

**From:** Luanne Kerry [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 25, 2025 4:40 PM  
**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>  
**Subject:** Re: Youtube Channel to watch the Public Meeting

Hello Danielle,

Thank you very much for providing the Youtube link to the meeting.

As an owner at Bayshore Landing, please be advised that I am opposed to the building of a 25 storey development at 149, 151 and 153 Dunlop Street East and 5 Mulcaster Street.

Regards,  
Anne L. Kerry

[REDACTED]

On Tue, Feb 25, 2025 at 10:09 AM cityclerks <[cityclerks@barrie.ca](mailto:cityclerks@barrie.ca)> wrote:

Good afternoon,

As per your call we just received here is the link for you to be able to watch tomorrow night's Public Meeting virtually.

[Affordability Committee Meeting | February 26, 2025](#)

Thanks, and have a wonderful day.

**Danielle Glenn**  
**Legislative Coordinator**  
Legislative and Court Services

**From:** cmlovesbooks [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 26, 2025 1:57 AM  
**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>  
**Subject:** Proposed amendments to planning Act

**Subject:** Proposed amendments to planning Act

RE: Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting, by the Blackthorn Development Corp. on behalf of Dunlop Developments (Barrie) Inc. for the lands known municipally as: **149, 151 and 153 Dunlop Street East and 5 Mulcaster Street, Barrie ON**, which is scheduled for **Wednesday, February 26, 2024, at 6:00 p.m.**

I sent a detailed written response to this proposal for the Neighbourhood meeting held about a year ago. I'd like to reiterate that I am strongly against this proposed building for the following reasons:

- The building is far too big for the space.
- The impact on local traffic during construction would be atrocious and after completion, that many more people/vehicles would permanently and negatively impact the traffic flow. Also, the proximity of the proposed driveways to both the busy intersection of Mulcaster and Dunlop Street as well as the Bayshore Landing entrance will cause continual congestion.
- Too few parking spaces for residents will worsen the competition for the already limited parking downtown for local businesses and nearby waterfront parks and trails.
- Turning right from Simcoe/Mulcaster to Dunlop Street East would be more dangerous with the building being right up to the sidewalk – whereas now the existing building is set back for frontal parking, allowing drivers greater visibility of oncoming traffic.
- Large sections of Bayshore Landing residents' views will be obliterated, privacy, light, and peace and quiet will be permanently encroached, with property values adversely affected.
- That size of building will generate an enormous amount of garbage and recycling. With the building filling every inch of the available space, where is all this refuse going to be placed weekly for pick up? Will it be visible to waterfront/North Shore Trail users? What a visual blight that would be.
- Where will moving and delivery trucks park to unload? Right now, at the Lākhouse Condominium, trucks are seen completely blocking one of two **live lanes** of traffic on Dunlop Street – bad enough hazard a block away from a very busy intersection but untenable within meters.

Please submit my comments for the public meeting.

I would like the following comments to be included too, but while I believe this is a valid viewpoint, you may judge it not appropriate for inclusion at this time, but please do include the points delineated above.

Internet commentators on stories of this building proposal (and others) (as in *Barrie Today*) state that opposition by residents is an effort to impede progress and accuse thoughtless NIMBYism. They diminish and disrespect the genuine dismay that people whose homes, a sanctuary for themselves and their families, and their largest life investment, are being threatened by real issues caused by inappropriately proposed developments. No one is trying to stop progress, but progress must be well-reasoned and appropriate to a site and a neighbourhood. These cavalier responders would likely experience huge reactions and resistance if *their* homes and peace of mind were being threatened by 25 or 29 story monstrosities within mere meters of their windows.

More thoughtful consideration and a modicum of human compassion for real people being suddenly faced with the possibility of the loss of something precious would be appreciated.

This isn't Tokyo or downtown Toronto, there is no need to cram huge buildings into every available inch of space, especially on our beautiful waterfront.

The majority of these issues and comments are equally valid concerning the 29-story building proposed to the East of Bayshore Landing at Dunlop and Poyntz.

Submitted by Cindy Madden

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**From:** Evelyn Bell-Frappier [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 26, 2025 9:57 AM  
**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>  
**Subject:** Next election

Please make clear that IF COUNCIL PASSES ANY MORE CHANGES TO OUR ACCESS TO THE WATERFRONT INCLUDING THE CORNER OF DUNLOP STREET EAST AND MULCASTER FOR A 25 STORY CONDO THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL WILL BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE AS THE MAYOR PROMISED WHEN HE WAS RUNNING THAT THAT WOULD NOT HAPPEN. SOME OF US ARE NOT ABLE TO ATTEND THE MEETING AT CITY HALL DUE TO AGE AND MOBILITY.

**From:** Elaine Helwig [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 26, 2025 10:25 AM  
**To:** Michele Freethy <[Michele.Freethy@barrie.ca](mailto:Michele.Freethy@barrie.ca)>  
**Subject:** Proposed downtown condo building 149-153 Dunlop st

Hi Michele not sure if this concerns means much. But a building this magnitude of size will absolutely ruin the beauty of seeing Barrie's number one attraction, its waterfront! [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] this size of building will not only be an eyesore, but will block views and sunlight we even get to see from other buildings. This will be a rich attraction for the wealthy and not considerate to the others that call downtown Barrie their home, and leisure home as this would impede in the beautiful walkway we have and lakefront!

