



City of Barrie

70 Collier Street (Box 400)
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Minutes - Final General Committee

Monday, June 1, 2009

7:00 PM

Council Chamber

GENERAL COMMITTEE REPORT

For consideration by the Council of the City of Barrie on June 8, 2009

The meeting was called to order by Mayor D. Aspden at 8:04 p.m. and the following were recorded as being present:

COUNCIL:

Mayor, D. Aspden
Councillor, M. Ramsay
Councillor, J. Lehman
Councillor, R. Jackson
Councillor, L. Strachan
Councillor, M. Prowse
Councillor, J. Brassard
Councillor, J. Moore
Councillor, A. Nuttall.

ABSENT:

Councillor, B. Ward
Councillor, A. Prince.

STAFF:

Chief Administrative Officer, J. Babulic
City Clerk, D. McAlpine
Director of Communications and Intergovernmental Affairs, R. James-Reid (left the meeting at 9:17 p.m.)
Director of Engineering, W. McArthur (left the meeting at 10:16 p.m.)
Director of Leisure, Transit and Facilities, B. Roth
Director of Planning Services, J. Taylor (left the meeting at 10:16 p.m.)
General Manager of Corporate Services, E. Archer (joined the meeting at 9:46 p.m.)
General Manager of Infrastructure, Development and Culture, R. Forward
Real Estate Manager, K. Gray (joined the meeting at 9:17 p.m.)
Supervisor, Vital Statistics, Corporate Mail and Print Services, L. Pearson.

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

SECTION "A"

09-G-253

REPORT NO. 4 OF THE COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE DATED MAY 21, 2009.

Report No. 4 of the Community Services Committee dated May 21, 2009 was received. (File: C05)

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

SECTION "B"

09-G-254

TAP WATER CONSUMPTION OVER BOTTLED WATER

That staff investigate the feasibility and potential strategies to eliminate the use of bottled water and report back to the Community Services Committee on the financial and workplan implications. (09-G-107) (09-G-186) (Circ. March 9, 2009, C7) (File C05)

This matter was recommended for consideration of adoption (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

09-G-255

This matter was recommended for consideration of adoption (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

09-G-256

ENGINEERING CONDITIONS FOR BISHOP DRIVE EXTENSION - RESIDENTIAL PLAN OF SUBDIVISION

That the Engineering Conditions, as prepared by the Engineering Department for the proposed Residential Plan of Subdivision by Concord Ontario Developments Ltd. (Ministry File 43T-051130), located north of Ardagh Road, and east of Ferndale Drive South, be approved, and that

Engineering Drawing No. 201185 (Sheet No. 201185-1 through 201185-SD2), as prepared by EMC Group Ltd., be approved, subject to the satisfaction of the Engineering Department. (ENG029-09) (File: D12-358)

This matter was recommended for consideration of adoption (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

09-G-257

**FORD STREET STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITY (POND KD6)
RETROFIT MUNICIPAL CLASS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT -
SELECTION OF PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION**

1. That the Preferred Alternative Solution shown in Appendix "A" of Staff Report ENG032-09 be endorsed as the Preferred Alternative Solution for the Ford Street Stormwater Management Facility Retrofit Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA).
2. That the detailed design and construction of the Preferred Alternative Solution for the Ford Street Stormwater Management Facility Retrofit be considered in the 2010-2019 Capital Plan.
3. That staff use best efforts to secure non tax based funding for the proposed retrofit.
4. That the Engineering Department advise the public prior to project implementation.(ENG032-09) (File: D03-FO)

This matter was recommended for consideration of adoption (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

09-G-258

**FINANCING APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS TO THE ONTARIO
STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING AUTHORITY (OSIFA)**

1. That staff be authorized to submit an application and initiate proceedings for the issuance of debentures in the amount of \$35 million with Ontario Strategic Infrastructure Financing Authority (OSIFA) for the Holly Recreation Centre, the Collier Street Parkade, the GO Transit project, Urbanization of Montgomery, Kenneth, Bertha, and Section 326 and local improvement water & wastewater installations for Kenneth, Bertha, Montgomery; Foster Drive and Cox Mill Ph I in accordance with section 15.1 of the City of Barrie's Purchasing By-law 2008-121.
2. That staff be authorized to proceed with a phased financing approach for the Surface Water Treatment Plant (SWTP) and the Water Pollution Control Centre Expansion (WPCC) through OSIFA that involves the use of a revolving construction financing facility with a corresponding debenture issue in increments of up to \$75 million, with a total amount of debt issuance not to exceed \$231 million in accordance with section 15.1 of the City of Barrie's Purchasing By-law 2008-121.

