



City of Barrie

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

Minutes - Final Planning Committee

Tuesday, February 2, 2021

7:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

GENERAL COMMITTEE REPORT

For consideration by Barrie City Council on February 22, 2021.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Lehman at 7:01 p.m. The following were in attendance for the meeting:

Present: 10 - Mayor, J. Lehman
Deputy Mayor, B. Ward
Councillor, C. Riepma
Councillor, K. Aylwin
Councillor, A. Kungl
Councillor, R. Thomson
Councillor, G. Harvey
Councillor, J. Harris
Councillor, S. Morales
Councillor, M. McCann

Absent: 1 - Councillor, N. Harris

STAFF:

Chief Administrative Officer, M. Prowse
City Clerk/Director of Legislative and Court Services, W. Cooke
Committee Support Clerk, T. Maynard
Committee Support Clerk, T. McArthur
Deputy City Clerk, C. Swan
Director of Information Technology, R. Nolan
Director of Development Services, M. Banfield
General Manager of Community and Corporate Services, D. McAlpine
General Manager of Infrastructure and Growth Management, A. Miller.

The Planning Committee met for the purpose of a Public Meeting at 7:02 p.m.

Mayor Lehman advised the public that any concerns or appeals dealing with the application that were the subject of a Public Meeting should be directed to the Legislative and Court Services Department. Any interested persons wishing further notification of the Staff Report regarding the application were advised to contact the Legislative and Court Services Department. Mayor Lehman confirmed with the Director of Development Services that notification was conducted in accordance with the Planning Act.

21-P-001**APPLICATION FOR A ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT SUBMITTED BY INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS ON BEHALF OF 407-419 MAPLEVIEW INC. (ENCORE GROUP) - 407, 411, 413, 417 AND 419 MAPLEVIEW DRIVE WEST (WARD 7) (FILE: D30-003-2020)**

Vanessa Simpson of Innovative Planning Solutions advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting is to review an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment on behalf of 407-419 Maplevue Inc. (Encore Group) for lands known municipally as 407, 411, 413, 417 and 419 Maplevue Drive West, and within the Holly Planning Area.

Ms. Simpson discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- The existing site context and streetscape of the subject lands;
- Aerial photographs illustrating the evolution of the Holly Community from 1989 to 2018;
- The proposed Essa/Maplevue Development;
- A summary of similar developments outside the intensification areas;
- The built form, density and height ranges and parking ratios associated to the proposed development;
- The community comments and concerns raised at the neighbourhood meeting;
- The modifications to the application in response to community feedback;
- The original and revised site plans submitted with the application;
- Photographs illustrating the rear boundary trees and the trees to remain;
- The supporting studies and policies submitted with the application; and
- The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.

Michelle Banfield, Director of Development Services provided an update concerning the status of the application. She reviewed the public comments received during the neighbourhood meeting. She advised that the primary planning and land use matters are currently being reviewed by the Technical Review Team. Ms. Banfield discussed the anticipated timelines for the staff report regarding the proposed application.

VERBAL COMMENTS:

1. **Anna Maria Del Col, 37 Redfern Avenue** advised that she is strongly opposed to the proposed development. She discussed sections of the City's Official Plan and advised that she believes the development does not conform with such as the scale and physical

character of the development; it must respect and reinforce the existing physical character and uses of the surrounding area, setback of buildings from the street, the pattern of rear and side-yard setbacks, and keeping the mature trees and general landscape character of the existing streetscape. Ms. Del Col further provided an overview on the existing neighbourhood, particularly on Redfern Avenue and Maplevue Drive of the subject lands. She commented on the current character of the neighbourhood such as residential single-family homes, large yards, and lots of beautiful, enormous, mature trees.

