

## Tara McArthur

---

**From:** Kapil Uppal  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 31, 2021 6:29 PM  
**To:** cityclerks  
**Cc:** Gary Harvey  
**Subject:** 407-417 Maplevue Drive West - Rezoning Application

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the development 407-417 Maplevue Drive West.

I appreciate that the meeting has to take place via Zoom in light of the global pandemic and the work of the City must continue.

The process has not been adequate – in fact, there is not even a time posted on the City website for the Planning Meeting scheduled on February 2, 2021 and there has been no reason provided as to why the time is not posted.

Furthermore, there has been no Zoom link released and people not speaking are not provided a link. What if a person would like to speak after hearing something at the meeting? Surely, they would be afforded that opportunity if this was a face-to-face meeting.

The proposal calls for 5 single family homes, bungalows, to be converted into 72 homes. The request is to go from R1 to RM2 with several special provisions.

I want to go back to the neighborhood meeting on September 16, 2020 where the meeting went beyond the length of time allotted. Not one person supported the proposal and there was lots of feedback provided to IPS. Height, density, traffic, character, not in an area earmarked for intensification among a host of other concerns. All the homes adjacent to this property are single family bungalows or two storey homes.

I was very disappointed that the proposal started off at 3 storeys and has now moved to 4.5 storeys. It did not inspire confidence that the developer and builder wanted to work with the community.

On December 15, at a council meeting, Councillor McCann spoke (not about this project) about a win, win, win being the best scenario. For the city, the residents, developer and builder. With this proposal, the only one that wins is the developer and the builder. At the same meeting Deputy Mayor Ward said that planning is about compromise – I certainly did not see any compromise after IPS heard our concerns for 2 plus hours. (I echo the sentiments of Councillor McCann and Deputy Mayor Ward).

If the City of Barrie follows the Official Plan and Policies I believe that we can come to fair, just and equitable solution for all parties impacted by this development. The policies and by-laws are outlined in Janet Foster's report and are clear and concise.

First, I'm not in favour of RM2 zoning to be approved. This parcel of land should remain R1 which would allow for 7 to 16 units. If the official plan and policies are followed there would be no need to approve this as RM2.

If the City decides to go outside of its official plan and policies and RM2 zoning is approved, this development should be:

- 10 meters in height
- No roof top patios
- 16 to 33 units
- Be designed to fit in with the current community
- Respect the privacy of adjacent homes
- Certainly no back to back townhomes

I think this is an opportunity for the City to help builders, developers and residents understand that the City of Barrie Official Plan Policies means something and will be followed. It's time to reset and adhere to the policies that are in place. If RM2 is granted for this development (which I don't believe it should be), they must build within RM2 zoning provisions, no exceptions. Special zoning provisions that are requested should be an exception rather than the norm and they must meet the needs of the residents of the city of Barrie and specifically those impacted. There are no policies or bylaws that would suggest that special provisions would be granted for any reason to this development or RM2 zoning.

I'm pleased to let you know that our Community Group has engaged in discussions with the mediator hired by Encore – while we were confused with the mediator's offer of sidewalks for our street, donation to a south end Library and other offers; I believe we have moved past that by letting her know that our interest remains in the development at 407-419 Maplevue Drive West. We would be happy to continue to engage in further dialogue.

I think there is an opportunity for the residents, the builder, developer, mediator and the city to get together and find a solution that works for all parties. Perhaps I'm being naïve but I think it would benefit all if we were able to endorse a plan together. We want to be a partner at the table and work with all interested parties. However, the builder must understand the policies and zoning provisions of the City of Barrie must be respected.

For the reasons stated above, I'm not in support of the application to rezone from R1 to RM2 with special provisions and I would respectfully request it be denied.

Thank you,  
Kapil Uppal

## Tara McArthur

---

**From:** Ethel Noonan  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 31, 2021 6:49 PM  
**To:** cityclerks  
**Subject:** 27 storey condo

No we do not want this condo, we moved to Barrie because we didn't want to live in a city like Toronto Peter and Ethel Noonan

Sent from my iPad

To Whom it may Concern,

January 29, 2021

Re: FILE # D30-003-2020  
407–419 Mapleview Drive West

We are writing to express our absolute opposition and strong concerns about the proposed amendment to the zoning by-law for 407-419 Mapleview Inc. (Encore Group) - 407, 411, 413, 417 and 419 Mapleview Drive West, Barrie within the Holly Planning Area. As Barrie residents and taxpayers since 1990, and specifically in the neighbourhood of Mapleview Drive West and Essa Road since 2004, we are deeply concerned about the effect that such potential changes would bring to our neighbourhood and city, therefore we ask that the proposed amendment to the zoning by-law be turned down.

The above-mentioned 5 properties are currently zoned as Residential Single Detached Dwelling First Density (R1) and should remain as such since as homeowners, the property which we purchased on 52 Redfern Ave. (the street immediately perpendicular and south of the current properties under discussion) was purchased for our residence based on the already established zoning and population density and type of housing in the area. The same is true for our neighbours, both those whose yards touch the back/south property lines of these 5 properties, as well as those on the opposite side of Redfern Ave. where our home is located. It would be unfair to change such zoning as owners who purchased properties in the immediate vicinity on established property types would now have to reconsider their personal homes and all that they have invested into them over the years because of a proposed development change that will have a great impact to current owners' properties with the high likelihood of lowering property values significantly based on significant population density increase and numerous issues associated with that change.

