771, 140772. I would like to note that Appendix 1 – Conservation Authority Areas still identifies an NVCA Floodplain in error. Given the previously agreed upon changes of removing the natural heritage/hazard features, this floodplain area should also be removed. The NVCA was also involved in the previous Board hearing in which the revisions proposed were accepted by their office. It is requested that the NVCA Floodplain be removed in its entirety from the subject property. A floodplain area cannot exist if no natural feature is located on site. See Figure 1 below outlining the subject property and area in blue that needs to be removed:

647 WELHAM ROAD, UNIT 9A, BARRIE ONTARIO L4N 0B7
TEL: (705) 812-3281

EMAIL: INFO@IPSCONSULTINGINC.COM



Appendix 2: Phasing Plan

Appendix 2 identifies the subject lands split between Phases 3 West and 4 West (Figure 2). The southern portion (approximately 25.0 hectares) is under Phase 3W, while the northern portion (approximately 12.0 hectares) is Phase 4W. It is unclear why

12.0 hectares of land is placed into Phase 4W. My experience with phased development within Secondary Plan areas is that the delineation of phases generally follows the ability to deliver infrastructure, major roads, natural heritage features, major concession/property lines, etc.

In this circumstance, none of the identified features exist between Phase 3W and 4W on the Trans Canada site. The proposed phasing plan places the subject lands in a scenario where two separate Plan of Subdivision applications will be required. This in my opinion, would not result in the best planning outcome given that such a small parcel remains in Phase 4W. Furthermore, infrastructure that would be required to develop Phase 3 lands will also support Phase 4 lands based on its limited size and configuration. The phasing line does not follow any logical boundary when compared to the other phasing boundaries within the Salem Secondary Plan. **It is requested that the Phase 3W boundary be enlarged to extend to the limits of Essa Road which is a logical boundary to terminate Phase 3 W on the Trans Canada Pole site.**

A review of the Phasing policies outlines the following information.

9.5.2 Phasing


i) To ensure the timely build out of new neighbourhoods in the Designated Greenfield Area:

i) Development in Phase 2E and 2W shall not be permitted until 60 percent of the land in the preceding phase, being Phases 1E or 1W, as identified on Appendix 2, is subject to an approved draft plan of subdivision, approved draft plan of condominium, or registered site plan.

ii) Phases 2E and 2W may develop independently of each other, as long as the development threshold outlined in 9.5.2.(i)(i) is satisfied.

iii) Development in Phases 3E and 3W, and all subsequent phases, is not permitted until 60 percent of the land in the preceding phase, being Phases 2E or 2W, as identified on Appendix 2, is subject to a registered M-Plan or equivalent level of approval, as determined

by the City. iv) Phases 3E and 3W may develop independently of each other, as long as the development threshold outlined in 9.5.2(i)(iii) is satisfied.



We have significant concerns with the substantial difference between phasing permissions between Phases 2 and 3. Development in Phases 3W, and all subsequent phases, is not permitted until 60 percent of the land in the preceding phase, being Phases 2E or 2W, as identified on Appendix 2, is subject to a registered M-Plan or equivalent level of approval, as determined by the City. This wording significantly differs from lands within Phase 2 which requires 60% of Phase 1 lands being approved draft plan of subdivision, approved draft plan of condominium, or registered site plan. Under the proposed policy framework, Phase 3 landowners would require Phase 2 lands to be within a Registered M- Plan or other similar approvals. This will significantly alter the timing in which Phase 3 lands can commence Planning Act applications and will ultimately leave the City with a significant building permit gap between Phase 2 and 3 if Phase 3 lands cannot begin their planning process until 60% of phase 2 lands are registered. **We request confirmation from the City that the Phasing Plan remain consistent between all Phases in the Secondary Plan areas. We would request that the wording utilized in 9.5.2(i) be used to describe the sequence of phasing in 9.5.2 (iii).**

Density Provisions

We understand that the City will be inserting additional wording into the Draft Official Plan that will identify density staging provisions for different phases within Designated Greenfield Areas. The current draft increases density from 62 to 79 persons and jobs per hectare without a graduated scale. **We would respectfully request further clarification in order to understand implications to our site.**

Conclusion

Thank you for your consideration of the above noted comments. We are available to discuss should you have any questions or comments. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Innovative Planning Solutions



**Darren Vella, MCIP, RPP President &
Director of Planning**

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:07 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Comments on Barrie's Official Plan - 2nd Draft
Attachments: 44134 Barrie Official Plan 2nd Draft Response letter.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Darlene Quilty
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 5:12 PM
To: Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Cc: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Subject: RE: Comments on Barrie's Official Plan - 2nd DraftThanks

Michelle,

After 14 months working from home I can't remember what the staff in our office look like. 😊

The updated letter is attached!

DARLENE QUILTY | Planning Co-ordinator

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me via email or at 705-627-2302.