Thanks,

Elaine Helwig Barrie resident

From: bob luffman [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2025 10:41 AM  
To: cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>  
Subject: Condos being built across from Bayshore landing against

Sent from my iPhone against it

**From:** Erin Steingard [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, February 26, 2025 11:57 AM

**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>

**Subject:** Concerns regarding new build for 149,151,153 Dunlop st E and 5 Mulcaster st

Dear Sir/Madame,

I am writing this to express my strong opposition to the new build proposal for 149, 151, [153 Dunlop St. E](#) and 5 Mulcaster. As a resident [REDACTED] I have deep concerns with the negative impacts this new build will have on our infrastructure. Barrie already has multiple high-rise condos along the waterfront and downtown. I fear adding more condos will only continue to negatively impact the residents of Barrie. Safety being an enormous concern. The risks this proposal poses to pedestrians, especially families and children as a result of an increase in traffic is terrifying. Dunlop and Mulcaster have significant pedestrian traffic year-round. This can be seen at city hall with family skating in the winter, the farmers market, in addition the many other events and attractions downtown Barrie offers year-round. The foot traffic only intensifies in the summer when Barrie and neighbouring residents spend their days downtown by the water and the Dunlop strip.

Adding another condo to Barrie's waterfront only takes away from the city's historic charm. The serene waterfront, once known for its beauty and tranquility, will soon be overrun with pollution and worsening traffic, resulting in an increase in accidents that large cities face. If this proposal is approved, the beautiful waterfront once enjoyed by all, will soon become a distant memory for the residents of Barrie.

I recognize the need for additional housing in a city that is growing rapidly. However, incorporating multiple high-rise condos along the waterfront does not offer the residents of Barrie affordable housing. Instead of helping the city of Barrie and its residents, this proposal will aid in the destruction of the heart and soul of this beautiful and historic city. Please reject this proposal and help protect Barrie's attractive and charming desirable waterfront.

Thank you for your time and understanding with this important issue.

Sincerely,

Erin Steingard

**From:** Gayle Parsley [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, February 26, 2025 3:08 PM

**To:** cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>

**Subject:** Protesting a the ZONING BYLAW that is trying to build 25 story buildings at 149, 151, 153 Dunlop st east & 5 Mulcacter street

This is absolutely ridiculous to think that the people living in this area want to have this bylaw passed. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I know that the city wants to make money but the people of Barrie should count. To put building of that size in the worst spots in Barrie will cause nothing but trouble there are lots of other places available but these locations have the worst traffic especially at Dunlop and Mulcacter. It is hard enough to get regular parking, the availability for ambulances, and you would completely destroy our park area and this is too close to the lake. Our area of Barrie is not equipped to handle any more traffic as well as the trouble getting up the lakeshore and Mulcacter in the winter. Putting up a 25 story building would be such a dangerous thing to do we are also having problems with all the parking needed with the buildings we already have and in the summer time part of Dunlop street gets down to 2 small lanes when the patios open up.

Please make sure that this message gets seen. We are just ordinary people and are seniors trying the best we can to get around and a BYLAW like this will make it even harder. Most people moving into these buildings most have 1 or 2 cars let a lone visitors and even the waist management trucks and delivery trucks would cause more trouble for people in our area.



From: Kaitlyn Minnings <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2025 5:53 PM  
To: cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>  
Subject: Zoning bylaw change

I am emailing to state my strong opposition to the zoning change proposed for a 25-story building downtown. I think it will compromise the lifestyle of many downtown residents and businesses with heavy traffic and block nature views. I believe it will also interfere with the natural beauty of Barrie's waterfront and clash with the rest of the city. Let's keep Barrie beautiful and preserve the unique small city feel!

-Kaitlyn Minnings

**From:** Lloyd Spooner,  
Email:  
**To:** Affordability Committee of the Council of the City of Barrie  
**Subject:** Written comments relating to Application for an Amendment to the Zoning By-law on behalf of Dunlop Developments (Barrie) Inc. – 149, 151 and 153 Dunlop Street East and 5 Mulcaster Street, City of Barrie

### My Personal Background

I have been a resident, [redacted] and tax payer since moving permanently to the City of Barrie in October of 1986. I would make frequent visits to the City with high school and organized sport teams and for many shopping trips throughout the 1970's. At that time the City only had a population of around 25,000 or so and I have had the distinct pleasure of living in this beautiful City at various locations over these many years. It has also been my privilege to observe as the City of Barrie has grown up, so to speak, into the picturesque, vibrant and historic City that it is today. I was employed by the City as a Professional Engineering Technologist from 1988 until 2017 and was very fortunate to be part of a highly skilled and motivated planning team. Our planning team worked cooperatively and closely with many Council's over the years. Aligning together, we were able to shape the City's development while maintaining its amazing natural features and landmarks, including our breath taking waterfront vistas of Lake Simcoe for everyone to enjoy.

### Comments about the Proposed Development

Even though the proposed development has many redeeming features, the proposed site location is an extremely poor choice and the project should not move forward at this specific location.

The City Council should deny the proposed amendments to the Zoning By-law the proposed development project, at this location, for the following reasons:

#### **1. Non-compliance with planning document:**

- The site doesn't comply with several of the current Zoning By-law requirements.
- The proposed over development of this small site will surely intimidate and overwhelm the existing adjacent and nearby properties. The proposed Zoning amendment would increase the Maximum Gross Floor Area from 600% to 1000%.
- The proposed building height amendment of 80m (originally proposed as 70.66m at March 04, 2024 Neighbourhood meeting) dwarfs the current Zoning By-law requirements of 10m within 5m of the front lot line and lot flankage. The proposed parking space amendment of 0.6 spaces/resident (originally proposed at 0.9 at the original March 04, 2024 Neighbourhood meeting) is a decrease from 1.0 spaces/resident currently required.
- The proposed amendment to 0% Minimum Commercial Coverage would simply ignore the Minimum 50% Commercial Coverage currently required.



- The proposed amendment would eliminate the 3m buffer zone along the side and rear lot lines currently required.

**Note:** Each of the above proposed amendments clearly highlights the obvious concern; this site is a poor candidate for this development as proposed and should not proceed.

