



Meeting Agenda General Committee

Thursday, September 19, 2013

7:00 PM

Council Chamber

Additional Meeting

1. CONSENT AGENDA

Nil.

APPLICATIONS FOR AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT, AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING BY-LAW AND A PLAN OF SUBDIVISION - KIERLAND DEVELOPMENT INC. / GRAIHAWK ESTATES INC. / 3590 PETER LIMITED (AUBURN DEVELOPMENTS INC.) - MEADOWS OF BEAR CREEK SUBDIVISION - NORTHWEST OF ARDAGH ROAD AND WRIGHT DRIVE AND NORTH OF KIERLAND ROAD AND GORE DRIVE (WARD 6) (September 19, 2013) (File: D09-OPA31/D12-404/D14-1556)

Mr. Stephen Stapleton of Auburn Developments indicated that the purpose of the public meeting is to review applications for an Official Plan Amendment, an amendment to the Zoning By-law and a Plan of Subdivision for two distinct parcels. He advised that the first block, Phase 2, is located on the northwest corner of Ardagh Road and Wright Drive, generally bounded by the extension of Summerset Drive and the second block, Phase 3, is located north of the terminus of Keirland Road and Gore Drive. He noted that the property is approximately 27.546 hectares in size and located in the Ardagh Secondary Planning Area.

Mr. Stapleton advised that the lands are currently designated Future Urban and Environmental Protection within the City's Official Plan and are currently zoned Agriculture (A) and Environmental Protection (EP) and that the owner has applied to redesignate the subject lands to Residential and to amend the current zoning of the property from Agriculture (A) and Environmental Protection (EP) to Residential Single Detached Third Density (R3) and Residential Multiple (RM2) to permit the future development of the property for single detached and medium density residential. He also noted that a portion of the site been proposed in the Open Space (OS) zone for parkland, stormwater management and buffer areas adjacent to Centre Creek and the Bear Creek Provincially Significant Wetland.

Mr. Stapleton displayed a map of the proposed draft plan of subdivision

and advised that the plan as presented will likely be amended due to comments received from the Conservation Authority, the public and City staff. He noted that the developer had proposed a 15 m buffer between the subdivision and lands to be designated Environmental Protection and the Conservation Authority requires a 30 m buffer on average, which will necessitate revisions to the plans.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. **Rick Olech, 126 Nicholson Drive and Jeff Ward, 113 Nicholson Drive** representing the Friends of the Bear Creek Wetland Community Group addressed their opposition to the proposed Development. Mr. Olech and Mr. Ward read from written correspondence received on September 18, 2013 from the Friends of the Bear Creek Wetland Community Group. They noted that the Group understands that development and growth will occur in the community, but are advocating for responsible intensification. They stated their interest in working with the City and the developer to protect the City's green spaces and requested that the long-term implications of the proposed development be considered.

Mr. Olech and Mr. Ward provided comments and raised concerns with respect to the proposed development on behalf of the Group related to the following matters:

- Environmental
 - The displacement of wildlife, specifically along Street B;
 - The wetland is one of the last natural habitats in the City;
 - The amount of consultation with environmental groups and conservation authorities;
 - The status of the completion an Environmental Study and related peer review as well as an inventory of animal and plant species;
 - The combined impact of the Pratt Manhattan and Auburn developments on the wetland; and
 - Whether the proposed development plan is in accordance with provincial and municipal policy.
- Neighbourhood
 - The dust, debris and noise that would be caused by construction of proposed development;
 - The impact on property values;
 - Homeowner privacy;
 - The movement of wildlife; and
 - The timeline associated with the construction of the development.

