City of Barrie
Official Plan (OP) Draft Two
Comment Matrix

Please refer to the Working Version of the Official Plan to track the changes made based on responses.

Contributor	Consultant	OP Chapter	OP Policy	Comment	Response
Gary Bell		1	1.2	The Community Vision Statement includes a reference to “focussed” development for downtown vibrancy. The meaning of “focussed” is not clear here or elsewhere in the Plan.	"Focussed" will be changed to "planned."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	1	1.2	This policy states a “Cultural richness amongst a backdrop of flourishing natural areas” We are not sure what this actually means	Current line is "new and old blend harmoniously, creating a cultural richness amongst a backdrop of fluorishing natural areas." Recommended change for clarification: "New and old blend harmoniously, creating an attractive and dynamic city amid a backdrop of fluorishing natural areas."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	1	1.3	This policy states “hard and soft infrastructure (e.g., stormwater management and affordable housing respectively) Also, “creating stronger synergies across the City” What does this mean and what is the objective in which it is trying to achieve?	First part will be changed to: "To address global and climatic volatility, this Plan also includes policies guiding infrastructure maintenance and development to accommodate unpredictable change, so that Barrie can quickly recover after major storm events and other shocks to the system." Additionally, reference to "synergies" will be changed to: "a strong economic ecosystem."
LSRCA		1	1.3	Please replace the photo for the “Green and Resilient” section to show something more reflective of the natural heritage system. The current photo shows an unnatural landscape with hardened edges and non-native annual plantings. A photo from Ardagh Bluffs or the Bear Creek Eco Park would be much more appropriate. We’d be happy to provide the one below of the Bear Creek Eco Park, if needed.	The Green and Resilient section is not only about the city’s Natural Heritage Systems, but about the city’s urban infrastructure and built form. Therefore, we feel the photo is appropriate. At the same time, the Communications team will be reviewing the finalized draft before the Official Plan goes to Council for adoption and may be replacing/adding in more photos.
LSRCA		1	Community Vision	The Vision statement should speak not only to a premiere waterfront, but also to Lake Simcoe and the numerous resources that it provides for the community as well as the health and sustainability of the watershed. Suggested wording: “…with linkages to a premiere waterfront and access to Lake Simcoe and the many resources it provides for the community. New and old blend…”	Section refers to “flourishing natural areas” in the following sentence. As vision statements need to be kept precise, and as the waterfront is one of the most iconic spaces in the city, we feel the statement is appropriately worded.

LSRCA		1	Foundation of Plan	Expand on Lake Simcoe Protection Plan section. Describe LSPP's role within the watershed with regard to natural heritage and natural hazards. Also could include LSPP's vision within this section.	This will be changed to: The Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, 2009 (LSPP) responds to a provincial mandate to better protect water resources and natural heritage and to address natural hazards in the Lake Simcoe watershed.
LSRCA		1	Founding Principles	Mentions that policies aim to accommodate unpredictable change and recover quickly after "major shocks to the system". It is unclear what shocks to the system refers to (storm events?).	Last sentence will be changed to: "…so that Barrie can quickly recover after major storm events and other shocks to its systems."
Kelly Patterson McGrath		1	Vision Statement	The current community vision statement needs to be compelling, specific and clearly states who we are and our goals. Make it easy for residents to connect with it. It reads like a Planning Statement right now. It's long. Use words like inclusion, environmentally responsible, indigenous. We must think of our future generations. *(examples of other municipalities' vision statements included in email)* Here are some ideas Barrie is an engaging, inclusive waterfront community that cares about environmentally sustainable growth and quality of life for all. An inclusive, connected, prosperous city where we look after each other and our environment. To enhance community and individual well being – social, economic, and physical. To protect and improve the environment. To provide quality service equitably.	The development of the community vision statement was based on significant public engagement and feedback, which included over 700 pages of written feedback and many hours of discussions and meetings. At the same time, based on the commenter's feedback and its alignment with public feedback, the recommendation is to change the final line to "Barrie's transformation is evidenced by investment in all areas of the city, including investments in greater diversity and inclusion, greater accessibility and social wellbeing, greater environmental stewardship and greater economic prosperity."