## **2. Environmental Impacts:**

- Concerns with the existing site's subsurface utilities/soil contamination have potential to provide preferential pathways for the migration of the contaminated groundwater into Lake Simcoe and the City's drinking water aquifer. (See attached **Exhibit A** - page 34 of the Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment Watters Environmental Group April 2024)
- The proposed development is within 30m of Lake Simcoe and an area of natural significance. See **Exhibit B** – page 9 of the Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment Watters Environmental Group April 2024)
- Further investigation and risk assessment is required. (See **Exhibit C** – page 129 of the Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment Watters Environmental Group April 2024)

## **3. Impact on Infrastructure:**

- Potential contamination of the City's drinking water aquifer and Lake Simcoe.
- Loss of production well capacity and potential permanent loss of infrastructure assets.

## **4. Community Opposition:**

- There has been strong public resistance from residents regarding this project's location, scale (site over development) and potential negative impact on the existing neighbourhood such as aesthetics, decreased site lines to the waterfront/activities and property devaluation in some instances.

## **5. Traffic and Parking Issues:**

- The Capacity Analysis Results shows poor level of service for the Dunlop Street East and Mulcaster Street intersection (See **Exhibit D** page 18 - 7.0 Summary and Conclusions from the Transportation Study November 13, 2024 CGE Transportation Consultants). The proposed development of this site will contribute to the poor level of service at this intersection and the City will be left with any burden of cost to remove the condition.
- Future traffic projections (2028) show the Dunlop/Mulcaster street intersection falls to Level of Service F (poor service level –delay and queue movements) for the WBLT, NBTR and SBLTRL (See **Exhibit E-1 and E-2** pages 15 and 16 - 4.0 Capacity Analysis from the Transportation Study November 13, 2024 CGE Transportation Consultants).
- Queuing of traffic in the range of 186m along Dunlop Street, to the east of Mulcaster, would trap exit/entrance traffic at 150 Dunlop Street East and the south bound traffic on Poyntz Street. While queuing of traffic in the range of 135m along Mulcaster, to the north of Dunlop will likely impede Collier Street movements. (See **Exhibit E-2** page 16 -4.0 Capacity Analysis from the Transportation Study November 13, 2024 CGE Transportation Consultants).





- Reducing on-site parking space requirements will increase on street parking. Originally proposed an amendment to reduce from 1 space per residential unit to 0.9 now requesting 0.6 spaces per residential unit. This will place a greater burden on the City to provide additional on street parking and increase walking distances for patrons to existing down town businesses.

**6. Technical deficiencies:**

- Without the ability to appeal a decision to the Ontario Land Tribunal, comments from the public should be allowed after the Technical Review by City Staff stage of the Development Review Process and prior to recommendations to Council.

**7. Insufficient mitigation measures:**

- City may need some of the proposed development property to add additional lanes of traffic in the future.

**8. Lack of Public engagement:**

- Without the ability to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal, the public needs to be consulted with after the Technical Review by Staff and prior to recommendations being forwarded to Council.

**9. Financial Concerns:**

- Cost to the City for loss of existing infrastructure or the requirement of new and/or upsizing of additional infrastructure resulting from development.

**10. Legal Requirements:**

- Since the changes brought about by Bill 185, the Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act, 2024 limits the ability to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal; the City's Development Review Process needs to place a higher priority on Technical Review. This stage of the process could incorporate additional public consultation prior to submitting recommendations to General Committee. This would create a layer of transparency/accountability by Staff/Council highlighting a summary of technical review concerns. This could be accomplished through meetings with the Report/Study review staff prior to submitting Staff Report recommendations to Council.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments for this proposed development.

  
Lloyd Spooner, CET



Area of Potential Environmental Concern	Potentially Contaminating Activity	Contaminants of Potential Concern	Media Potentially Impacted (Groundwater, Soil and/or Sediment)
APEC 10C	#58 – Waste Disposal and Waste Management, including thermal treatment, landfilling and transfer of waste, other than use of biosoils as soil conditioners	PHCs, VOCs, BTEX, THMs, Metals, As, Sb, Se, CN-, CR (VI), Hg	Groundwater
APEC 11	Not Applicable – Road Salt Application	Per paragraph 1 of Section 49.1 of O. Reg. 153/04, testing for EC and SAR in soil or sodium and chloride in groundwater is not necessary on the Phase One Property.	Not Applicable

Notes: VOCs = Volatile Organic Compounds  
 BTEX = Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylenes  
 THMs = Trihalomethanes  
 PHCs = Petroleum Hydrocarbons in the F1 to F4 ranges  
 PAHs = Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons  
 PCBs = polychlorinated biphenyls

iii. the potential for underground utilities, if any present, to affect contaminant distribution and transport;

Watters Environmental was not provided with any underground utility drawings for the Phase One Property; however, Watters Environmental anticipates that the underground utilities at the Phase One Property would be between 2 to 3 mbgs. The depth to groundwater was measured at approximately 1.96 and 2.10 mbgs in monitoring wells on the south side of the Phase One Property and 6.33 and 6.44 mbgs in monitoring wells on the north side of the Phase One Property. As such, Watters Environmental anticipates that subsurface utilities on the south side of the Phase One Property could act as preferential pathways for the migration of contaminated groundwater (if any exists).

- The soil samples analyzed at the Phase Two Property were within a pH range of 5 to 9 for surface soils (i.e., soils that are no more than 1.5 metres below the soil surface) and 5 to 11 for subsurface soils (i.e., soils that are more than 1.5 metres below the soil surface);
- Kempenfelt Bay (Lake Simcoe) is approximately 20 metres southeast of the Phase Two Property at its closest point; therefore, the Phase Two Property is located within 30 metres of a water body;
- The Phase Two Property is located within 30 metres of an area of natural significance, as land south and east of the Phase Two Property is identified as an Environmental Protection Area (Level 3) in the City of Barrie Official Plan (Adopted April 2023) and the Phase Two Property is located within 30 metres of Lake Simcoe where Black Redhorse, a threatened fish species in Ontario, is identified as being present;
- The Phase Two Property is not located within areas where the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act or Oak Ridge's Moraine Conservation Act, 2001 applies;
- The Phase Two Property is not a "shallow soil property," as defined in O. Reg. 153/04 as bedrock is not present within 2.0 metres below ground surface (mbgs). Watters Environmental did not encounter bedrock in the deepest borehole drilled in this Phase Two ESA, which was at a depth of approximately 9.14 mbgs; and
- Grain size analysis indicated that the soil is predominantly coarse textured (see Section 6.4 of this report).