- Design Concept
 - Elevation differences between existing and proposed neighbourhoods;
 - Increased intensification impacts on the existing neighbourhood and green space;
 - The need for consistency and continuity with existing neighbourhood and the Pratt Manhattan development; and
 - The proposed application not addressing storm water management ponds in consideration of how much water will be displaced.
- Intensification
 - The proximity of the proposed development to the Bear Creek wetland which is not in keeping with the City's Natural Heritage Strategy;
 - The Bear Creek area is not one of the four main areas for intensification outlined in the City's Intensification Study; and
 - The areas within the former Innisfil lands should be considered for development prior to environmentally protected wetlands.
- Transportation Corridor
 - Safety concerns such as excessive speeding with respect to Street "A" identified in the proposal due to the length of the road;
 - The proposed right in/right out only access for Street "B" and its impact on traffic flow in the area; and
 - The traffic impact on Gore Road and the capacity for Gore Road to handle the additional volume of vehicles.

In closing, Mr. Olech noted that the Group understands that Barrie is a growing community, but wants Council and staff to ensure that fair and responsible growth occurs with minimal impact on the area residents and environmentally protected land. He stated that the Group wants to be involved in the process.

2. **Robin Brandon and her daughter, 128 James Street**, spoke on behalf of the Bear Creek Eco Rangers. Robin Brandon noted that the wetland area is important to the community as it provides a place for educating children on wildlife and a place for families to visit. Ms. Brandon's daughter, a member of the Bear Creek Eco Rangers indicated she does not want the developer to build on the eco park as she wants the animals to be safe.

3. **James Burgin 16 Graihawk Drive**, noted that he and his family moved 10 years ago from Hamilton due to the opportunities waterfront and the local options to enjoy environment. He raised concerns that proposed Phase 3 of the development will eliminate the wooded area where majority of animals live. Mr. Burgin also expressed concern about the major disruption, dirt and dust that the construction in the area would cause, as well as the impact on the safety of children walking to school. He described further concerns with respect to the impact of the development on municipal infrastructure such as roads, fire stations and services such as garbage collection. Mr. Burgin indicated that the preservation of the wetlands is important, so it is important that the residents work with the developer on making the development work for everyone.
4. **Jennifer Burgin, 16 Graihawk Drive**, outlined that the proposed development would impact all citizens and visitors who enjoy a greener city and not just the neighbouring homes or in the Ardagh Bluffs community. She indicated she had received comments from 114 concerned citizens and provided examples of some of the comments received with respect to concerns for the wildlife habitat, increase in traffic, and the loss wetland and wildlife as an educational opportunity.
5. **Marco Bonardie, 118 Nicholson Drive**, noted that development not a bad thing but smart development is key. He decided to move to Barrie because of its natural beauty and his children fell in love with wetlands. He raised concerns with respect to the difference in elevation between the back of his property, which would require fill to address. He asked where the soil would come from, noting that where it came from may impact the area eco system.
6. **Roman Garach, 7 Reynolds Lane**, commented on the use of cell phones/blackberries during the public meeting.
7. **Alexis Guindon, 38 Kierland Road**, asked if a traffic study had been completed. She raised concerns with respect to the potential additional traffic that would result from the proposed development, noting that the area is currently very congested. She inquired regarding the responsibility for the additional infrastructure costs and whether less disruptive methods of construction could be utilized by the developer to reduce impacts on the environmentally protected lands. Ms. Guindon stated that she did not believe that it made sense to have the zoning change from environmentally

protected to urban residential. She also raised concern that it appeared that some of the environmentally protected land was being utilized to join the segments of a road.

8. **Mr. Mark Tulloch, 6 Graihawk Drive**, raised concerns regarding the long term impact of the proposed development including declining property values in the existing neighbourhoods. He noted that the City may feel forced to approve development applications due to the possibility of ending up at the Ontario Municipal Board and the related costs to the municipality/taxpayers. Mr. Tulloch encouraged residents to contact their MPP with respect to decreasing the decision making power of the Ontario Municipal Board.
9. **Mr. Ashraf-Zadheh Mohamed Saeed, 23 McIntyre Drive**, noted he had many of the same concerns as the previous speakers including the impacts of the proposed development on environmentally protected lands.

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

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

1. Correspondence from Skelton Brumwell & Associates, dated July 5, 2013.
2. Correspondence from Bell Canada, dated August 30, 2013 and September 3, 2013.
3. Correspondence from David Paul and Nancy J. Clark, dated September 7, 2013.
4. Correspondence from Penelope Gane, dated September 10, 2013.
5. Correspondence from the Friends of Bear Creek Wetland Group, received September 18, 2013.