LSRCA		2	2.3	This section speaks to "minor adjustment to the boundaries" not requiring an OPA – What will be considered minor? What will be the trigger for an OPA?	Generally, an OPA will be needed for any development not following the policies in this plan; further guidance is provided for in policy 2.5.a.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	2	2.8	A suggestion that could resolve these concerns would be to include in the Official Plan an area specific policy identifying that the subject lands should be developed primarily for singledetached housing with other medium density forms in appropriate locations to a minimum density of 16 units per gross developable hectare or 50 residents and jobs per hectare to allow the City to achieve its overall density targets. This would allow development to proceed to a density and scale anticipated under the Hewitt Secondary Plan policies	We will be updating the density target for Neighbourhood Areas to be more aligned with this suggestion and we will be incorporating more flexibility. The intent of the Official Plan is "One City, One Vision, One Plan" and thus, we will not be keeping a separate area specific policy for the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies overall. At the same time, we have tried to incorporate all of the Secondary Plan policies into this draft new Official Plan and will do an additional review to capture anything that is missing and to ensure a smooth transition; if there are particular policies that we are still missing in the existing Official Plan, please let us know.

Hi-Way Pentecostal Church	Darren Vella / IPS	2	2.8	The subject lands possess a site specific special policy area in the approved Official Plan which reads as follows: New Section 4.8.X – Defined Policy Area (XX) is added as follows: The following policies shall apply to the lands show on Schedule C, municipally known as 40, 42, 44 & 50 Anne Street North and 124, 128 & 130 Henry Street. a) In addition to the uses permitted in the Environmental Protection Area designation the following uses shall be permitted; i) A Bioretention Cell and associated stormwater management controls. b) In addition to the Site Plan Control Policies in Section 6.3 of this Plan, the lands which are designated Environmental Protection Area are subject to the following policy; i) A scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) (restoration plan for watercourse corridor, SAR, ELC) is required to be completed, to LSRCA satisfaction, prior to site plan approval. This policy is extremely important given the permitted uses within the Natural Heritage System do not permit the uses outlined in the approved OPA. We would request that this defined policy area be inserted into the Official Plan to ensure that this development can proceed as proposed.	Defined Policy Area included as 2.8.7, and policy area is delineated on Map 2.
LSRCA		2	2.3.1	The importance of the Natural Heritage System to the community should be better captured in this section. Suggested wording: “Natural heritage features and areas are essential to the landscape and the community – they contribute to the overall environmental and social…” “…policies to ensure the features and functions are protected to so that they can continue to perform their ecological functions, providing ecosystem services to the City, such as flood attenuation, carbon sequestration, pollination, infiltration, recreational opportunities, and so much more. These services are all vital to the health and well-being of the community.” The terms “Water Systems” and “Tablelands” are used in this section, are they defined? Perhaps “Fluvial System” would be more appropriate than “Water Systems”.	The definition for tablelands and water systems used is the common definition, therefore clarification isn’t needed. The section has been revised slightly to address the suggested wording. Further information on specific ecosystem services is provided in other sections with the Plan.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.3.2	The policies begin at “b” as opposed to “a”.	Policies in this section to begin with policy "a"

LSRCA		2	2.3.2	The UGC is an area of focused growth… it is also an area with constraint associated with identified flood and erosion hazard areas. It would be helpful to have direction in this section speaking to opportunities for flood attenuation and also the protection/improvement and restoration of the watercourses within the UGC. Additionally, the UGC is adjacent to the shoreline of Lake Simcoe – recognizing the need to protect the shoreline through policy in this section would be helpful.	Other sections of the plan speak to flood and erosion hazards, as well as the waterfront.
