

Legislation Text

File #: 11-G-047, Version: 2

APPLICATION FOR AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT, REZONING AND DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION - JONES CONSULTING GROUP LIMITED ON BEHALF OF THE OWNER, 3251586 CANADA INC. -YONGE STREET NORTH OF MAPLEVIEW DRIVE EAST (March 7, 2011) (File: D09-OPA127, D14-1495 and D12-394).

Brandi Clement of The Jones Consulting Group Ltd. explained that the purpose of the public meeting is to review an application for an Official Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Draft Plan of Subdivision submitted by The Jones Consulting Group Ltd. on behalf of the owner, 3251586 Canada Inc.

Ms. Clement explained that the applicant has submitted a complete application for approval of an Official Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Plan of Subdivision for lands located on Yonge Street north of Mapleview Drive East, with a portion of the subject lands on the east side of the GO Transit Rail Corridor and a portion of the subject lands on the west side of the GO Transit Rail Corridor. The subject property is legally described as Part of Lot 15, Concession 12, Being Part 1, Plan 51R-10923, and is located within the Painswick South Planning Area and the Bayshore Planning Area.

Ms. Clement provided the site characteristics and explained that the proposal includes 30.53 hectares immediately west and east of the GO rail line. She noted that the subject lands are the only remaining undeveloped portion of the Barrie Heritage Development lands. She reviewed the surrounding land uses and explained that the lands are identified as within a Major Transit Station Area with density requirements of 50-120 units per hectare.

Ms. Clement noted that the lands are currently designated Residential, Institutional, General Commercial and Open Space within the City's Official Plan, the Painswick South Secondary Plan and the Bayshore Secondary Plan. She explained that the applicant proposes to re-designate the subject lands within these plans to Residential, General Commercial and Open Space in accordance with the proposed development scheme. She stated that the subject lands are currently zoned Agriculture (A) and Residential Holding (RH) in accordance with Zoning By-law 85-95 and By-law 2009-141. Ms. Clement stated that the applicant proposes to rezone the subject lands to Residential Apartment Dwelling First Density Special (RA1-SP), General Commercial, Multiple Residential Second Density Townhouse (RM2-TH) in accordance with the proposed development scheme.

Ms. Clement provided the development concept for the east and west side of the rail line. She explained that the proposed Official Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Plan of Subdivision would permit the development of the subject property for a total of 973 dwelling units with a variety of housing forms including block/cluster townhouses, stacked townhouses, street townhouses, and 3 - 5 storey apartment buildings. She noted that the application also includes single storey retail/office commercial development. Ms. Clement concluded by stating that she believes the proposal conforms to the Growth Plan and is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statements. She noted that the proposal will use existing infrastructure, will support a transit-supportive and

alternative transportation environment, represents good planning and will be an asset to the City of Barrie.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Keegan Smith, 20 Chamboro Court, stated that he was representing a group of citizens who are opposed to the development proposal. He noted and that he believes the existing infrastructure for the development is inadequate and feels the roads are not built for the increased traffic that would be generated if the development is approved, the schools are at capacity and the emergency services are stretched to their limit. Mr. Smith commented that he believes this proposal will impact the existing residential areas and that there will not be places for the children to play. Mr. Smith explained he does not feel that it is fair to extend Popular Drive as it represents a drastic change for the existing residents and he believes there will be an increased amount of speeders on Pine Drive and Hurst Drive as well. He questioned if there will be an environmental impact if the proposal is approved and noted that the Lake Simcoe Conservation Authority commented that the proposal does not comply with the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and Ontario Regulation 179/06. He concluded by urging members of Council to oppose the proposed development.

Duncan McLelland, 264 Pine Drive, noted that his property is at the T-intersection of Pine Drive and Popular Drive and would be directly impacted by the traffic if the proposal is approved. He commented that he is opposed to Popular Drive being opened as a connection for through traffic. He stated that he believes the high density of the proposal will cause a high traffic corridor and provide an access route to downtown Barrie. He questioned why Popular Drive needed to be utilized for the development and stated that he feels that the value of his home will be negatively impacted. Mr. McLelland asked if additional stop signs and speed bumps will be required in his subdivision due to the increased traffic. He concluded by stating that he feels the proposal and the resulting increased traffic is not in keeping with the existing estate setting and country lifestyle of the established 40 year old neighbourhood.

