



Minutes - Final
General Committee

Monday, April 24, 2017

7:00 PM

Council Chamber

GENERAL COMMITTEE REPORT

For consideration by Barrie City Council on May 1, 2017.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Lehman at 7:03 p.m. The following were in attendance for the meeting:

- Present:** 9 - Mayor, J. Lehman; Councillor, B. Ainsworth; Councillor, R. Romita; Councillor, D. Shipley; Councillor, B. Ward; Councillor, P. Silveira; Councillor, A. Prince; Councillor, S. Morales; and Councillor, M. McCann
- Absent:** 2 - Councillor, M. Prowse; and Councillor, A. Khan

STUDENT MAYOR:

Austin Morby, W.C. Little Elementary School.

STAFF:

Chief Administrative Officer, C. Ladd
City Clerk/Director of Legislative and Court Services, D. McAlpine
Deputy City Clerk, W. Cooke
Director of Corporate Facilities, R. Pews
Director of Creative Economy, K. Dubeau
Director of Engineering, R. Sutton
Director of Legal Services, I. Peters
Director of Roads, Parks and Fleet, D. Friary
Executive Director of Access Barrie, R. James-Reid
Executive Director of Innovate Barrie, R. Bunn
Executive Director of Invest Barrie, Z. Lifshiz
General Manager of Infrastructure and Growth Management, R. Forward
Manager of Growth Planning, S. Forfar
Manager of Sustainable Development, M. Kalyaniwalla
Manager of Water Operations, C. Marchant
Planner, B. Chabot
Planner, C. Terry
Service Desk Specialist, T. Versteeg
Supervisor of Transit Business Services, B. Forsyth
Theatre Technician, M. McLeod.

The General Committee reports that the following matter(s) were dealt with on the consent portion of the agenda:

SECTION "A"

**17-G-072 REPORT OF THE FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES COMMITTEE
DATED MARCH 29, 2017**

The Report of the Finance and Corporate Services Committee dated March 29, 2017 was received.

This matter was recommended (Section "A") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

**17-G-073 REPORT OF THE COUNCIL COMPENSATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
DATED APRIL 12, 2017.**

The Report of the Council Compensation Review Committee dated April 12, 2017 was received.

This matter was recommended (Section "A") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

**17-G-074 REPORT OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER / CITY MANAGER
RECRUITMENT COMMITTEE DATED APRIL 18, 2017.**

The Report of the Chief Administrative Officer/City Manager Recruitment Committee dated April 18, 2017 was received.

This matter was recommended (Section "A") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

The General Committee recommends adoption of the following recommendation(s) which were dealt with on the consent portion of the agenda:

SECTION "B"

17-G-075 BARRIE HISTORICAL ARCHIVE

1. That a link be provided from the City of Barrie's website to the Barrie Historical Archive's website.
2. That the Barrie Historical Archive be requested to provide additional detailed information regarding their request for funding. (File: C05)

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

17-G-076 ESTABLISHING AN ACCESSIBLE BUSINESS AWARD

1. That an Accessible Business Award Program be established to recognize local businesses and organizations that encourage and support accessibility in the City of Barrie.
2. That the award be presented annually at a City Council meeting that is close to National Access Awareness Week.

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

17-G-077 BARRIE ARTS AWARD - ACCESSIBILITY BASED AWARD

1. That the annual contribution of \$1000 towards the Barrie Arts Award for an accessibility based award to be funded from the Accessibility Advisory Committee Account #01-06-0930-0000-3070, be approved.
2. That the Accessibility Advisory Committee continue to support the Culture Branch in obtaining a corporate sponsor from the private sector to fund the remaining \$1,000 towards the accessibility award.