3. That a by-law be enacted in the form attached to FIN002-09 in Appendix "A" to authorize the Treasurer or designate to submit applications to OSIFA for construction financing for the Surface Water Treatment Plant (SWTP) and the Water Pollution Control Centre Expansion (WPCC).
4. That the Mayor and Treasurer or designate be authorized to execute a Financing Agreement with OSIFA that provides for the construction financing and to sign the necessary certifications as required by OSIFA to support the financing arrangement for the SWTP and WPCC. (FIN002-09) (File: F00)

This matter was recommended for consideration of adoption (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2006.

09-G-259

2007 & 2008 ANNUAL DEVELOPMENT CHARGES REPORTS

That the following 2007 & 2008 annual development charge reports be received:

- a) Municipal Development Charge Reserve Fund Statement (Appendix "A" & "B" to FIN009-09);
- b) Molson Park Drive/Highway 400 Area Specific Development Charge Reserve Fund Statement (Appendix "C" & "D" to FIN009-09);
- c) Whiskey Creek Area Specific Development Charge Reserve Fund Statement (Appendix "E" & "F" to FIN009-09);
- d) Listing of Section 13 Credits (Appendix "G" to FIN009-09) owing where a front ending agreement existed prior to the first City by-law under the *Development Charges Act, 1997*; and
- e) Listing of Section 38 Credits (Appendix "H" & "I" to FIN009-09) owing where a front ending agreement exists subsequent to the first City by-law under the *Development Charges Act, 1997*. (FIN009-09) (File: F00)

This matter was recommended for consideration of adoption (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

09-G-260

OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONING APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT 200C DOCK ROAD/PLUNKETT COURT

1. That the application by the Jones Consulting Group Limited c/o Rick Jones on behalf of Joseph Santos to amend Schedule 2 - Land Use, of the Bayshore Secondary Plan from a Low Density Residential designation to a Medium Density Residential designation for a 0.47

ha parcel of land located on the south side of Dock Road, west of Kempenfelt Bay known municipally as 200C Dock Road be denied.

2. That the associated rezoning application to amend Zoning By-law 85-95 from One-Family Detached Dwelling First Density (R1) to Multiple-Family Dwelling Second Density (RM2) for the 0.47 ha property known municipally as 200C Dock Road also be denied (D14-1452).
3. That Schedule D of the Official Plan be amended to redesignate Plunkett Court from a "Future Collector" to a "Local Road" as part of the update to the Official Plan. (PLN022-09) (File: D14-1452)

This matter was recommended for consideration of adoption (Section "B") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

The General Committee met for the purpose of a public meeting at 8:04 p.m. and reports as follows:

Mayor Aspden advised the public that any concerns or appeals dealing with the Application for a Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning should be directed to the City Clerk's Office. Any interested persons wishing further notification of the staff report regarding the application were advised to sign the appropriate notification form required by the City Clerk's Office. Mayor Aspden confirmed with the Supervisor of Vital Statistics, Corporate Mail and Print Services that notification was conducted in accordance with the Planning Act.

SECTION "C"

09-G-261

APPLICATION FOR A PLAN OF SUBDIVISION, OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONING - SIERRA VISTA HOLDINGS LIMITED - 650 BIG BAY POINT ROAD AND 63 KELL PLACE (JUNE 1, 2009) (File: D12-389/D09-120/D14-1471)

Celeste Phillips of Meridian Planning Consultants explained that the purpose of the public meeting is to review an application for a Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning submitted by Meridian Planning Consultants Inc., on behalf of the owner, Sierra Vista Holdings Limited (Mr. T. Barwick) for lands located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Big Bay Point Road and Hurst Drive.

Ms. Phillips described the property legally as Part of Lot 15, Concession 13

and Block 208, Registered Plan 51M-594, City of Barrie and is located within the Bayshore Planning Area. She noted that the property is known municipally as 650 Big Bay Point Road and 63 Kell Place and has a total area of approximately 1.35 h (3.25 acres).

Ms. Phillips commented that the lands are designated General Commercial and Residential within the City's Official Plan, General Commercial and Residential within the Bayshore Secondary Plan and are currently zoned General Commercial C4 Zone and Residential Single Detached Dwelling Third Density R3 Zone in accordance with Zoning By-law 85-95.