Based on the above, Watters Environmental compared the soil and groundwater sample analytical data from the Phase Two Property to the Table 1 Full Depth Background SCS for Residential/Parkland/Institutional/Industrial/Commercial/Community Property Use as contained in the MECP publication "Soil, Ground Water and Sediment Standards for Use Under Part XV.1 of the Environmental Protection Act", April 15, 2011. These soil and groundwater quality standards are hereafter referred to as the "Table 1 SCS".



## 7.0 CONCLUSIONS

### 7.1 Summary of Findings

Based on the results of this Phase Two ESA, Watters Environmental presents the following findings:

- The Phase Two ESA was conducted in accordance with Ontario Regulation 153/04 (i.e., Records of Site Condition – Part XV.1 of the Act, made under the Ontario Environmental Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990 Regulation”);
- Soil containing PHC F4 exceeding the Table 1 SCS was identified on the northwest side of the Phase Two Property;
- Fill containing fluoranthene (a PAH) exceeding the Table 1 SCS was identified on the southeast side of the Phase Two Property;
- The concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons (PHCs F1-F4), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), Trihalomethanes (THMs), benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (collectively BTEX), hydride-forming metals (As, Sb, Se), other regulated parameters [i.e., boron-hot water soluble (B-HWS), hexavalent chromium [Cr(VI)], cyanide (CN-), mercury (Hg), electrical conductivity (EC) and sodium adsorption ratio (SAR)], and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in all other soil samples collected throughout the Phase Two Property meet the Table 1 SCS;
- Groundwater containing concentrations of metals parameters (i.e., barium, copper, and/or silver) exceeding the Table 1 SCS was identified on the northwest side of the Phase Two Property and groundwater containing concentrations of a hydride-forming metal (i.e., antimony) exceeding the Table 1 SCS was identified on the southeast side of the Phase Two Property; and
- The concentrations of PHCs, VOCs, THMs, BTEX, PAHs, and other regulated parameters [i.e., Cr(VI), CN-, Hg, sodium, and chloride] in all other groundwater samples on the Phase Two Property meet the Table 1 SCS.

Based on the results of this Phase Two ESA, further investigation (i.e., vertical delineation of groundwater exceedances) and risk assessment will be required prior to filing a Record of Site Condition.

EXIST 1

## 7.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The key findings are summarized below:

- Results of the trip generation analysis shows that the proposed redevelopment is expected to generate 50 and 34 two-way trips during the weekday AM and weekday PM Peak Hour, respectively. It is noted that the general threshold of a major development is 100 peak hour vehicles and it therefore anticipated that the proposed development will not have significant impacts to the adjacent network.
- It is also noted that the site was previously occupied by a commercial development. As a result, the proposed redevelopment is expected to add a net total of only 25 trips during the weekday AM Peak hour. Furthermore, the PM trips of the redevelopment are anticipated to be significantly lower than those of the previous commercial development.
- The site design does not suggest any safety concerns for the circulation of the design vehicles and is expected to operate acceptably.
- Analysis shows that acceptable levels of service are maintained with the Future Year 2033 traffic volumes at the Dunlop Street & Bayfield Street/Clapperton Street and the Bayfield Street & Simcoe Street intersections. Site traffic will have a negligible impact on the intersection operations.
- Analysis shows that the Dunlop Street East & Mulcaster Street intersection will experience poor Levels of Service (LOS) during the PM peak hour under the Future Background 2028 scenario, primarily due to background traffic growth and proposed background developments. Similar conditions are anticipated for the Future Year 2033 traffic volumes. However, it's worth noting that the intersection's potential issues are largely due to these background factors, as the impact from the site's relatively low traffic volumes is negligible.
- The proposed parking supply of 165 parking spaces, meeting the parking by-law. However, in light of recently approved adjacent development parking rates and the ITE parking demand rates, a parking reduction for the proposed development is both justified and recommended.
- However, analysis shows that the proposed parking supply for the condominium component of the development will exceed the demand rate ITE requirements.



## 4.0 CAPACITY ANALYSIS

The Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) utilizes a term "level of service" (LOS) to measure how traffic operates in intersections. There are currently six levels of service ranging from A to F. Level of Service "A" represents the best conditions and Level of Service "F" represents the worst. Synchro software was used to determine the level of service for intersections in the study area. All worksheet reports from the analyses can be found in the Appendix.

**Table 2** shows the control delay per vehicle associated with LOS A through F for signalized and unsignalized intersect

Signalized Intersection		Unsignalized Intersection	
Level of Service	Control Delay per Vehicle (sec)	Level of Service	Control Delay per Vehicle (sec)
A	$\leq 10$	A	$\leq 10$
B	$> 10$ and $\leq 20$	B	$> 10$ and $\leq 15$
C	$> 20$ and $\leq 35$	C	$> 15$ and $\leq 25$
D	$> 35$ and $\leq 55$	D	$> 25$ and $\leq 35$
E	$> 55$ and $\leq 80$	E	$> 35$ and $\leq 50$
F	$> 80$	F	$> 50$

4.1 Capacity Analysis Results

Table 3 shows the LOS, control delay, and 95th percentile queue length for existing, future background and future total conditions.

