



City of Barrie

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

Final Affordability Committee

Wednesday, April 26, 2023

6:00 PM

Council Chambers/Virtual Meeting

AFFORDABILITY COMMITTEE REPORT

For consideration by General Committee on May 10, 2023.

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Councillor, J. Harris at 6:04 p.m. The following were in attendance for the meeting:

Present: 4 - Mayor, A. Nuttall
Deputy Mayor, R. Thomson
Chairman, C. Nixon
Councillor, J. Harris

ALSO PRESENT:

Councillor, C. Riepma
Councillor, A. Kungl
Councillor, A. Courser
Councillor, N. Nigussie
Councillor, G. Harvey
Councillor, S. Morales
Councillor, B. Hamilton.

STAFF:

Chief Administrative Officer, M. Prowse
City Clerk/Director of Legislative and Court Services, W. Cooke
Committee Support Clerk, T. Maynard
Deputy City Clerk, T. McArthur
Director of Economic and Creative Development, S. Schlichter
Director of Corporate Facilities, R. Pews
Director of Information Technology, R. Nolan
Director of Legal Services, I. Peters
Director of Operations, D. Friary
Director of Recreation and Culture Services, D. Bell
Executive Director of Access Barrie, R. James-Reid
General Manager of Community and Corporate Services, D. McAlpine
General Manager of Infrastructure and Growth Management, B. Araniyasundaran
Manager of Growth and Development, T. Thompson
Manager of Planning, C. McLaren

Senior Planner, A. Gameiro
Service Desk Generalist, K. Kovacs
Supervisor of Information Management and Privacy, M. Williams.

The Affordability Committee met for the purpose of three Public Meetings at 6:04 p.m. Councillor, J. Harris advised the public that any concerns or appeals dealing with the applications that were the subject of the Public Meetings should be directed to the Legislative and Court Services Department. Any interested persons wishing further notification of the Staff Reports regarding the applications were advised to sign the appropriate notification forms required by the Legislative and Court Services Department. Councillor Harris confirmed with the Manager of Growth and Development that notification was conducted in accordance with the Planning Act.

The Affordability Committee met and reports as follows:

**APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND DRAFT PLAN
OF SUBDIVISION - 259 SALEM ROAD AND 910 ESSA ROAD (WARD 7)
(FILE: D30-006-2023)**

Keith MacKinnon of KLM Planning Partners advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting is to review applications submitted by KLM Planning Partners Inc. on behalf of Watersand Construction Inc. for a Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision for land known municipally as 259 Salem Road and 910 Essa Road and located within the Salem Secondary Planning Area.

Mr. MacKinnon discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- An aerial view of the site location and surrounding lands;
- An overview of the Salem Secondary Plan, including historical land use designations of the subject lands;
- The site location's land use designations and phasing under the City's Official Plan;
- An overview of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment;
- A conceptual plan for the proposed development; and
- The studies, reports, and drawings completed for the applications.

Tiffany Thompson, Manager of Growth and Development, provided an update concerning the status of the application. She advised that the primary planning and land use matters are currently being reviewed by the Technical Review Team. Ms. Thompson discussed the anticipated timelines for the staff report regarding the proposed application.

Verbal Comments

Bryan White, 185 Salem Road, questioned whether water and sewer municipal servicing would be available for the properties located at 260 and 264 Salem Road and for those properties on the north side of Salem Road and inquired as to how the private lands that have been retained by property owners will be protected.

Ward 7, Councillor Harvey asked questions of Mr. MacKinnon and City staff and received responses.

Written Comments

Correspondence dated April 25, 2023, from Jonathan Watt.

APPLICATION FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION -500 SALEM ROAD (WARD 7) (FILE: D30-008-2023)

Tyler Kawall of Innovative Planning Solutions advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting is to review applications submitted by Innovative Planning Solutions Inc., on behalf of LSR Salem Inc., for a Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision for the property known municipally as 500 Salem Road, Barrie.

Mr. Kawall discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- An aerial view of the subject lands and site description;
- An overview of surrounding land uses;
- The site's land use designations under the City's Official Plan;
- The site's designations under the Salem Secondary Plan;
- The current Zoning of the subject lands;
- A timeline of the planning matters associated with the proposed development;
- The proposed development concept and the Draft Plan of Subdivision;
- The studies, reports, and drawings completed for the applications;
- The proposed development's compatibility with various policies, including the Salem Secondary Plan, greenfield residential and density targets, natural heritage system preservation, and the creation of mixed housing types; and
- A summary of the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment.