Ms. Del Col discussed her concerns with the Arbor Report submitted by the developer and that in her opinion, is full of inconsistencies such as trees being marked in fair condition are slated to be removed, and other trees marked in poor or marginal condition are being preserved, trees are being removed due to a conflict with the proposed development, and the preservation or removal, and aesthetic value is defined only in relation to the proposed development. Ms. Del Col noted her concerns with the developer not taking the concerns and requests made by area residents at the neighbourhood meeting into consideration including the need to preserve the enormous twin maples that are close to the fence line, that tower over the entire neighbourhood, and how their loss to the streetscape would greatly impact the community. She questioned whether it would be beneficial for the neighbourhood to commission its own arbor report to be used to support the argument for preserving as many of these mature trees as possible and whether City staff review the arbor reports to ensure they are interpreted correctly and fairly. Ms. Del Col advised that she feels a significant level of mistrust in the developer behind this proposal and that trees are just one example of how they say they listened have to concerns but are making the barest of concessions.

In closing, Ms. Del Col noted the personal and emotional nature of what this development means to City residents, a neighbourhood of dream homes, retirement homes, wide streets, big yards, and lots of mature trees. She asked that Council take this decision seriously when considering the proposed development and how it will impact the community and their lives.

2. **Andrew Zvanitajs, 37 Redfern Avenue** provided a presentation regarding his opinion on the potential safety concerns surrounding the proposed development. He discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- Mr. Zvanitajs background as a retired firefighter, paramedic and Deputy Fire Chief;
- The proposed design of the development;
- The safety concerns associated to the design of the development and rescue challenges for emergency services;

- An aerial view of the subject lands and surrounding areas;
- The Review of the Site Plan and design challenges for emergency vehicles;
- An example of a fire in 2019 on Edgehill Drive that tapped all City resources for a 12 unit building and the damage surrounding homes; and
- The existing firefighting resources in the south end of Barrie not meeting NFPA standards for a fire in this size of a building.

In conclusion, Mr. Zvanitajs noted that this level of density and height is not conducive to the neighbourhood nor does it add to the safety and well-being of residents in the event of an emergency.

Councillor, S. Morales asked a question to Mr. Zvanitajs and received a response.

3. **Kapil Uppal, 43 Redfern Avenue** advised that he is in opposition to the proposed development, and that the community has mobilized and want to have a say with a petition signed by over 700 people. He commented on the proposed conversion of five single family homes into 72 homes, and the request for a rezoning from Residential to RM1 with special provisions. Mr. Uppal discussed the community's concerns at the neighbourhood meeting including concerns with height, density, traffic, parking, out of character, and is not in an area marked for intensification. He noted that not one person at the meeting supported the proposal nor did it inspire confidence that the developer and builder want to work with the community on a compromise. Mr. Uppal suggested that if the City's Official Plan policies are followed, he believes that a fair, just, and equitable solution for all parties impacted by this development can come together.

Mr. Uppal addressed further concerns with the proposal that included: privacy concerns to the surrounding homes with the proposed height and roof top patios, 75 units does not fit in that parcel of land, and a design of back-to-back townhomes is not in character with the neighbourhood. He suggested that the residents, the builder, developer and City staff engage in further discussion to find a solution that works for all parties.

In conclusion, Mr. Uppal asked Council and Planning staff to enforce the policies that are already in place to ensure a responsible development moves forward. He noted that he is not in support of the application and requested that it be denied.

4. **Joffre McLeary, 16 Dyer Boulevard** discussed his opposition to the proposed development. He advised that in his opinion this project is unnecessary, the proposed height, density and number of units does not fit on these lands and is not in character with the existing neighbourhood. Mr. McLeary noted that other municipalities like the City of Toronto would never allow a such a development in Forest

Hill, Rosedale, or the Beaches as they are recognized communities within the City of Toronto and Barrie should treat this area the same and protect the neighbourhood. He commented that this neighbourhood is a pleasant, healthy, and safe environment to raise children and should be protected. Mr. McLeary acknowledged his understanding that the Province requires that all municipalities increase density and is a necessary step to curb urban sprawl and protect farmland, however he indicated that the City of Barrie does not need to place large apartment complexes in the middle of homogeneous neighbourhoods which are functioning well.

