

From: Dorton, Peter (MTO) <Peter.Dorton@ontario.ca>
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2021 1:29 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Cc: Tina Gonneau Tina.Gonneau@barrie.ca
Subject: FW: Notice of Public Meeting - Update to Affordable Housing Provisions

Hi Shelby.

MTO has no issues or concerns with this proposed amendment.

Thanks,
Peter Dorton
Senior Project Manager
Ministry of Transportation
Central Operations, Highway Corridor Management Section
159 Sir William Hearst Avenue, 7th Floor
Toronto, ON M3M 0B7
Cell: (437) 833 - 9396
E-Mail: peter.dorton@ontario.ca
Web: www.mto.gov.on.ca/english/engineering/management/corridor

Subject: Notice of Public Meeting - Update to Affordable Housing Provisions

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Good morning.

Attached please find Notice of Public Meeting to consider a City-wide, municipally initiated amendment to Zoning By-law 2009-141 to facilitate more affordable housing options.

If you have any questions concerning the attached, please do not hesitate to contact the File Manager, Shelby White at Shelby.White@barrie.ca.

Tina Gonneau
Agreements Officer
Development Services
City of Barrie
70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400
Barrie, Ontario L4M 4T5
Office: 705-739-4220 Ext. 4416 – Fax: 705-739-4270

From: Meaghan Allison
Sent: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 8:23 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: June 15 Public Meeting

Hello Shelby,

In regards to the upcoming public meeting regarding changes to accessory units, please accept this email as confirmation that I do not support the proposed changes being made to the detached accessory units within the City of Barrie.

Thank you,
Meaghan Allison

-----Original Message-----

From: Rachel Holden

Sent: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 8:45 PM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: Coach houses in Barrie

Hello Shelby

I am the current owner of three homes, all with coach houses in the City of Barrie.

I'm concerned to see the City taking steps to limit or further restrict coach house construction in the City. Tenants have been literally walking up the driveway of my home to ask when construction will be finished because rentals are so hard to come by.

The current size restrictions in relation to lot size already dictate that most coach houses would need to be 2 bedroom units, or smaller. The removal of basements as a option will ensure that coach houses are not a housing option for families or room mates.

Many of the applications I am getting for two bedroom units are blended/ extended families or three roommates coming together to make costs live-able. We need to keep options open for urban intensification and let our farm land remain.

While I know neighborhoods dominated by owner occupants may not understand or appreciate urban density, the cost of housing is out of reach for many and needs to be expanded for communities to flourish. Renters are not bad people. Renters don't bring down property values. Rental units should be welcomed, not shunned.

Thank you for your attention.

Rachel Holden

From: Adam Heisz
Sent: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 10:15 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Restrictions on garden suits

Hello,

I am a resident of ward one and have lived within 1 km of where I purchased my home for the better part of 30 years. I'm 38 and I saved for a long time to be able to purchase my dream house in the area I grew up. I fully support any restrictions to amend the garden suit bylaw.

A minimum distance apart would also be a help, when considering this. There were two garden suits built within a couple hundred feet of each other in the Melrose Ave. and Nelson St. area.

Another possible thing to look at is if the house is a duplex not allowing a garden suit.

Reducing development cost for a fixed rent rate for a set amount of years with scheduled rent increase tied to inflation could probably be a good plan, that way you could help developers build affordable housing on a larger scale on larger parcels of land that are more suitable than cramming more units in single family homes owned by absentee landlords that don't even live in the city.

While I do understand there is a large need for affordable housing, restrictions need to be in place so over crowding of neighbour hoods doesn't become an issue. The ward one neighbour hood have multiple low rise apartment building mixed evenly threw out all the older subdivisions. These building have been there since the 50's and are not an issue but when you start allowing the houses around them to be turned into triplexes it becomes a crowding issue. Where are these tenants going to park their vehicles? On the street on bus routs and in the way of snow plows?

The city already has a problem with absentee landlords in the college area allowing 10 plus unrelated ppl to live in a 3 or 4 bedroom house allowing these garden suits to be added to duplex properties is only going to make problems worse and not address the affordable housing issue.