SCATEH / Jennifer van Gennip		2	2.3.2 and 2.3.4 and 2.5.j	In Draft One, we saw a target of 10% affordable housing city-wide, and 35% requirements in the Urban Growth Centres (UGC). Our recommendation was to maintain the UGC target at 35% and increase the citywide target to 30%. Instead, in Draft Two we see the city-wide target stay at 10%, with a drop to a 20% target in the UGCs and the addition of a 20% target in the two Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA). We recognize that much of the development will happen in the MTSAs and UGCs so this may be a net gain, but we question the reduction from 35% to 20%. Surely it was not in response to an outcry from the public. We strongly recommend reinstating the 35% target for UGCs. The reason for our recommendation to increase to 35% is based on the fact that affordable housing is defined by the province as what is affordable for those with a household income at or below the 60th percentile. A target of 10-20% of new builds citywide as “affordable” for approximately 60% of the population of Barrie will always be a problem.	We understand the need for greater affordable housing in Barrie, and are committed to seeing greater affordable housing options available to meet the needs across our diverse population. After further discussions between Drafts 1 and 2, based on stakeholder conversations as well as research, the target of 20% was chosen, as it will help us to work towards building a significantly greater amount of affordable housing, while hopefully still not disincentivizing developers from building residential units in Barrie and having negative impacts on affordable housing in other ways. We will continue to monitor progress and adapt accordingly.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.3.2.e.ii	Requires at least 20% of housing units in the UGC to be affordable. This target continues to be too high which will discourage growth from occurring in the UGC.	The target of having 20% of housing units as affordable in the Urban Growth Centre was introduced in draft two of the new Official Plan; in draft one, the original target was 35%. Staff made this deliberation after careful consultation with a variety of stakeholders as well as after further research and feel this target is appropriate. It should be noted that the City of Barrie has already met its existing Official Plan target of 10% of housing in Barrie being affordable. We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie.

Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.a.iii	The Official Plan contains numerous policies outlining the new requirements for provision of affordable housing. These policies include but are not limited to Policies 2.3.2(e)(ii) & 2.3.4 (a)(iii) & 6.4.2(e). As we have commented to staff in meetings and prior submissions, policies that mandate provision of affordable housing are in effect inclusionary zoning. It is our understanding that Provincial Policy (Bill 108) for inclusionary zoning mandates that it can only be applied in areas that have a Development Permit System in place or within a Major Transit Station Areas, and only once the pre-requisite studies have been completed. We are not aware that these requirements are in place and thus the Official Plan Policies requiring affordable housing are not enforceable. Staff have advised that the inclusion of these policies in the Official Plan is a first step towards meeting the Provincial requirements outlined above. In our view, the policies for affordable housing should be amended or removed. Amendments could include addition of policy language to clarify that the affordable housing requirements of the Official Plan are not in force until such time as the pre-requisite studies and polices have been put in place. Or alternatively, remove the requirements entirely until a comprehensive Official Plan Amendment based on the required studies can be brought forwards.	We appreciate that inclusionary zoning mandates are not yet in place in the City of Barrie, and aware that enforcement cannot take place in areas such as the Major Transit Station Areas until requirements have been met. We should note that the use of the noun "the urban growth centre" in relation the future tense "will be planned to" identifies that these targets will come into effect in the future.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii	As such, we are recommending that this policy be modified to include language acknowledging that a DPS or PMTSA must be in place prior to the requirement being enforced or revise the proposed policy as voluntary.	We appreciate that inclusionary zoning mandates are not yet in place in the City of Barrie, and aware that enforcement cannot take place in areas such as the Major Transit Station Areas until requirements have been met. We should note that the use of the noun "the urban growth centre" in relation the future tense "will be planned to" identifies that these targets will come into effect in the future.
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii	Lastly, if the municipality is looking for 20% affordable housing, then incentives should be created to make this requirement more palatable for the development industry. The City of Barrie has traditionally not supported these initiatives at the development level, and hence costs to implement can be unachievable. This is the opportune time to revisit this important issue.	We are open to working with the development industry to encourage greater affordable housing and will consider options in addition to those existing incentives provided through the affordable housing strategy. The Official Plan sets out the broader vision for this, and, to highlight our commitment, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: ""b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing."

BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii and 2.5.j	BILD remains concerned that by embedding the requirement for affordable housing (10% city average and 20% in the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Areas) without understanding the specific policies, structure or framework on how this is to be achieved, can become very problematic and can lead to many appeals. In particular, we believe that the definition of Affordable is wide open to interpretation as it relates to low and moderate household incomes. As such, we are kindly requesting clarification on the following: • Kindly confirm how a developer is going to be able to fulfill the requirement or be able to assess the financial burden at the front end of the planning approval? • Has the City contemplated any tools that would be able to provide for more affordable housing such as a Community Benefits Charge, City incentives of zoning and infrastructure, as well as partnerships with all levels of government? If not, when and how will this be considered? • How is the stewardship of these affordable units going to be maintained into the future? How will the City ensure these units remain in neighbourhoods for their intended purpose rather than being flipped in short order at market prices?	As the existing Official Plan maintains a 10% target for affordable housing, which has been achieved, we believe that we can -- through partnerships with developers -- work to improve the affordability of housing in Barrie. The City is contemplating further tools to achieve and incentivize more affordable housing through its Affordable Housing Strategy, and is also considering the challenge of stewardship. To affirm our committment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: "b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, private developers, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing." While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii and 2.5.j	Affordability has simply been prescribed in this draft as a percentage of new builds, but how this will be supported through appropriate housing mix, incentives, strategic location of housing, maintenance, time and terms of affordability, affordable ownership versus rental structures and supports, and building management has not been included.	While the City is contemplating further tools to achieve and incentivize more affordable housing through its Affordable Housing Strategy, the commentator's concerns about how affordable housing targets might be implemented and achieved is noted. While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means. Additionally, to affirm our committment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: ""b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, private developers, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing."

800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii and 2.5.j	We note that the New OP generally requires 10% of new units to meet affordability criteria; 20% in Major Transit Station Areas (“MTSAs”). We caution the City against unintended consequences of such a policy. For example, it may mean that while one unit in a building becomes more affordable, every other unit becomes less affordable. Instead, we would like to see the City incentivise construction of affordable housing by using the other planning tools at its disposal. For example, units could be made more affordable by providing exemptions from development charges or property tax breaks for units meeting certain conditions.	While having targets for affordable housing is critical for developing greater affordable housing options across the City, we agree that incentivization tools and working with a variety of partners (such as developers and non-profits) is also crucial. As part of the City of Barrie's Affordable Housing Strategy, we will continue to monitor the effectiveness of current tools and strategies and we will adjust to ensure that our affordable housing strategy is successful and aligned with the perspectives of our partners.
10-24 Grove Street West	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii and 2.5.j	There is no question that the provision of affordable housing is a basic human right/requirement and a critical component of inclusive community. However, the mandatory provision for affordable housing in all new developments is not practical or achievable and is of concern to our Client. All developments are not conducive to the provision of truly affordable housing due to building type, location, proximity to supportive amenities, and financial feasibility. Additionally by mandating each development includes a prescribed amount of affordable units will likely at the same time increase the cost of the remaining market units which would be working against this objective.	It should be noted that the City of Barrie has already met its existing Official Plan target of 10% of housing in Barrie being affordable. We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie.
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	2	2.3.2.e.ii and 2.3.4.iii and 2.5.j	Additional details are needed on how the City’s affordable housing policies will be implemented and interpreted, for example, how targets will be monitored and evaluated through the development process.	While the City is contemplating further tools to achieve and incentivize more affordable housing through its Affordable Housing Strategy, the commentator's concerns about how affordable housing targets might be implemented and achieved is noted. While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means. Additionally, to affirm our committment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: ""b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing."