John Culshaw, 220 Walnut Crescent commented that he previously worked for the Town of Innisfil and believes there are many flaws with the proposal, especially the Block east of the railway tracks and asked if the easterly portion is zoned a "Special Policy Area" due to the high water table. He noted that he believes townhouses are not economically feasible and feels that Pine Drive was not constructed to be a major arterial road. He questioned if Pine Drive will have to be widened if the proposal is approved. He indicated that there may be claims against the City if the proposal is approved and requested Council to turn down the proposal.

Fran Burton, 269 Pine Drive commented that she is opposed to the development east of the railway and questioned if the existing water and sewers could handle the density. She stated that she feels that it is unacceptable for Popular Drive to be opened as it may cause dangerous traffic concerns for the residents who live in Bayshore Estates. She stated that she believes the proposed development will have a devastating impact to the existing area, including the woodlands and wildlife and is too large for the size of property.

Andrew Lomaga, 81 Gerald Street Toronto, stated that he is representing Sierra Vista Holdings and believes that that the commercial portion of the development should not be approved as there are existing undeveloped commercially zoned properties in the area. He commented about his experience with an OMB hearing concerning the Sierra Vista property and his frustration with the outcome. He concluded by stating that he is opposed to the proposal of additional commercial zoning until the existing four properties in the Big Bay Point Road area are developed.

Fred Van Arragon, 201 Popular Drive expressed appreciation to his neighbours for taking the time to attend the public meeting. He stated that he has lived in the area for eighteen years and feels that the development proposal is not appropriate for the area. He commented that the existing neighbourhood was developed in the seventies and feels that the existing home owners purchased their properties believing that it was a quiet neighbourhood. Mr. Van Arragon commented that he feels it is necessary to ensure a transition in the

development of the lands on the west side of the railway and is concerned about the loss of wetlands and forest habitat if the development is approved on the east side of the railway. He questioned whether the proposal represents smart planning if it disturbs the current neighbourhood and traffic patterns and asked if the existing infrastructure can manage the impact of the development. He stated that he feels the current proposal requires drastic modifications and that Popular Drive should not just push through. He urged all members of Council to consider the proposal protect the wetlands and do the right thing for the City.

Jonathan Steffler, 48 River Ridge Road commented that he is a professional fire fighter and believes the concerns provided by the previous residents are valid. He noted that the density of the proposal may be an issue as the emergency services required to serve the development will be impacted. He stated that it appears that the City of Barrie is continually trying to catch up to the growth and questioned if another fire station will be constructed to meet the needs of the residents in this area. Mr. Steffler concluded by indicating that he is concerned about the high density of the proposal and noted that if approved the City may require the assistance of a mutual aid agreement to meet the emergency service requirements.

Eleanor McGillvery, 1 Esther Dr. commented that she is not opposed to development in principle but is concerned about the design factor of the proposal and requests that the buildings not look similar to each other. She noted that she feels that the transit system in the south end of Barrie needs to be improved before this development proposal is approved.

Andrew Strauss, 211 Walnut Crescent noted that he is opposed to the plan of subdivision on the east portion of the development and how the proposal will impact the surrounding area. He commented that he would like both developers to answer why they cannot loop the roads through the subdivision.

Members of General Committee asked a number of questions to the representatives of the applicant and City staff.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Correspondence dated January 17, 2011 from Charles F. Burgess, Senior Planning Coordinator for the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority.
2. Correspondence dated January 28, 2011 from Jim Arnott, Municipal Coordination Advisor, Distribution Asset Management for Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc.
3. Correspondence dated March 2, 2011 from Caron Goodreau.
4. Correspondence dated March 7, 2011 from David and Carol Steele.
5. Correspondence dated March 2, 2011 from David S. White on behalf of Hewitt's Creek Management Inc.