



City of Barrie

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

Final Planning Committee

Tuesday, June 7, 2022

7:00 PM

Council Chambers/Virtual Meeting

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

For consideration by Barrie City Council on June 20, 2022.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor, J. Lehman at 7:02 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, B. Thompson
Committee Support Clerk, T. Maynard
Coordinator of Elections and Special Projects, T. McArthur
Deputy City Clerk, M. Williams
Director of Development Services, M. Banfield
Director of Economic and Creative Development, S. Schlichter
Director of Finance/Treasurer, C. Millar
General Manager of Community and Corporate Services, D. McAlpine
General Manager of Infrastructure and Growth Management, B. Araniyasundaran
Planner, L. Juffermans
Senior Planner, A. Gameiro
Senior Planner, C. Kitsemetry
Service Desk Generalist, K. Kovacs.

The Planning Committee recommends adoption of the following recommendation(s) which were deal with on the consent portion of the agenda:

SECTION "A"

22-P-027

DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION EXTENSION POLICY

1. That staff be directed to delete Council Motions 86-P-27 and 09-G-286 and that the procedure regarding the extension of Draft Approved Plans of Subdivision be approved and added to the Council Policy Manual as attached as Appendix "A" to Staff Report DEV016-22.
2. That the change comes into effect for applications for draft plan of subdivision extension received after June 30, 2022. (DEV016-22)

This matter was recommended (Section "A") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 6/20/2022.

22-P-028

APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT - 157 ARDAGH ROAD (WARD 6)

1. That the Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by Innovative Planning Solutions, on behalf of Data Tamer Inc. (c/o Michael Lato), to rezone the lands known municipally as 157 Ardagh Road from 'Residential Single Detached Dwelling Second Density' (R2) to 'Residential Multiple Dwelling First Density' (RM1), be approved.
2. That the written and oral submissions received relating to this application, have been, on balance, taken into consideration as part of the deliberations and final decision related to the approval of the application, and as identified within Staff Report DEV018-22.
3. That pursuant to Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act*, no further public notification is required prior to the passing of the by-law. (DEV018-22) (File: D30-027-2021)

This matter was recommended (Section "A") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 6/20/2022.

The Planning Committee met for the purpose of the three Public Meetings at 7:04 p.m.

Mayor Lehman advised the public that any concerns or appeals dealing with the applications that were the subject of the Public Meeting should be directed to the Legislative and Court Services Department. Any interested persons wishing further notification of the staff report regarding the applications were advised to contact the Legislative and Court ServicesDepartment at cityclerks@barrie.ca.

Mayor Lehman confirmed with the Director of Development Services that notification was conducted in accordance with the Planning Act.

SECTION "B"

22-P-029

APPLICATIONS FOR AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT - 320 BAYFIELD STREET (FILE: D30-007-2022) (WARD 4)

Nick Woods of Corbett Land Strategies Inc. advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting is to review applications for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment on behalf of 320 Bayfield Holdings Inc. for lands known municipally as 320 Bayfield Street, Barrie. The parcel is 12.2 hectares (30.3 acres) in area, with frontage of 284 metres (931 feet) along Bayfield Street, 522 metres (1712 feet) along Coulter Street and 57 metres (187 feet) along Glenwood Drive and is currently occupied by a commercial shopping centre, referred to as the Bayfield Mall.

Mr. Corbett discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- The background of the development proposal;
- The site context of the subject lands;
- Illustrations depicting the current site location;
- The development proposal;
- The conceptual site plan, elevations and renderings for the subject lands;
- The current and proposed Official Plan designation for the subject lands;
- The current and proposed Zoning By-law designation for the subject lands;
- A summary of the Neighbourhood meeting comments related to the development proposal;
- The rationale for amendments to Official Plan and Zoning By-law for site location; and
- The next steps in the project.

Logan Juffermans, Planner provided an update concerning the status of the application. He reviewed the public comments received during the neighbourhood meeting. He advised that the primary planning and land use matters are currently being reviewed by the Technical Review Team. Mr. Jufferman discussed the anticipated timelines for the staff report regarding the proposed application.

Ward 4 Deputy Mayor, B, Ward asked a number of questions of Mr. Woods and City staff and received responses

VERBAL COMMENTS:

No verbal comments were received.