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.3.2.f.ii	Speak to winter city design elements? What is this and this would be better served to be included in the urban design guidelines rather than the Official Plan.	As stated in the Growth Plan, "municipalities will develop and implement urban design and site design official plan policies ... that direct the development of a high quality public realm and compact built form" (5.2.5.6). The definition of winter city design elements is implied in the final clause within the policy: in other words, those elements that support "a safe attractive, and inviting pedestrian realm that supports year-round use." Further elaboration on this will be provided in the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines. As this serves City Council's strategic priority of "ensuring a vibrant, safe and welcoming downtown," and as it builds off of responses we have heard from the public, the policy will remain. Moreover, it should also be noted that this policy is not development specific, but speaks to the Urban Growth Centre more broadly, allowing for flexibility in interpretation.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.3.2e)ii)	Requires “at least” 20% of housing units in the UGC to be affordable. The Landowners are concerned that this target is much too high and will discourage growth in the UGC, which in turn could restrict growth in the designated greenfield areas.	The target of having 20% of housing units as affordable in the Urban Growth Centre was introduced in draft two of the new Official Plan; in draft one, the original target was 35%. Staff made this deliberation after careful consultation with a variety of stakeholders as well as after further research and feel this target is appropriate. It should be noted that the City of Barrie has already met its existing Official Plan target of 10% of housing in Barrie being affordable. We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.3.3	Draft subsection c) acknowledges that redevelopment of the Strategic Growth Areas will be planned over the long term, and the evolution of the area will not be immediate, however Policy 2.3.3 is silent with respect to interim development permissions that would allow moderate infill or expansion to existing functions that would not otherwise conform with the intensification policies of the draft Official Plan, prior to comprehensive redevelopment. We continue to suggest that interim development policies be incorporated into the draft Official Plan in order to ensure the continued viability of existing land uses is maintained in advance of redevelopment.	After a review of the Official Plan, the only section where there may be confusion about the permissiveness of interim or infill development is in section 2.6.9 Employment Area -- Non-Industrial. Therefore, a policy will be added to make this explicit. Otherwise, none of the other land use policies contain any language that would suggest this type of use would be restricted.

520-526 Big Bay Point Road	James Hunter/IPS	2	2.3.3.e	Policy 2.3.3.c. states that the Strategic Growth Areas shall accommodate higher levels of intensification, tall buildings and higher densities. Further, policy 2.3.3.g. states that development in Strategic Growth Areas will be planned to be transit-oriented, shall maximize the use of existing and planned transit infrastructure with appropriate transit supportive densities and mix of uses, and be pedestrian-friendly to support active transportation. Additionally, policy 2.3.3.i. states that higher densities and taller built form will be encouraged within Strategic Growth Areas and particularly at major intersections of intensification corridors. In order to achieve the goals of the SGA's and develop the built form intended, significant densities will be required. Similar to the policies within sections 2.3.2 (UGC) and 2.3.4 (MTSA's), the SGA policies should provide density provisions or minimum targets for SGA's that separate them from other areas of the City, as these areas are directed for high levels of development and intensification.	Strategic Growth Areas are guided by the densities set in the Land Use Designations. Each Land Use Designation either sets a minimum density target/range, or encourages greater intensification along Intensification Corridors or other higher-order streets. Further clarification regarding the application of density provisions for a Land Use Designation is being provided for in the General Land Use Policies section and within the Land Use Designation sections themselves.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.3.3.e	2.3.3e) states "The City will establish a minimum density target for the Strategic Growth Areas to support intensification and the development of complete communities", however it is unclear what the density target is, and through what means that density target will be established (i.e. Secondary Plan or future OPA). We suggest revised language to clarify the minimum density targets applicable.	This policy has been removed to avoid confusion. However, Strategic Growth Areas are guided by the densities set in the Land Use Designations. Each Land Use Designation either sets a minimum density target or a range, and encourages greater intensification along Intensification Corridors or other higher-order streets. Further clarification regarding the application of density provisions for a Land Use Designation is being provided for in the General Land Use Policies section and within the Land Use Designation sections themselves.
Artenosi Developments Group: 284 + 286 Dunlop & 119 + 121 Henry St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.3.3.f	Confirm SGA at Dunlop and Anne St still enables a tall building built form with ground floor non-residential use that will achieve the planned economic function. This is not clear based on the SEED policies as they state the primary use must be non-residential, whereas by the nature of a mixed use building if all the upper floors are residential the residential component will have far more floor area than that of the non-residential ground floor component.	Suggested revision to 2.3.3.f.: "…will be planned to fulfill non-industrial economic and employment growth." A mixed-use building with non-residential on the ground floor, focused on appropriate employment uses, and with residential on upper floors, should be permitted in SEED found within an SGA.