The proposed building changes from 5 Residential Single Detached Dwelling First Density to 88 residential units on such a small parcel of land is unfair because of privacy concerns to current residence owners who neighbour the current 5 properties. Based on the very high increase in immediate residential population for such a small area as well as the proposal for 4 22-unit townhouse blocks that are each 4.5 stories high, significant changes in privacy would occur to current neighbouring yards being looked down on by the many newly proposed units, 2.5 stories higher than current homes surrounding these 5 properties. Also, visual access to current homeowners bedrooms and living areas will occur for the upper 2.5 stories of the proposed 4 buildings (taking away all privacy for which current owners' residences and properties were originally purchased) which is unfair and unacceptable for the neighbours of both Redfern Ave and those across the street on the north side of Mapleview Dr. West. All current owners are taxpayers whose established properties must be protected for the privacy for which they were purchased.

Another serious concern that such a zoning change would cause for the current owners/residences of this neighbourhood is the traffic issue of extended wait times, particularly at p.m. rush hour, because of vehicles heading west on Mapleview Dr and needing to turn left

to cross the eastbound traffic to enter the 88 unit townhouse parking area (not just for all the residents, but guests, deliveries and services to the development as well!) thereby holding up westbound traffic the short distance from Essa Road without a proper turning lane. The traffic report indicated that the current road arrangement meets the criteria, but this will be at a great disadvantage and time constraint to current residents who will now have to wait to pass all those turning left to this potential development parking, and then wait again to turn left to go on Redfern Ave. from Maplevue Dr West. Other residents with current properties west of this section of Maplevue Dr. West (with the current 5 driveways for the single detached dwelling properties,) will also pay the price in increased commute times with such traffic issues. This is a very unappealing prospect for drawing potential commuters to our community and very unfair to current property owners who purchased properties based on location and commute times for which Barrie is known. This will adversely impact all subdivision owners west of this parcel of land.

Furthermore, if potential residents, guests, deliveries and services of the proposed 88 townhouses are aware that driving north on Essa Road and turning left at the Dyer Blvd stoplight just south of Maplevue Dr. West will enable them to drive through our little subdivision in order to make a right turn into eastbound traffic from Redfern Ave onto Maplevue Dr. West thereby enabling a right turn into their parking area (vs. waiting on Maplevue Dr West to turn left into their parking area,) traffic will increase significantly on Redfern Ave making it a main thoroughfare creating a nightmare of traffic for Dyer Blvd and Redfern Ave at p.m. rush hour especially, destroying the quiet streets of our neighbourhood. This is especially concerning for our 2 streets as we do not have sidewalks for our families with young children, for pedestrians or cyclists who use our streets to avoid the heavier traffic on the other main streets. Our taxes have been high enough over the years for our undeveloped streets and we should not have to pay the price of increased taxes to pay for such amenities such as sidewalks to keep our neighbourhood safe from the increase in traffic that such a proposed development at 405-419 Maplevue Drive West would adversely cause. The safety of students who walk to the 2 schools in the immediate vicinity on Essa Road using our 2 neighbourhood streets of Redfern Ave and Dyer Blvd would also be put at risk and this is unacceptable.

The City and current developer must consider the opposition of current taxpayers and residents to such a zoning change based on the established zoning, and instead consider using the 5 properties as they are intended: for 5 single housing development projects that fit with the current neighbourhood and zoning. In summary, the proposed 88 townhouse unit development on this small parcel of land should be done in a different area of the city where current residents, owners and neighbourhoods do not have to be negatively affected by such development in their pre-existing established areas.

1. The population density of such a development is ludicrous for this neighbourhood when you consider that a small parcel of land that currently holds 5 single family dwellings is being considered to be changed to that of 88 townhouse family dwellings in 4 multi unit buildings.
2. The privacy that will be taken from current homeowners' established properties based on the increased population, the 2.5 stories above all current dwellings and the ability of the

proposed new units to see right into current homeowners bedrooms and living area windows as well as overlooking their yards is unacceptable.

3. The traffic implications for the already established neighbours, neighbourhoods and the potential detrimental implications for our residents and safety of walking students of the 2 nearby schools are completely objectionable.
4. The change of the neighbourhood to a heavily populated area does not fit the current design intention or zoning of the area will result in unacceptable decreased property values for current owners which is unfair based on the reason they purchased and invested in their properties in the first place.

We trust that you will seriously consider our concerns as Barrie property owners and taxpayers and respect our opposition and the opposition of our neighbours to this proposed zoning amendment by maintaining the current zoning of 405-419 Mapleview Drive West.