Attachments: [130919 - Public Notice - Meadows of Bear Creek.pdf](#)
[130919 - Presentation - Meadows of Bear Creek.pdf](#)
[130919 - Correspondence - Meadows of Bear Creek.pdf](#)

APPLICATIONS FOR AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT, AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING BY-LAW AND A PLAN OF SUBDIVISION - INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS ON BEHALF THE OWNER HEDBURN DEVELOPMENT CORP. - SOUTH OF EDGEHILL DRIVE AND WEST OF PRINGLE DRIVE (WARD 5) (September 19, 2013) (File: D09/OPA34/D12-408/D14-1560)

Mr. Darren Vella of Innovated Planning Solutions advised that the purpose of the public meeting is to review applications for an Official Plan Amendment, an amendment to the Zoning By-law and a Plan of Subdivision submitted by

Innovative Planning Solutions on behalf of the owner Hedburn Development Corp. He noted that the subject lands are located south of Edgehill Drive and west of Pringle Drive. The property is legally described as Block 298 within Registered Plan 51M-706, and is located within the Edgehill Planning Area and has a total area of approximately 2.49 hectares.

Mr. Vella indicated that the lands are currently designated within the City's Official Plan as Institutional and are zoned Education Institutional (I-E) and that the owner has applied to redesignate the subject lands from Institutional to Residential and rezone the subject lands from Education Institutional (I-E) to Single Residential Detached Third Density (R3) Single Residential Detached Third Density Special Provision (R3-SP). He advised that a Plan of Subdivision has been submitted requesting the development of 37 residential units in the form of single detached residential lots.

Mr. Vella provided highlights of the development proposal including the built form and anticipated price range for the units. He listed the studies submitted in support of the applications and reviewed the Provincial Planning Policy framework. Mr. Vella reviewed the City of Barrie's Edgehill Secondary Plan provisions related to the school site, noting that the provisions outline that the subject land could provide for low density residential, if the school board determined that the lands were not required for school purposes. He stated that the lands were released by the school board and reverted to the owner when the City did not exercise its first right of refusal to acquire the parcel. Mr. Vella concluded by providing his professional planning opinion that the proposed development is consistent with provincial and municipal planning policies.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. **Kathie Daoust, 32 Reynolds Lane**, raised concerns with respect to the types of properties to be developed, noting that in the past properties identified for single family dwellings were turned into duplexes and/or rental properties, resulting in parking and traffic impacts in the area. She questioned what steps could be taken to ensure that the development does not turn into multi-residential development.

Ms. Daoust stated that the fence separating her property from the subject lands has been located on her property and not on the property line. She described a large stock pile of soil from the site alterations that has resulted in dirt blowing into her pool and is a safety concern. Ms. Daoust questioned the school board's determination that a school was not required and commented on the work underway including the removal of trees, prior to the rezoning of the lands. Ms. Daoust noted that a number of residents paid a premium for their properties in order to have privacy in their backyards, which would be lost as a result of the development and further impacted if decks were built overlooking their backyards. Ms. Daoust asked if residents are going to be reimbursed for lost property values due

to the privacy of their backyards being lost.

S. Naylor, Director of Planning responded to the inquiry related to the ability to limit the conversion of the single family dwelling units.

- 2 **Bill Yates, 6 Reynolds Lane**, appeared on behalf of area residents and noted that a petition had been submitted by the Pringle Park Homeowners Group with 116 signatures. He commented that the residents were never notified by the school board that the lands were not going to be developed for a school site and questioned who received the proceeds from the sale. Mr. Yates stated that the site preparations undertaken have caused excessive dust and noise as well as damage to his home. He indicated that he believes it is inevitable that the 37 homes will be built. Mr. Yates expressed concern that there are insufficient recreational opportunities for youth in the area currently and that there needs to be recreational opportunities beyond the playground for smaller children, if the development is to proceed. He questioned the purpose associated with the special provisions being requested.