Ms. Phillips commented that the application proposes to amend the Official Plan and Bayshore Secondary Plan to redesignate the lands from General Commercial to Residential and to amend the Zoning By-law to rezone the property from General Commercial C4 and Residential Single Detached Dwelling Third Density R3 Zone to Residential Multiple Family Dwelling Second Density Special Provision RM2 (SP) Zone. She noted that the Special Provisions would provide an increased density for block/cluster or stacked townhousing from 40 units per hectare to 43 units per hectare, a reduced front yard setback along Hurst Drive from 7.0 m to 3.0 m and a reduced rear yard setback from 7.0 m to 2.0 m. She indicated that the effect of the applications would be to permit future development on the lands for a 58 unit condominium townhouse development.

Ms. Phillips stated that the proposed Plan of Subdivision for the property is legally described as Part of Lot 15, Concession 13, known municipally as 650 Big Bay Point Road. Block 1. She commented that Block 1 has an area of approximately 1.34 ha. She noted that this block has been identified on the Plan of Subdivision and is proposed to be further subdivided in the future into smaller parcels through the Part Lot Control process and application for condominium to implement the proposal for a 58 unit condominium townhouse development.

Ms. Phillips stated that a Public Information Meeting was held on June 17, 2008 to receive public comments regarding the development. She noted that notification of the meeting was hand delivered to all residents within a 120 metre radius of the subject property. She commented that after the Public Information Meeting, further consultation took place with City Planning staff and the applications were submitted in late February, 2009. Ms. Phillips explained that the development applications, if approved, would allow for a 58 unit condominium townhouse development with access from Hurst Drive. She commented that the applications would be subject to the Site Plan Control Process and that the architectural design for the development had not yet been determined. She noted that an exemption to the City's Tree Cutting By-law would be required if the applications were approved.

Ms. Phillips noted that the growth plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe - Places to Grow Provincial Policy requires municipalities to facilitate and promote intensification and also encourages a range of mixed housing types and land uses. She feels that the redesignation and rezoning of these lands

will satisfy the policies of the Places to Grow.

Ms. Phillips stated that the City of Barrie's Intensification Study provides recommendations for appropriate areas and policies to guide intensification for the next 25 years. She stated that the Intensification Study indicates that intensification projects are permitted outside the identified areas, subject to evaluation criteria. She commented that this evaluation includes adequate hard and soft services, transportation facilities, public transit, long term liveability and sustainability of the housing project, and the scale and physical character of the development and its integration with the character of the surrounding area. She stated that she feels the proposed development meets the evaluation criteria outlined in the study.

In closing she commented that she believes that redevelopment of these lands is an efficient use of existing infrastructure on an underutilized property, represents good planning and is in line with Council Strategic Priorities.

Ms. Tremblay of Richardson Foster provided an overview of the proposed site servicing and grading associated with the applications.

COMMENTS:

1. **Andrew Miller, 58 River Ridge Road** stated that he feels that Council should not approve the rezoning. He stated that 58 townhouses in this location would impact the existing houses in the neighbourhood. He noted that he believes that there is not enough space on the subject property to accommodate the proposed residential development. He commented that he is concerned with the increase of traffic on Hurst Drive if the proposed development is approved. He commented that the restaurant located on the subject property is the only restaurant in the immediate area and services the local population as a meeting place. Mr. Miller noted that he believes the restaurant has a historical significance to the local residents and is also concerned with the number of mature trees that will have to be removed for the proposed development.
2. **Laurie Stibbert, 11 Edwards Drive** stated that she is opposed to the application as it does not represent the best interest of the neighbourhood. She commented that she believes that the development does not meet the criteria established for the consideration of applications for intensification that are located outside of the four categories of areas as specified in the City's Intensification Study. She commented that the development is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighbourhood which is currently single detached dwellings. Ms. Stibbert expressed concern regarding the adequacy of services to support the proposed development and the impact on traffic. She questioned if the existing schools would be able to accommodate the increased students that would result if the proposed development was approved. She noted

that she believes that the condominiums and townhouses would impact the long term sustainability and liveability within the current community. Ms. Stibbert provided examples of two successful commercial plazas that serve the needs of their local neighbourhoods. Ms. Stibbert commented that the current pub and building has survived many changes over the past 30 years and has been a meeting place for the local community. Ms Stibbert encouraged members of Council to listen to the people from the neighbourhood and not approve the application.