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

17-G-078 MADY CENTRE FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS AND GEORGIAN THEATRE PROGRAMMING

1. That the report to Finance and Corporate Services Committee dated March 29, 2017 regarding the development of additional programming for the Mady Centre for the Performing Arts and Georgian Theatre be received for information purposes.
2. That Invest Barrie staff report back to the Finance and Corporate Services Committee on the outcomes of implementation for additional programming at the two City of Barrie Theatres in the spring of 2018.
3. That any net profits associated with the extra theatre programming outlined in the presentation to the Finance and Corporate Services Committee on March 29, 2017, be allocated to the Public Art Committee. (File: R00)

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

17-G-079 AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN APPROVAL FORM TO MOVE WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY TO CLASS A BILLING

1. That the Director of Corporate Facilities be authorized to execute the consent letter to have the Wastewater Treatment Facility opt into the Industrial Conservation Initiative (ICI) and move the Wastewater Treatment Facility to Class A billing for the Global Adjustment portion of the electrical bill for the plant.
2. That the Director of Corporate Facilities be authorized to execute future agreements (presently yearly) to remain in the ICI program that are in keeping with the general intent and purpose of the original agreement. (FCT002-17) (File: P01)

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

17-G-080 AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN DEVIATION REQUEST FORM FOR SOLAR PROJECTS

That the City Clerk be authorized to execute the Rodent Deviation Request form attached as Appendix "A" to Staff Report FCT003-17. (FCT003-17) (File: E11)

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

17-G-081 LITIGATION MATTER - ARDAGH ROAD

That staff be directed to implement the steps outlined in Appendix "A" to Confidential Staff Report LGL004-17 and should the application be resolved, the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to execute any documents that may be requisite. (LGL004-17) (File: L00)

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

17-G-082 PARKING PROHIBITION ON DUNSMORE LANE (WARD 1)

That Traffic By-law 80-138 Schedule "B" "No Parking in Specified Places Where Signs on Display at Stated Times" be amended to add the following:

<u>Dunsmore Lane</u>	Southerly portion of Dunsmore Lane on the south and west side from Johnson Street to a point 375 metres west thereof.	7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday to Friday Friday, excluding Statutory Holidays."
<u>Dunsmore Lane</u>	Northern portion of Dunsmore Lane on the south and east side from Johnson Street to a point 417 metres west thereof.	7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday to Friday Friday, excluding Statutory Holidays."

(RPF003-17) (File: T02-PA)

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

17-G-083 SUBMISSION OF A BID TO HOST THE DOCS ON ICE ANNUAL FUNDRAISING DOCTORS HOCKEY TOURNAMENT

That staff in the Recreation Services and Creative Economy Departments in conjunction with representatives of the Physician Recruitment Task Force investigate the feasibility associated with submitting a bid for the City of Barrie to become the next available host community for the Docs on Ice annual fundraising doctors hockey tournament, and report back to General Committee. (Item for Discussion 8.2, April 24, 2017) (File: R00)

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

17-G-084 PERMISSION FOR LOW FLYING OF FLIGHTS FOR COMMUNITY EVENTS

That the Mayor and/or Executive Director of Invest Barrie be delegated the authority to issue letters on behalf of the City of Barrie approving of flights over the community associated with special events involving airshow aerobatic maneuvers or flybys/flypasts as well as any related arrival, practice, media, and departure flights. (Item for Discussion 8.2, April 24, 2017) (File: A00)

This matter was recommended (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

The General Committee met for the purpose of three Public Meetings starting at 7:09 p.m.

Mayor Lehman 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. Mayor Lehman confirmed with the Manager of Growth Planning that notification was conducted in accordance with the Planning Act.

SECTION "C"

17-G-085 APPLICATION FOR A ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION - SUBMITTED BY INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS ON BEHALF OF 2440511 ONTARIO INC. - 521 AND 527 BIG BAY POINT ROAD (WARD 9) (FILE: D12-424 / D14-1619)

Mr. Darren Vella of Innovate Planning Solutions advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting was to review applications submitted by Innovative Planning Solutions on behalf of 2440511 Ontario Inc. for a proposed development located at 521 and 527 Big Bay Point Road.