These landlords also will state they are building them to be affordable?! Ask them how much they rent them for? They are far from affordable. Barrie has the third or fourth highest rental rate in Canada which is making it a hot spot for joint venture real estate deals for people who can afford to invest across the Province. Allowing this scale of development is also driving the cost of housing up in the city by out of town investors. Making the housing problem even worse.

I know I am not the only Barrie resident who thinks the recent changes are not for the better and don't help solve the high rent costs and the major lack of affordable housing.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and I truly hope the city takes action to address this issue.

Adam Heisz

From: Jack Kerr
Sent: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 10:45 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Purposed changed to bi-law

Evening Shelby

As someone who wants to see affordable housing and the city of Barrie grow to better suit the growth coming and our future generations I do not support you purposed changed to bi law for detached units (second dwellings) within the city of Barrie.

Thank you

Jack Kerr

Mortgage Agent | **Anthem Mortgage Group**

A: 387 Mapleview Drive West Barrie ON L4N 9G4

P: [705.721.4509](tel:705.721.4509) ext 104 **M:** [705.333.4403](tel:705.333.4403) **F:** [705.721.5112](tel:705.721.5112)

E: jack@anthemmortgage.ca **W:** www.anthemmortgage.ca

Brokerage #: 10294 **Licence #:** M20001585

IMPORTANT NOTICE: Anthem Mortgage Group is a member of the Verico Network. Information sent by way of public Internet e-mail is non-secure as it is not encrypted. Anthem Mortgage Group is not responsible if that information is intercepted and misused. This e-mail and any attachments are confidential, may be covered by legal professional privilege or exempt from disclosure under applicable law, and are intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to and must not disclose, copy, distribute or retain any or part of this e-mail and any attachments without written permission of Anthem Mortgage Group. If you received this e-mail in error, please advise me (by return e-mail or otherwise) immediately.

From: Matt Plunkett
Sent: Wednesday, June 9, 2021 10:45 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Secondary Dwellings

Hi Shelby,

It has come to my attention about the restrictions that are being proposed towards secondary dwellings (including limiting size to 699 sq/ft, not allowing basements, etc.)

I believe this is counter productive to what the main goal should be - which is creating more housing. As a realtor, I see first hand the shortage we are experiencing in both resale & rentals, and it has had a massive effect on our prices. We need more support towards building more homes.

I do not support the new restrictions being proposed.

Thanks for your time,

Matt Plunkett

-----Original Message-----

From: Dan Couture

Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 7:20 AM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: Affordable housing

I do not support the proposed changes to regards for detached accessory units in the city of Barrie.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Garrett Hill
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 10:42 AM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Proposed Changes: By-law 2009-141

Hi Shelby,

I strongly oppose the proposed changes to by-law 2009-141.

In my opinion, the proposed changes will do the exact opposite of what they are intended for. Affordable housing stems from a supply and demand issue. The proposed changes will eliminate the possibility of 2 bedroom coach houses which will limit the supply of these units and increase the cost. The City of Barrie must see the bigger picture of the supply issue and not cater to the few NIMBYs in the city. Furthermore, allowing second stories in coach houses but not basements is completely backwards when the major concern of these accessory dwelling units is that they encroach on the privacy of neighbors. I sincerely hope that the proposed changes are reconsidered and adjusted to actually help increase the supply of all units.

Regards,

Garrett Hill

From: seyon sathiyananthan
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 12:37 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Changes to Barrie Bylaw Re Coach Houses

I DO NOT support the changes to the City of Barrie Bylaw regarding detached auxiliary units.

Affordable housing is only possible if the requirements are easier to meet.

Thank you,
--
Seyon Sathiyananthan

From: Seyon Sathiyananthan
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 12:40 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Response to City of Barrie Bylaw Changes to Detached ADUs

I DO NOT support the changes to the City of Barrie Bylaw regarding detached auxiliary units.

Affordable housing is only possible if the requirements are easier to be met.

Thank you,
--
Seyon Sathiyananthan

From:

Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 1:21 PM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: Coach Houses

We have heard about the proposed changes the City of Barrie is making in regards to coach houses (detached ancillary units) and we do not agree... this will have a huge impact on rentals and affordability within this city.

Thank you,

Christa Asselstine

From: Alex Pal
Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 2:23 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Coach house by-law changes

Hello Shelby,

My name is Alex Pal and I am a real estate investor and developer. I am just emailing in opposition of the proposed changes to the coach house bylaws that have been proposed.