Table 3 Intersection LOS, Delay, and Queue by Movement

Intersection	Movement	Existing Traffic Conditions						Background 2028 Traffic Conditions						Total 2028 Traffic Conditions						Total 2033 Traffic Conditions													
		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		All Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		All Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		All Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		All Peak Hour									
		V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)	V/C	Delays (s)								
Bayfield Street & Dunlop Street East	EBL	0.230	25.4	17.6	C	0.460	24.2	18.1	C	0.430	23.4	20.4	C	0.520	26.7	21.0	C	0.440	23.6	20.6	C	0.520	26.8	21.1	C	0.470	24.1	22.8	C	0.440	25.1	23.5	C
	EBRT	0.230	13.1	14.9	B	0.390	11.6	30.2	B	0.280	10.6	20.0	B	0.440	11.7	39.8	B	0.280	10.5	20.4	B	0.460	11.8	40.5	B	0.270	10.4	21.8	B	0.460	11.3	44.3	C
	WBRT	0.510	21.7	24.2	C	0.490	18.5	34.7	B	0.590	20.8	36.7	C	0.600	20.0	51.7	B	0.570	20.7	38.5	C	0.610	20.0	52.3	C	0.590	21.2	40.5	C	0.640	21.7	56.4	C
	WBR	0.000	18.7	0.0	B	0.020	15.9	0.0	B	0.000	16.6	0.0	B	0.020	15.2	0.0	B	0.000	16.4	0.0	B	0.020	15.1	0.0	B	0.000	16.4	0.0	B	0.020	15.7	0.1	B
	NBRT	0.160	8.0	20.2	A	0.280	11.9	32.4	B	0.220	12.7	24.3	B	0.320	13.9	40.7	B	0.220	12.9	24.7	B	0.320	13.9	40.7	B	0.290	13.5	27.2	B	0.390	16.0	46.2	B
	SBL	0.020	8.0	3.5	A	0.080	10.2	7.3	B	0.030	11.2	4.1	B	0.090	11.8	9.1	B	0.030	11.4	4.1	B	0.080	11.8	9.0	B	0.030	11.8	4.3	B	0.090	13.3	9.9	B
SBR	0.210	9.3	25.3	A	0.380	12.9	44.6	B	0.280	13.3	30.8	B	0.440	15.3	56.0	B	0.290	13.5	31.3	B	0.440	15.3	56.2	B	0.320	14.3	34.7	B	0.520	18.0	64.4	B	
SBR	0.040	8.1	2.0	A	0.080	10.1	7.6	B	0.040	11.3	2.8	B	0.090	11.6	9.7	B	0.040	11.5	2.8	B	0.040	11.5	9.7	B	0.040	11.8	3.6	B	0.070	13.0	10.5	B	
Simcoe Street & Bayfield Street	EBL	0.230	5.0	8.6	A	0.350	6.7	13.2	A	0.260	4.9	9.2	A	0.370	6.7	14.9	A	0.280	4.9	9.2	A	0.370	6.7	14.9	A	0.330	6.6	10.1	A	0.430	6.6	17.0	A
	EBRT	0.470	6.1	39.8	A	0.650	9.8	63.2	A	0.510	6.2	45.3	A	0.690	10.3	77.1	B	0.510	6.2	45.9	A	0.700	10.6	79.0	B	0.610	8.8	53.0	A	0.760	11.9	97.3	B
	WBRT	0.450	11.6	33.4	B	0.540	14.7	36.7	B	0.480	11.7	37.3	B	0.610	16.6	41.7	B	0.490	11.7	38.3	B	0.620	16.6	42.1	B	0.600	14.7	42.7	B	0.640	16.9	48.0	B
	SBL	0.040	15.0	4.4	B	0.040	14.3	5.9	B	0.050	16.7	4.7	B	0.050	15.5	6.5	B	0.050	15.8	4.7	B	0.060	16.5	6.5	B	0.040	14.8	5.4	B	0.060	16.2	7.2	B
	SBR	0.100	15.3	12.1	B	0.180	14.9	16.4	B	0.110	16.0	13.0	B	0.190	16.2	17.4	B	0.110	16.1	13.0	B	0.190	16.2	17.5	B	0.120	15.1	13.9	B	0.210	17.0	18.7	B
	SBR	0.100	11.3	5.8	B	0.140	11.1	7.6	B	0.130	11.4	6.2	B	0.170	11.1	8.2	B	0.130	11.4	6.2	B	0.170	11.0	8.2	B	0.140	11.5	6.8	B	0.200	11.8	8.8	B
Mulcaster Street & Dunlop Street East	EBL	0.110	10.8	12.2	B	0.210	10.8	24.2	B	0.160	10.4	18.0	B	0.260	10.0	34.3	B	0.160	10.4	18.4	B	0.260	10.0	35.2	A	0.170	8.9	16.6	A	0.300	8.9	36.2	A
	EBRT	0.830	31.1	87.0	C	0.930	47.1	115.7	D	0.940	45.3	132.1	D	1.050	74.2	161.9	E	0.940	48.2	133.1	D	1.050	76.4	164.7	E	1.020	66.8	162.1	E	1.180	104.7	188.0	F
	WBRT	0.010	4.1	0.0	B	0.020	4.3	0.0	B	0.010	4.3	0.0	B	0.020	4.9	0.0	B	0.010	4.3	0.0	B	0.020	4.9	0.0	B	0.010	4.3	0.0	B	0.020	4.9	0.0	B
	NBL	0.010	13.3	2.7	B	0.150	18.0	9.4	B	0.010	15.2	2.7	B	0.050	18.0	5.7	B	0.040	16.6	6.1	B	0.080	19.5	6.7	B	0.080	17.2	6.6	B	0.080	20.7	7.2	C
	NBL	0.090	23.8	120.6	C	0.380	19.1	54.6	B	0.320	33.0	141.1	C	1.170	122.4	198.8	F	0.830	34.0	143.2	C	1.130	126.3	197.5	F	0.990	54.5	164.5	D	1.390	203.6	223.3	F
	SBLTR	0.230	16.3	47.5	B	0.390	51.3	174.8	D	0.420	19.7	57.6	B	1.070	441.7	133.9	F	0.440	20.2	58.7	C	1.070	468.1	136.9	F	0.620	27.1	76.8	C	2.480	706.9	131.5	F
Mulcaster Street & Commercial Access/Site Access	EBLTR																																
	WBLTR																																
	NBLTR																																
Mulcaster Street & Commercial Access/Site Access	EBLTR																																
	WBLTR																																
	SBLTR																																
Dunlop Street & Project RIRO Access	EBLTR																																
	WBLTR																																
	NBLTR																																
Mulcaster Street & Project Access	EBLTR																																
	WBLTR																																
	SBLTR																																