Mr. Vella responded to the inquiry with respect to the requested special provisions.

3. **Greg Leader and his daughter, 62 Knupp Road**, advised that he moved to his property to allow his daughter to attend school nearby. He commented that he believes that the area residents should have had a voice in the decision made not to proceed with a school and been advised in advance of the subject property being sold. Mr. Leader stated that he feels the process needs to stop. His daughter noted that the land should have grass and trees so that the wildlife can remain and families can have picnics and that houses should not be built.

Mayor Lemman provided background information regarding the Simcoe County District School Board's Accommodation Review Process. Councillor Silveira provided comments regarding the school board's determination that a school was no longer required.

4. **Paul Kuznecov, 61 Knupp Road**, noted he agreed with Mr. Yates concerns about the proposed development and reiterated comments related to the need for youth amenities. Mr. Kuznecov advised that he moved to Barrie to avoid having a backdoor neighbours and for the additional green space. He stated that the additional homes are not needed and green space is required. He raised concerns with respect to the proposed setback between Reynolds Lane, Knupp Road and the proposed development and the privacy that will be lost by the current area

residents.

5. **Terrence Boyle, 77 Bronte Crescent**, provided comments on the school board's decision not to construct a school and concerns related to the process.
6. **Greg Sneddon, 20 Reynolds Lane**, advised that he purchased his home with assurances that a school and not residential housing was going to be built behind his property. He specifically chose his property to avoid having neighbours overlooking the property and paid a premium for the lot. Mr. Sneddon noted that he wants to retain his privacy and is concerned about the time and money that he has put into his property. He inquired about the opportunity to control the type of housing built as well as the elevation of the lots and building heights. Mr. Sneddon commented that the area residents may have a decrease in property value depending on the type of housing that ends up being built.
7. **Roman Garach, 7 Reynolds Lane**, raised concerns with respect to the process and that site alterations were commenced prior to permits being issued. He noted safety concerns with respect to the construction vehicles and site alterations. Mr. Garach reviewed information from the land registry with respect to the history of the real estate transactions related to the site. He questioned the timing associated with the original zoning for the site and the sale of the property to the school board. Mr. Garach asked if the City would have allowed the property to be developed as residential at the time that the subdivision was originally planned. He commented that he does not believe that there is a reason for the proposed development to proceed that would benefit the existing residents.

Mr. Garach stated that he believes the existing streets have insufficient capacity, turning movements are unsafe and that there isn't a safe access from the proposed subdivision as the sidewalk has not been extended. He suggested that the infrastructure be addressed prior to any additional residential homes being constructed.

8. **Mike Tutty, 59 Knupp Road**, raised concerns regarding the lack of communication with the area residents. He noted that the subject property was more actively used by the community for recreational purposes than the parkland until the site alterations were undertaken and that this land should be reclaimed by the City for parkland. Mr. Tutty commented that the existing parkland is inadequate.
9. **Ray Pharand, 16 Reynolds Lane** stated that he had moved to the area to

permit his son to attend school nearby. He commented regarding the number of school buses travelling through the area and questioned the determination by the school board that the school was not required. Mr. Pharand noted that he believes the property was a seasonal wetland until the site alterations took place. He discussed the use of the subject property as parkland prior to the site alterations and his disappointment with respect to the removal of the trees. Mr. Pharand described concerns related to the privacy that will be lost, indicating schools do not make noise on evenings and weekends. He requested that the developer be required to provide noise attenuation measures. He indicated that the traffic is an issue now and that the added volumes once the development is completed will not help the situation.

10. **Catherine Sneddon, 20 Reynolds Lane** commented on the loss of privacy due to her proximity to the proposed development. She also noted that 50-60 trees were removed before anyone could investigate and that these trees were providing homes for wildlife in the area. She suggested that the developer be required to replace the trees to provide privacy and green space for the wildlife.
11. **Crystal Vancasteren, 14 Reynolds Lane** discussed concerns related to the lack of sidewalk connection from the existing subdivision to the inadequate park area and heavy truck traffic. She suggested that safety provisions be implemented if the development proceeds.

