

From: Barb Tansley

Sent: Wednesday, November 22, 2017 2:42 PM

To: CityClerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>

Cc: Bailey Chabot <Bailey.Chabot@barrie.ca>

Subject: 521,527,531 Big Bay Pt Rd amendment to zoning bylaw application- comment letter

Honourable Mayor , Members of Council and City Staff

This letter is in response to the application for an amendment to the zoning by law proposed by [2440511](#) Ont Inc., and affecting 521, 527 and [531 Big Bay Pt Rd.](#)

I would like to oppose the application based on it's current form considering the following facts as they relate to policies and by laws:

Residential Density - The proposal increases the intensification density for the 3 properties to triple the amount allowed in Barrie's zoning by laws. Only a fraction of 521 is in the intensification corridor.

Set Backs - The application wants to reduce the setbacks for the new structures on the 3 properties which has the potential to impact neighbouring structures, neighbouring water supplies and neighbouring septic systems during construction. After construction reduced set backs will also impact sight lines for many RM1 residential properties in the neighbourhood. Reduced setbacks also means reduced areas to put snow in the winter and higher piles of snow along the street boulevard.

Sight Lines - Placing the new structures plus the 1.5 m planter box so close to the street will impact neighbouring properties and their ability to see oncoming vehicular ,pedestrian and bicycle traffic when exiting / entrancing driveways. Emergency services wouldn't be able to view addresses if needed. This is counter to the cities design policies which are intended to provide an extra wide buffer

zone between the different zoning areas. This will be exacerbated in winter when the snow is piled high along the street from 5 lanes of roadway.

Privacy - The neighbouring properties should have the right to maintain privacy during construction and also once the units are completed and occupied. With the increased density and reduction in proposed setbacks the expectation of privacy won't be maintained in our yard or through our windows. A minimum of 8 end unit glass balconies will be able to view our yard and look in our windows. Although the screen option for end glass facing east is better than none, the buildings are too close/high. There are walkways from each unit to the street which will impact privacy. In addition to the right to maintain privacy is light and views of the sky.

The 12 m height of the buildings proposed is 2 m more than zoning standard of 10m. This equates to a 4 story as the basement is above ground. There will be shadowing.

Garbage - The proposal includes using Molok waste containers which is an open underground system that the city is not equipped to service and would require some kind of special provision to service.

Drainage - we already have drainage issues along Big Bay Point Rd with the grade reversal because of work not being completed to design specifications during the road widening, water and sewer installation in 2007. In addition the neighbouring property (531, included in the proposal) regraded and sloped their driveway to drain onto the yard to the east in 2014. The length of the north-south boundary between properties from the north and south east corners of the proposed development has been excavated and left open for months, undercutting the boundary length of the property line. This caused the grade to drop along the fence which sits 8"

inside the property line to the east. Higher density and reduced setbacks will exacerbate these issues. Also commercial operations behind the affected properties use the area immediately adjacent to the back yards as an area to pile snow in the winter. Spring melting causes the drainage from the snow pile to drain into the back yards of adjacent properties. The high density of the proposed design does not allow for adequate snow storage or removal in winter or drainage of the area in the spring.

The Functional Servicing Report included with the application has flawed data - For example the addresses listed on the cover page don't match the application and in fact aren't part of the application. The drawing doesn't show the correct highlighted area, it excludes the most recent acquisition. In the Justification Report the proposed amendment area shows an excavation on this newly acquired lot and in another report the same property shows a garage. City staff can't be expected to make correct decisions based on flawed input.

Intensification Policies, Density and Negative impact - The size of the proposals for an amendment to zoning is too big. 60 condos on this size of lot is at the very least 12 units too many (at 8 units per bldg max as stated in the zoning by law maximums)

Negative impact on community. At least 6 residences have sold as a result of rezoning.

Poor connectivity to existing neighbourhood.

The design may be too unique, modern and urban and doesn't blend in to the lower density single family dwellings to the east, north or south. There should be a much wider expanse as a buffer and more screening. Columnar trees to the east and west would help but are not a commitment according to the report.

Stability, Excavation, Proximity, Depth - We have concerns about the stability, excavation, proximity and depth of the building construction and sewer pipes along the east side yard. How will the ensuing excavations affect the stability of our structures, well, septic, weeping tile which could be as close as 10 ft. This location of the proposal has already been excavated and left open for months. Only recently has it been partially filled in. This resulted in erosion below / above ground affecting the property to the east. Before that the grass was ripped away, the length of the back yard with large equipment affecting same grass and not restored.

Amenity Space - The quantity of amenity space isn't enough for this kind of density. It appears the primary amenity space would be the balconies which are said to be too small to hang out on and not big enough to put more than two chairs on. There seems to be a contradiction that when concerns were expressed at the neighbourhood meeting about privacy and glass balconies we were assured the area wasn't big enough to place more than 2 chairs on but yet it's supposed to be big enough to count as amenity space (unconsolidated).

Are there set backs for the well and septic?

Tree Preservation - Our trees are at risk even in the protection zone with the size /scale of the project in front, rear and side yards. It's too close and too big. What is the name, phone number, dept. of the person we call if tree protection zone protocols aren't met?

Noise, Vibration, Dust, Exhaust - The noise of the construction, dust, vibration of equipment on our homes structures, weeping tile, well, septic is a concern. The exhaust and dust of the construction equipment so close to neighbouring yards during construction will have an impact on the freedom to enjoy our property. In the future

there will be at least sixty cars idling and warming up in the winter and a normal westerly breeze will blow those fumes directly into our home and yard. It's the same westerly wind that blew the node in an easterly direction .

Parking - We don't feel there is adequate parking for the density. There isn't any on street parking available on Big Bay Point Rd. The existing residences already have issues not having enough parking for company especially on holidays. Where are the additional visitors and service vehicles supposed to park? Bible for Missions has already acquired another property for 31 more parking spaces in addition to what they have now.

Please do not pass the amendment to zoning in its current state of design/ density/ height/set backs/ snow storage etc. While change is inevitable, we believe as residents our rights should be protected without being accused of being “NIMBY”. The very things that drew us to the area are being taken away from us piece by piece and changing the face of the City to something that is less and less desirable. We trust you to make the required changes to the zoning bylaws proposed to reflect residents concerns or turn down the application.

Sincerely,

Barbara Tansley