Andrew Gameiro, Senior Planner, provided an update concerning the status of the application. 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.

Verbal Comments

Mario Titus, 27 Toronto Street, sought clarification as to whether there would be another presentation regarding the proposed development and expressed concern regarding the lack of information presented during the public meeting.

Ward 7 Councillor, G. Harvey asked questions of Mr. Kawall and City staff and received responses.

Written Comments

Correspondence dated April 24, 2023 from MHBC Planning.

APPLICATION FOR AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT - 95 COOK STREET AND 103 AND 107 NAPIER STREET (WARD 1) (FILE: D30-007-2023)

Kyle Galvin of Innovative Planning Solutions advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting is to review applications submitted by Innovative Planning Solutions Inc. on behalf of 255605 Ontario Inc. for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for lands known municipally as 95 Cook Street, 103, and 107 Napier Street, Barrie.

Mr. Galvin discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- An aerial view of the site location, including total lot area and frontage;
- The land uses surrounding the site;
- The past and current designations under the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law;
- A draft Site Plan and overview of the proposed development;
- A preliminary development concept rendering illustrating the architectural styling of the proposed townhomes;
- An overview of the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments;
- The Traffic Analysis conducted and its findings; and
- The studies, reports, and drawings completed for the applications.

Andrew Gameiro, Senior Planner, provided an update concerning the status of the application. 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.

Verbal Comments

1. **Mandy Hillyard, 113 Cooke Street**, requested that City staff ensure that emergency vehicles can access the site. Ms. Hillyard requested that the developer be challenged to host a charette in the community to inform the development's design. She also requested that the developer consider dedicating two bungalow units for lower income seniors and two units to Habitat for Humanity. Ms. Hillyard concluded by requesting that Council challenge the planners and consultants for creativity with respect to the proposed development.
2. **Patricia and Timothy Roebuck, 101 Napier Street**, commented that she has lived directly beside 103 and 107 Napier Street and north of 95 Cook Street for 37 years. She stated that she is not against development but that it must be done ethically and respect the

existing neighbourhood. Ms. Roebuck expressed that she strongly opposes the proposed development as it is not compatible with the existing historic neighbourhood, the lack of comprehensive traffic study in the immediate area, the intensification proposed by way of reduced setbacks, the height in relation to existing neighbours, the total gross floor area, and inadequate parking in the development with the potential for overflow onto neighbourhood streets.

Ms. Roebuck noted that the site is in the historic East End neighbourhood, which is multi-generational with mixed types of housing and tenure, and where residents respect each other's privacy and enjoyment of property. She commented that the neighbourhood contains bungalows with residents who have lived there for decades and are looking forward to aging in place.

Ms. Roebuck expressed concerns with respect to the Traffic Study and questioned whether the study is representative of the peak rush hour traffic volumes as it was conducted at the beginning of Christmas holidays. She questioned why the intersecting streets of Napier Street and Codrington Street were not included in the study and expressed concern for the safety of elderly residents, and families with children who walk or cycle past the site to go to work, school, or the lakeshore. She noted that the study didn't address pedestrian safety with the influx of cars that are expected to be introduced to the neighbourhood because of the proposed development.

Ms. Roebuck expressed concern regarding the requested setback reduction. She commented that the proposed exceptions to the front and rear yard setbacks represent a reduction of 57 percent and 71 percent respectively. She expressed concern with the reduced setback's impact on the neighbouring properties and the loss of privacy resulting from two or three storey structures looking onto neighbouring backyards. Ms. Roebuck expressed further concerns with respect to the request for tandem parking and the potential for overflow parking on congested city streets.

Ms. Roebuck expressed concern regarding the destruction of vegetation and mature trees at the site of the proposed development. She commented that the developer destroyed the urban forest in the Summer of 2021 by chopping down mature trees and destroying the home and refuge of many species. Ms. Roebuck questioned where the concern is from the developer with respect to the conservation, sustainability, and quality of life for residents in the neighbourhood now that Barrie is certified as a Bird Friendly City.

Ms. Roebuck concluded by questioning how the City balances the requests of existing residents with the desire to add more households in neighbourhoods by cutting back on green space. She expressed concern with the intensification proposed for the site and questioned why it needed to occur in the neighbourhood when so much

development is already being proposed for downtown Barrie that hasn't involved the destruction of wooded areas and quiet neighbourhoods. Ms. Roebuck commented that the proposed development will change the character of neighbourhood forever and that existing residents have expressed the desire to move as a result. Ms. Roebuck urged Council to deny the development application.