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture
On behalf of TransCanada PipeLines Limited

113 Collier St. | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | C 705 627 2302 | dquilty@mhbcpplan.com |

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

From: Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Sent: June-02-21 5:04 PM

To: Darlene Quilty
Cc: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Subject: RE: Comments on Barrie's Official Plan - 2nd Draft

Hi Darlene,
I'm surprised no one in your office told you Kathy had left! But with Covid times we aren't likely side by side anymore. This letter is fine addressed to Kathy, but if you'd like to readdress that's up to you.

Michelle Banfield, RPP

Director of Development Services
x5466

From: Darlene Quilty
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 5:02 PM
To: Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>
Cc: Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Subject: FW: Comments on Barrie's Official Plan - 2nd Draft Good Afternoon

Michelle,

I sent the attached comments to Kathy (as I did on the first draft) but received a response that she is no longer with the City. Should I revise and address the letter to you?

Thank you,

DARLENE QUILTY | Planning Co-ordinator

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me via email or at 705-627-2302.

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture
On behalf of TransCanada PipeLines Limited

113 Collier St. | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | C 705 627 2302 | dquilty@mhbcplan.com |

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

From: Darlene Quilty
Sent: June-02-21 4:57 PM

To: kathy.suggitt@barrie.ca

Cc: Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca

Subject: Comments on Barrie's Official Plan - 2nd DraftGood

Afternoon Kathy,

Attached are our comments on the 2nd draft of the new Official Plan for your consideration. If you have any questions or require any additional information please let me know.

Thank you!

DARLENE QUILTY | Planning Co-ordinator

I am currently working remotely and it is best to reach me via email or at 705-627-2302.

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture
On behalf of TransCanada PipeLines Limited

113 Collier St. | Barrie | ON | L4M 1H2 | C 705 627 2302 | dquilty@mhbcplan.com |

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

June 2, 2021

Ms. Michelle Banfield, RPP Director of
Development Services City of Barrie
City Hall, 70 Collier Street
P.O. Box 400, Barrie, ON L4M
4T5

Via email: Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca

Dear Ms. Banfield:

**RE: Official Plan Update for the City of Barrie, 2nd Draft
Our File No. PAR 44134**

As you may know, we are the planning consultants for TransCanada Pipelines Limited (TCPL), an affiliate of TC Energy Corporation (TC Energy). This letter is in response to circulation of the City's revised draft Official Plan. We have reviewed the second draft and appreciate the revisions incorporated from our previous comments.

Following are additional comments for the City's consideration:

1. Section 4.3.1.6.2 – Multi-Use Trails

A multi-use trail is shown over the pipeline right-of-way on Map 4a. A policy should be included in Section 2.6.12.2 to reference the need to consult with TCPL in relation to any trail locations or trail development.

2. Section 2.6.12.2 b) - TransCanada should be referenced as: 'TransCanada Pipelines Limited (TCPL)' and all items in the section as TCPL.


3. We request the following policies be added to Section 2.6.12.2 b):

- v. TCPL operates two high-pressure natural gas pipelines within its right-of-way crossing the City and is identified on Map 2 of this Plan. TCPL Limited is regulated by the Canada Energy Regulator (CER), which has a number of requirements regulating development in proximity to its pipelines, including approval for activities within 30 metres of the pipeline centreline.

- vi. New development can result in increasing the population density in the area that may result in TCPL being required to replace its pipeline(s) to comply with CSA Code Z662. Therefore, the City shall require early consultation with TCPL or its designated representative for any development proposals within 200 metres of its pipelines.
- vii. Trails on the pipeline right-of-way require approval from TCPL. Early consultation during the design process is encouraged to ensure TCPL's design requirements are met.
- i. In addition to the requirement for setbacks for principle buildings, structures and accessory structures, the following should be setback a minimum of 7 metres from the limit of the pipeline right-of-way:
 - a. Private roads, driveways, parking spaces and parking areas.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the second draft. If you have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact our office. Kindly forward a copy of the final Plan byemail to dquilty@mhbcpplan.com.

Sincerely,



**Darlene Quilty,
Planning Co-ordinator
on behalf of TransCanada Pipelines Limited**

Joanne Werth

From: Tomasz Wierzba
Sent: Tuesday, June 22, 2021 9:06 AM
To: Anna Sajecki
Subject: FW: Watersand Construction Comment Letter
Attachments: KLM OP Review Letter June 2, 2021.pdf

Kindly,

Tomasz

Planner & Heritage Barrie Committee Staff Liaison

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Development Services

Barrie City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext: 4403 | Fax: 705-739-4270 | www.barrie.ca



From: Keith MacKinnon <KMacKinnon@KLMPPlanning.com>
Sent: Friday, June 4, 2021 3:51 PM
To: Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>; Tomasz Wierzba <Tomasz.Wierzba@barrie.ca>
Cc: Paolo Sacilotto
Subject: Watersand Construction Comment LetterHi Michelle &

Tomasz,

On behalf of Watersand Construction and their related companies c/o DG Group, kindly find attached our submission letter to the second draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan for your consideration. We would be pleased to discuss these comments with you further. Thanks,

Keith.