4.1.1 Dunlop Street & Bayfield Street/Clapperton Street

Analysis shows that acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) are maintained with the Future Year 2033 traffic volumes. Site traffic will have a negligible impact on the intersection operations.

4.1.2 Bayfield Street & Simcoe Street

Analysis shows that acceptable LOS are maintained with the Future Year 2033 traffic volumes. Site traffic will have a negligible impact on the intersection operations.

4.1.3 Dunlop Street East & Mulcaster Street

Analysis shows that the intersection will experience poor Levels of Service (LOS) during the PM peak hour under the Future Background 2028 scenario, primarily due to background traffic growth and proposed background developments. Similar conditions are anticipated for the Future Year 2033 traffic volumes. However, it's worth noting that the intersection's potential issues are largely due to these background factors, as the impact from the site's relatively low traffic volumes is negligible.

4.1.4 Dunlop Street East & Project RIRO Access

Analysis shows that the proposed access will operate with acceptable LOS at Future Year 2033 traffic conditions.

4.1.5 Mulcaster Street & Project Access

Analysis shows that the proposed access will operate with acceptable LOS at Future Year 2033 traffic conditions.

February 26, 2026

Re: The Proposed Amendment to the Zoning By-Law as requested by the developers of 149, 151 and 153 Dunlop Street East and 5 Mulcaster Street.

I am writing to express my grave concern regarding the potential construction of a large development. As you are no doubt already aware, this development would directly affect the view from my property, which was a significant factor in my decision to purchase this unit back in the fall of 2016.

Unfortunately, the plans to develop the property directly opposite my home has led to extreme difficulty in being able to sell my condo. Feedback from prospective buyers express concerns over how this new building would block the scenic views. This has not only impacted the appeal of my unit but it has also significantly lowered its market value.

I am very concerned about the requests by the developer to not only to allow a building height of 25 stories, but also to exempt certain established requirements relating to set-backs, to reduce the minimum coverage for gross floor area and location of commercial uses. I do not see how reducing what is the current minimum requirement for consolidated outdoor amenity area along with reducing the minimum required landscaped buffer along side and rear lot lines will positively enhance the quality of life for anyone living in downtown Barrie.

Surely the developer must be able to find a solution for their building plans that will enhance not only their opportunity to enhance the lives of their potential residents, but also that of their immediate neighbours? My past experience with properties I have owned when development occurs in the area has led to an increase in my property value. That is clearly not what is happening here.

I respectfully request that you reconsider the proposed development plans, or explore alternative solutions that would minimize the negative impact on my property and others in the area. I appreciate your time and attention to this matter and hope for a resolution that works for all parties involved.

Sincerely,

Donna Crowley

26 February 2025

City Clerk  
Barrie City Hall  
70 Collier St, PO Box 400  
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

Comments on Proposed Zoning Amendment: 149, 151 and 153 Dunlop Street East and 5 Mulcaster Street

To Whom It May Concern:

Please find below my written submission in reference to the Zoning By-Law Amendment request for the proposed development at Dunlop St E and Mulcaster St.

I am a long-time resident of the \_\_\_\_\_ in downtown Barrie and am formally registering my opposition to this project and the proposed Zoning amendment for this project.

I also have the following general comments regarding some of the studies presented as part of this application. Specific comments on each of the submitted reports that were reviewed can be found at Annex A.

1. The proposed project fails to meet the City of Barrie's Official Plan, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and stated goals for maintaining and enhancing public enjoyment of the downtown core and Waterfront. The project project will increase traffic, noise, wind and shadow effects, and parking challenges for all users, while reducing landscape and vegetated cover, consistency with surrounding heritage elements, public safety and views and accessibility to the waterfront by local residents and visitors.
2. The project also fails to demonstrate that the proposed design is the only viable option for development at site. Exceptions should only be considered where there is a true need. There is no true need for this project as proposed. There is no reason the project design cannot be altered to meet the requirements for this site.
3. The submitted studies are incomplete and disjointed. Several do not reference the conclusions of key related studies, such as the Landscape Plan not referencing the Arborist Report and the Environmental Impact Study not referencing the Stormwater and Landscape Design conclusions. Other important information for review is missing, such as the additional site delineation and risk assessment recommended in the Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment. Furthermore, many of the studies do not incorporate or address key concerns raised by the public at the Neighbourhood meeting in March 2024, such as specific requests to consider the impact of seasonal and special events on traffic, parking and noise impacts. In addition, some of the studies do not address the actual impact to the existing

residents in the area (e.g. the Wind Study does not assess change to wind at heights relevant

4. The Geotechnical and Hydrogeological studies raise concerns regarding the suitability of the site for such intense development and therefore puts the technical feasibility and affordability of the proposed development into question. These concerns were identified in previous development proposals for the site, and were ultimately responsible for scuttling those projects. These concerns, in addition to the other concerns regarding environmental and community impacts and incompatibility with other planning requirements, should prompt a rethink of the expectations for this property. Rather than going through repeated reviews for unsuitable high-density proposals at this site that wastes developer, City staff and community time and resources, the City of Barrie should acknowledge the physical limitations of this property and zone the property for lower-density development that is more in keeping with the physical realities and stated goals for a welcoming and vibrant downtown core.