For some reason, it seems that more and more roadblocks are being presented to the only individuals that are working towards creating more housing inventory in our towns.

This is across southern Ontario and for the life of me, I can't understand why. With complete respect, constantly making things harder for people to create more inventory is counter-intuitive to the over Ontario plan of infill and producing more housing stock and just doesn't make sense.

I will be at the June 15th hearing.

Thank you for your consideration

--

Best Regards,
Alex Pal
Owner, Pal Property Solutions

From: Brian Keller

Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 2:47 PM

To: cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>; Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: City-wide Update to Affordable Housing Provisions (D30-007-2021)

Hello Shelby et al, I hope this email finds you well.

As an experienced landlord, affordable housing advocate and Realtor I do not support the proposed changes with regards to detached accessory dwelling units. I believe more investigation and input from constructors, landlords and tenants is required before finalizing.

Regards,

Brian Keller

From: Ken Bekendam

Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 3:53 PM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: new proposed changes to detached accessory dwelling units

Hi Shelby,

I'm writing to you to express my disapproval of the proposed changes to the detached accessory dwelling unit bylaw. All of the proposed changes will end up with less affordable housing units being built. As a professional design/build company specializing in these types of developments, the proposed changes will have a net negative impact and will only increase the supply/demand issues by limiting supply with new regulations that do not make sense.

With respect,

-Ken

Ken Bekendam

-----Original Message-----

From: janine vandermeer

Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 7:05 PM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject:

Just emailing to voice my opinion that I do not agree with the proposed changes to detached ancillary units!!

Thanks

Janine Alton

-----Original Message-----

From: Logan Cardinal

Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 8:00 PM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: New coach house regulations

Hi Shelby,

I do not agree with the proposed bylaw changes for building a detached coach house.

We can not afford to put a stop to this as we need the housing in our area.

Just because a few neighbours are not happy with this shouldn't change the fact that this is needed in our communities!!!!

Thanks

Logan Cardinal

-----Original Message-----

From: Lisa Warwick

Sent: Thursday, June 10, 2021 8:01 PM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: Coach houses

I do not agree with the new proposed changes to coach houses in Barrie. People NEED affordable housing within a nice neighbourhood. ! This is just silly.

Lisa Warwick

Sent from my iPad

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris Franco

Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 6:15 AM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Cc: Mike McCann <Mike.McCann@barrie.ca>

Subject: Public Comment - Chris Franco - City Initiated Amendment to Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2009-141 – City-wide Update to Affordable Housing Provisions (D30-007-2021)

Hello Shelby,

I would like to send in my comments regarding the proposed amendments to the city bylaw, in particular the accessory dwelling units.

After review of these proposed changes,

It makes no sense as to why the city will disallow basements. It impacts no one and creates additional living space for unusable space.

Secondly the 45% allowable size from the principal residence on the older homes does not give much livable space.

Eg, 600sqft home, I can only build a 270sq ft?

The 10% lot coverage made sense as majority of homes have decent size lots.

In my point of view, this government intervention will greatly impact affordability within Barrie.

As it is now, every unit that's constructed either as a second suite or Accessory is always filled within very short timelines.

This will have more people shy away from doing dwelling units and thus creating more of an inventory crisis for housing.

Barrie isn't creating more land, we have to have the foresight 20-30 years down the road when generational families will likely transition into the backyards of their homes and give the principal residence to their kids due to affordability.

Thank you for taking my comments.

Chris Franco.

From: Calvin Ng
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 7:57 AM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Oppose By-law 2009-141

Hello Shelby,

I am the owner of _____, Barrie and I do not support the changes to the accessory dwelling units as it will impact rent affordability and create more of an inventory crisis. I recently posted an ad for a 2 bed unit, I had over 300 inquiries over the weekend alone. The current rental inventory crisis is already very serious.

https://www.barrie.ca/City%20Hall/MediaRoom/Pages/Detail_PublicNotices.aspx?PublicNotice=515

Thank you.

Regards,
Calvin

-----Original Message-----

From: Brandon McDonald

Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 11:11 AM

To: cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>

Subject: Changes to ancillary Units

Good morning,

I am emailing this to let you know that I do NOT support the changes to the Ancillary Units in Ontario. This would make the housing crises even worse and would make the rental market even more competitive than it is already. We need to make affordable living an option for everyone! I know tenants that live in these Ancillary units and they absolutely love them because they get what feels like their own home in Ontario's crazy Real estate Market!