WRITTEN COMMENTS:

1. Correspondence from Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority dated May 27, 2022.

This matter was recommended Section "B" to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/20/2022.

22-P-030

APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT - 651, 655, 659, 669 AND 673 MAPLEVIEW DRIVE EAST (FILE: D30-011-2022) (WARD 9)

Katherine Rauscher of MHBC Planning Ltd. advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting is to review an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment on behalf of Sobeys Developments Ltd. Partnership and Sobeys Capital Incorporated for lands known municipally as 651, 659, 655, 669 and 673 Mapleview Drive East.

Ms. Rauscher discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- The site location for the proposed development;
- The site context for the subject lands;
- The current Official Plan designation for the subject lands;
- The new Official Plan designation for the subject lands;
- The Zoning By-law designation for the subject lands;
- The proposed Zoning By-law Amendments;
- The proposed development for the site location;
- A rendering of the proposed elevation for the subject lands;
- The Landscape Plans; and
- The application's alignment with Provincial Policy, Growth Plan and focus of design.

Celeste Kitsemetry, Senior Planner 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. Kitsemetry discussed the anticipated timelines for the staff report regarding the proposed application.

Ward 9 Councillor, S. Morales asked a number of questions of Mr. Rauscher and City staff and received responses.

VERBAL COMMENTS:

No verbal comments were received.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE:

No written correspondence was received.

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/20/2022.

Mayor, J. Lehman left the Chair at 7:38 p.m. and Deputy Mayor, B. Ward assumed the Chair.

SECTION "C"

22-P-031

APPLICATION FOR A ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT - 19 DUNDONALD STREET, BARRIE (FILE: D30-026-2021) (WARD 2)

Mayor Lehman declared a potential pecuniary interest concerning the foregoing matter as his parents live in close proximity to the proposed development. He did not participate or vote on the matter. He left the Council Chambers.

M. Prowse, Chief Executive Officer declared a potential pecuniary interest concerning the foregoing matter as he lives in close proximity to the proposed development. He did not participate in discussion related to the proposed development. He stayed in the Council Chambers.

James Hunter of Innovative Planning Solutions advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting is to review an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment Inc. on behalf of Pat and John Hargreaves for lands known municipally as 19 Dundonald Street.

Mr. Hunter discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- The existing site context and surrounding land uses; ·
- Illustrations depicting the current site location;
- The aerial context of the site location;
- The development proposal and architectural renderings for the subject

lands;

- Visual models of the location and context for the subject development
- The Official Plan designation for the subject lands;
- An overview of the Official Plan for the site location;
- The current and proposed rezoning for the development proposal
- The required and proposed By-law Conformity;
- The studies completed in support of the application;
- The Shadow Analysis study completed for the proposed development; and
- The next steps in the project.

Andrew Gameiro, Senior Planner for the Development Services Department provided an update concerning the status of the application. He reviewed the public comments received during the neighbourhood meeting. He advised that the primary planning and land use matters are currently being reviewed by the Technical Review Team. Mr. Gameiro discussed the anticipated timelines for the staff report regarding the proposed application.

Ward 2 Councillor, K. Aylwin asked a number of questions of Mr. Hunter and City staff and received responses.

VERBAL COMMENTS:

1. Charles Biehn, 49 Theresa Street discussed his written analysis of the traffic report for the proposed development on Dundonald Street. Mr. Biehn highlighted some of the main issues regarding the inaccuracies of traffic counts in previous reports, safety issues, the construction phase and parking vehicles and equipment on a narrow road, pedestrian traffic with no sidewalks, bicycle parking, in addition to the safety concerns of riding a bicycle on the hill and having to share the road with vehicular traffic. He expressed his opinions that the conclusions and recommendations made within the staff report need to be revisited.

Mr. Biehn described the new Official and policies related to new developments and noted they have to be no more than three storey buildings in an area with roads similar to Dundonald Street. He indicated that currently there are twenty-one development projects anticipated in the City of Barrie. He commented that he felt that this proposed development is not needed to meet the intensifications targets of the City.