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

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

1. Correspondence from Erica Stewart, received September 11, 2013.
2. Petition submitted by the Pringle Park Homeowners Group with 103 signatures.
3. Correspondence from Bell Canada, dated August 30, 2013 and September 3, 2013.
4. Correspondence from Hydro One, dated September 3, 2013.
5. Correspondence unsigned, received September 19, 2013.

Attachments: [130919 Additional Correspondence - Edgehill Dr and Pringle Dr..pdf](#)
[Public Mtg - Pringle Drive Sept 192013 - Final.pdf](#)
[130919 - Public Notice - Edgehill Dr and Pringle Dr.pdf](#)
[130919 - Correspondence - Edgehill Dr and Pringle Dr.pdf](#)

APPLICATION FOR MUNICIPALITY INITIATED HOUSEKEEPING AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW 2009-141- CITY OF BARRIE (September 19, 2013) (File: D14-HOU)

Ms. Kathy Brislin, Senior Policy Planner advised that the purpose of the public meeting is to review an application for municipally initiated housekeeping amendments to the Comprehensive Zoning By-Law 2009-141. Ms. Brislin noted that the proposed amendments are to address minor inconsistencies and anomalies that have come to light since the passage of Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141, approved August 10th, 2009 and advised that the proposed amendments include both text and mapping changes to the By-law.

Ms. Brislin indicated that the proposed amendments to the text of the By-law relate primarily to points of clarification or interpretation, and include a new definition, amended standards to address deficiencies, omissions, conflicts or inconsistencies and summarized the following text changes to the by-law:

1. Definitions:
 - a) Clarify the definition of boarding rooming and lodging houses to distinguish these from other types of dwellings.
2. Section 4.0 General Provisions:
 - a) Revise the parking standards for Data Processing Centres to be more reflective of office use and other parking requirements in this land use category;
 - b) Revise the parking standards to provide for the minimum length of parallel parking spaces;
 - c) Add a provision for temporary seasonal sale of fruit and vegetables on vacant commercially owned properties; and
 - d) Provide consistent building setback standards for properties abutting the TransCanada PipeLine Right of Way and amend Appendix "B" to the Zoning Bylaw to identify the location of the TransCanada Pipeline Right of Way.
3. Section 5.0 Residential Zone Standards:
 - a) Establish a minimum driveway length and minimum internal private roadway width for Block / Cluster / Street / Stacked Townhouses and Walk-up Apartments; and
 - b) Permit the required outdoor amenity area within the required rear and side-yard setbacks in the Residential Multiple (RM2-TH) Zone.
4. Section 6.0 Commercial Zone Standards:
 - a) Amend the parking standard for residential use in the Shopping

Centre Commercial (C3) Zone by the addition of clause 6.3.4.4 h) requiring 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit rather than 1 space per 18.6 sq. metres gross leasable area.

5. Section 8.0 Institutional Zone Standards:
 - a) Add a maximum 15m height standard previously established in By-law 85-95 for the Major Institutional (1-M-1) Zone, which affects the Court House lands at 75 and 85 Mulcaster Street; and
 - b) Move the special provision for the Institutional Educational (1-E-1) Zone which affects 25 Burton Avenue - Simcoe County Christian High School (Unity Christian High School) from Section 13 to the Section 8 General Provisions. The maximum of 15m building height standard would continue to apply.
6. Section 12 Agricultural Zone Standards:
 - a) To provide setbacks related to single detached dwellings that are consistent with the Residential (R1) Zone Standards in Section 5.3 of the By-law.
7. Section 13 Special Provisions:
 - a) Applies to 351 Town Line Road - Proposes the addition of Special Provision 13.5.1 OS (SP-118) to provide a front yard setback of 1.5 m for the existing building. This is a standard included that was included in the former By-law 85-95; and
 - b) Amend Special Provision 13.1.113 R2 (SP-287) to include 128 Penvill Trail (Block 180 Plan 51M-783 and Block 219 Plan 51M-771 and Part 1, 51R-32786) to require a minimum lot frontage of 15 m and minimum lot area of 750m².