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	2	2.3.3.f. and 2.6.8	In summary, it is submitted that refinement of the policy framework applicable to those lands forming part of the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Employment and Economic District, which are also classified as a Strategic Growth Area, is required to avoid speculation and uncertainty with respect to the future use and development of the area in question. Initially, the policies speak to intensification of the built form to create complete communities inclusive of high density residential development and regional shopping destinations. In contrast, the SEED policies place significant emphasis upon offices and mixed use industry clusters as the predominant forms of land use. The need to provide for spatial separation between the differing forms of land use may be effective to compromise the ability of the City to realize the significance of the area as a Strategic Growth Area.	The primary intent of those lands designated SEED within a Strategic Growth Area is to support employment-focused growth. At the same time, the other policies under section 2.3.3 Strategic Growth Areas still apply. As clarified further in section 2.3.3 and 2.6.8 collectively, a mixed-use building with non-residential on the ground floor, focused on appropriate employment uses, and with residential on upper floors, should be permitted in SEED found within an SGA.
17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.3.4	Allandale MTSA: Although the density target of 70 units per hectare is a minimum value, it is well below the minimum 150 residents and jobs combined per hectare for Transit corridors and station areas listed in the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. It is also unclear why the Allandale Station possesses a minimum density target of 70 units per hectare while the Barrie South Major Transit Station Area has a minimum density target of 150 units per hectare. The Allandale station is located adjacent to the Urban Growth Centre and not only contains the Go Station but also the future Barrie Transit Hub. This collection of transit supportive activities deserves policies to support densities at the high levels within the City. It is recommended that the minimum density target be revised to be more aligned with the Growth Plan to achieve the goal of becoming a medium-sized city.	We have reviewed and analyzed the Allandale MTSA in relation to density potential. While there are some restrictions due to the historic fabric within the neighbourhood, we have revised the minimum density target to 130 persons and jobs per hectare. We will additionally support higher densities in the MSTA, where appropriate.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.3.4.a)	Lands in Hewitt's are designated within the Barrie South MTSA which is required to provide 20% affordable housing units. The Landowners wish to point out that the vast majority of the MTSA area has approved draft plans and site plans ranging from singles to higher built forms, none of which provide 20% affordable housing. Based on those approvals, the Landowners feel that 20% is an unrealistic target that is unattainable during the planning horizon.	It should be noted that the City of Barrie has already met its existing Official Plan target of 10% of housing in Barrie being affordable. And that the requirement of 20% in the MTSA is for new developments (those that have already been approved will not be subject to the draft Official Plan policies). We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate on and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie and meeting a 20% target for the MTSA.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.3.4.a).iii)	Requires at least 20% of the housing units within the MTSA be affordable. This policy was not included in the first draft and in our opinion, given a significant amount of land is already draft plan approved or under construction, this policy is not achievable.	It should be noted that the City of Barrie has already met its existing Official Plan target of 10% of housing in Barrie being affordable. And that the requirement of 20% in the MTSA is for new developments (those that have already been approved will not be subject to the draft Official Plan policies). We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate on and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie and meeting a 20% target for the MTSA.