Sincerely,  
Ingrid and David Long

cc: Mr. Gary Harvey, Ward 7 Councillor  
Logan Juffermans, Planner, Development Services Department - Planning, City of Barrie  
Dana Suddaby, Planner, Development Services Department - Planning, City of Barrie  
City Clerk's Office, City of Barrie

Janet Foster, Planner

Planning Submission Letter, January 31, 2021  
On behalf of the Neighbourhood Residents

Planning Application D30-003-2020  
407-419 Mapleview Drive West  
Public Meeting February 2, 2021

My name is Janet Foster. I am a Registered Professional Planner. I have been retained by the Neighbourhood Residents, surrounding the subject lands, to prepare a Planning submission to support their position regarding the subject rezoning of lands located at 407-419 Mapleview Drive West from Residential First Density R1 to Residential Multiple Second Density RM2 SP, with special zoning provisions.

The Neighbourhood position is that the subject lands should not be rezoned RM2 SP with special zoning provisions as the proposed redevelopment of the subject lands would not be compatible with the adjacent existing, established, low density residential neighbourhood character. And, such redevelopment would allow building height and density that is not characteristic of the neighbourhood, as it is considered to be overbearing, overshadowing, abrupt in the landscape and considered overdevelopment of the site.

The Neighbourhood Residents recognize that the existing dwellings on the 5 subject lots are in need of repair and maintenance. The immediate surrounding lands on the south side of Mapleview Drive West consist of an existing established low density, large lot residential neighbourhood development established through large lot patterns, predominately of 1-2 storey building heights, generous building yard setbacks, pitched/peaked roof lines and ground level amenity areas.

The lots immediately to the west of the subject lands at 423 and 427 Mapleview Drive, bounded by Redfern Avenue on the west, are newly built residential dwellings that have maintained the existing large lot form of development and are not expected to redevelop in the foreseeable future. The subject Rezoning which is requesting special zoning provisions for increased height and unit density, roof top patios and built form that does not transition or step back from the existing built form, would result in a development that does not respect the existing neighbourhood character.

The Provincial Policy Statement and the Provincial Growth Plan identify that the Province of Ontario will grow in population. In order to accommodate such growth, the Province sets out policies and growth targets to be implemented at the municipal level through Official Plan

policies and zoning bylaws. The City of Barrie has been recognized as a Growth Centre where population and density targets have been established. The City is experiencing rapid growth as can be seen by the filing of more than 100 current planning applications, totaling 1,000s if not 10s of 1,000s of new dwelling units. In order to accommodate such growth, the City of Barrie Official Plan sets out where intensification and increased density shall be directed and focused and where municipal infrastructure and servicing requirements are to be improved in order to successfully manage and support such growth.

### City of Barrie Official Plan Policies

Official Plan policies identify areas of new growth, where the highest levels of intensification are to be directed and where policies recognize areas of relative stability. Growth should take the form of progressive or transitional increases in density in existing neighbourhoods through low impact intensification. Official Plan policies are to provide the general public and reality investors with clarity, predictability and a level of certainty as to where and what level of development might be expected to occur over the long term in different parts of the City.

The City of Barrie Official Plan, Schedule A, Land Use, designates the subject lands as Residential. Zoning Bylaw 2009-141 zones the lands Residential First Density R1 which recognizes large lot residential development, primarily permitting single detached dwellings.

Policy 4.2, Residential, provides goals, “to guide the formation of residential planning areas which foster a sense of neighbourhood and belonging for their residents.” And, “to plan the location and design of residential development to enhance compatibility between dwelling types at different densities and to minimize potential conflict between incompatible land uses.”

Design policies contained in Policy 4.2.2.4, identify that “densities shall be graduated where possible in order to provide for integration between adjoining residential land uses. Where medium or high density uses abut development of a low density nature, buffering protection will be provided to minimize the impact to the lower density uses.”

Schedule I, Intensification Areas, of the Official Plan, identifies where specifically, the City of Barrie is directing and focusing intensification of residential development. From Schedule I, the subject lands are:

- not located within a Major Transit Area
- not located within a Primary Node or Major Transit Node
- not located within a Secondary Node
- not located on a Primary Corridor
- not located within the Urban Growth Centre

In accordance with Schedule I, Intensification Areas, Intensification Policies are contained in Section 4.2.2.6 of the Official Plan.

Policy 4.2.2.6 b) identifies that residential intensification shall be focused in the intensification areas as identified on Schedule I. Development proposals for higher densities in other locations

will be considered subject to Housing and Residential Official Plan policies.

Policy 4.2.2.6 d) identifies that “Development applications that propose residential intensification outside of the Intensification Areas will be considered on their [own] merits provided the proponent demonstrates the following to the satisfaction of the City:

i) that the scale and physical character of the proposed development is compatible with, and can be integrated into, the surrounding neighbourhood;”

In addition, the Policy contained after 4.2.2.6 d) vi) states that Schedule I identifies the intensification areas of focus, and, applications outside these areas “that propose higher densities than existing conditions will not be treated favourably simply because they satisfy the definition of ‘Intensification ’and contribute towards the City achieving its intensification and density targets.”

Housing policies contained in Section 3.3 identify the provision of an appropriate range, size and tenure of housing is supplied; that the quality and variety of housing stock is maintained and improved; and to encourage all forms of housing required to meet the social, health and well-being of residents.