Mr. Biehn expressed his opinion that the proposed development is too large for the site and would be better suited for something within the policies of the Official Plan that would be more appropriate for the neighbourhood. He indicated that the neighbours are in the process of hiring their own planner and all responses will be directed to them.

2. Beth Foster, 30 Amelia Street described the community of trees on Dundonald Street. Ms. Foster discussed the need for more green

spaces, the benefits of having trees, as well as the benefits that trees bring such as carbon dioxide, oxygen intake and trees as a necessity. She indicated that the Official Plan identified 19 Dundonald as a significant woodlot that contained two level three natural heritage features that is a potential habitat for an endangered and threatened species.

Ms. Foster discussed the Tree Inventory/Assessment and Preservation Plan/Removal Plan prepared by Riverstone Environmental Solutions Inc., which indicated that the existing trees on the property would be negatively impacted. Ms. Foster advised that Council should maintain the integrity of the City's Official Plan.

3. Cathy Colebatch, 97 Cumberland Street echoed the previous speakers comments. Ms. Colebatch discussed the Heritage Neighbourhood Evaluation Report for the property and how it is lacking details on the history of the house and lands for 19 Dundonald Street. She suggested that a Heritage Impact Assessment be completed for the property.
4. Anne Marie Dixon, 10 Highland Drive spoke on behalf of her husband and their neighbours against the proposed development at 19 Dundonald Street. Ms. Dixon expressed their concerns for the excessive height of the proposed development, the ongoing construction projects around the City, the geographical difficulties of Dundonald Street, the existing restrictions related to the intensification area, the effects of traffic on the street, the lack of sidewalks, the hill during winter conditions, and the poor visibility for vehicles and pedestrian traffic on the hill.
5. Nadine Carr, 49 Theresa Street echoed the concerns of the previous speakers regarding the proposed development at 19 Dundonald Street and commented on the need to preserve farmlands. Ms. Carr described that the property is not within the intensification zone of the New Official Plan and that the site is situated in an historical neighbourhood. She commented that she felt that the proposed development should be scaled down for the property.
6. Brian Wood, 250 Codrington Street discussed the similarities in opposition to developments of 19 Dundonald Street and Johnson Street Beach, the number of storeys in the development, and his concerns for the increased number of cars.
7. Nick Lougheed, 52 Dundonald Street indicated that he is not opposed to the development of 19 Dundonald Street but is concerned with the type of development being proposed. Mr. Lougheed described the location of the development as fronting onto a local street and he indicated that the presentation from the Developer may have been misleading. He suggested that more weight needs to be put on correspondence submitted by residents who live in the Ward.

Mr. Loughheed suggested that the developers need to work within the scope of the Official Plan and engage with the neighbours of the proposed development.

8. Marc Brenner was called to speak, and there was no response.
9. Stephen deRusett, 12 Yonge Street indicated his inability to afford to live in Barrie and how he commutes to the municipality as there is a lack of affordable housing. Mr. deRusett described the lack of housing and the need for infill near the downtown cores and he stated that he felt that the proposed development would provide more housing opportunities for those that may not be able to afford a single detached home. He indicated that his only concerns of the development were the increase in parking spaces. He advised that a development close to downtown Barrie with all its amenities could potentially reduce vehicular traffic and increase active transportation, such as walking and riding bicycles.
10. Blake Edgar, 53 Idlewood Drive, Midhurst indicated that he supports the development but that he can't afford to live in Barrie and happens to live with family as there is not enough affordable housing. He expressed his opinion that there are too many parking spaces proposed in the development.
11. Chris Franco, 144 Puget Street described the location of his property as in close proximity to the proposed development and types of buildings in the area such as the Roxborough Condominiums. He provided a historical background of Barrie's population growth versus housing. He indicated that the municipality has had significant population growth.

Mr. Franco indicated the municipality needs more private dwellings and rental units to increase the housing stock in the municipality and provide an opportunity for more units on the marketplace. He emphasized that the municipality is in a housing shortage. Mr. Franco mentioned a comment made previously about "protect our area" and felt that this development is a potential gateway for someone to afford to live in Barrie.

Mr. Franco indicated that this proposal isn't about protecting an area, it's about protecting and providing housing and providing an opportunity for more people to move to the municipality and enjoy the beautiful City. He felt that there is a need to look beyond NIMBYism before a decision is made on the proposed development.