Concerned resident of Ontario

Brandon McDonald

From: SLC Property Management
Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 5:08 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: RE: Amendments to (D30-007-2021)

Hi Shelby,

I am the owner of _____ which is a registered legal second suite. I first started investing into creating more affordable housing with the City in 2019. The City has been very supportive of working together with us. We have a housing crisis right now in Southern Ontario and our goal shouldn't be to make it more difficult to create affordable housing, but to encourage more people to play their part in helping with the solution. I am not in support of the new proposed changes.

Regards,

Andrew

From: Rosalina Lin-Allen

Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 6:38 PM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: Concerns & objections about the proposed amendment to the Affordable Housing Zoning by-law

Hi Shelby,

My husband and I have been providing rental units in Barrie since 2016. 50% of our units are affordable rental properties and we are planning to supply more rental units with the opportunity brought forth by being able to build detached accessory dwelling units on the same property. Otherwise, providing additional rental units has become cost prohibitive with the property pricing in Barrie nowadays.

I just learnt about the proposed amendments to the Affordable Housing Zoning By-law, in particular the size restrictions of 65 m2 regardless of lot size. I am concern that the size restriction will make such dwelling too small and undesirable for most prospective tenants.

In addition, building a detached accessory dwelling is a significant undertaking for an investor, with a significant amount of capital and effort, not to mention all kinds of risk exposure that comes with building a net new dwelling unit. All this plus increasing building material and lumber cost, we are starting to second guess whether building a detached accessory dwelling unit in Barrie make business sense.

In conversations with other investors, I can see how the newly contemplated restrictions can create additional barriers for investors and reduce the potential supply of affordable rental housing in Barrie. We appeal to you to consider the hurdles – need to secure capital, the risk exposures, the marketability of smaller units – from an investor's standpoint and make decisions that result in a win-win scenario for all stakeholders in the community.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Mike & Rosalina

-----Original Message-----

From: adam marion

Sent: Sunday, June 13, 2021 9:36 AM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: Express concerns

Hello Shelby,

I believe you are correct person to contact about this, if not please disregard.

I have been made aware of the changes proposed to the construction of second suites. I do not understand the rationale behind these changes we have a massive housing issue in this city and this is counter productive in solving that issue and just adds more red tape. I just wanted to voice my concern.

Thank you for your time.

From: Carol Ann Hutchinson
Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 8:35 AM
To: Keenan Aylwin <Keenan.Aylwin@barrie.ca>
Cc: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Coach Houses

We would like to express our concerns regarding the development of coach houses. We DO NOT think this is the solution to Barrie's housing crisis. We have spent 10's of thousands of dollars over the years to make our backyard our private oasis. We can't imagine having a coach house in our neighbour's backyard overlooking the fence into our yard. One of the reasons people have bought houses in this neighbourhood is because of the size of the backyards, never imagining that there would be such a thing as a coach house that could be built in their neighbour's backyard.

We agree that there is a housing crisis, and think a better solution would be for the City of Barrie to build more affordable apartment buildings (ie. the corner of Bayfield St and Sophia St).

If the City of Barrie is determined to go ahead with these coach houses, we suggest that it be a law that the property owner MUST live in one of the dwellings to help eliminate absentee landlords. Absentee landlords are already a problem in this ward.

We hope that you take our concerns into consideration. Thank you for your time.

Lloyd and Carol Ann Hutchinson

From: Vlad
Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 9:30 AM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Please Stop Zoning By-law Updates for Affordable Housing!

Hello Shelby White,

I am an investor in Barrie and built a number of second suites and one detached accessory dwelling unit (a Coach House).

The proposed changes will tie up my and other investors' hands and will not help solve the housing crisis in Barrie. Right now when you publish a rental ad in the Barrie area you get hundreds of requests within a day.

We need a lot more units created, a lot more housing for renters. With tighter regulations it will make it harder to build and create more units and thus it will limit new potential supply feeding into the crisis, and the housing crisis will worsen.

Some of the proposed changes make it unattractive to build and create more units.