Mr. Vella discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- The context of the subject applications including information concerning the site and surrounding land uses;
- The current land use designation and zoning;
- The property in the context of the Intensification Areas;
- The initial development proposal as presented at the neighbourhood meeting held on March 9, 2017;
- An architectural rendering the initial development as presented proposed;

- The concerns of neighbouring residents and City of Barrie staff associated with the initial development proposal;
- A revised development proposal for a 34 back to back townhouse project,
- Examples of architectural renderings of various elevations of back to back townhouses;
- A chart illustrating the proposed zoning by-law amendments associated with back to back townhouse concept versus the original block cluster townhouse concept; and
- The proposed standards for Intensification Areas in context with the proposed development.

In conclusion, Mr. Vella commented that even though a portion of the lands were not located within the Intensification Node, there are policies within the Official Plan that allow for intensification to occur outside of the Node and it was his opinion this proposal satisfied the criteria.

Ms. Bailey Chabot, Planner provided details related to the history of the application as well as the primary planning and land use considerations associated with the applications. She discussed the comments and concerns of the members of the public in attendance at the Neighbourhood Meeting held on March 9, 2017. She noted that the comments received were associated with the original development proposal.

VERBAL COMMENTS

1. **Mr. Dave Lawlor, 512 Big Bay Point Rd**, noted that he had provided copies of his submission to the City Clerk. Mr. Lawlor read from one of his submissions advising that his property is almost across the road from the subject lands. He observed that the Yonge Street and Big Bay Point area was identified in the Intensification Urban Design Study as an intensification node and that it was understood that Lot 521 falls slightly within a node, and that lot 527 does not. Mr. Lawlor described the surrounding properties as primarily single family residential. Mr. Lawlor advised that he felt that the area around the proposed development has already experienced extensive development, particularly along Yonge Street as it has been zoned commercial for some time.

Mr. Lawlor expressed concern for his neighbours who he felt would be impacted by the proposed development. He stated that if the rezoning was permitted, a precedent would be set for other developers to appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board for similar projects and that further negative impacts on traffic flow may occur.

Mr. Lawlor discussed his concerns related to the proposed single entrance/exit associated with the initial development proposal, as well as the lack of visitor parking. He commented that the section of the roadway where the proposed development is to be located does not have traffic signals to mitigate excessive speed in the area. Mr. Lawlor discussed the increase in traffic on Big Bay Point Road since it was widened to five lanes, particularly during the morning and evening rush hours. He suggested that the City had given up on the traffic problems since it approved to initiate a parking prohibition along all of Big Bay Point Road. Mr. Lawlor indicated that he felt the proposed expansion of Big Bay Point Road over Highway 400 to Harvie Road along with the traffic from the proposed townhouse units, would make the traffic situation worse.

Mr. Lawlor expressed that he felt that if the proposed townhouse complex at this location was permitted that it would be irresponsible. He discussed that he felt that proposed development may necessitate additional traffic signals and would compromise the relief that Big Bay Point Road to Harvie Road was intended to provide to the traffic on Mapleview Drive. Mr. Lawlor stated that he believes that Big Bay Point cannot accommodate both additional traffic flow and development of medium density residential housing. Mr. Lawlor said he was not aware of any traffic studies being undertaken.

Mr. Lawlor spoke to the revised development proposal and commented that even though a second entrance/exit was proposed, the increase in units would mean a further increase of traffic on Big Bay Point Road. He reiterated that he felt that City needs to decide whether it wants density or to support traffic flow.

In conclusion, Mr. Lawlor noted he had three areas of concern related to the proposal the first being an escalation in traffic associated with the number of housing developments and extension of Big Bay Point Road necessitating a specific traffic study; the second being the significant changes to the site plan from what was presented at the Neighbourhood Meeting; and thirdly that the residents who attended the public meeting were not contacted by the City via email to confirm when the Public Meeting was to be held. Mr. Lawlor indicated he felt that the City had failed to proceed with due diligence and therefore the proposed rezoning should not proceed.