12. Peter Dauphinee, 33 Amelia Street described the area and advised that it is easy to look at NIMBYism for the neighbourhood. He described living in the neighbourhood for twenty-years in an area of the City he loves. Mr. Dauphinee indicated that suggestions have been provided to the developer in the hopes that there can be a

middle ground for this type of development. He advised that he is not opposed to the development of this property but only that needs to be reasonable in size and beautiful for the City. Mr. Dauphinee explained that property values change over time, but that is not how the municipality should plan for future developments.

13. Blythe Reina, 50 Eugenia Street explained that she moved to Barrie recently from Guelph. She questioned whether a proper risk assessment had been completed for the site location. She discussed concerns related to safety, traffic, and snow banks and snow removal for Eugenia Street and Dundonald Street and sightlines for the intersection at the top of the hill. She explained that she walks her children to school and has almost been hit by vehicles at the intersection of Eugenia Street and Dundonald Street. She asked about the impacts from construction of other developments in the area.
14. Megan Gibbons 124 Duckworth indicated that the Official Plan Amendment is not in keeping with policies and the growth area. She advised that she agrees there will be some development on this property. Ms Gibbons discussed concerns related to traffic, safety, roadways, curbs, gutters, stormwater run off, the scope of the Environmental Assessment related to habitat and century homes and woodlots. She suggested that the Environmental Impact should be revisited for the proposed development.
15. Donna Winfield, 58 Dundonald Street discussed concerns related to traffic at the intersection of Dundonald Street and Amelia Street. Ms. Winfield expressed her doubts concerning the affordability of the units within the proposed development and other developments already constructed or in the construction phase. She advised that she is in support of a development in the area that is within reason such as a four-storey development.
16. Barry Vickers, 78 Amelia Street echoed many of the comments made by the previous speakers. Mr. Vickers discussed the slope of Dundonald Street, the parkland and recreational spaces, the impact of the development on the health of the greenbelt and the future of the community. He questioned how a nine-storey building contributes to the urban fabric of a single and two-storey dwelling area.
17. Cathy Colebatch, 97 Cumberland Street spoke for the second time and discussed the approved but unbuilt developments within the City. She questioned the safety issues that prevented the development from proposing townhomes instead of a nine-storey development.
18. Joy Thompson, 71 Penetang Street described moving from Toronto, 30 years ago, because of the developments and the increase in population and crime. Ms. Thompson advised that once developments are built that they cannot be demolished. She

indicated her involvement with previous developments along Lakeshore Drive and Mulcaster Street and Collier Street that removed the grocery store. She expressed that the long-term effects for the City and its residents need to be considered before the short-term goals.

WRITTEN COMMENTS:

1. Correspondence dated May 16, 2022 from Dave Cumming.
2. Correspondence dated May 16, 2022 from David Won.
3. Correspondence dated May 21, 2022 from Chris Dixon.
4. Correspondence dated May 23, 2022 from Thomas Mills.
5. Correspondence dated May 22, 2022 from Dina Wells.
6. Correspondence dated May 16, 2022 from Scott Campbell.
7. Correspondence dated May 30, 2022 from Brian Cullingford.
8. Correspondence from Charles Biehn.
9. Correspondence dated May 25, 2022 from Dale and Diane Loyst.
10. Correspondence dated May 27, 2022 from Donna Winfield.
11. Correspondence dated May 16, 2022 from Doug and Diane Eves.
12. Correspondence dated May 24, 2022 from Nick Loughheed.
13. Correspondence from Pat Cawley.
14. Correspondence dated May 25, 2022 from Joy Thompson.
15. Correspondence dated May 30, 2022 from Mike and Susan Laycock.
16. Correspondence dated June 1, 2022 from St. Mary's Church.
17. Correspondence dated May 29, 2022 from Jeannie Mills.
18. Correspondence from Nadine Carr.
19. Correspondence dated June 2, 2022 from Julie Dlugokecki.
20. Correspondence dated May 16, 2022 from Kim Thompson.
21. Correspondence dated May 14, 2022 from Sheraz and Mehek K.
22. Correspondence dated May 15, 2022 from Alexander Lefebvre.
23. Correspondence dated May 15, 2022 from Peter Cappucci.
24. Correspondence dated May 17, 2022 from Warren Beech.
25. Correspondence dated May 16, 2022 from Mark Henderson.
26. Correspondence dated May 20, 2022 from Sondra Yanchus.
27. Correspondence dated May 17, 2022 from Stacey Larmon.
28. Correspondence dated May 19, 2022 from Sabrina Savoia.
29. Correspondence dated May 20, 2022 from Dylan Yanchus.
30. Correspondence dated May 17, 2022 from Michelle Greco.
31. Correspondence from Omowunmi Talabi.
32. Correspondence from Ofei Ukanah.
33. Correspondence from Amy Fitzgerald.
34. Correspondence from Abby Waterhouse.
35. Correspondence from Andrew Waterhouse.
36. Correspondence from Bev Waterhouse.
37. Correspondence from Mike Waterhouse.
38. Correspondence dated May 20, 2022 from Jeremy Moore.
39. Correspondence dated May 27, 2022 from Tomas Sample.
40. Correspondence dated May 27, 2022 from Jonathan Waugh.
41. Correspondence dated May 29, 2022 from Maureen Carrel and Brian Tattersall.