3. **Walter Cardiff, 28 Watson Place**, stated that he lives in a great neighbourhood which contains the "Down the Road Pub" as a centrepiece of the community. He commented that he feels that this pub is what makes the neighbourhood unique. He noted that he is concerned that the proposed development would erode the sense of community and the project would eventually become rental units. He feels that developments of this nature encourage vandalism and police issues. He stated that if the property is not rezoned these types of problems would be avoided. He noted that a petition containing hundreds of signatures of persons opposed to the development had been collected. Mr. Cardiff encouraged Council to deny the application.
4. **John Clark, 283 Pine Drive** advised that he is opposed to the application and encouraged Council to deny the application. He stated that there has been a large amount of growth in the area since he purchased his property. He noted that the neighbourhood surrounding the subject property consists of only single detached homes. He feels that if the development was approved, the townhouses would not be consistent with the characteristics of the existing neighbourhood. He stated that he feels the homes being built in the area are not currently being sold quickly and are remaining empty for a period of time. He stated that many signatures had been obtained from residents who are in opposition to the development. He feels that the mature trees, the pub and surrounding space provide charm and appeal for residents and visitors which would be destroyed if townhouses were built on this property.
5. **Brian Duggan, 55 Regalia Way** commented that the houses currently being built in the area are not being sold quickly. He questioned why there was a need for more townhouses. He is concerned that the proposed development will take an opportunity to create much needed jobs in the area. He stated that the existing pub employs approximately 19 people and provides a service for the local community. He encouraged Council to leave the zoning of the property for commercial uses such as dry cleaning, restaurants, walk-in clinics or a hair salon that would provide services to the local community. He stated that the current zoning should be maintained.

6. **Peter Stibbert, 11 Edwards Drive**, stated that he is concerned with the storm run-off during the winter and snow removal. He commented that the existing house on the subject property is the original farmhouse for the area and feels that the heritage of the building should be investigated.
7. **Ed Fraser, 13 Edwards Drive**, indicated that he moved to the area 5 years ago for the peace and quietness of the neighbourhood. He stated that the proposed development is not in conformity with the existing community. He feels that the privacy of property owners will be altered if the development was approved. Mr. Fraser expressed concern with the increase in traffic that would result if this development was approved and inquired regarding the percentage of RM2 dwellings to be permitted within the Baysshore Secondary Plan.
8. **Kevin Hogg, 35 Kell Place**, stated that he feels the property should remain zoned as commercial. He noted that residents in the area have to walk 1 km. to the nearest convenience store.
9. **Deborah Hummell, 5 Purt Court**, commented that she believes that if 58 new families were to move into the area, the current two year waiting list for day care would increase.
10. **Klaus Mayer, 34 Edwards Drive**, stated that he moved to the area because he was looking for a bungalow community in which to retire. He noted that he paid a premium amount to locate in this area and feels that the development of townhouses would have a negative impact on the value of the existing properties. He stated that he does not feel that the development would benefit the people in the immediate area.
11. **Scott Reid, 39 Princess Margaret Gate**, indicated that he lives in the area and his mother-in-law's house backs onto the subject property. He stated that he moved to the area because of what the neighbourhood offered as a community. He noted that the residents have been subject to the Surface Water Treatment Plant development. He commented that he believes it would be a travesty to lose additional trees in the area. He noted that the closest commercial development is 1 km. away from the subject property. He stated that he feels that it is important that the current zoning of the property be maintained as the property is ideal for a commercial use.
12. **Brenda York, 3 Todd Drive**, stated that she believes intensification requires the use of more electricity which places pressures on the electrical grid. She encouraged City Council to deny the application.
13. **Noelle Larouchi, 62 Kell Place**, indicated that he is opposed to the residential development. He stated that he enjoys the welcoming sense of community provided by the current neighbourhood and stated that the pub located on the subject property is utilized

regularly. He noted that he would hate to lose the sense of community.

14. **David Miller, 655 Big Bay Point Road** noted that he lives directly across from the proposed development. He is concerned that the increased traffic generated by the development will further congest an already busy traffic situation. He commented that he enjoys the existing neighbourhood but feels that over time the townhouses will slowly lose their attractiveness which would impact the atmosphere of the neighbourhood. He requested that Council deny the application.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

1. Letter dated May 14, 2009 from Holly Spacek, Senior Planner, Simcoe County District School Board.
2. Letter dated May 18, 2009 from David and Carol Steele.
3. Letter dated May 22, 2009 from Laurie Stibbard.
4. Letter received May 26, 2009 from Ed and Marion Fraser.
5. Correspondence dated May 27, 2009 from Don and Joanne Bauerlein.
6. Letter dated May 27, 2009 from Chris Damas.
7. Letter dated May 27, 2009 from Mark Yandt and Julie Moore.
8. Form letters dated May 27, 2009 received from eighty-one residents (list of individual names included with the June 1st General Committee Agenda).
9. Letter dated May, 2009 from Heather and Klaus Mayer.
10. Memorandum dated May 27, 2009 from Ted and Kathryn Lintner.
11. E-mail dated June 1, 2009 from Frank Wynia.
12. Petition received May 29, 2009 with 48 signatures.
13. Petition received June 1, 2009 with 1316 signatures.