- Coach houses should allow basements and 2 storey Coach Houses do not make sense due to privacy issues for the neighbours.
- Limiting to just 65 sq. m. gross floor space does not make sense - it is too small for a family to rent, you can hardly fit a good 2 bedroom apartment in this space.
- We should keep 10% rule or at least increase maximum size of the coach house to 75 sq m
- We should be allowed to add a basement to add more living space at a smaller footprint
- Detached private garage on the first floor of the Coach House also does not make sense due to privacy issues with 2 storey units.

The new zoning by-law should be revised again and controversial regulations removed!

Please help and hear other investors in the community speak and voice their concerns.

Regards,
Vlad Maevskiy

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris Dimitriadis

Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 11:37 AM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: Proposed Bylaw changes - Coach Houses

Good morning Ms. White,

I recently became aware of the proposed changes to the City of Barrie's bylaws regarding backyard garden suites/coach houses. I would like to unequivocally express my opposition to the changes that specifically limit the size of units and look to eliminate the option of basements.

There is an undeniable rental housing crisis in the City of Barrie and across the entire Simcoe region and this will perpetuate that. Council needs to stand up and put the focus on tenants that can't afford to live in Barrie and are potentially finding themselves homeless, as opposed to the home owners that complain about not wanting their backyard time disrupted.

The proposed changes will severely limit the number of garden suites built and those that are built will be limited to one bedrooms and be less efficient without the basements to allow for high efficiency gas furnaces. Why is the City looking to eliminate units that could accommodate young families?

Further, in the midst of a pandemic and economic uncertainty, the investors/builders that are bringing this new supply of rental housing to the market are also providing employment with decent pay to those in desperate need of financial stability.

Implementing these proposed changes will take Barrie from being looked upon as an established leader in tackling the rental crisis and providing housing for those in need, to a City led by a weak Council that cares more about complaints and votes from a few vocal homeowners.

Regards,
Chris Dimitriadis

-----Original Message-----

From: MacNeil Construction

Sent: Monday, June 14, 2021 11:12 AM

To: cityclerks <cityclerks@barrie.ca>

Subject: June 15 coach house convo

Good day guys,

I'd like to register to speak if the opportunity presents itself during tomorrow evenings discussion on garden suites and coach houses located here in barrie.

I have one that has been built beside me, one of which I share a driveway with.. has been built poorly.. and has been left fully unattended by the owner of the property.

I've been in the construction industry for 20 years and have operated my own company within barrie for the past 7 years.. with a decent track record when it comes to operations in close quarters residential areas.

I've had lots of time to think on how these could be implemented better in the right neighborhoods and on the right properties.. the one beside my should have never been allowed due to the size of the property and it's shared driveway.

Thank you,

Jon MacNeil

From: Franca Marinelli

Sent: Friday, June 11, 2021 10:10 AM

To: Office of the Mayor <OfficeoftheMayor@barrie.ca>; Clare Riepma <Clare.Riepma@barrie.ca>; Keenan Aylwin <Keenan.Aylwin@barrie.ca>; Barry Ward <Barry.Ward@barrie.ca>; Robert Thomson <Robert.Thomson@barrie.ca>; Natalie Harris <Natalie.Harris@barrie.ca>; Gary Harvey <Gary.Harvey@barrie.ca>; Ann-Marie Kungl <Ann-Marie.Kungl@barrie.ca>; Jim Harris <Jim.Harris@barrie.ca>; Sergio Morales <Sergio.Morales@barrie.ca>; Mike McCann <Mike.McCann@barrie.ca>

Subject: Public Meeting June 15 Second Suites

Your Worship and Members of Barrie City Council

The following is being submitted by the members of ward1residents association. We look forward to clarification with regard to the following questions.

Questions and Comments for the Public Meeting regarding Amendments to Zoning By-Law 2009-141 to facilitate and better affordable housing.