This area and immediate neighbourhood is characterized by large lot single detached dwellings. This form of housing should continue to be available, provided and maintained within the City in order to contribute to the range and availability of housing types for all income levels and housing preferences. Redevelopment applications adjacent to large lot single detached dwelling forms of development should recognize and respect this unique built form and supply of housing within the City. The City encourages residential revitalization and intensification within Built-up areas of the City which are to take the form of low impact redevelopment such as second suites and infill. Official Plan Policies identify that the “review process for intensification applications will include consideration of the existing and planned character and lot fabric of the area”.

Official Plan Residential policies contained in Section 4.2 guide the formation of residential planning areas which foster a sense of neighbourhood and belonging for their residents. The location and design of residential development is planned to enhance compatibility between dwelling types at different densities and minimize potential conflict.

Policies identify that average low density residential development ranges between 12 and 25 units per net hectare. Where medium residential density averages between 26 and 53 units per net hectare. Given these policy density ranges, and the size of the subject lands being 0.64 hectares in size, average density on the subject lands could range between 7-16 units (R1 Standards) and 33 units (RM2/53 units/ha), not the proposed 138 units per hectare (88 units) or revised proposal of 113 units per hectare (72 units).

Design policies contained in the Residential section identify a need for the provision of a functional open space amenity area including landscaping, screening, buffering and densities that shall be graduated to provide integration. Where medium density uses abut development of a

low density nature, buffering protection is to be provided to minimize the impact on the lower density uses. The City will encourage the maintenance and improvement of the character and appearance of existing residential areas.

In accordance with Schedule B, Planning Areas, the subject lands are within the Holly Secondary Planning Area. However, in accordance with the Holly Secondary Plan, the subject lands were excluded and therefore were/may not have been considered for future redevelopment and would not have been included in the infrastructure and servicing upgrades to accommodate additional development either by the City for infrastructure and servicing improvements or accounted for in private servicing infrastructure by the Holly Secondary Plan developers group for the redeveloping area.

The subject lands and surrounding area have not been targeted, are not targeted, nor are the focus of intensification, increased density or strategic population growth.

#### City of Barrie Proposed New Official Plan Policies

The City of Barrie has recently released, for review, its proposed new Official Plan policies. While these policies have not yet been approved, they provide guidance and the direction the City is intending for future growth and development to the year 2041. In addition, the new Official Plan includes Urban Design policies to guide future planning and development applications and identifies, visually, and describes varying built forms in order to provide clarity as to how the City is intended to grow and be designed in the built form.

Section 2.3, Becoming a Complete City and Elements of Barrie's Community Structure, is illustrated on Map 1, Community Structure. Policies identify where the highest levels of growth will occur, which include strategic growth areas and intensification corridors, and identify areas of relative stability, including existing established neighbourhoods. Policies identify that an increase in density will be allowed in existing neighbourhoods through low impact intensification.

The Community Structure is meant to illustrate geographic areas to provide clarity, predictability and a level of certainty as to where and what level of development might be expected to occur over the long term and in different parts of the City.

This area of the City is not recognized for strategic growth on Map 1, Community Structure of the new Official Plan. This area of the City is not recognized for higher levels of growth. Maplevue Drive West, between Essa Road and County Road 27 is not recognized as an intensification corridor.

Map 2, Land Use, designates the subject lands as Neighbourhood Area. Neighbourhood Areas are low density neighbourhoods. New development in these areas are to be in limited levels and are to be in keeping with the existing character, scale, building mass and building height of adjacent residential land uses.

Neighbourhood Areas recognize existing low density neighbourhoods dominated by human scale built form. They provide most of the City's low-rise housing stock and are considered established neighbourhoods, not intended to experience significant physical change that would alter their general character. New development is permitted that respects and reinforces the existing scale, height, massing, lot pattern, building type, orientation, character, form and planned function of the immediate local area. Any proposed development must be sensitive to and compatible with the character, form and planned function of the surrounding context. The policies promote intensification through additional residential units (basement apartments) or detached ancillary dwelling units and other forms of low impact intensification.

In accordance with Urban Design Standards contained in Section 3.3, applications in Neighbourhood Areas, will generally be designed to respect and reinforce the existing physical character and uses of the surrounding area. 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.

New Official Plan policies identify that the City will not support over-development. The policies of this Plan including Urban Design, provide direction to ensure high quality urban design is achieved without over-development occurring on any given property. Over-development is characterized by development that negatively impacts local amenity and character, exceeds the maximum permitted height or density, inappropriate built form requiring unwarranted variances to the City's development standards, and where another built form solution is more appropriate. New policies specifically identify that "Back-to-Back Townhouses are discouraged in Neighbourhood Areas."

Specific Urban Design Policies are included for proposed new townhouse developments. In Neighbourhood Areas, the scale, massing, setback and orientation of Townhouses will be determined through the review and approval process. Townhouses shall generally front onto a public street and ensure building entrances provide direct access to a public sidewalk. The facing distance between blocks of Townhouses that are not separated by a public street should generally be a minimum of 18.0 metres to maximize daylight, enhance landscaping treatments and provide privacy for individual units.

#### What defines Neighbourhood Character

What defines a neighbourhood? How big is a neighbourhood? What boundary or features should be considered (roads, rail, environmental features)? Should a Neighbourhood be defined by Planning Act circulation requirements circulated to land owners that are affected or could be impacted by a proposed Rezoning application (120 metres around the subject lands)?

