



PLANNING AND BUILDING SERVICES MEMORANDUM

TO: MAYOR J. LEHMAN, AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL **File:** D14-1630/D09-OPA64

FROM: J. FOSTER, SENIOR PLANNER

NOTED: A. BOURRIE, RPP, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUILDING SERVICES
J. F. THOMPSON, P. ENG., CMM, PMP
GENERAL MANAGER OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT
(ACTING)
M. PROWSE, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

RE: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPLEMENTARY TO STAFF REPORT PLN024-17,
OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT – GROVE STREET
DEVELOPMENTS INC. (YMCA LANDS)

DATE: OCTOBER 23, 2017

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide members of Council with additional information regarding PLN024-17, Grove Street Developments Inc. (YMCA site), as requested at the General Committee meeting on October 16, 2017.

Zoning Holding (H) Provision vs Site Plan Conditions

In accordance with the Planning Act, Council may, in a by-law passed under Section 34, Zoning By-laws, use a Holding "H" provision in conjunction with any use designation and specify the use to which lands, buildings or structures may be put at such time in the future. The Holding symbol is removed by amendment to the By-law. When a holding provision is utilized, conditions are attached to the holding that must be satisfied in order to lift the holding. Therefore lands cannot be built upon or used for their intended purpose until such time as the conditions have been fulfilled and Council amends the zoning by-law to remove the holding provision.

The lands are subject to site plan control. The Planning Act, under Section 41, Site Plan Control, allows a municipality to approve a site plan with conditions that are required to be fulfilled prior to the registration of the site plan agreement. At the General Committee meeting on October 16th, Planning staff were asked to "Bump Up" the review of the site plan for Council approval. Therefore conditions of site plan approval will be by way of a Council approval.

Items such as the requirement for an easement along the easterly portion of the subject lands and the extension of a sidewalk on the north side of Grove Street could be made a condition of a holding provision or a condition of site plan approval.

A zoning holding provision does provide a higher level of municipal control over the use and development of a site. The use of a holding provision, does however, encumber the lands and extends the timeframe for approval as an amendment to the by-law is required to lift the hold.

Site plan conditions are most appropriate in dealing with the details of a development rather than the principle of development. The construction of a sidewalk on the north side of Grove Street and extending the turning taper on Grove Street are appropriate conditions at the site plan stage of development. A detailed traffic and pedestrian movement analysis can be undertaken as a condition of site plan approval. Given that the applicant does not own all lands required to facilitate a sidewalk and turning lane, acquisition may/will be required, where costs can be made a condition of site plan approval.

However, upon further consideration of Council's concerns regarding the securement of an above and below grade easement in order to provide the adjacent Bayfield Street properties opportunity for rear access and potential underground parking, staff feel, that in this instance, Council's concerns are legitimate in ensuring the securement of such easement at the zoning/land use stage of the planning process. Should Council desire to maintain control and protect for such future easement through the site specific zoning bylaw, paragraph 3 of Staff Report PLN024-17 would need to be amended to include a Holding "H" provision in the zoning bylaw. Such motion would read as follows:

3. That a Holding (H) provision be applied to the site, requiring the following conditions be cleared by the applicant:
 - a) A final land appraisal and determination of Community Benefit, completed to the satisfaction of the City of Barrie's Section 37 Negotiating Committee, prior to the rezoning of the site taking full force and effect.
 - b) A parking study illustrating that a parking ratio of 1 parking stall per 1 residential unit can be accommodated internally to the site without creating any spill over impacts on adjacent streets. The study will be required prior to the initiation of Phase 2 and completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Services and the Director of Engineering.
 - c) That the owner provide/grant an easement to the benefit/in favour of the property owners having frontage on Bayfield Street, adjacent to the subject lands, that provides above and below grade vehicular access and use to the properties fronting onto Bayfield Street, to be constructed by the owner of the subject lands, where such access to the lands under easement shall have access from a municipal right of way, to be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building Services and the Director of Engineering.

Traffic on Grove as a Result of Phase 1 of the Development

A Traffic Impact Study was completed for the proposed site. One of the scenarios that was completed was the expected units to be occupied while the YMCA is still in operation. Based on the phasing and scheduled construction of Phase 1, the expected occupancy of Phase 1 is 193 units while the YMCA was still operational on site. At General Committee, the owner identified 272 units would be built in Phase 1. Staff has confirmed through the owner that 193 units are proposed to be occupied in Phase 1 while the YMCA continues to be operational.