In conclusion, Mr. McLeary stated that this development is simply unsupportable and takes away from the integrity of the neighborhood. He asked that City Council protect this neighbourhood, by not supporting this development.

5. **Chris Clarke, 56 Redfern Avenue** provided a presentation in opposition to the proposed development. He discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- Satellite images illustrating the subject lands for the proposed development and the surrounding residential lands;
- Satellite images illustrating the immediately impacted zone and the potential placement of the proposed development within the existing neighbourhood;
- The immediately impacted zone statistics and information associated with the proposed development and existing neighbourhood;
- The development does not meet the City's Official Plan policies according to scale and character;
- The proposed density exceeds all development guidelines;
- Privacy concerns of proposed rooftop patios to the existing neighbourhood; and
- A summary of the opposition points of the proposed development.

In conclusion, Mr. Clarke advised that the neighbourhood is in strong opposition to this development, have many concerns with the overall negative impacts that will result from this proposal, and sets a bad precedent. He urged Council and Planning staff to enforce the policies the City has already developed and do the right thing.

Councillor, S. Morales asked a question to Mr. Clarke and received a response.

6. **Dave Robinson, 41 Redfern Avenue** acknowledged that he was pleased to see that the developer has considered the use of brick on the development which he felt is more aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Robinson advised that Mapleview Drive is considered a main arterial road and that there is a portion of the road that has been widened to seven lanes, three lanes on each side with a center turning lane

passing and then farther down the road there is only four lanes which means vehicles are squeezing down to four lanes.

He discussed concerns that he felt that the numbers listed in the traffic survey from November do not jive with the amount of traffic during the summer months along Maplevue Drive, as people use this road as a crossover to travel to their cottages and to get around Barrie to avoid an already busy Highway 400 and Highway 27. He advised that on top of that traffic there is more development to the west, with the potential expansion of Highway 427 eventually coming to Barrie. Mr. Robinson stated that this stretch of Maplevue Drive should be widened to be the same as Maplevue Drive to the east. He suggested that with a proposed development of this size, a centre turning lane would be required with the amount of vehicles that would be coming in and out at that point. He stated that this project would mean providing the developer a variance of no frontage and no setbacks, which would negate any possibility of widening the road at that point, which is something that should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Robinson suggested that if the developer went back to two buildings rather than four buildings then he felt that this would be better for the size of the land without any kind of setback or any kind of variance for setback, because that property is needed for future planning and for widening Maplevue Drive.

7. **Janet Foster, 1 Parker Court** noted that she is a Registered Professional Planner and has been retained by the neighbourhood residents surrounding the subject lands. She advised that in her opinion the subject lands should not be rezoned RM2 SP as it is not compatible with the adjacent existing, established, low density residential neighbourhood character, is overshadowing, abrupt in the landscape and should be considered overdevelopment on the site.

Ms. Foster provided a detailed report associated to the existing established neighbourhood and surrounding areas, an overview on Provincial Policies and Growth Plan, and identified sections of the City's Official Plan policies and Zoning By-law that in her opinion this is not smart growth. She identified that a proposed development must be sensitive to and compatible with the character, form, and planned function of the surrounding context. Ms. Foster commented that consideration should be given to matters within the neighbourhood such as existing lot size, configuration, and patterns, building types and orientation, building heights and scale adjacent and immediately surrounding properties, and setbacks from the street, pattern of rear and side yards and general landscape streetscape. She advised that the neighbourhood residents have concerns with the parking and spillover on-street parking on Redfern Avenue, the built form would be an abrupt building form on the landscape along Maplevue Drive West between Essa Road and County Road 27, it would increase building height, increase density

through increased building lot coverage and unit count, and permit roof top patios and negatively impact the physical character of the existing neighbourhood.