The Planning Act requirements for circulation of a Rezoning application is to provide written notice to owners of property within 120m of the subject lands. The subject lands are situated within an existing, well established low density residential neighbourhood. Surrounding the subject lands and within 120m, is Mapleview Drive to the immediate north and further north and west are existing established low density single detached dwellings. A church is located to the north west of the subject lands. To the south are existing established low density large lot single

detached dwellings. In addition, the subject lands form part of the neighbourhood that is bounded by an Environmental Protection valley corridor to the south and east. This natural corridor provides some of the lots with rear yard buffer privacy within the low density neighbourhood and provides a natural buffer for the neighbourhood from commercial activity along Essa Road.

Within the 120m area, the neighbourhood is characterized by existing, primarily, low rise, 1 and 2 storey residential dwellings, some on large lots with generous rear, side and front yard building setbacks. Roof lines are all of a pitched/peaked residential design. Access to lots is via a driveway to a public street and where private amenity takes the form of ground related rear yard uses. The natural topography is generally flat. The Maplevue Drive roadway has generous right of ways/boulevards with generous sidewalk widths, where built form is setback.

Existing zoning within the area includes single detached dwellings zoned R1, R2, R3 and R4 and some multiple dwelling units zoned RM1 to which permits semi-detached dwellings and RM2 which permits low rise town housing. One property on the north side of Maplevue Drive West, northwest of the subject lands located at 480 Maplevue Drive is occupied by a church and zoned RM2 SP-226. The special zoning provisions limit the building height to 2-3 storeys.

There are 2 other properties along the Maplevue Drive stretch, between Essa Road and County Road 27, approximately 0.5km from the subject lands that are zoned for medium density residential development. One is on Seymour Crescent, south side of Maplevue Drive, west of Marcellus Drive is zoned RM2-TH, currently occupied by 2 storey townhouses. The other is located at 500-504 Maplevue Drive and has been developed as a 3 storey apartment, zoned RM2 SP-139. The special zoning provisions limit the site to a walk up apartment or stacked townhouses. Both the 480 and 500-504 Maplevue Drive properties, zoned RM2 provide generous buffering in the side yards and in the form of rear surface parking areas to adjacent existing low rise residential development. There are no elevated parking structures or roof top patios within the general area.

#### Position of the Neighbourhood Residents

This residential neighbourhood is existing, established and characterized by larger lot, low rise, residential development. The proposed application for medium density RM2 with Special Zoning Provisions that would increase the height and density of that zone to the extent of:

- Increased building heights from 10m to 15m,
- Increase density from 40 units/ha to 138 units/ha,
- Increase the building lot coverage on the site from 60% to 152%,
- Decrease the front yard setback from 7m to 0.5m,
- Decrease the landscape buffer from 3m to 2.2m, and
- Remove the provision for consolidated amenity space.

is not viewed to be in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood or the surrounding area primarily consisting of 1 to 2 storey building heights with generous yard setbacks.

In addition, the proposal only includes 3 surface visitor parking spaces for 88 units. No parking is permitted on Mapleview Avenue and therefore there are concerns with regard to spillover on-street parking on Redfern Avenue which is currently enjoyed by the existing neighbourhood with long large driveways, where on-street parking occurs only occasionally.

It is respectfully submitted that the applicant's proposal for special zoning provisions to the requested Rezoning of the lands to RM2 SP represents an overdevelopment of the subject lands, where the proposed development is viewed to be out of character with the existing low density nature of the surrounding neighbourhood community. Consideration should be given to the fact that, if the proposed Rezoning were to be approved, the built form would result in the first of its kind, an anomaly, an abrupt building form on the landscape along Mapleview Drive West between Essa Road and County Road 27.

The proposed Rezoning with Special Zoning Provisions that would increase building height, increase density through increased building lot coverage and unit count, and permit roof top patios,

- Would negatively impact the physical character of the existing neighbourhood,
- Is not considered low impact intensification and not considered compatible with adjacent existing residential uses,
- Is not in keeping with the existing low density, large lot sizes, low building heights, existing building setbacks, building orientation, or scale of the existing residential developments within the neighbourhood,
- Does not respect adequate buffering or building transition from the existing adjacent low residential development,
- Roof top patios do not exist within the neighbourhood and would not afford the privacy currently enjoyed in the neighbourhood, and
- Provision of 3 visitor parking spaces is not adequate for an 88 unit development and could/would result in parking spillover onto the adjacent residential streets.

Therefore, the proposed Rezoning with special zoning provisions, should not be approved.

The Applicant has entered into discussions with the Residents in order to address their concerns. However, at this time, both positions remain far apart. The Residents remain interested in further discussions, however, would like to see a revised plan that better reflects the Resident concerns, better adheres to City Official Plan policies and is more in keeping and compatible with the adjacent neighbourhood character.

This planning submission is respectfully submitted on behalf of the Neighbourhood Residents,

Sincerely,

Janet Foster, RPP

Attached Photos of Neighbourhood Area and along Mapleview Drive West



North side of Maplevue Drive, view of the subject lands, looking east towards Essa Road from Redfern Avenue and the subject lands looking west from the north side of Maplevue Drive.