The total traffic generated by the subject site for the 193 units plus YMCA traffic scenario is 239 AM trips and 283 PM trips. Of this traffic volume, the proposed 193 units generate 69 AM trips and 88 PM trips. The existing YMCA traffic generates the other 170 AM trips and 195 PM trips. These values represent peak hour traffic, not traffic for the entire morning or afternoon. These numbers are calculated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers – Trip Generate Manual 9th Addition using Code High-Rise Apartment (222).

The analysis reviewed all vehicle movements to determine the level of service, the results are as follows:

Bayfield Street and Grove Street	Weekday AM Peak Hour					Weekday PM Peak Hour				
Movement	Volume to Capacity Ratio	Delay (sec.)	Level Of Service	95th % Queue (m)		V/C	Delay (s)	LOS	95th % Queue (m)	
				Model	Storage				Model	Storage



PLANNING AND BUILDING SERVICES MEMORANDUM

** Overall	0.58	32.9	C	-	-	0.63	25.6	C	-	-
Eastbound Left	0.23	16.2	B	22.9	20.0	0.41	25.0	C	30.9	20.0
Eastbound Through Right	0.09	14.6	B	14.7	-	0.12	20.5	C	19.6	-
Westbound Left	0.17	32.0	C	17.9	25.0	0.25	30.3	C	25.4	25.0
Westbound Through Right	0.36	34.9	C	40.0	-	0.50	34.7	C	58.4	-
Northbound Left	0.20	34.7	C	7.3	30.0	0.12	20.8	C	8.1	30.0
Northbound Through Right	0.63	35.6	D	70.8	-	0.75	30.2	C	109.4	-
Southbound Left	0.35	25.1	C	21.1	50.0	0.37	20.9	C	15.4	50.0
Southbound Through Right	0.83	35.1	D	125.7	-	0.59	19.2	B	87.4	-

The eastbound left turn storage length during PM peak hour is the critical movement as it exceeds the existing storage length, however this does not pose operational concerns as the vehicle storage can be accommodated in the 15 metre taper storage and will not impede the eastbound through/right movements. There is also an advanced left turn signal for eastbound left turn movement which provides a priority movement for vehicles to minimize delay.

Based on the results of the operational review, the intersection of Bayfield Street and Grove Street is operating at a sufficient Level of Service of C and staff do not foresee any operational or safety concerns. Please refer to the table below for a summary of the Level of Service Criteria.

Level of Service Criteria

LOS	LOS Description	Control Delay (Seconds per vehicle)
A	Very low delay; most vehicles do not stop (Excellent)	less than 10.0
B	Higher delay; more vehicles stop (Very Good)	between 10.0 and 20.0
**C	Higher level of congestion; number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many still pass through intersection without stopping (Good)	between 20.0 and 35.0
D	Congestion becomes noticeable; vehicles must sometimes wait through more than one red light; many vehicles stop (Satisfactory)	between 35.0 and 55.0
E	Vehicles must often wait through more than one red light; considered by many agencies to be the limit of acceptable delay	between 55.0 and 80.0



PLANNING AND BUILDING SERVICES MEMORANDUM

F	This level is considered to be unacceptable to most drivers; occurs when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection (Unacceptable)	greater than 80.0
---	--	-------------------

Another scenario that was analyzed was full build out of the site without the widening of Bayfield Street. Under this scenario, all intersections operated at acceptable levels, except for the Bayfield Street / Rose Street and Hwy 400 Ramp. These intersections are further removed from the development and had traffic delays without the proposed development. When the full build out of the development was added the situation remained virtually unchanged and as a result the delays at this intersection were unrelated to the proposed development. As a result it was concluded by Northcote Engineering and the City's Traffic Department that improvements were not required to accommodate the full build out of the subject lands.

Parking Study

Staff Report PLN024-2017 recommends a holding provision for future phases of development subsequent to Phase 1, pending the results of an on-site parking study to ensure that the proposed parking ratio of 1 parking space per unit is sufficient to service the development. The study will count actual parking and be completed to the satisfaction of the City of Barrie.

Phase 1 forms what staff believe is a reasonable sample, or basis, for what would occur on the remainder of the site from a parking perspective. Should parking demand outweigh supply for the Phase 1 development, the existing YMCA surface parking area will remain available to accommodate interim overflow parking.

Council requested clarification on how the parking standards would be met, should the above-noted parking study identify that additional parking is required for the development. Staff note that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment creates a *maximum* height and density of 24 storeys and 290% GFA, and that the proposed parking ratio of 1:1 is a *minimum* requirement. If the parking study demonstrates that a greater ratio is required, the applicant will be required to provide adequate parking for all units, including Phase 1.

There are alternatives to accommodate additional parking:

- Add additional levels of underground parking to meet the demand of the site;
- Provide some surface parking;
- Reduce the total number of units in order to reduce the parking demand.