3. **Margaret Williams, 94 Napier Street**, expressed concern over what is happening to the East End of Barrie. Ms. Williams noted that a key determinant of people's happiness worldwide is that their concerns are listened to and that their values are reflected in government policy. She questioned whether residents were heard when the development at Cook Street and Highland Avenue was constructed, or the development at corner of Lakeview and Codrington Streets.

Ms. Williams commented that the neighbourhood is not the 400 corridor at Canada's Wonderland where large homes are built on small lots. She stated that the developer is presenting a similar proposal for the site and expressed concern over the request to reduce the rear and front yard setback by half of the standard. Ms. Williams commented that there are currently 32 proposed building sites in Ward two that will result in 6000 additional units, and questioned whether it is necessary to have high density housing in this neighbourhood when there are 10 wards in the city.

Ms. Williams commented that the residents love and respect their greenspace and questioned whether the homeowners adjacent the property will be compensated for the lost value on their homes where mature trees have already been destroyed. She expressed concern that the requested changes represent the beginning of the end of residents' greenspace and questioned whether traffic signals would be installed, and the roads expanded to four lanes. Ms. Williams concluded by stating that she hopes the voices of residents are heard.

4. **Kelly Roth, 20 Weldon Street**, expressed that the proposed development is aggressive and infringes on the lives of East End residents. Ms. Roth commented that the East End of Barrie has been identified as a historical area in the City's Official Plan due to its historical neighbourhood groupings of buildings, its streetscape, and character. She noted that a Historical Character Impact Evaluation could have been completed to ensure the protection of the neighbourhood.

Ms. Roth noted concerns regarding the development's total area, site configuration, reduced setbacks, and building type, height, and massing. She commented that the reduced setbacks will result in encroachment on neighbours. Ms. Roth expressed concern with respect to the disruptive nature of student housing and the potential for increased traffic in the area.

Ms. Roth commented that the development proposes substantial changes to the property and that the request for a RM2 designation from institutional use is not appropriate for the area as it does not fit the existing character of the East End. She stated that the Official Plan states that streetscapes and trees should be protected in a historical neighbourhood and noted that no measures were taken to preserve the mature trees in the area which were destroyed to maximize profit. Ms. Roth stated that the East End is considered a prestigious and sought-after neighbourhood in part because of its mature trees and that the value of adjacent properties will be reduced by their destruction.

Ms. Roth expressed concern regarding the safety of children walking to and from school and playing on the sidewalks and streets. She noted that the City acknowledged the speeding issue in the neighbourhood by adding speed cushions on Codrington Street. She commented that one of the Official Plan's founding principles is to manage and direct growth to ensure safe communities. Ms. Roth noted she is extremely concerned about the safety of children in the neighbourhood.

Ms. Roth commented that residents have received backlash from the developer and have received letters stating that their fences will be removed and replaced at a reduced length from the property line. She stated that residents have sought legal advice which has indicated that the residents are the rightful owners of land as they have occupied the land for the last 45 years. Ms. Roth commented that losing the land and the destruction of majestic mature trees is devastating. Ms. Roth concluded by applauding the preservation of the church space for community use and requested that the site be rezoned to allow five townhomes and that the preservation and appeal of the City's East End be considered in the decision.

5. **Lisa Henderson and Chris Sherry, 98 Napier Street**, commented that she agrees with the comments made by the previous speakers. She stated she moved from Toronto to Barrie in 2010 to start a family and that the decision to come to Barrie was for more greenspace, less traffic, and safety. Ms. Henderson expressed concern with the traffic studies conducted and questioned whether the parking spaces per unit include the garages. She stated that garages often become overflow storage and that this could result in overflow parking on neighbourhood streets. Ms. Henderson expressed safety concerns for children walking to Codrington Public School because of the increased traffic in the neighbourhood and questioned whether these factors were considered in the Traffic Study.
6. **Jorg Enderlein, 302 Codrington Street**, commented that a 90 percent build-up on the property is not feasible. He expressed concern with the proposed front yard setback of three metres and noted that this is not feasible or functional. Mr. Enderlein expressed concern that the proposed reduced setbacks will turn the street into a

back alley prone to the social issues already present in the City and turn the area into a ghetto. Mr. Enderlein requested that Council respect the law that is currently in place and noted that the City's planning policies should be more functional than having developers request a high number of amendments.