Existing Residential Development on Redfern Avenue, looking east and west.





Rear yard from Redfern Avenue looking north toward the subject lands. And looking south east towards Maplevue Drive from Churchland Drive, where the rear yards are on the north side of Maplevue Drive.





500-504 Maplevue Drive West adjacent to existing low density residential dwellings to the west along Ginger Drive and to the north with generous side and rear yard setbacks.





Existing Townhouse Development on Seymour Crescent, looking east and below looking south from Maplevue Drive.



Existing newly built dwelling at 423 Mapleview Drive, immediately abutting the west side of the subject lands.



---

February 1, 2021

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

FILE NO.: D30-003-2020

Dear City Clerk:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING FOR PROPOSED  
AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING BY-LAW  
MAPLEVIEW INC. (ENCORE GROUP)  
407, 411, 413, 417 AND 419 MAPLEVIEW DRIVE WEST  
CITY OF BARRIE

Thank you for circulating notification with respect to a Notice of Public Meeting for Zoning By-law Amendment for the lands known municipally as 407, 411, 413, 417 and 419 Maplevue Drive West. The application is intended to facilitate the redevelopment of five (5) residential parcels totaling 0.6 hectares, which are currently occupied by single detached residential dwellings. The proposal would facilitate the redevelopment of the site with four (4), 22-unit back-to-back townhouse blocks, 4.5 storeys in height with a total of 88 residential units. The subject lands are located on the south side of Maplevue Drive West, west of Essa Road and east of Redfern Avenue.

Simcoe County District School Board (SCDSB) Planning staff have no objection to this development. However, it has come to our attention that several proposed developments in the nearby Hewitt's Creek Secondary Plan Area have increased the number of residential units in their proposals when compared to the estimates SCDSB staff have on record. Our records stem from the Secondary Plan Density permissions from the tertiary plan provided in 2017. This significant increase presents a considerable challenge for the SCDSB when assessing the number of elementary school sites required to accommodate growth in the nearby Hewitt's Creek Secondary Plan Area and the southern area of Barrie as a whole. Planning staff recognize that this newly proposed development is located outside of both the Hewitt's Creek Secondary Plan Area and the Salem Secondary Plan Area. However, this new development proposal creates significant further concern compounding our existing concerns for the nearby Secondary Plan Areas as to the ability to accommodate future students that would be generated from these proposals. Given this, SCDSB Planning staff request further discussion regarding additional elementary school sites in order to accommodate the increased number of expected residential units.

SCDSB Planning staff also request that the Simcoe County District School Board's standard conditions, as indicated below, be included moving forward and conveyed to potential purchasers:

- That the owner(s) agree in the Subdivision Agreement to include in all Offers of Purchase and Sale a statement advising prospective purchasers that accommodation within a public school in the community is not guaranteed and students may be accommodated in temporary facilities; including but not limited to accommodation in a portable classroom, a "holding school", or in an alternate school within or outside of the community.
- That the owner(s) agree in the Subdivision Agreement to include in all Offers of Purchase and Sale a statement advising prospective purchasers that if school buses are required within the Subdivision in accordance with Board Transportation policies, as may be amended from time to time, school bus pick up points will generally be located on the through street at a location as determined by the Simcoe County Student Transportation Consortium.

Please provide the Simcoe County District School Board with a copy of the notice of decision, including a copy of the draft approved conditions for our files. Once the Subdivision Agreement has been registered, please provide the Simcoe County District School Board with a copy of the registered agreement in electronic format. Once the Plan has been registered, please provide the Simcoe County District School Board with a copy of the registered plan in electronic format.

Should you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Thank you,



Nick Gooding  
Planner

-----Original Message-----

From: Ethel Noonan

Sent: Sunday, January 31, 2021 6:49 PM

To: cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>

Subject: 27 storey condo

No we do not want this condo, we moved to Barrie because we didn't want to live in a city like Toronto  
Peter and Ethel Noonan

Sent from my iPad

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Ethel Noonan

Sent: Sunday, January 31, 2021 6:55 PM

To: cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>

Subject: 88 back to back 4 1/2 storey townhouses

No we don't want 88 townhouses on Maplevue will make too much traffic Peter and Ethel Noonan

Sent from my iPad

**From:** Anna Maria Del Col

**Sent:** Sunday, January 31, 2021 8:27 PM

**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>; Logan Juffermans <Logan.Juffermans@barrie.ca>; Dana Suddaby <Dana.Suddaby@barrie.ca>

**Subject:** Resident Comments for February 2 Planning Committee Meeting

Hello,

Please find attached my comments in advance of the February 2, 2021 Planning Committee Meeting re: the proposed development at 407-419 Maplevue Drive West. Our entire neighbourhood is strongly opposed to this development, and we want to ensure that planning staff is made aware. Attached are the notes that I will speak to at this Tuesday's meeting.