Ms. Foster advised that the Applicant has entered discussions with the residents in order to address their concerns, however, both positions remain far apart. She further advised that the residents remain interested in further discussions and would like to see a revised plan that better reflects the residents' concerns, better adheres to City Official Plan policies and is more compatible and in keeping with the adjacent neighbourhood character.

Councillor, S. Morales asked a number of questions to Ms. Foster and received responses.

8. **Bill Koniuch, 38 Dyer Boulevard** explained that he is a long-time resident of Barrie and a professional engineer. He expressed concerns with the long-term plans for high density development versus existing neighbourhoods in the City. He noted that changing the by-law to move to a more dense zoning for an existing neighbourhood should be contingent on the developer expressing why this development would be good for the community, as the developer will only be here until the development is completed and the residents will have to live with the aftermath.

Mr. Koniuch described parallels to previous changes to this and other neighbourhoods, and the possible negative impact on items such as waterflow, trees, storm water management, septic systems, privacy, public safety and fire protection. He stated that what the developers are going to do is only to mitigate superficial problems and that these matters need to be more strongly considered from a scientific and engineering viewpoint, and the points suggested by Mr. Clarke should be forwarded to the Barrie Fire and Emergency Service Department and that the onus is on the City and to consider these issues and not the neighbourhood to provide all the details.

He advised the intent of intensification is not to plop developments into existing neighbourhoods, and suggested there are open spaces, even in the heart of the city, which have been identified for intensification nodes. He stated the onus should be on the developer to show the City and the neighbourhood why this development would be good for them and not the other way around. He advised that he has invested his life savings in the neighbourhood and that the developer has not, and once the development is complete, they will move on.

He explained that there are areas designated for higher growth that the neighbourhood had to already contend with and even if the residents are not going to win the battle, there is a need to control and preserve the variety of neighbourhoods. He acknowledged Mr. McLeary's comments concerning Toronto's unique neighbourhoods

that have been preserved and exist in a metropolitan area and considers Barrie to be no different. Mr. Koniuch stated that the development would destroy the fabric of the existing neighbourhood.

He expressed concerns over placing this high-density development at this location which would create difficulty in making a left hand turn onto Mapleview Drive. He explained that with the growth of communities to the west of Barrie and with potential expansion of Highway 427, there would be a problem for the City if there was a need to widen Mapleview Drive in the future.

He stated that this proposal does not consider future growth and is not in the best interest of the community, and the development skirts the intent and spirit of our by-laws and how we would like to see growth in the city.

Councillor, S. Morales asked a question to Mr. Koniuch and received a response.

Pursuant to Section 6.4 of the Procedural By-law 2019-100, Councillor, G. Harvey raised a point of order and requested that the nature of the questions remain for clarification purposes only to obtain the relevant information to the matter under discussion. Mayor J. Lehman requested that any further questions be stated succinctly, and questions not be used as a means of making statements or assertions.

9. **Robert Tigwell, 58 Redfern Avenue** advised that his property does not immediately back onto the proposed development. He commented how this process has reignited his appreciation of municipal leadership and politics, and commended the Council on stepping up to do the job they do as it is not easy. He noted that Council is the sober first thought and is thankful for that. Mr. Tigwell expressed that Council represents residents and not just in these small matters but by establishing the character of the City that everyone has invested in.

He commented on the time and effort spent by the residents and that the need for intensification has become a licence for developers to own the City. He stated that it is indicative of the developers to feel like they can ask for whatever they want and expect to get it. Mr. Tigwell requested a sober second thought based on the representation and stated he felt he needed to speak tonight in order to walk down the street.

10. **Michelle Renauld, 43 Dyer Boulevard** advised that besides being a resident, she is also a teacher at École secondaire Roméo-Dallaire located at 736 Essa Road and that she is doubly invested in this neighbourhood because she lives here with her family and has three elementary school-aged children who love the neighbourhood. She explained she disagrees that 70 plus units should be built on this

property which backs onto beautiful Redfern Avenue and the park where she frequently visits with her family, when there is no lockdown.