7. **Gary Bell, 365 Codrington Street**, commented that he attended the Neighbourhood Meeting and spoke in support of infill redevelopment that is ground oriented. He noted that the proposed development townhomes are good in the concept as the site is currently vacant, underused, and is important and well-known in the area. Mr. Bell stated that he agrees with the comments that have been made by previous speakers.

Mr. Bell expressed concern with the proposed Zoning By-law amendments. He stated that most of the proposed rear yard setbacks do not comply with the R2 zoning standard of seven metres and stated that this will have a negative impact on privacy and compatibility with the surrounding neighbours. Mr. Bell also expressed concern with the proposed reduced front yard setback of three metres onto Cook Street as this does not respect the existing setback of neighbours and will block their view down the street. Mr. Bell requested that any exception to the setbacks be carefully considered.

Mr. Bell noted that the proposed development is requesting tandem parking and that it will be a very busy property. He expressed concern with the Gross Floor Area (GFA) of the development in comparison to the property and noted that the proposal is 1.5 times the permitted GFA. Mr. Bell expressed that the proposed development is overly massive and non-compliant with City policies and that the cumulative effect of the exceptions being sought is a development that does not respect the nature and character of the existing neighbourhood. Mr. Bell requested that Council reject the proposed Zoning By-law amendment and require the developer to redesign the project to comply with the RM2 zoning standards and the Official Plan for a low-impact infill development that is compatible with the scale, height, massing, and character of the local area.

Mr. Bell concluded by stating that the project should conform and comply with what the City wants and not the other way around. He expressed that it is not appropriate to design a project and then ask for a by-law change after. Mr. Bell stated that the City's standards and policies should be followed and that the development should not be approved at the cost of existing neighbourhood residents and good city planning. He expressed support for a charette being held to improve the proposal without an appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal.

8. **Trevor Cooper, 32 Wellington Street**, stated that he agrees with the comments that have been made by previous speakers. He noted that

Georgian College is in the same Ward as the proposed development and fears that it could be turned into student housing by future landlords. Mr. Cooper expressed concern that the proposed development will create housing with issues that the City does not know how to deal with yet.

9. **Michael Speers, 108 Cook Street**, expressed concern with the Traffic Study and the planning application as a whole and requested that it be rejected. Mr. Speers noted that an institutional designation has been designated for a building whose use has not yet been confirmed. He expressed concern that parking requirements for this structure have not been identified due to the unknown future use of the building. Mr. Speers commented that the Traffic Study was conducted under the assumption that this structure would become a childcare facility and stated that if the use changes the Traffic Study will be void and another one should be conducted.

Mr. Speers expressed concern with the requested setback reduction and the impact it will have on sightlines and the safety of pedestrians and children walking to and from school. He noted that a 300 percent increase in traffic on Cook Street is expected and expressed concern that reduced setbacks will create health and safety risks to pedestrians. Mr. Speers concluded by stating that he was a Paramedic in the City for 31 years and that pedestrian versus car interactions do not end well for adults and especially children.

10. **Dragan Kosanovic, 102 Cook Street**, commented that he lives directly across the street from the proposed development. Mr. Kosanovic expressed concern with the amount of traffic coming and going from the site and questioned why there is only one access point into the property. He expressed that this has the potential to create congestion and safety concerns and requested that this be reviewed. Mr. Kosanovic concluded by questioning why the proposal shows a full church at the site and noted that the structure has already been demolished.

11. **Peter Koetsier, 51 Highland Avenue**, stated that he agrees with the comments that have been made by previous speakers and that he would like to echo everything that has been said. Mr. Koetsier noted that a portion of the development is being referred to as two storeys in height but that these units are split-level structures that stand between two and a half to three storeys in height. He expressed concern that the applicant is requesting RM2 Zoning, but that the proposal exceeds the RM2 standards by 50 percent.

Mr. Koetsier expressed concern with the reduced setbacks being requested and urged City staff and Council to seriously consider the exceptions being requested. Mr. Koetsier stated that the proposed development is not compatible with the Official Plan which states that developments must be compatible with the scale, height, massing,

and character of the surrounding neighbourhood. He questioned why a Zoning By-law and Official Plan are in place if exceptions such as those being proposed can be made. Mr. Koetsier concluded by urging Council to respect the City's existing planning policies.