2. **Ms. Barb Tansley, 533 Big Bay Point Road** read from correspondence she had submitted. She advised that she felt the proposed amendment to the Zoning By-law and Draft Plan of Subdivision should be denied. Ms. Tansley discussed the current zoning provisions for the area and her concerns associated with the impacts on privacy, lack of afternoon sunlight or seeing the sunset due to the proposed number and height of the townhouse units. She noted that she attended the Neighbourhood Meeting to discuss her concerns related to privacy and now in the revised proposal the main entrance had changed to face her property and not the street. Ms.

Tansley commented the renderings shown at the Neighbourhood Meeting illustrated a 3-storey development and now it was 4-storeys. She questioned how the revised proposal would address the concerns of the neighbourhood. She also commented on her concerns related to the differing proposals.

Ms. Tansley discussed her concerns related to the impact on privacy and the shadowing the proposed development would cause for neighbouring properties. She noted that the properties were sold without any signage and questioned if the two mature trees on the lots would be preserved. Ms. Tansley relayed concerns associated with drainage.

Ms. Tansley commented on the negative impact the proposed development could have on property values in the neighbourhood. She discussed her concerns associated with potential structural damage to the homes, noise, dust and deliveries that would be the result of the construction. Ms. Tansley also discussed her concerns related to the lack of space for garbage and snow storage.

In closing, Ms. Tansley requested that that City Council deny the application.

3. **Ms. Patricia Scicluna, 24 Grand Forest Drive** commented that she moved to this area nine years ago but it used to be a quiet area but she has seen an increase of traffic on Grand Forest Drive because of traffic avoiding Big Bay Point Road. She indicated that she can't sleep in her front bedroom due to the noise. Ms. Scicluna stated that building townhouses in the proposed area on Big Bay Point Road, would be nonsense as there is already too much traffic at Yonge Street and Big Bay Point Road. She discussed the difficulties in making turning movements at this intersection and noted if additional buildings are added that it will make it impossible to go through this intersection.
4. **Mr. Tony Stevenson, 208 Montgomery Drive** noted that Ms. Tansley had touched on many of his points. He discussed his concerns related to the resale value of his home, the close proximity of the proposed townhouse to his property and the impact on his family's privacy.
5. **Mr. Bob Adams, 537 Big Bay Point Road** advised that he lives close to Ms. Tansley and that the traffic in the area is really bad all year round. He discussed the difficulties seeing past snow banks and exiting safely from driveways and noted he felt that the additional traffic that would be caused by the proposed townhouse development would complicate the issue resulting in more accidents. Mr. Adams noted that there wasn't an area for snow storage in the proposed development plan or sufficient visitor parking, and that the parking would overflow onto the neighbouring streets. He also commented

about his concerns related to privacy as the balconies would overlook neighbouring backyards. Mr. Adams expressed concern related to effects on housing prices as he wants the value of his property to continue to increase. In closing, Mr. Adams questioned why the parking couldn't be located underground to reduce the height back to 3-storeys and reiterated his concerns related to the lack of visitor parking.

Members of General Committee asked questions of the applicant's representative and City staff, and received responses.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

1. Correspondence from David Lawlor, received March 9, 13 and 27, 2017.
2. Correspondence from Barbara and Brian Tansley, dated April 18, 2017.
3. Correspondence from David Lawlor, received April 24, 2017.

This matter was recommended (Section "C") to City Council for consideration of adoption/receipt at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

17-G-086

APPLICATION FOR AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT - SUBMITTED BY MACNAUGHTON HERMSEN BRITTON CLARKSON (MHBC) PLANNING LIMITED ON BEHALF OF THE OWNER, D.D. 37 JOHNSON LTD. - 37 JOHNSON STREET (WARD 1) (FILE: D09-OPA62 / D14-1618)

Mr. Eldon Theodore of MacNaughton Hermesen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting was to review applications for an Official Plan Amendment and a Zoning By-law Amendment for the lands municipally known as 37 Johnson Street.

Mr. Theodore provided a presentation and discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- An overview of the proposed development;
- The context of the site including the existing apartment building and surrounding land uses;
- The benefits of the proposed development;
- An overview of the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments;
- The application in relation to Provincial and City policies;
- The proposed Site Plan details;
- The height and density of the proposed new building;
- The traffic and parking studies completed in support of the applications;

- Images from the Shadow Study completed in support of the application; and
- A summary of the application, with renderings of the site before and after with the proposed development.