Thanks in advance,

Anna Maria Del Col

---

**Comments Submitted January 31, 2021**

**Re: Proposed Development at 407-419 Maplevue Drive West**

My name is Anna Maria Del Col and I am a Barrie resident. I would like to state that I am strongly opposed to the proposed development at 407-419 Maplevue Drive West in its current iteration. While the report presented and submitted on behalf of our community by Janet Foster states our case very clearly, I would like to add the following to the record:

A huge reason for our rejection of the proposed development is that “the scale and physical character of the proposed development” is not “compatible with, or can be integrated into, the surrounding neighbourhood.” This is a direct quote from the current Official Plan for Barrie. In addition, looking ahead at the Barrie Official Plan 2041, there is plenty of detail about how development in Neighbourhood Areas must “respect and reinforce the existing physical character and uses of the surrounding area.” Development in Neighbourhood Areas will “respect and consider” things such as the size and configuration of lots, the building type of nearby properties, the setback of buildings from the street, the pattern of rear and side-yard setbacks, and “the presence of mature trees and general landscape character of the streetscape.” While it’s clear that the proposed development at 407-419 Maplevue Drive West does not respect or consider any of these things, I would like to focus on the last item: the “mature trees and general landscape character of the streetscape.”

If you’re not familiar with the neighbourhood under discussion, but particularly Redfern Avenue and the portion of Maplevue Drive that is proposed for this development, you should know that it has a very obvious and consistent character. It is characterized by residential, one- or two-story homes, with large yards and lots of beautiful, enormous, mature trees. This is the kind of neighbourhood that people want to move into – the kind of neighbourhood that has been lifesaving throughout the pandemic – and the trees are a huge part of this beloved streetscape.

The developer has submitted a detailed arbor report, which marks 26 mature trees for removal. I'd like to focus on this report:

- First, the developer's interpretation of the report seems to be full of inconsistencies: trees marked as being in fair condition are slated to be removed, but trees marked as being in poor or marginal condition are being preserved.
- Second, of the 61 trees under consideration in the report, there are only 4 trees marked as being in poor condition: #5 (preserve), #8 (remove), #11 (remove), and #36 (preserve).
- Third, in the report it states clearly that the trees being removed "conflict with the proposed development, and are of limited aesthetic value to be retained for the development." So, the health of the trees is not a determining factor for preservation or removal, and aesthetic value is defined ONLY in relation to the proposed development.
- In response to concerns expressed at the neighbourhood meeting in September 2020, the developer has agreed to preserve tree #18 – but they have ignored our request to also preserve tree #19. We absolutely insist that both trees #18 and #19 are preserved. These are enormous twin maples, close to the fence line, that tower over the entire neighbourhood, and their loss to the streetscape would be immense.
- Also in response to neighbourhood concerns, the developer has agreed to preserve an additional 10 trees – but they are still removing 26 healthy, mature trees, which is far too many.
- The following trees can and should be preserved: #1, 2, 3, 14, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34. These are all healthy trees around the outside perimeter of the properties to be developed, and any responsible development that respects the "mature trees and general landscape character of the streetscape" should be able to sustain them.

Finally, regarding the arbor report provided by the developer, I have two questions for council and planning staff:

- If it would be beneficial for city council or staff, should our neighbourhood commission its own arbor report – which we could then use to support our argument for preserving as many of these mature trees as possible?
- Who on city staff looks at arbor reports to ensure that they are being interpreted correctly and fairly?

It should be stated that there is a significant level of mistrust in the developer behind this proposal. The trees are just one example of how they say that they've listened to our concerns, but in reality, they are making the barest of concessions.

My final comments for council and planning staff are of a more personal and emotional nature. I'm sure that you're all aware of what these kinds of proposed developments mean to city residents, and that you've seen your fair share of emotions on display in council meetings before. But to make it clear: this kind of development, so far out of scale and character with the neighbourhood that we know and love, can cause a tremendous amount of stress and worry – especially in the middle of a pandemic. We all moved to this neighbourhood because we love its character. These are our dream homes, our retirement homes, with wide streets and big yards and lots of mature trees. We are all very happy here, and during the pandemic we were grateful every day for the kind of neighbourhood that made it possible to safely walk and bike and be outside surrounded by greenspace. When we first heard the news of this proposed development – five single-family bungalows being demolished and replaced with

88 residential condo units, with zero setbacks and so many trees set for removal – every single one of us went through the turmoil of deciding whether or not to sell our homes and move on. We still face that question, knowing that a development this far out of scale with our current neighbourhood will have an impact on the sale prices of our homes and therefore on our futures. PLEASE take this seriously when you consider the proposed development and how it will impact our community and our lives. We love our neighbourhood and sincerely hope that you will do the right thing.

Sincerely,

Anna Maria Del Col

**From:** The Long's

**Sent:** Sunday, January 31, 2021 11:45 PM

**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>

**Cc:** Gary Harvey <Gary.Harvey@barrie.ca>; Logan Juffermans <Logan.Juffermans@barrie.ca>; Dana Suddaby <Dana.Suddaby@barrie.ca>

**Subject:** Re: Amendment to the Zoning By-law 407–419 Maplevue Drive West OPPOSITION LETTER

Hello, Please find attached a letter expressing our opposition and concerns for the proposed amendment to the zoning by-law for 407-419 Maplevue Inc. (Encore Group) on Maplevue Drive West, Barrie within the Holly Planning Area.

Thank you for forwarding this to the appropriate parties so that our voice is represented at the meeting on Tuesday February 2, 2021.