42. Correspondence dated May 27, 2022 from Erica Sample.
43. Correspondence dated May 29, 2022 from Matt Baker.
44. Correspondence dated May 26, 2022 from Ryan Scott.
45. Correspondence dated May 28, 2022 from Ryan Davies.
46. Correspondence dated May 25, 2022 from Benjamin Hayes.
47. Correspondence dated May 20, 2022 from Simon Latham.
48. Correspondence from Joe Beleskey.
49. Correspondence from Sagar Dawar.
50. Correspondence dated June 6, 2022 from Matthew Follwell.

This matter was recommended Section "C" to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/6/2022.

The Planning Committee met and recommends adoption of the following recommendation:

SECTION "D"

22-P-032

APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT - 520 AND 526 BIG BAY POINT ROAD (WARD 8)

1. That the Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by Innovative Planning Solutions on behalf of Morriello Construction Limited to rezone the lands known municipally as 520 and 526 Big Bay Point Road from 'Residential Single Detached Dwelling First Density' (R1) to 'Residential Apartment Dwelling First Density - 2 with Special Provisions' (RA1-2)(SP-XXX), attached as Appendix "A" to Staff Report DEV017-22 be approved.
2. That the following Special Provisions for the 'Apartment Dwelling First Density - 2 with Special Provisions' (RA1-2)(SP-XXX) be referenced in the site specific zoning by-law:
 - a) Permit 1.24 parking spaces per residential unit, whereas 1.5 parking spaces per unit is required;
 - b) Permit a front yard setback of 6.0 metres, whereas a minimum setback of 7.0 metres is required;
 - c) Permit a landscaped open space of 26.1% whereas a minimum of 35% is required;
 - d) Permit a maximum gross floor area of 135%, whereas up to 100% is permitted;
 - e) Permit a maximum building height of 16.85 metres, whereas a maximum building height of 15.0 metres is permitted;

- f) Permit a maximum parking lot coverage for apartment dwellings of 45%, whereas a maximum of 35% is permitted;
 - g) Permit an apartment balcony projection of 2.2 metres, whereas a projection of 1.5 metres is permitted; and
 - h) Permit a landscaped buffer area for a parking area along the west lot line of 0.5 metres, whereas a landscaped buffer area of 3.0 metres is required.
- 3. That the written and oral submissions received relating to this application have been, on balance, taken into consideration as part of the deliberations and final decision related to the approval of the application as amended, and as identified within Staff Report DEV017-22.
 - 4. That the owner/applicant is required to negotiate community benefits as per Section 37 of the *Planning Act* as amended, to the satisfaction of the Director of Development Services at the time of Site Plan Control.
 - 5. That pursuant to Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act*, no further public notification is required to the passing of the by-law. (DEV017-22) (File: D30-006-2021)

This matter was recommended (Section "D") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 6/20/2022.

ENQUIRIES

A member of Planning Committee addressed an enquiry to City staff and received a response.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

CHAIRMAN