12. **Justina Debney, 96 Cook Street**, commented that she would like to reiterate the comments already made by previous speakers. Ms. Debney noted that safety is her top priority as she has a family with young children. She acknowledged that development would occur but expressed concern that profit is superseding ethics and the safety of the community. Ms. Debney expressed concern for the safety of children walking to and from school during peak hours of the day and noted that the proposed development will result in increased traffic in the neighbourhood.

Ms. Debney commented that the developer found it more advantageous to pay a fine for destroying trees rather than pay for the permit and suggested that this speaks to the morality of the developer. Ms. Debney acknowledged the impacts of provincial policy on City planning and the importance of affordable housing but indicated that the proposed development appears to be about profit. She requested that the City take responsibility and stand up for the safety of children in the community. Ms. Debney questioned what the developer and City will do to ensure the safety of children going to and from school and questioned whether traffic signals or stop signs will be installed and whether roads will be expanded to four lanes of traffic.

Ms. Debney noted that the site has become an eye sore with the back of the property becoming a dumping area for soil and other types of waste and suggested that this is indicative of the moral standing of the developer. Ms. Debney concluded by stating that the application should and must be rejected.

13. **Blair White, 296 Codrington Street**, commented that he wishes to reinforce the concerns expressed by residents so far. Mr. White stated that projects like the proposed development should not be approved. He noted that in all the documentation submitted to justify the project, there was no recommendation to redesign or reject the project. Mr. White suggested that the developer is paying for studies to tell the Committee what it needs to hear to receive approval to break planning policies that the residents want to be upheld.

Mr. White expressed his opinion that the developer is providing opinions but not facts regarding the proposed development. He commented that the old East End Neighbourhood does not contain one building with more than two units and questioned how the proposed development will fit within the existing neighbourhood given this fact. Mr. White questioned the developer's claims that the proposed development will be enhanced through site building and

design and that it is an appropriate scale for the existing neighbourhood. Mr. White commented that the developer has stated that they are interested in feedback and collaboration to find common ground with existing residents but that this is not true as he has not been consulted even though the development proposes to construct 12 units in his backyard.

Mr. White commented that he expressed concerns at the Neighbourhood Meeting with respect to the proposed development's density and parking but that these concerns were not taken seriously by the developer as they are not required to consult with residents. Mr. White expressed concern that there have been no meaningful changes to the proposal resulting from the meeting and comments provided last year. Mr. White noted that the Arborist's Report contained a recommendation to consult with adjacent property owners over the removal of trees, however, no consultation has taken place. Mr. White expressed concern that the developer is not guided by their own recommendations.

Mr. White noted that the City's Official Plan states that the proposed development must be a good fit within the existing neighbourhood and questioned how this standard will be met by the proposed development. He commented that he trusts the City and its elected officials to uphold its commitments to the residents of the City. Mr. White concluded by asking Council to uphold the City's planning policies.

14. **Creighton Vermeer, 97 Napier Street**, commented that he lives in the area with his wife and young son and that he wishes to reiterate the concerns being voiced by his neighbours. Mr. Vermeer expressed concern regarding the number of amendments and size of the exceptions being requested and stated that this seems unreasonable as the exceptions being sought are over 50 percent of the current standard. Mr. Vermeer questioned whether the number of amendments being sought indicates that the proposal should be rethought.

Mr. Vermeer noted the request for tandem parking and questioned whether the two parking spaces include the garage. He expressed concern that many do not use the garage to park their vehicles and that the parking overflow onto the street will create safety issues for children walking to and from school. Mr. Vermeer also noted that the surrounding neighbourhood is mostly bungalows and that the proposed development is overly aggressive and not in keeping with the character of the community.

Mr. Vermeer concluded by requesting that Council adhere to the City's planning policies and be firm with the developer. He requested clarification regarding the next steps in the application process, including the timing and what will happen with the public comments provided.

Ward 1 Councillor, C. Riepma asked questions of Mr. Galvin and City staff and received responses.

Written Comments

1. Correspondence from Ministry of Transportation dated March 30, 2023.
2. Correspondence from Angela Andrews dated April 11, 2023.
3. Correspondence from a Petition of Residents dated April 16, 2023.
4. Correspondence from Lisa Henderson dated April 17, 2023.
5. Correspondence from Mark Handy dated April 17, 2023.
6. Correspondence from Patricia Cross dated April 17, 2023.
7. Correspondence from Dragan Kosanovic dated April 17, 2023.
8. Correspondence from Dan Fox dated April 17, 2023.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

CHAIRMAN