1. What is the minimum size of and maximum number of sleeping quarters allowed in
 - a. Second Suite
 - b. Ancillary Dwelling Units
2. Does the By-Law mean that both a Second Suite AND Ancillary Dwelling Unit on the same Property. If so, are there any minimum requirements to allow for both types on the same property.
3. If the Second suite AND Ancillary Dwelling Unit are allowed on the same property how many occupants are allowed as tenants on a single property? There is fear, due to the way BLR bylaws are written, that it could allow for up to 18 persons. Please clarify what the allowable maximum number of tenants would be in all permutations of primary dwelling, Second Suite and Ancillary Suite.
4. How does the 75 meter rule for BLRs apply, if at all, to Second Suites/Ancillary Dwelling Units?
5. Is the 75 meter rule between BLRs meant to be the distance between "houses".not property lines. Can you please confirm/clarify this?
6. While Second Suite/Ancillary Dwelling units are usually initiated by occupant homeowners, eventually the properties will catch the attention of Absentee -owners/Landlords who will purchase properties at a premium and consequently drive up rents to maximize on their investment. Further, premium sales prices will put upward pressure on surrounding house prices in the 'updraft'. What is being done to limit this undesirable effect?
7. The City states that since the Second Suites initiative has been in place housing prices have increased dramatically. This is not to suggest a correlation but instead poses the questions: Is the Second Suite initiative really working? Shouldn't governments be deeply studying this and perhaps seek more effective solutions? What is the action on this?
8. The issues related to (bad)Absentee landlords are of great concern to residents of Ward 1. Is there anything the City can put in place to control/prevent the eventual sale of these multisuite properties to

absentee business investors? PS. It is not lost that the City has responded well to related concerns by providing additional by-law officers and the Absentee Landlord Pilot in Ward 1 Thank You to the City of Barrie!

9. Instead of promoting low density, dispersed housing that more vastly and directly (and often negatively) affects the quality of life of existing residential neighbourhoods, why doesn't the City focus on promoting and expediting high density housing (apartments) buildings where impact to neighbourhoods is concentrated and limited in reach.

To this, why doesn't the City induce developers to do just that, develop current perimeter lands or low impact areas with high density housing eg: Cherry Hill in London Ontario.

10. What is the City doing to work with Georgian College to expedite student housing on-campus and in lesser impact area of the Ward 1 or elsewhere in the City. When will this additional inventory be put in place?

11. The City of Barrie's Affordable Task Force Strategy (of 2015) emphasized engagement by groups such as building, housing, industry, governmental, social and health related, but not once are representatives of existing neighbourhood or residents associations cited as possible participants in the strategy.

Would, or could the City establish an Affordable Housing Task Force or Advisory Committees that includes ALL stakeholders, including representatives of resident groups, owners of rental businesses, rental tenants, realtors, managers of property management companies that act as rental agents for the investors and other interested parties? The mandate could include researching how other communities (in North America, or globally) have addressed the problem and to become aware of the ramifications of decisions made on the quality of life of all Barrie citizens.

12. There is a widely-held belief, based on the frequent and similar negative experiences between existing residents, rental units and absentee landlords, that the over-proliferation of Second Suites and Ancillary Dwelling Units is counter to everyone's interest of Vibrant, Safe and Resilient Neighbourhoods. Why then is the city continuing to focus on a solution that has limited affect and comes with its own, regular basket of problems?

To seek a solution, would the City of Barrie hold ward meetings regarding the issue of affordable housing and the growth of the boarding house businesses, dwelling rental businesses in Barrie where resident feedback can be heard?

13. Because of the size of lots (not the residents' fault) and its proximity to Georgian College, proliferating Second Suites and Ancillary Dwellings Units will further attract absentee rental housing business investors to Ward 1 and consequently put the quality of life in the area at further risk. Residents of Ward 1 want to help but there is a particular bias towards Ward 1. What is the City doing to balance this situation to other Wards?

From: cathy.colebatch

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 2:46 PM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Cc: Jim Harris <Jim.Harris@barrie.ca>; Michelle Banfield <Michelle.Banfield@barrie.ca>; Barbara Mackie

Subject: City Initiated Amendment to Comprehensive Zoning By--Law - Affordable Housing

Good Afternoon Shelby

I'm reaching out on behalf of a number of Allandale Residents, as well as for my own benefit to see if you would be open to a Zoom Call to discuss in more detail some of these amendments in support of affordable housing. Prior to the actual public meeting if possible.

Many of our historic neighbourhoods already have legal/illegal second suites in them and have always been accepted as a form of growth & intensification.

I attended a virtual COA meeting last night on 61 McDonald St both to witness the meeting, ask questions and make comments. The reason I did this was the variance request was most like one from 26 Granville St which is/was an issue for neighbours prior to COA Committee approval.