Ms. Celeste Terry, Planner provided details related to the history of the application as well as the primary planning and land use considerations associated with the application. She discussed the comments and concerns of the members of the public that were in attendance at the Neighbourhood Meeting held on February 24, 2017.

VERBAL COMMENTS:

1. **Mr. Clare Riepma, 220 Kempenfelt Drive** advised that as the President of the Barrie East End Home Owners' Association he was representing 200-300 area home owners. Mr. Riepma commented that the east end of Barrie is a stable community where it is nice to live and raise family. He discussed concerns associated with the proposed development and noted that it did not make sense to double the density to have twice as many people on the property as there is now. Mr. Riepma noted that he felt that this development would not fit into the fabric of the neighbourhood. He discussed the Intensification Study and suggested that if development like this occurs outside of the City Centre it could detract from redevelopment of the downtown. He indicated that he felt that the plan is poorly thought out in relation to only providing one parking space per unit and that the area residents and businesses would not find it acceptable to accommodate overflow parking. Mr. Riepma remarked that the infrastructure in the area is old and needs to be updated and is not adequate for the construction of the proposed development. In conclusion, Mr. Riepma noted that the proposed development doesn't conform to the City's Official Plan and is not a fit in the neighbourhood. He requested that the application be denied.
2. **Mr. Jim Cancilla, 25 Algonquin Trail** advised that he has lived in the area for over 30 years. He stated that his subdivision was well thought out with wide, tree lined streets, big lots, and a park that provides a buffer from the apartment building and that people who move into the neighbourhood stay for many years as it is a great place to live. He commented that the Official Plan and Zoning By-law provisions for the North Shore Planning Area represented good planning then and now, and that 37 Johnson Street was never meant to be enlarged or added to or have a separate building on the site. He noted he felt that the density is not needed in the neighbourhood. He requested that the property be left alone as the proposed development would destroy the integrity of the neighbourhood. Mr. Cancilla referred to the petition signed by over 400 residents noting that it was also signed by several area businesses. In closing, Mr. Cancilla requested that the application be denied.

3. **Ms. Nadine Saunders, 7 Campfire Court** advised that a petition had been submitted with over 430 names of taxpayers and businesses in opposition to the application. She commented that while they all agree with intensification, they feel that the proposal is oversized and it will negatively impact the area streets and parks. Ms. Saunders remarked that there is no justification for this development as this site is not underutilized and located in the City's Urban Growth Centre. She discussed her concerns associated with the proposed size of the development and noted that there are other areas within the City that are more suited to this type of development. She highlighted that similar applications for the subject site in the past were not approved. Ms. Saunders described deficiencies associated with the existing development at 37 Johnson Street.

Ms. Saunders noted that she felt that the Developer had no regard for the City's Official Plan and Growth Policies or goals for intensification, and that the proposed development is oversized and would set a negative precedent for the area. She mentioned an article in the Barrie Examiner related to smart planning, and commented that this development is not smart planning or in the best interest of the City of Barrie. Ms. Saunders noted that not all who signed the petition reside in Ward One. She suggested that members of Council attend the site and stand in the driveway and view the sight lines. In closing, Ms. Saunders reiterated that this development is not a fit for the neighbourhood as there are already a number of mixed uses along Blake Street and expressed her hope that the proposed application would not be approved.