In closing, I reiterate my opposition to the propose project and Zoning amendments.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions regarding this submission.

Sincerely,

Stephanie San Miguel

## Annex A

### Sun Shadow Study

- There is no analysis or summary of the results of this study anywhere in the project documentation. However, the study shows there will be significant shadow impacts on key features of the downtown core throughout the year that will negatively impact residents, business and safety. This goes against the Official Plan goals of promoting and enhancing the waterfront and parkland for public enjoyment, as well as for promoting a safe and attractive and inviting space for all Barrie residents.
- Specifically:
  - The intersection of Dunlop St and Mulcaster St will be in shadow during the morning hours all year round. This could reduce safety for drivers and pedestrians by extending icing and darkness in and around the intersection, especially in winter. This effect may be especially pronounced given steep grade along Mulcaster St;
  - Parts of Sam Cancilla Park will be in shadow during the afternoon hours all year round. This effect will be especially pronounced during the high-use period in the summer, when almost the entire length of the park will be in shadow for a period of time. Shadows will reduce the quality and enjoyment of Sam Cancilla Park throughout the year, but especially during the key summer period. Note that it is possible portions of the North Shore Trail will be impacted by shadow in the later afternoon (i.e. after 5pm), although this was not covered by the study;
  - Shadow will extend over nearby businesses and homes covering almost an entire city block, including the intersection of Collier St and Mulcaster St and City Hall in the winter months. This will impact sunlight enjoyed by restaurants with patios, the skating rink and the Farmer's Market. These effects may be compounded over even larger areas by combining with the shadow effect from other tall buildings in the area; and
  - Shadow effects will impact residents of Bayshore Landing during the afternoon hours all year round, but especially during the summer months. This will significantly impact quality of life and enjoyment of living spaces.

### Wind Study

- Notwithstanding the conclusion that wind impacts from the proposed development are 'acceptable', the study confirms there will be a noticeable increase in the wind speed at and around the site created by the proposed development (by approx. 5km/h in places), particularly in the autumn and winter. A 5km/h increase in wind speed can impact the pedestrian experience, such as increasing windchill effects in winter.
- The report only considers the wind effects at street / pedestrian level. It does not assess the impact on wind at elevations that can impact the residents of Bayshore Landing (e.g. ability for Bayshore Residents to open windows from Floors 3-14, use patio spaces).
- The report does not discuss potential changes on snow deposition or icing at and around the building due to changes in wind speed or direction created by the proposed project, nor the impact of increased winter wind chill experienced by pedestrians on the street from the projected increase in wind speeds along Dunlop St.



- The report does not evaluate the cumulative impact on wind speeds from other proposed developments in the immediate area. The construction of other high-rise towers along Dunlop St may magnify the wind tunnel effect.

### Noise Study

- The study is focused on the noise experienced by residents of the development itself and not on the noise impacts to surrounding sites from the development.
- The study identifies that current noise levels at the proposed development will exceed the MECF standards at all times and will require additional design mitigations to bring these to acceptable levels. These noise effects are primarily attributed to traffic in the area. This corroborates comments by Bayshore Landing residents and others at the Neighbourhood meeting last year regarding the already-high ambient noise levels downtown. Noise is a critical quality of life and health issue, and directly impacts public enjoyment of the downtown space. Existing buildings in the immediate area, such as Bayshore Landing and business along Dunlop St, might not be able to mitigate for the increased noise levels without making substantial and costly updates to their own building envelopes.
- The study does not consider the increased noise impacts that result from seasonal traffic changes (e.g. summer weekends, winter snow clearing), lake-based activities (e.g. speed boats in summer, snowmobiles in winter), and other events (e.g. festivals, parades, fireworks, etc.). These can result in significant point-in-time spikes of noise that might still exceed acceptable levels even after mitigation.
- The study does not address the impact of noise during construction, which will be a significant issue for local residents, businesses and recreation users during the 2+ years of construction.

### Arborist Report

- The Arborist Report confirms that 7 trees will need to be removed from the site.
- The report notes that trees must be replaced at minimum 1:1 ratio, however there is no discussion on where these trees will be planted given the minimal availability of land that will be available at the site following construction.
- The report does not discuss the impact of the shadow effect, wind or changes to drainage on the remaining trees in Sam Cancilla Park.

### Landscape Plans

- The Landscape Plan does not reference the Arborist Report, which recommends replanting with a number of native tree species of a minimum size. The Landscape Plan proposes the use of different tree species.
- It is not clear from the Landscape Plan whether the proposed plantings represent the 1:1 replacement of the seven trees that will be removed. There is no discussion on this point in the submitted studies, raising the possibility the requirement will not be met.

### Transportation Study

- The study clearly identifies a marked impact from increased traffic at the Dunlop St and Mulcaster St intersection. This is a key intersection for residents and visitors to

downtown Barrie. Although the report notes the impacts are not specific to the proposed development, they nevertheless demonstrate the effect from the increased development in the overall area. Traffic impacts were a major concern raised by residents at the Neighbourhood meeting last year.

- The study does not consider the impacts from seasonal traffic changes (e.g. summer weekends) or from the numerous events resulting in road closures and increased visitors to the area throughout the year (e.g. festivals, weekly Farmer's Market, parades, etc.). Traffic impacts will likely be much higher at these times.
- The study does not consider the impacts on traffic from construction. While the construction plan notes there will be no road closures during construction, there will be increased truck and worker traffic at a critical downtown intersection and along a key section of the Waterfront. Access to the Waterfront Trail and parking for the nearby parks will overlap with truck and construction equipment traffic, resulting in safety concerns for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists.
- The study uses incorrect values for the parking study (160 parking spaces vs 122). While the study considers a reduced parking allocation scenario, the number of parking spots it recommends (147) is still higher than the final number proposed for this development. Given the study is using incorrect assumptions, the conclusions of this study on the parking component are not valid. The parking study should be redone using the actual proposed numbers for this project.
- The study underestimates the demand for residential and on-street parking in this area. The issues with parking at Lakhouse serve as an example of how the proposed 0.6 parking factor is not realistic. The lack of sufficient parking for residents and visitors to local businesses was a key concern raised at the Neighbourhood meeting last year.
- The study does not address safety concerns resulting from the shadow study, such as increased icing and darkness at the Dunlop St and Mulcaster St intersection in winter.