Keith MacKinnon BA, MCIP, RPP

PARTNER

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.

Planning | Design | Development

64 Jardin Drive, Unit 1B Concord, Ontario L4K 3P3

T 905.669.4055 (ext. 234) F 905.669.0097 E kmackinnon@klmplanning.com

Please consider the environment before printing this email



64 Jardin Drive, Unit 1B
Concord, Ontario
L4K 3P3
T. 905.669.4055
F. 905.669.0097
klmplanning.com

SENT VIA EMAIL

P – 190

June 2, 2021

Planning and Building Services
City of Barrie

70 Collier Street
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Attention: Ms. Michelle Banfield, RPP
Director of Development Services

Re: Draft City of Barrie Official Plan
May 6, 2021 Draft

**Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments and Perthshire
Developments Inc. c/o DG Group**

City of Barrie

Dear Ms. Banfield,

On behalf of Watersand Construction, Wormwood Developments and Perthshire Developments c/o DG Group, we are pleased to provide you with comments related to the May 6, 2021 draft of the City of Barrie Official Plan. Our concerns noted are similar to those submitted by the Salem Landowners Group Inc., which includes the following:

- Overall, policies continue to be very prescriptive with lots of “shall” and very difficult to read and interpret. Official Plans are supposed to be guiding documents with “motherhood policies” and use more of “should” and “may”.
- The Official Plan has now been changed to require 79 persons and jobs per hectare

whereas it was 62 persons and jobs in the previous version. We noted previously that 62 was much too high and now it has been increased. In our opinion, the density should continue to mirror that as set out in the Growth Plan.

- As noted previously, the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas are not that old and are currently being implemented after being approved in 2016 by the OMB (now LPAT). Why remove all of these policies when only one current landowner has applied for an Official Plan Amendment in the Hewitt's Secondary Plan area? All other landowners have complied with the policies in the plan to seek their current approvals

- Section 2.4.2.3.c) – requires 52% of the housing mix to be high density within designated greenfield areas. What is the rationale behind this? Is the City working to no longer offer single detached, semi-detached and street townhouse dwelling units as a housing option within the Salem Secondary Plan area?
- Section 2.5.j) – requires a minimum of 10% of all new housing units to be affordable. In our view, this continues to be too high to achieve. A more achievable approach would be 5% of the total units across the city as a whole.
- Section 2.6.1.3.d) continues to require a min of 50% ground floor in low rise buildings to be non-res. The Watersand Draft Approved plan accommodates an 11 acre commercial block that will more than satisfy the commercial needs within the area. This should not apply to the Salem area.
- Section 2.6.1.3.e) i) and ii) – as noted previously, the minimum densities of 50 and 60 units per hectare are very high, especially compared to the current density ranges in the Salem and Hewitt’s Secondary Plans. The densities within the respective Secondary Plans should continue to be respected.
- 6.4.2.iii) – this policy should encourage the demonstration of affordable housing as opposed to requiring it.
- 6.4.2.iv) – min target of 10% of affordable units within medium and high-density residential designations continues to be too high. The standard should be 5% within these designations across the city.

As it relates to the draft maps, we are pleased to provide the following issues as it relates to the Watersand, Wormwood and Perthshire lands:

- Watersand Commercial Block is now designated as a Network Hub. Section 4.4.2.2.a advises the City Shall direct medium and high density development around these hubs. The commercial block does not have medium or high density residential uses nor does the surrounding land uses. As a result, and noted previously, this should be located on the east side of Veterans Drive along the Employment blocks. (Map 4A)
- As noted previously, Exell Avenue which is a proposed collector Road extending into the Watersand Phase 2 area (north of McKay Road West, west of Reid Drive), is not required as does not go anywhere. This should be shown as a local road in its place. (all maps)
- As noted previously, all maps have road configurations for the future employment (Watersand) and residential (Watersand) lands, with street names, that do not make sense in their makeup and should not be shown as the lands will not be developed in that format.
- A park is shown on the southside of Walker Street, immediately east of the NHS system which is not consistent with the draft approved plan of subdivision. (All maps)
- A park is not shown on the Watersand Phase 2 lands, north of McKay, west of Reid Drive (all maps).

We look forward to seeing the above noted changes reflected in the revised Official Plan. We also wish to be notified of any decisions of Council and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and

Housing related to the Official Plan. Lastly, we would be pleased to discuss this with you further, if required.

Yours truly,

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'KM', is positioned to the left of the typed name.

Keith MacKinnon BA, MCIP, RPPPartner

cc. Paolo Sacilotto – DG Group

cc. Alexa-Rae Valente – DG Group