Ms. Renauld advised that she is concerned for the safety of her students at the school, who live and walk in the area and cross the already busy Maplevue Drive. She expressed that with the proposed development the traffic volumes would increase which has the potential to seriously harm one of her students. Ms. Renauld described that she teaches in a small school with approximately 240 students and that she considers these students like her own children.

Ms. Renauld explained that she had not initially planned to provide comments but after listening to the other speakers she felt it was necessary. She stated that if this development had been planned for your neighbourhood and you had young children and were invested in the neighbourhood, you would be doing the same thing.

In closing. Ms Renauld advised that she does realize there needs to be development but thinks there should be a different type of development for this land. She explained that she is not a Planner but as a parent and as a teacher who teaches in the neighbourhood, she does not think this development is the right solution.

WRITTEN COMMENTS:

1. Correspondence from Joffre McCleary dated January 10, 2021.
2. Correspondence from Gary and Nickolas Cyr dated January 10, 2021.
3. Correspondence from Chris Clarke dated January 12, 2021.
4. Correspondence from Diane Tompkins dated January 25, 2021.
5. Correspondence from Diane Tompkins dated January 25, 2021.
6. Correspondence from Diane Tompkins dated January 25, 2021.
7. Correspondence from Gary Litster dated January 25, 2021.
8. Correspondence from Diane Tompkins dated January 25, 2021.
9. Correspondence from Gisele Martin dated January 25, 2021.
10. Correspondence from Rick Tomkinson dated January 26, 2021.
11. Correspondence from Debbie Jones dated January 26, 2021.
12. Correspondence from Beryl and Alan Gibbs dated January 26, 2021.
13. Correspondence from Donald Johnston dated January 26, 2021.
14. Correspondence from Robert Higgs dated January 26, 2021.
15. Correspondence from Matt Nieforth dated January 27, 2021.
16. Correspondence from Linda Stephens dated January 27, 2021.
17. Correspondence from Pam Moss dated January 25, 2021.
18. Correspondence from Karen McCleary dated January 28, 2021.
19. Correspondence from Debbie Guyader dated January 28, 2021.
20. Correspondence from Joffre McCleary dated January 28, 2021.
21. Correspondence from Lucy Power dated January 28, 2021.
22. Correspondence from Amber Brain dated January 29, 2021.
23. Correspondence from Ingrid and David Long dated January 29, 2021.

24. Correspondence from Kapil Uppal dated January 31, 2021.
25. Correspondence from Ethel Noonan dated January 31, 2021.
26. Correspondence from Ethel Noonan dated January 31, 2021.
27. Correspondence from Janet Foster dated January 31, 2021.
28. Correspondence from Anna Maria Del Col dated January 31, 2021.
29. Correspondence from Ingrid and David Long dated January 31, 2021.
30. Correspondence from Andrew Zvanitajs dated January 31, 2021.
31. Presentation from Chris Clarke dated January 31, 2021.
32. Presentation from Andrew Zvanitajs dated January 31, 2021.
33. Correspondence from Simcoe County District School Board dated February 1, 2021.
34. Correspondence from the Gourlays dated February 1, 2021.
35. Correspondence from Glenn Bennett dated February 1, 2021.
36. Correspondence from Glenn Bennett dated February 1, 2021.
37. Correspondence from Pamela Preston dated February 1, 2021.
38. Correspondence from Allan Weishar dated February 2, 2021.
39. Correspondence from Cherylyn and John Cameron dated February 2, 2021.
40. Correspondence from Donna O'Neil dated February 2, 2021.
41. Correspondence from Wendy Hope dated February 2, 2021.

This matter was recommended to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 3/1/2021.

ENQUIRIES

Members of Planning Committee did not address any enquires to City staff.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

CHAIRMAN