#### Energy Conservation Report

- The report proposes options for improving the energy efficiency of the proposed development, but does not confirm what measures will actually be taken by the development to improve energy efficiency. This report adds no value in terms of understanding how the project meets the "Green City" planning goals.
- The report does not address options for broader sustainability and 'green building' goals, such as charging stations for electric vehicles, water conservation, waste reduction, climate change vulnerability, etc. Note these topics are also not addressed in the Environmental Impact Study.

#### Environmental Impact Study

- The study did not consider the following:
  - Impact of dewatering at the scale identified in the Hydrogeological Study;
  - Stormwater and landscape design information as these studies were not available at the time the EIS was prepared;
  - Impact of sun shadow and wind studies;
  - Air quality impacts from construction and increased traffic in the area;
  - Ongoing effects of occupancy and building maintenance;



- A comprehensive review of alternatives to the project.
- Ecological surveys were conducted at the end of October 2021. This timing is not conducive for survey work as it is outside the active period for most species.
- The proposed project does not meet the requirement in the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan to “establish and increase vegetation protection zone around Lake Simcoe.”
- The study does not consider the cumulative impacts from other developments and projects in the area.

### Phase 2 ESA

- The Phase 2 ESA recommended further site delineation and a site risk assessment. As these studies have not been completed, the actual risks presented by the site are still unknown.
- The sampling program did not consider the potential for PFAS as a contaminant of concern. This could have been introduced in the fill material or potentially via other uses at the site.

### Geotechnical and Hydrogeology Studies

- The Geotechnical study identifies concerns with the suitability of the site for the proposed development. While there are available technologies to overcome these limitations, the long-term and cumulative effects on soil stability are not addressed. Moreover, the study does not address the question regarding the cost of implementing more complicated construction measures. These costs would presumably be carried over into purchase price per unit. The proponent does not address the potential follow on effects on housing affordability.
- The Hydrogeological study identifies significant concerns with dewatering at the site to enable construction and a two-level underground parking area. It is unclear what the long term impacts on the environment will be from this activity or whether permitting will be allowed for this project.

### Urban Design Brief

- This report fails to explain why the project merits special exceptions from the current standards. It is effectively an advertising document for the project.
- The Site and Surrounding Area Context analysis only considers the availability of entertainment services in the area (e.g. restaurants, shopping, parks). It does not consider the availability of elements essential for a well functioning and desirable community, such grocery, medical and dental facilities, schools and other professional services. These services are mostly absent from Barrie’s downtown core at this time and are not reasonably accessible elsewhere in Barrie without a car. The proposed project document fails to consider how the development is affected by or will address these concerns.
- The study notes the project will “contribute to the urban tree canopy.” However, the project will result in the loss of seven trees and related documentation does not explain how - or even if - these will be adequately replaced. The project is also looking for an exception to required landscape buffer. Overall, the project will result in a net loss of vegetative cover.

- The study notes the project will “contribute to the public streetscape.” The project proposes a minimum of four stories of bricked parking area at the ‘human level’ with minimal landscaping around the building. This will be placed at one of the key intersections for access to the downtown and Waterfront parkland. As a private structure, the majority of the building and its facilities will be out of bounds to the public.
- The study notes the project will “provide access and views to the lake.” As this is private property, the project will only increase access and views for the building’s residents. Overall, the project will reduce views currently enjoyed by other residents and visitors, and will create a significant visual barrier to the lake for pedestrians and drivers along Dunlop St and Mulcaster St.
- The study notes the project will result in a facade that is consistent with Dunlop St heritage. This project will not remotely resemble any structure in the immediate area, which with the exception of Bayshore Landing, are mostly 3-storey historical structures and parkland. It is impossible for a modern 25-storey, glass-clad tower to be consistent with the surrounding streetscape.
- The study notes the project will “mitigate against runoff” by including underground and aboveground parking. It’s unclear how these activities are related and how the proposed parking will result in an overall net improvement to water drainage at the site from what is currently present.
- The study notes the project “does not abut existing development of neighbouring properties” and that “shadow impacts are limited.” While it’s true the property does not directly abut other built properties, the project is across the street from numerous structures containing businesses and residential units. The statement on the shadow impact on these surrounding properties is incorrect and contradicts the results of the Sun Shadow study.

### Planning Rationale Report

- The study summarizes the conclusions of some of the studies produced for this proposal. Concerns with the results of those studies have been covered elsewhere.
- The study notes the goal for the Urban Growth Centre is to have a minimum density of 150 persons *and jobs* per hectare. It is unclear how the proposed project promotes the goal of long-term job creation within the downtown core outside of the ~2 year construction period. Jobs created by the proposed retail space will be retail or service type (e.g. restaurant), which is already readily available within the downtown area. This project will not meet the need to create diverse job opportunities, such as professional, manufacturing or administrative jobs, that would attract a diversity of residents to the downtown area and create a community where residents could live *and* meaningfully work.
- The project fails to meet the requirement under the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan to demonstrate there is no alternative to placing the proposed project on that property and that the area of the structure is minimized. Contrary to the requirement, the project as proposed is designed to maximize the area occupied by the building on the property. Moreover, there are many alternative building options and designs that could provide the required setback from Lake Simcoe and meet the City of Barrie’s planning goals for the community.