

Pg 1/3

Monday December 5, 2016

Mayor Lehman and Members of Council

Thank you for allowing me to address the motions before you this evening on the 5 Points Development.

I will be speaking in opposition of the Zoning by law amendment.

First, I would like to thank staff for all the hard work on this project so far. I know a lot of time and effort has gone into this process.

As a long time resident of Barrie I'm speaking from a place of passion for our City, and concern for what will become of our Historic Downtown Dunlop St. as we move forward. I personally walk, shop, dine and attend culture events all the time, so I do have a vested interest in my downtown.

The project itself is too large in scale. Height, mass and density are not respectful of our current surroundings in the downtown core.

Building a 20 story condo on this particular site is not going to resolve our issues or make a huge impact in target numbers. It will however set a precedent with respect to applications that follow to our small historic downtown district. We need to be very careful how we move forward.

The City is working toward its growth potential, throughout the main corridors and nodes. We do not need to cram it all into one building.

I do recognize that Municipalities are subject to Urban Growth Planning, Provincial Policies, and Tall Building Polices. These are policies and guidelines that allow for Municipal Councils to make informed decisions.

These policies do not say, "You must build 20 stories" on this particular piece of land, we do have options.

Staff Report and Recommended Motions can be approved, amended or sent back for more information.

- 1) I would like to request Council not approve The Zoning By-Law amendment as requested by the applicant, Advance Tech Developments.
- 2) I would like Council to defer your vote on this matter tonight and consider an alternate solution for this development. Staff could continue to negotiate points in the best interest of this property. Continue to work with the developer on perhaps reducing the size of this project.

This does not mean I do not want development to occur in this location. We do need to revitalize and improve our downtown.

This particular location at 5 points is very important to our downtown community. If we don't have the required 50% Commercial space by way of shops and perhaps more public gathering space, what is the appeal for the public portion of this project? I don't see this as a mixed use project with 17% commercial and no office space included. Where is the community benefit?

My suggestion would be, 100 new units, plus 100 parking spaces. This could still be considered high density. Included in those numbers could be the 9 affordable rental units. Not just one bedroom units as recommended but a mix of, 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units, as families come in all sizes. These affordable units should also come with a parking space. To make assumptions that affordable units mean folks can't afford a vehicle is not acceptable.

It will be difficult enough to have families move in with just one vehicle. Most families I know have two or more.

This new building will be fronting Dunlop St. Currently all buildings, east and west for blocks (between Mulcaster to the east and Toronto St to the west) are no higher than 4-5 stories, but zoned C1-1 for 10 stories or 30 metres.

If Council allows this rezoning to occur we will be changing the face of the Dunlop Streets "historic downtown feel that draws tourism. The height and scale of this project is simply too large.

In order to accommodate the rezoning to 20 stories, we are being asked for too many concessions in order to make it happen. Increase double the height, increase max height of the podium, reduction in step backs, minimum of commercial coverage to make more space for parking, reduction in minimum setback for balconies, reduction in parking spaces, and no landscape buffers. Most of these are not small reductions.

The staff report itself refers to that fact that building design, podium height and stepping is intended to reduce the effect of the height. 20 stories are 20 stories. There will be visual impact.

**Under the Historic Neighbourhood Strategy** (people lead planning) we also identified through many public meetings and surveys what communities would like to see and where.

Good design standards, and proposals that are to be appropriate in scale and height. Medium to High is acceptable provided it is complimentary to the Neighbourhood. Please recognize the HNS principles. Council and the Community have been working hard to make changes that are reasonable and in keeping with these principles.

**Under our Official Plan**, comments are made that speak to respecting physical scale and characteristics of existing development.

**Under Tall Building Policies** - Tall buildings – defined as above 3 stories in height but no maximum. Couldn't we consider 10 stories to be a Tall Building?

**Site lines** - looking down Bayfield St toward our waterfront site lines have not been protected to date. As you walk down the hill and look out at the waterfront your view is partially blocked by the two existing tall buildings south of Dunlop St.

**Landscape Buffer** of 3 meters is required under the current zoning; **I would request** this be kept, as opposed to dealing with it at site plan control. The current tall building across from the Bus Terminal is a dismal example of ground level without proper landscaping. Proper sustainable landscaping, not just patio planters, adds to a community.

To quickly recap

My ask would be to reduce building height, number of units, number of parking spaces, retain the existing landscape buffer, retain or adjust percentage of commercial space, perhaps add office space, and continue to notify the public where applicable.

The current zoning by law for this property was created by our planning department to represent a guideline for future development in the best interest of City Planning.

It certainly appears that we are being asked to compromise or negotiate too many details in order to make this building fit.

I would ask that you consider my words here tonight before giving final approval.

Thank You.  
Cathy Colebatch