We will await the zoom contact information as requested in another email so that we may be part of that meeting.

Sincerely,

Ingrid and David Long

**From:** The Gourlays  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 9:45 AM  
**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>  
**Subject:** 27 story condo @Mapleview&Essa

This development is way too high, Barrie is a great place to live so stop trying to make it like Toronto, also what is with all this townhouse development, it seems like everything these days are townhouses, in a few years a developments like this if not properly maintained will turn it in to undesirable area. Not what we need here.

## Tara McArthur

---

**From:** Andrew Zvanitajs  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 31, 2021 5:04 PM  
**To:** cityclerks; Gary Harvey; Tara McArthur; Dana Suddaby  
**Cc:** Tina Gonneau; Logan Juffermans  
**Subject:** Comments in opposition to the proposed development at 407-419 Maplevue Dr. W

To Mayor & Members of Council and City Planning Committee Staff,

I encourage you to find that the proposed development and zoning changes proposed on 407-419 Maplevue by IPS for Encore properties **should not be considered as presented**.

This style of development is not tenable and clearly violates many regulations there is a by-law for; most specifically those related to height, density, and the safety of citizens.

This type of property will clearly impose traffic, parking, and congestion issues on the city further overburdening the city's resources.

Height, density, and character **MUST** be respected in this established and green neighbourhood; this proposal flies in the face of a well thought out urban design and will surely bring with it a litany of concerns over the coming years if allowed to proceed in its current state.

Please include my comments in the council correspondence and the official record of the meeting.

Regards,

Andrew Zvanitajs

**From:** Glenn Bennett  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 12:16 PM  
**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>  
**Cc:** Gary.Harvy@barrie.ca  
**Subject:** Development Essa/ Mapleview

This development looks very dense and overcooked.  
27 stories-----REALLY !

---

**From:** Glenn Bennett  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 12:09 PM  
**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>  
**Cc:** Gary.Harvy@barrie.ca  
**Subject:** Development 407-409

This proposed development is too high and way too dense for the proposed area.  
Can't imagine the no of cars—and what about snow.  
I don't live right there but I feel for the people that do!

Glenn Bennett

**From:**

**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 1:01 PM

**To:** cityclerks <[cityclerks@barrie.ca](mailto:cityclerks@barrie.ca)>

**Cc:** Gary Harvey <[Gary.Harvey@barrie.ca](mailto:Gary.Harvey@barrie.ca)>

**Subject:** Application #2 N/W corner Essa Rd/ Mapleview Ave

Hello- our biggest concern would be traffic congestion. I am not certain the area can handle with the current configuration. Mapleview is already busy and in the summer on Essa Friday afternoons become a steady stream of traffic with cottage goers thinking they can shortcut to the 400. I am all for progress but feel it is just too much in one spot with limited access points from different roads.

Regards

George Allen

-----Original Message-----

From: Allan Weishar

Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 11:12 AM

To: Logan Juffermans <[Logan.Juffermans@barrie.ca](mailto:Logan.Juffermans@barrie.ca)>

Subject: 407-418 condo development

one lot from facing these ugly condo developments planned on Maplevue Ave. I have live here 34 years in our quiet neighbour hood and never expected to see this area turned from single home developments. I am opposed to these condo plans as are all our neighbours. Allan

Sent from my iPad

---

**From:** cherylyncameron

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 2, 2021 11:24 AM

**To:** cityclerks <[cityclerks@barrie.ca](mailto:cityclerks@barrie.ca)>

**Cc:** Gary Harvey <[Gary.Harvey@barrie.ca](mailto:Gary.Harvey@barrie.ca)>;

**Subject:** Attention City Clerk Application 1 - 407-419 Maplevue Ave

I am opposed to this application. The special zoning provisions requested are problematic as it changes the character of the neighbourhood which is currently based on single residences. The impact is considerable particularly related to traffic and parking issues. This proposal in no way improves the community – there is no give back in this plan but rather an imposition on the neighbourhood. My neighbours will also lose their sense of privacy as the project includes 4 1/2 stories townhouses. The sight line would be directly on the backyards of several houses. These residents will lose their privacy when swimming, exercising and generally enjoy their backyards – no fence is high enough to mitigate this.

Questions:

What is the screening referred to in the letter to residents from Lynn Strachan on Jan 15<sup>th</sup>?

Where is the traffic study? I find it hard to believe that there is no impact?

What is the city planning for calming traffic on Maplevue?

Is the city considering this application in tandem with Application 2? If both of these projects go ahead the impact on the surrounding neighbourhoods is significant.

Cherylyn and John Cameron

**From:** Donna O'Neil

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 2, 2021 2:32 PM

**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>

**Subject:** N/E Corner Essa Road and Mapleview

Hi

I would to give my opinion on what you are proposing for that area. I don't think we really need buildings as high as 27 floors, I would propose

maybe 4 to 5 floors. Retail no because there is so many vacant places as it is, there is not enough retail to go in there. i think everyone should rethink what

they want to do with that land! It is more of a residential area then anything and it would be an eyesore for that whole area! We really do not need anymore

space there is a building on Mapleview just down from there that is pretty much empty

Thankyou

Donna O'Neil