

Legislation Text

File #: 12-G-197, Version: 1

APPLICATION FOR AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING BY-LAW - INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS ON BEHALF OF ADVANCE TECH DEVELOPMENTS - 376 BLAKE STREET, BARRIE (WARD 1) (AUGUST 13, 2012) (File: D09-OPA021/D14-1539)

Cameron Sellers of Innovative Planning Solutions explained that the purpose of the public meeting is to review applications for an Official Plan Amendment and a Zoning By-law Amendment submitted by Innovative Planning Solutions on behalf of Advance Tech Developments. He explained that the lands are located on the north side of Blake Street between Steel Street and Johnson Street (Ward 1), are situated in the Codrington Planning Area and known municipally as 376 Blake Street with a total area of 0.4 hectares (1.2 acres). Mr. Sellers provided photographs of the subject property and the surrounding area. He described the existing site conditions and surrounding land uses. Mr. Sellers reviewed the current Official Plan designation and existing zoning for the site.

Mr. Sellers explained the development proposal for the site and the rationale for the proposed medium density zoning. He provided artistic renderings of the proposed buildings and reviewed the details of the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment including an outline of the requested zoning exceptions. Mr. Sellers listed the studies that have been submitted to the City in support of the application. He indicated that he believes the proposal is consistent with Provincial policy planning, the City of Barrie Official Plan and the City of Barrie Growth Management Study. He concluded by providing a summary of the proposal and his professional opinion with respect to the planning rationale associated with the applications.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- 1. Louis Cote, 23 Alexander Avenue** expressed concern regarding the identification of the subject property provided in the notice of the public meeting and provided suggestions for future notices. Mr. Cote inquired if the proposed townhouses were two or three stories.

Mr. Sellers provided a response to the inquiry.

- 2. Michelle Atefi, 360 Blake Street** inquired if the townhouses will be freehold or condominiums. She requested additional details concerning the proposed amenity space once it becomes available and asked that the contact information for Innovative Planning Solutions be provided.

Mr. Sellers provided a response to the inquiries.

- 3. Barb Mercer, 33 Alexander Avenue** stated that she is opposed to the proposed development. She explained that she has lived in the area for many years and believes that the current bowling alley is a good piece of the City's fabric and would prefer if the subject property remained status quo. Ms. Mercer noted that she is not opposed to the land being rezoned to residential, however, she does not agree with the provision of exemptions to the EM2 zoning standards. She expressed concern with the

zoning exceptions requested related to the increased density, decreased setbacks and decreased parking requirements. She commented that she does not believe that the entrance to the development can accommodate two-way traffic. Ms. Mercer indicated that she does not feel that there will be adequate parking available for the development and stated that she would prefer fewer units. Ms. Mercer commented that she believes the increased density will result in increased traffic on Blake Street in an area designated as a Community Safety Zone. She suggested that a building with a smaller footprint, with additional greenspace would be more environmentally-friendly. Ms. Mercer concluded by reiterating that she does not object to the rezoning to residential, noting her objection relates to the exemptions being requested by the developer from the RM2 zoning standards.

4. **Ed Prince, 386 Blake Street** explained that he is the Property Manager for Lions Hall adjacent to the subject site. He expressed concern with the proposed density and the increased amount of traffic. He explained that the Lions Hall has many functions that are held after 11:00 p.m. and believes that the third floors of the townhouses will be impacted by noise coming from the events being held at the banquet hall. Mr. Prince suggested that a clause be included in the sales transaction for the townhouses acknowledging the presence of the banquet hall.

5. **Chad Gilchrist, 29 Alexander Avenue** explained that his backyard abuts the property line of the proposed development. He noted that he agrees with the previous comments made by Ms. Mercer and expressed concern about the setback exemption being requested by the developer. He commented that he feels that if the development is approved he will lose his privacy.

6. **Ray Mercer, 33 Alexander Avenue** commented that he opposed increased density for a previous development in the area. He noted that he believes that a six foot green buffer area should be included around the perimeter of the subject property. Mr. Mercer inquired if the setback provisions for the rear yard are being maintained.

Mr. Sellers provided a response to the inquiry.

7. **Bryan Murray, 21 Alexander Avenue** provided history regarding the property ownership of the area and suggested that a hydro easement exists. He inquired if the proposed development included access to the hydro easement.

Mr. Sellers responded to the inquiry.

8. **Bill Hester, 5 Huron Street** provided some information concerning the surrounding neighbourhood noting the various types of dwelling units. He stated that he believes that the decision regarding the development proposal will impact the existing residents. Mr. Hester commented that he feels that there have been no issues with the current bowling alley and he doesn't understand why the property owner wants to convert the property to residential. He expressed concern regarding the loss of jobs that would result from converting the bowling alley to residential units. Mr. Hester indicated that he does not feel that townhouses are the best choice for the neighbourhood.

Members of General Committee asked a number of questions related to the presentation and received responses from the presenter and staff.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Correspondence from the Simcoe County District School Board, dated July 23, 2012.

2. Correspondence from Bell, dated July 25, 2012.
3. Correspondence from Bell, dated August 2, 2012.