4. **Mr. Rob McCallum, 21 Algonquin Trail** questioned whether the City would be liable for anything falling from the building if it approved the development with the reduced setbacks from the park. Mr. McCallum discussed the amount of higher density buildings in the neighbourhood in comparison to the entire City and the inward ratio that would be in place if the development was approved. He described the provincial vacancy rates for rental housing versus the City of Barrie vacancy rates. Mr. McCallum discussed the number of rental units proposed to be constructed in Barrie and questioned if Barrie was that desperate that it required the proposed 220 units. He observed that some property owners, including 37 Johnson Street were currently appealing their assessment. Mr. McCallum suggested that other property owners may appeal their assessments as well, which would result in lost revenues. He commented that Starlight Investments is a large company with a number of buildings and assets and are looking for further revenues at the expense of the neighbourhood. Mr. McCallum questioned the value of the Official Plan, if it was to be ignored

5. **Mr. David Hindley, 27 Johnson Street** advised that he has lived adjacent to subject property for over 30 years. He described what it is like to live next to an apartment building advising that there are cars parked in front of his home and at the side of his home on Campfire Court daily. He discussed of the aggravation felt by area residents about the overflow parking issues and that friends, family and tradespeople are not able to park near his home. Mr. Hindley noted that he felt that once the additional units from the proposed building were added, it would make this situation a whole lot worse for the entire area. Mr. Hindley urged Council to take his comments under advisement.
6. **Ms. Wendy Wolak 24 Algonquin Trail** discussed her concerns associated with the proposed development site being located in a wellhead protection area as a nearby aquifer feeds into wells. She noted that the area is on the high vulnerability index and expressed her concerns associated with the potential transfer of pollutants and a high water table. Ms. Wolak suggested that the high water table would require dewatering and questioned where would the water go. In closing, Ms. Wolak remarked that she strongly opposed the application.
7. **Ms. Carol MacNichol, 2 Campfire Court** remarked about the number of times similar applications had been presented and that the area residents have had to fight against developers who don't want to adhere to Barrie by-laws and meet our standards. She discussed her concerns associated with the current traffic and noise in the area. She expressed concerns regarding noise and traffic that would result from the development. Ms. MacNichol commented that she did not understand why the residents have to do this over and over again. She stated that she hoped that the application is turned down again and that they are not back in three to four years doing this again with another developer.
8. **Ms. Angela Baldwin 3 Barrie Terrace**, advised that she is a Professional Planner and noted that she knows it is important to intensify. She stated that she felt that the City had done the correct thing by developing the Intensification Policy and establishing provisions in the Official Plan. She commented that the density proposed for the development is 293 units per hectare and she does not know of any other development within the City that has the same density. Ms. Baldwin stated that just because the site may have land available does not mean that the site should be intensified. She referred to the current density in the neighbourhood and suggested that the neighbourhood is not appropriate for the proposed amount of intensification. She spoke to intensification as identified in the City Policy, and the nodes and areas identified. She expressed that the area is primarily low density housing. She stated that the existing building already exceeds the density in the intensification nodes and noted that the site is not in an intensification node. Ms. Baldwin

discussed that Johnson Street is a minor collector road and really only functions as a local road which would cause parking and safety issues. Ms. Baldwin discussed her concerns associated with adding 423 parking spaces to a street that does not function as an arterial road and the congestion that would be created. She commented that this is not just a “not in my backyard” case and that the principles were different in the 1970’s versus planning policy today. Ms. Baldwin indicated that even though there is transit and are other amenities, she does not believe the site meets the criteria for intensification, is not the right site for intensification and does not represent good planning.

9. **Mr. Robb Meier, 10 Napier Street** commented that he felt that this is an exciting development for the City and the site is close to many amenities such as transit and the North Shore Trail. He suggested that even though it is not within one of the intensification nodes, he felt the proposal makes good sense and noted that the Intensification Policy does not exclude evaluating other locations. He stated that he believed the proposal made good sense for the City, as the updated parking requirements promote less car dependence, the roads in the area are under capacity, there excess capacity in the surrounding neighborhoods and this proposal represents intensification in a responsible way. Mr. Meier discussed the petition submitted and noted that not all of the 430 people who signed it live in Ward One. He commented that there is a rental housing crisis that could be addressed by embracing proposals such as this one.
10. **Mr. Wilfod Jasek, 54 Arrowhead Road**, discussed concerns associated with the potential shadowing impacts from the proposed development. He noted that he hoped that the plan will not go forward.
11. **Mr. Lyman Paquette, 37 Johnson Street Unit 812**, discussed his concerns associated with fire safety for the new building, as new water connections would be required and it is not close to a fire hydrant. Mr. Paquette observed that the new building will be approximately 7 metres from the existing building and noted his concerns about the privacy for residents in the existing building as well as the impact on the roots of the trees from the construction and shadowing in the existing park. He stated that there simply isn’t enough room on the site for the additional building.
12. **Mr. Chuck MacNichol, 2 Campfire Fire Court**, suggested that the same parking prohibition that was recommended for Dunsmore Lane be implemented on Campfire Court. Mr. MacNichol discussed the challenges associated with parking on the street resulting from non-residents who use Johnson Beach and noted that the proposed new building would add to the problem. He commented regarding the developer paying cash-in-lieu of parkland would not benefit the area residents as this money would be towards a park in another ward.