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	2	2.3.4.a.iii	The boundary of the Barrie South GO MTSA includes lands that are identified on the Land Use Schedule as Neighbourhood Area. It is unclear how the 20% affordable housing target (policy 2.3.4.a.iii) will be applied in this area, which has been identified for low-rise development and unit types where the definition of an affordable unit may be more challenging to accommodate.	We have revised the Barrie South GO MTSA boundary in light of the Neighbourhood Area that was included. We have also revised the minimum density target to 145 persons and jobs per hectare. We feel strongly that by continuing to offer and develop tools through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy to incentivize affordable housing in Barrie, and by working with our partners to collaborate on and find solutions, we can continue to make progress in mitigating the affordable housing crisis in Barrie and meeting a 20% target for the MTSA.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.3.4.d	Requires development in the Barrie South MTSA to achieve an average minimum density target of 150 uph. This policy needs to be clarified for the following reasons: i. I have reviewed all of the properties within that MTSA and I can confidently state that there is no likelihood that 150 uph will be achieved. Most of that area is planned and approved for densities vastly lower than 150 uph. ii. There are Neighbourhood Area lands designated MTSA in Barrie South. Are those lands to be planned to achieve 150 uph, or the 50/60 uph noted in point B2a) above. I do not see how Neighbourhood Areas can help achieve 150 uph.	We have done a review of the Barrie South MTSA, and have determined that a density target of 145 persons and jobs per hectare is feasible and have revised accordingly. At the same time, please note that the wording is "average minimum density target." We have also revised the MTSA boundary in light of the Neighbourhood Area lands.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.3.4.d)	The central portion of Hewitt's is within the Barrie South MTSA, that requires a minimum of 150 uph. The Landowners recommend that lands designated Neighbourhood Area be removed from the MTSA.	We have done a review of the Barrie South MTSA, and have determined that a density target of 145 persons and jobs per hectare is feasible and have revised accordingly. At the same time, please note that the wording is "average minimum density target." We have also revised the MTSA boundary in light of the Neighbourhood Area lands.

PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.3.5	Section 2.3.5 Employment Areas - The range of uses permitted in the new employment area designations are more restrictive than those currently permitted by Barrie's existing OP and Comprehensive Zoning By-law. Please refer to the Appendix for a comparison in permitted uses (in letter). These use restrictions appear contrary to the draft OP goals for economic prosperity which are expressed throughout the Plan.	We revised the Employment Areas in this draft new Official Plan to afford greater flexibility through both the Employment Area - Non-Industrial designation and the Employment Area - Industrial designation. We are also upholding existing approvals and permissions through a new policy; moreover, as part of the development of the new Zoning By-law, we will be holding consultations to ensure that the zoning corresponding with each land use designation is appropriate.
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.3.5.h	2.3.5h) related to Employment Areas, noting that “a limited range of small-scale retail and commercial uses may be permitted”. Large scale commercial/retail uses, including Major Retail are permitted by certain Employment Areas designations, and therefore it would be appropriate to identify these as permitted under Section 2.3.5.	Section 2.3.5 "Employment Areas" has been updated to better reflect the Employment Area -- Non-Industrial land use designation and maintain that flexibility.
624 Yonge Street / Heritage Square	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	2	2.3.6 (as well as 3.3.6)	The Site is fully serviced but is not yet fully built out. We are concerned that design policies of s. 2.3.6 and s. 3.3.6 use strong language intended to force development to occur closer to the street, which is incompatible with the existing servicing scheme for the Site. Rebuilding existing services would be inefficient and contradictory to provincial policy. Accordingly, we request that a policy be added to the New OP to permit intensification of existing sites, such as this one, based on designs that are compatible with existing servicing.	For policy 2.3.6.d.ii, the language will be softened; e.g., "Development and redevelopment, <u>where possible, must</u> be oriented towards those street segments."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.3.6.a.ii	2.3.6a)ii) related to intensification corridors, states “development or redevelopment must be oriented towards those street segments”. In our submission, flexibility should be incorporated and we suggest “must” be replaced with “should.”	For policy 2.3.6.d.ii, the language will be softened; e.g., "Development and redevelopment, <u>where possible, must</u> be oriented towards those street segments."
Artenosi Developments Group: 284 + 286 Dunlop & 119 + 121 Henry St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.3.6.c	What if conflict with underlying land use designation?	The purpose of policy 2.3.6.b is to ensure there is not a conflict between land use designation and intensification corridors. Recommended revision to further clarify: "It is expected that the level of intensification will vary along the length of an Intensification Corridor to reflect different contexts. The scale of built form along Intensification Corridors must conform with the applicable land use designation and Section 3 policies."