61 McDonald turned out to be an **existing** accessory building or conversion, that was looking for a variance to bring the structure into line. It also is a two storey building with living space on both floors. This structure is the size of a small full blown home with 2 bedroom, plus den upstairs while the living space is on the main floor. Including living/dining/kitchen.

How is this considered affordable under the accessory structures? Many believe the accessory structure is a small one storey granny style flat, not a two storey with living space on both floors. Do we have this all wrong?

Most recently 26 Granville went before COA in April for a minor (not minor) 3 metre variance on height. The COA approved with a condition that the lower unit was not to have living space only on the upper floor.

These two examples are in our Historic Neighbourhood areas through-out the city. To continue to allow 2 storey accessory structures will change the very nature of our historic neighbourhoods character, which were are meant to be protecting.

In reviewing some on the past COA minutes and files I am not the only one confused.

Look forward to a scheduled virtual chat if possible.

Sincerely

Cathy Colebatch

Co-chair Allandale Neighbourhood Association

From: Michael Christensen <mike@dcfhomes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 1:32 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Cc: Madeline Snow <Madeline.Snow@barrie.ca>
Subject: Re: June 15 Public Mtg

Shelby (and Madeline),

Attached is the plan that I worked through to create a secondary suite that was not in a basement. (The secondary suite is circled in RED.) I have never felt that basements are the best place to have a secondary suite and have tried to think a little outside the usual box in creating this plan. This model has the following features...

- two separate entrances to both units
- exceeds all egress requirements
- separate furnaces, water heaters, laundry to service each side
- full basement to both the primary and secondary units
- ALL above grade living spaces for the secondary unit
- an uncomplicated firewall details that does not have any penetrations between the units
- a front elevation that blends in to the surrounding streetscape

The one concern that I see at present is that I don't want to see the proposed maximum size of the secondary unit restrict this plan based on a percentage of GFA. As you can see from the brochure, the total SF is 2868, the Primary home is 1828 sf while the secondary unit is 1037 sf. Depending on how the "maximum SF" of the secondary unit is calculated (percentage of Total OR a percentage of the Primary Dwelling unit), my hope is that we will not have a problem building what we have sold.

I will plan to be a part of the public meeting, however as you can imagine, it will not be the platform to discuss the particular details of this specific plan. I appreciate you taking the time to consider our unique plan as you move ahead. If you see anything else otherwise unrelated to the proposed by-law change, I welcome your comments in that regard as well. Please feel free to contact me anytime if you have questions or concerns in this regards either via email

Thanks for your consideration,

Michael Christensen
Deer Creek Fine Homes
dcfhomes.com

On Jun 2, 2021, at 12:00 PM, Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca> wrote:

Hi Michael,

I have been working closely with Madeline while refining the proposed amendments. If you'd like to send along some plans for me to take a look at, I'd be happy to do so in consultation with Madeline and set up a chat to discuss it further next week if needed.

The intention of the changes is not to prevent the construction of any second suites that may have already been sold in the Salem and Hewitt's communities, so Madeline and I can definitely take a look at your plans to ensure there is no conflict with the proposed updates.

Thanks again for reaching out about this.

Regards,

Shelby

Shelby White, RPP

Planner

Pronouns: she/her/hers

Development Services

<image001.png>

City of Barrie: City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5

Office: 705-739-4220 x4517 | Fax: 705-739-4270

www.barrie.ca

This email message (including attachments, if any) is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, proprietary, confidential and exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Michael Christensen <mike@dcfhomes.com>

Sent: June 2, 2021 11:34 AM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: Re: June 15 Public Mtg

Shelby,

Could I send you a brochure of a plan that I have for you to look at? Before I created this plan, I sat with Michael Janotta, Chris Grexton and Madeleine Snow to review my idea before we moved ahead with it. We did go back and forth a number of times but the consensus was that this plan would work.

In the light of the upcoming meeting, could I send this plan to you and then perhaps have a brief discussion on it? I have a few of these plans sold and in the light of the revision, want to be sure that we have not sold something that we cannot build.