13. **Mr. Bob Burch 43 Indian Arrow Road** suggested that the members of Committee take a drive around 37 Johnson Street and look at the parking behind the building, and parking on the street and questioned how fire trucks and moving trucks would be able to negotiate the area.
14. **Ms. Carole Paquette, 37 Johnson Street Unit 812** commented that before building a new building the existing building should be completed. Ms. Paquette discussed that she is interrupted day in and day out with improvements being done to the building and noted she felt that the improvements were being done so higher rent could be charged as new people move in. She observed that the new building was being built out of greed. Ms. Paquette requested that the existing building at 37 Johnson Street be taken care of before a new building is constructed, so not to put it through.
15. **Mr. Ross Johnston, 33 Indian Arrow Road** commented that greed does not benefit community and this is a beautiful area of the community. He stated that his kids play in the park and would hate not to see the sunset.
16. **Ms. Joan McFadyen, 37 Johnson Street** advised that she has lived at her residence for approximately two years. She questioned if the developer's other buildings are looked at prior to new places being built and suggested that her building be reviewed. She described a number of concerns related to the lack of an elevator to the underground parking, the maintenance of stairs and mold. She noted she felt that the developer should look after what they have first.
17. **Mr. Lenny Savella 8 Campfire Court** questioned the level of occupancy in the existing building and the rental rates charged. He suggested that this information would be valuable as the applicant has stated the City needs more rental units. Mr. Savella discussed his concerns related to the increase in his property taxes since 2012. He stated that he appreciates the area. Mr. Savella stated that the construction and building itself would have long lasting repercussions and suggested that Council should seriously consider them.

Members of General Committee asked several questions of the applicant's representative and City staff and received responses.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Correspondence from Nadine Saunders dated February 28, March 21 and April 12, 2017. (Note: April 12, 2017 correspondence included petition with 428 signatures)
2. Correspondence from Gary and Jennifer Campbell dated March 1, 2017.

3. Correspondence from Aileen and Kevin Carrol dated March 5, 2017.
4. Correspondence from Cheryl Tomkinson dated March 9, 2017.
5. Correspondence from Jim Regier dated March 11, 2017.
6. Correspondence from Patricia West dated March 12, 2017.
7. Correspondence from Richard and Joan Reed dated March 14, 2017.
8. Correspondence from Rick and Wendy Wolak, received March 20, 2017
9. Correspondence from Jack Burke dated March 27, 2017.
10. Correspondence from Jason Grieve dated March 28, 2017.
11. Correspondence from Lori and Doug Bell dated April 3, 2017.
12. Correspondence from Dana and Joe Quinto dated April 3, 2017.
13. Correspondence from Jill Shipley and David Brown dated April 3, 2017.
14. Correspondence from Greg West dated April 17, 2017.
15. Correspondence from Elaine McCron dated April 18, 2017.
16. Correspondence from Florence Moll dated April 19, 2017.
17. Correspondence from Bob Burch dated April 21, 2017.
18. Correspondence from John and Diane Osborn dated April 21, 2017.

This matter was recommended (Section "C") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

General Committee recessed at 9:42 p.m. and resumed at 9:57 p.m.