Mr. Ross Cotton, Policy Planner, indicated that the proposed amendments to the Map Schedule result from a variety of reasons including road realignments, property line adjustments, land assembly/severances and mapping errors. He summarized the following Map Schedule changes proposed to Schedule "A" and Appendix "B" of By-law 2009-141:

1. 10 Checkley Street - Change from General Commercial (C4) and Transition Centre Commercial (C2-2) Zones to Transition Commercial (C2- 1) Zone.
2. Parts of former Simcoe Street and Lakeshore Drive (closed due to realignment) - Change from unzoned and Open Space (OS) Zone to Central Area Commercial (C 1-1) and Transition Centre Commercial (C2-2) and Open Space (OS) Zones.
3. 54 and 58 Clapperton Street- Change from Transition Centre Commercial

- (C2-1) Special Provision (SP-179) to Transition Centre Commercial (C2-1) Special Provision (SP-175) and Transition Centre Commercial (C2-1) Special Provision (SP-175) to Transition Centre Commercial (C2-1) Special Provision (SP-175).
4. 42, 44, and part of 50 Anne Street North - Change from Residential Multiple (RM1) Zone to General Commercial C4 Special Provision (SP-419)(H-1 09) Zone.
 5. Portion of City land located to the rear of 92 and 96 Ardagh Road (Part of Lot 8, Plan 20)-Change from Single Detached Residential (R1) Zone to Environmental Protection (EP) Zone.
 6. 466 Mapleview Drive West - Change from Agricultural (A) Zone to Single Detached Residential (R2) Zone.
 7. Portion of City land located in Part of Lot 9, Concession 12 - Change from Service Industrial EM3 (SP-408) to Service Industrial (EM3) (SWM) and General Industrial (EM4) (SP-409) to General Industrial (EM4) (SWM).
 8. 19 Herrell Avenue - Change from Environmental Protection (EP) Zone to Single Detached Residential (R2) Zone.
 9. 22 Herrell Avenue - Change from Open Space (OS) Zone to Single Detached Residential (R2) Zone.
 10. Portion of City land to east of 8 and 10 Trotter Court - Change from Single Detached Residential (R1) Zone to Environmental Protection (EP) Zone.
 11. 128 Penvill Trail (Block 180, Plan 51M-783 and Block 219, Plan 51M-771 and Part 1, 51R-32786) - Change from Environmental Protection (EP) Zone to Single Detached Residential (R2) Special Provision (SP-287) Zone.
 12. Portion of City land adjacent to 128 Penvill Trail (Block 206, Plan M-783) - Change from Single Detached Residential (R2) Special Provision (SP-287) Zone to Environmental Protection (EP) Zone.
 13. Amend Appendix "B" to include location of TransCanada Pipeline Right of Way - Appendix "B" to By-law 2009-141.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments with respect to the application.

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

WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

1. Correspondence from Skelton, Brumwell & Associates Inc., dated September 13, 2013.

Attachments: [130919 - Public Notice - Housekeeping Amendments to Zoning Bylaw.pdf](#)
[130919 - Presentation - Housekeeping Amendments to Zoning Bylaw.pdf](#)

3. PRESENTATIONS BY STAFF/OFFICERS/AGENTS OF THE CORPORATION

Nil.

4. DEFERRED BUSINESS

Nil.

5. REPORTS OF REFERENCE, ADVISORY OR SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Nil.

6. STAFF REPORT(S)

Nil.

7. REPORTS OF OFFICERS

Nil.

8. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Nil.

9. INFORMATION ITEMS

Nil.

10. ENQUIRIES

Nil.

11. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Nil.

HEARING DEVICES AND AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE (ASL) INTERPRETERS:

Assistive listening devices for the Council Chambers are available upon request from the staff in the City Clerk's Office.

American Sign Language (ASL) Interpreters are also available upon request. Please contact the City Clerk's Office staff at 705-739-4204 or cityclerks@barrie.ca regarding a request for an ASL Interpreter as soon as possible, to ensure availability.