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

SECTION "D"**09-G-262****SUNNIDALE PARK MASTER PLAN**

That the Sunnidale Park Master Plan be adopted in principle. (06-G-500) (06-G-501) (06-G-578) (09-G-023) (09-G-021) (09-G-184) (09-CMSC-038) (File: R00)

This matter was recommended for adoption (Section "D") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

09-G-263**SUNNIDALE PARK MASTER PLAN - IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

That the implementation/management strategy be considered in the 2010 to 2019 Capital Plan and future Operating Budgets. (06-G-500) (06-G-501) (06-G-578) (09-G-023) (09-G-021) (09-G-184) (09-CMSC-038) (File: R00)

This matter was recommended for adoption (Section "D") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

09-G-264**SUNNIDALE PARK MASTER PLAN - FUNDING**

That staff use their best efforts to secure non tax based funding for the proposed park improvements. (06-G-500) (06-G-501) (06-G-578) (09-G-023) (09-G-021) (09-G-184) (09-CMSC-038) (File: R00)

This matter was recommended for adoption (Section "D") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

09-G-265**SUNNIDALE PARK MASTER PLAN - ZONING BY-LAW UPDATE**

That the comprehensive Zoning By-law update be amended to:

- a) Incorporate a site specific amendment which would have the effect of restricting infrastructure in Sunnidale Park beyond replacement or minor upsizing of the current existing infrastructure and construction of a water reservoir of approximately 18,000 m³, and that any future infrastructure in the park be limited to that which accommodates amenities for low impact, passive recreational uses; and
- b) That in accordance with Section 34(17) of the Planning Act, further notification is not required in this respect. (06-G-500) (06-G-501) (06-G-578) (09-G-023) (09-G-021) (09-G-184) (09-CMSC-038) (File: R00)

This matter was recommended for adoption (Section "D") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

09-G-266**SUNNIDALE PARK MASTER PLAN - MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

That a Management Committee (Friends of Sunnisdale Park) be appointed by Council with public representation to assist with the implementation of the plan. (06-G-500) (06-G-501) (06-G-578) (09-G-023) (09-G-021) (09-G-184) (09-CMSC-038) (File: R00)

This matter was recommended for adoption (Section "D") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

SECTION "E"**09-G-267****SUNNIDALE PARK MASTER PLAN - FINAL DESIGN DRAWINGS FOR RESERVOIR**

That final detail design drawings for the reservoir be presented to Council for endorsement. (06-G-500) (06-G-501) (06-G-578) (09-G-023) (09-G-021) (09-G-184) (09-CMSC-038) (File: R00)

This matter was recommended for adoption (Section "E") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

The General Committee met and reports as follows:

SECTION "F"**09-G-268****ARTIFICIAL OUTDOOR ICE RINK**

The Committee met and discussed Painswick Park as the preferred location for an artificial ice rink and took no action. (09-G-193) (09-CMSC-015) (09-CMSC-040) (File: R00)

The General Committee reports that upon adoption of the required procedural motion it met In-Camera at 10:20 p.m. to discuss a confidential potential acquisition of property matter – Bell Farm Road. The Director of Communications and Intergovernmental Affairs, the Director of Engineering and the Director of Planning Services and members of the press and public were not present for this portion of the meeting.

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

SECTION "G"

09-G-269 CONFIDENTIAL POTENTIAL ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY MATTER - BELL FARM ROAD

That confidential motion 09-G-269 concerning a confidential potential acquisition of property matter - Bell Farm Road be approved.

This matter was recommended for adoption (Section "G") to City Council for consideration of receipt at its meeting to be held on 6/8/2009.

The meeting adjourned at 10:47 p.m.

The General Committee Report No. 28 was adopted by Council on June 1, 2009 with an amendment to 09-G-268 by resolution 09-A-298.

CHAIRMAN