17-G-087**APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED HOUSEKEEPING AMENDMENTS TO ZONING BY-LAW 2009-141 - CITY OF BARRIE (FILE: D14-1629)**

Ms. Celeste Terry, Planner advised that the purpose of the Public Meeting was to review an application for proposed amendments to update and refine the intent of the Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141. Ms. Terry advised that the proposed amendments are intended to address inconsistencies, barriers for implementation, errors and omissions that have become apparent through the use of the By-law since its approval

Ms. Terry discussed slides concerning the following topics:

- An overview of the proposed amendments to related to Section - 3.0 Definitions, Section 4.0 - General Provisions, Section 5.0 - Residential;
- An overview of the proposed amendments to all sections of By-law 2009-141; and
- Amendment to Zoning Map Schedule #1, #2.

VERBAL COMMENTS

Members of the public did not provide any verbal comments.

The Mayor asked questions of clarification and received responses from City staff.

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

Written correspondence was not received concerning this application.

This matter was recommended (Section "C") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

The General Committee met and recommends adoption of the following recommendation(s):

SECTION "D"

17-G-088 OUTSOURCING IMPLEMENTATION OF CORPORATE SPONSORSHIP STRATEGY

1. That the criteria for a consultant listed in Appendix "A" to the report to the Finance and Corporate Services Committee dated March 29, 2017 concerning outsourcing the implementation of the Sponsorship Pilot Program be approved.
2. That the list of city assets identified in Appendix "B" of the report to the Finance and Corporate Services Committee, be approved as potential sponsorship naming opportunities in the Sponsorship Pilot Program.
3. That a Request for Proposals be issued to engage a consultant for the Sponsorship Pilot Program based on the criteria and assets identified in Appendices "A" and "B" to the report of the Finance and Corporate Services Committee.
4. That staff report back to General Committee regarding all opportunities involving the direct naming and renaming of City property, buildings and structures.
5. That Invest Barrie and Access Barrie staff be authorized to undertake a non-standard procurement process to allow for negotiations for naming rights with new, potential sponsors of the Mady Theatre and report back to General Committee with a recommendation. (16-G-273) (INV001-16) (File: M00)

This matter was recommended (Section "D") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

ENQUIRIES

Members of General Committee addressed several enquiries to City staff and received responses.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Members of General Committee provided announcements concerning a number of matters.

The General Committee reports that upon adoption of the required procedural motion it met in closed session in the Sir Robert Barrie Room at 10:17 p.m. to discuss the content of confidential Staff Report LCS009-17 concerning a confidential personal information matter – appointment to the Heritage Barrie Committee. Members of General Committee (with the exception of Councillor, P. Silveira, Councillor, M. Prowse and Councillor, A. Khan), the City Clerk/Director of Legislative and Court Services, and General Manager of Infrastructure and Growth Management, were in attendance for the portion of the meeting closed to the public. Members of the press and public were not present for this portion of the meeting.

SECTION "E"

17-G-089 **CONFIDENTIAL DISCUSSION OF A PERSONAL INFORMATION MATTER - APPOINTMENT TO THE HERITAGE BARRIE COMMITTEE** (LCS009-17)
(File: C05)

That motion 17-G-089 of the General Committee Report dated April 24, 2017, 2017 concerning the discussion of confidential personal information matter regarding an appointment to the Heritage Barrie Committee, be received.

This matter was recommended (Section "E") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

The General Committee reports upon adoption of a procedural motion, it met in public/open session at 10:17 p.m.

Mayor Lehman noted that the in-camera/closed session portion of the meeting related to a confidential personal information matter. Mayor Lehman stated that with the exception of the procedural matter to move into public/open session, votes were not taken during the portion of the meeting closed to the public.

SECTION "F"

17-G-090 **APPOINTMENT TO THE HERITAGE BARRIE COMMITTEE**

That Greg Marek be appointed to the Heritage Barrie Committee for a term of office to expire on November 30, 2018. (LCS009-17) (File: C05)

This matter was recommended (Section "F") to City Council for consideration of adoption at its meeting to be held on 5/1/2017.

The meeting adjourned at 10:18 p.m.

CHAIRMAN