



64 Jardin Drive, Unit 1B
Concord, Ontario
L4K 3P3
T. 905.669.4055
F. 905.669.0097
klmplanning.com

SENT VIA EMAIL

P – 2442

November 11, 2021

Planning and Building Services
City of Barrie
70 Collier Street
Barrie, ON L4M 4T5

**Attention: Ms. Michelle Banfield, RPP
Director of Development Services**

**Re: City of Barrie Official Plan
September 23, 2021 Draft
Salem Landowners Group Inc.
City of Barrie**

Dear Ms. Banfield,

On behalf of the Salem Landowners Group Inc., KLM Planning Partners Inc. is pleased to provide you with comments related to the draft City of Barrie Official Plan 2051

NEW COMMENTS FOR SEPT 2021 DRAFT

- Section 2.3.2.d.i) should this not reference 2051?
- Section 2.4.2 re: existing master plans. What might be required as noted in this new paragraph?
- Section 2.4.2.1.d) and e) seem to contradict each other in terms of how to calculate persons and jobs per hectare;
- Section 2.4.2.3.e) and f) still seeks to achieve an overall (new word added) of 79 persons and jobs per hectare. As noted in previous correspondence, the Salem Landowners are concerned future applications will be required to have significant densities in order to offset those that have been approved at the lower density (as per the current Secondary Plan) in order to achieve the minimum standard. How does the City plan on interpreting this policy going forward?
- Section 2.5.c what does this mean that the “minimum residential density will be site specific and are to be applied on a unit per hectare basis”? Please clarify.

- Section 2.5.f why is lot creation only to occur when there is access to a public street?
- Section 2.5.l. as noted in our previous correspondence, 10% of all new housing units to be affordable housing continues, to be in the landowner's opinion, too high and should be reduced.
- Section 2.5.6 a) We recommend this policy be revised to state: "Where appropriate, land use permissions/approvals that existed prior to this Official Plan coming into effect, may be recognized in the implementing Zoning By-law without amendment to this Plan".
- Section 2.5.6.a.i) We question how the City has legislative authority to enforce this?
- Section 2.5.7.a) We recommend this policy be revised to state: "Applications deemed complete prior to the approval of this Plan by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing may continue towards final approval, which may include applications for extension and/or redline revisions under the policy framework in place at the time the Notice of Complete Application was issued."
- Section 2.6.1.3.c) i) and ii). Why would a radius of 450 m be used to determine how dense a project should be, especially since it will be on an intensification corridor? In addition, how is one to determine what the "densest" building within 450m is? What does "densest" actually mean? How is one to know how many units are within a building many years after it has been constructed?
- Section 2.6.1.3.h) The Salem Landowners request this policy be revised to allow flexibility as it should not apply to every arterial road.
- Section 2.6.4.3.c) sets out a requirement where no other services are available within a 450 metre radius, a mix of uses is required. In our view, this policy will not achieve the objective being sought. In the situation where a school site ultimately does not develop into a school and is therefore provided back to the developer, mixed use commercial will not be viable given the lack of proper exposure for the commercial uses to thrive. In our view, this should only be required on major collector and arterial roads, not on local roads.
- Section 2.6.7.1.b) and 2.6.7.2.d) restricts the use of LID's within park blocks. Why? If the City is truly looking to be a leader in the use of LID technology in order to avoid the use of traditional stormwater management ponds, LID's should be allowed in parks. Furthermore, provided the LID does not impede on the useability of the park, the developer should continue to receive 100% of the parkland credit even if it has LID features within it.
- Section 2.7.2.b) why would a D-4 assessment study be required outside of the assessment area? What discretion will staff use to determine this as a potential submission requirement?
- Section 3.2.3.1 sets out policies related to green development standards. How does the City intend to enforce this policy since many are not achievable together? If a proposal is not able to achieve any of the noted objectives, is the City going to reject an application? It would be nice to understand how this policy is going to be implemented going forward.
- Section 3.2.4.2. provides policies related to gateways however it does not speak to if the features will be on private or public property. In our review the gateway features should be on public property so the City can maintain them as necessary.

- Section 3.3.2 has now been changed from six storeys maximum to five. Why has this been reduced?
- Section 3.3.2.f) This policy is far too restrictive and precise. In the landowner's opinion, the reference to a setback of 7.5 metres should be removed as it should be appropriately dealt with through the applicable Zoning By-law. This policy should be removed.
- Section 6.6.1.b) would not allow SWM ponds and LID features to be included in buffer areas in the Greenspace, which is a mistake. Without the flexibility to locate these features, in particular LID's, there will be far less use of them, which seems contrary to the direction the LSRCA is taking on LID's.
- Section 9.5.2.i) why require registration when the approval timelines for draft approval are already long and arduous? We feel this is a mistake by the City, especially when the City is seeking to have development charges paid quickly. In our opinion, the policy objective should remain as draft approval as opposed to registration.
- All maps continue to denote Exell Avenue as a Minor Collector which is road that goes nowhere. As noted in previous correspondence, this should be revised to reflect a local road as it is more conducive to a local road street pattern.
- All maps continue to show a road pattern for the phase 4 lands along with the employment lands east of Highway 400. Given these lands have not yet been appropriately designed, the proposed road pattern should be removed so not to prejudice proper design of these lands.

We look forward to seeing the above noted changes reflected in the final version of the Official Plan, and as always, we would be pleased to discuss this with you further.

Yours truly,

KLM PLANNING PARTNERS INC.



Keith MacKinnon BA, MCIP, RPP
Partner

- cc. Salem Landowners
- cc. Tomasz Wierzba – City of Barrie
- cc. Mayor Lehman and Members of Council