Regards,

Michael Christensen

Deer Creek Fine Homes

dcfhomes.com

On Jun 2, 2021, at 11:25 AM, Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca> wrote:

Hi Michael,

Thank you for noting my typo below – the Notice is correct, the meeting is on June 15th at 7 PM.

We are still finalizing the details, but I anticipate the proposed change brought forward to the Public Meeting for review will set the maximum SF for a second suite at around 45% of the GFA of the principal building it is located in, unless it is a single storey dwelling/bungalow, in which case it could occupy the full basement.

By comparison, our current standards state it must be “subordinate to a principal unit,” so the intent is really to make this requirement clearer and easier to quantify/measure.

Regards,

Shelby

Shelby White, RPP

Planner

Pronouns: she/her/hers

Development Services

<image001.png>

City of Barrie: City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5

Office: 705-739-4220 x4517 | Fax: 705-739-4270

www.barrie.ca

This email message (including attachments, if any) is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, proprietary, confidential and exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Michael Christensen <mike@dcfhomes.com>

Sent: June 2, 2021 10:23 AM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: Re: June 15 Public Mtg

Thank you for the information Shelby. Just a note that you mentioned June 14th for the meeting but the web site says the meeting is June 15th.

In regards to the maximum SF of a secondary suite, do you have an idea what is being considered for this at present?

Regards,

Michael Christensen

Deer Creek Fine Homes

dcfhomes.com

On Jun 2, 2021, at 10:07 AM, Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca> wrote:

Good morning Michael,

Thank you for reaching out about the proposed Zoning By-law Amendments as it relates to second suites, and noting this very important consideration.

The proposed changes to the second suites provisions, including those in the Salem & Hewitt's Communities, are essentially to: clarify that they are only permitted as an accessory use in single detached dwellings, a semi detached dwelling unit, or a street townhouse dwelling unit; delete the minimum unit size requirements; and to introduce a maximum unit size. The maximum unit size proposed is set as a percentage of the total GFA, and should not be in conflict with the builder programs that are in place.

The draft wording of the proposed amendments will be available on the [project website](#) later this week or early next week, well in advance of the Public Meeting on June 14th. Once it has been posted, if you have any further comments or note any potential impacts on your sales portfolio, please let me know.

Kind regards,

Shelby

Shelby White, RPP

Planner

Pronouns: she/her/hers

Development Services

<image001.png>

City of Barrie: City Hall, 70 Collier Street, P.O. Box 400, Barrie ON, L4M 4T5

Office: 705-739-4220 x4517 | Fax: 705-739-4270

www.barrie.ca

This email message (including attachments, if any) is intended for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, proprietary, confidential and exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Christensen <mike@dcfhomes.com>

Sent: June 1, 2021 1:17 PM

To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>

Subject: June 15 Public Mtg

Good afternoon Shelby,

I am writing to ask for any info you have for this meeting in regards to the Proposed Amendment to the Zoning by-law as it relates to Secondary Suites.

We are one of the builders that have been mandated to include Secondary Suites in our Sales portfolio in the incoming Salem and Hewitt's Communities. We have house sales in These new lands that include secondary suites already and are trusting that in this proposed amendment that there will be no conflict with all Builder programs in place.

Regards,

Michael Christensen

Deer Creek Fine Homes Inc

www.dcfhomes.com

From: Zac C
Sent: June 14, 2021 2:49 PM
To: Shelby White <Shelby.White@barrie.ca>
Subject: Garden Suites

Hi Shelby, I wanted to voice my concerns regarding the changes to the garden suites bylaw. I rent out several units in Barrie and the demand and desperation I see is heartbreaking. We need to be able to offer more options and the proposed changes will only limit the development potential of these additional units. I think changes are untimely and we need to think very clearly before making rash decisions.

Garden suites when complete are not more imposing then a garage which is often built in the same area of people's yards. There has not been any negative drawbacks that I have witnessed. Limiting to a percentage of the main dwelling unit makes little sense because a smaller main dwelling unit could Infact make the property more suitable for construction of an additional unit. I think it is farsighted and unlikely to help in any meaningful way. I hope the bylaws can be maintained through this housing crisis and perhaps revisited when we make a dent in the demand. From first hand experience I can completely say we need to forge ahead and build additional units. People will get over the perceived negatives in due time, they just want to be heard out and I'm sure it is a temporary thing.

Thank you!
Zac