79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.3.6.d	Public transit infrastructure should not be the onus of the developer as this is operated by the City. Suggest this should be removed, an OPA should not be required if City does not have public transit or active transit infrastructure in place.	Suggested revised wording to place less onus on individual developers: "Intensification Corridors will be planned so that all new development and redevelopment within these corridors are supported by public transit infrastructure and active transportation infrastructure. This infrastructure will also incorporate winter city design elements, as detailed in the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.4.2.1.b	Policy 2.4.2.1 states that “all new development shall be planned to contribute to a housing mix …”. In our submission, this policy does not appropriately contemplate non-residential development, and would suggest that all new development incorporate a form of housing. We suggest revised language be considered to clarify that the housing mix target is applicable to new development that includes residential uses.	Suggested revision: "all new development will be evaluated by the City in the context of housing, so that the City can plan for an appropriate housing mix to ensure..."
LSRCA		2	2.4.2.1.f	Please include a policy that recognizes the importance of protecting natural heritage features when settlement area boundaries are being adjusted. Suggested wording: v) the protection of natural heritage features is addressed.	Sections 2.3.1, as well as Chapters 5 and 6 are what govern the City’s natural heritage features. Moreover, the maps provide further direction. Furthermore, there are no plans for any further settlement area boundary changes.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	2	2.4.2.1.k	Policy 2.4.2.1 (k) The planning process provides many opportunities for engagement and often landowners consult above and beyond the minimum requirements to better engage with local interests, neighbours, and community organizations. In some instances, such as with Indigenous interests, which are commonly engaged in relation to the archaeological study of a property, there are Provincial guidelines and regulations that must be followed to ensure appropriate engagement. We seek clarification on how the policy for additional engagement will be practically applied by staff during the planning process of site-specific development applications, in order to ensure that the appropriate Indigenous communities are consulted with.	Suggested revision to first sentence of policy: "Within the context of Provincial guidelines, the City shall work with Indigenous communities who have conncetion to the lands within the City to ensure consultation and engagement is appropriate to the type of planning application or planning process being undertaken."
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.4.2.3.c	As specified in Section 2.4.2.3 (c), City is proposing that 52% of housing is to be high/medium density. Being that this is a very intense built form, is this percentage realistic in a Greenfields setting, particularly since significant sections of the Greenfield areas have already been planned and finalized?	This policy will be removed; it does not need to guide land use development, as that can be done through other policies and density targets.

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.4.2.3.c	Policy 2.4.2.3 c) identifies that the housing mix for the Designated Greenfield Area shall target a higher-than-historical proportion of medium and high density housing with at least 52% of housing being high density development. It is understood that the 52% figure emanated from the City's Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). The MCR identifies a second suite in a residential unit as a form of high density development. It is requested that the OP recognize the intent of the MCR by acknowledging that second suites meet the 52% policy criteria.	This policy will be removed; it does not need to guide land use development, as that can be done through other policies and density targets. Additionally, we can verify that second suites do provide a form of intensification.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.4.2.3.c	Section 2.4.2.3.c) – requires 52% of the housing mix to be high density within designated greenfield areas. What is the rationale behind this? Is the City working to no longer offer single detached, semi-detached and street townhouse dwelling units as a housing option within the Salem Secondary Plan area?	This policy will be removed; it does not need to guide land use development, as that can be done through other policies and density targets.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.4.2.3.c	Requires at least 52% of new housing being high density with the DGA. This housing mix target does not seem reasonable, especially for the Salem Secondary Plan area that was designed to have a greater mix than what is being proposed. Again, we request the current Salem Secondary Plan target mix remain.	This policy will be removed; it does not need to guide land use development, as that can be done through other policies and density targets.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.4.2.3.c	States that DGA will be planned to achieve 52% high density, and all new development will be evaluated to determine how it contributes to achieving this target. I recommend that you clarify the intent of this policy for the following reasons: i. The City's MCR defines High Density differently from the High Density Designation which requires a minimum of 300 uph. For example, the MCR included second suites in the calculation of High Density. ii. In the case where staff is recommending that 52% of the DGA develop in accordance with the High Density designation (300 uph), then this density is inappropriate, particularly given that many of the DGA sites are already draft plan approved at densities closer to 35 uph. That would put an incredible and unrealistic burden of developing the balance of the unapproved DGA lands at unsupportable densities to average out to 300uph.	This policy will be removed; it does not need to guide land use development, as that can be done through other policies and density targets.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.4.2.3.e.v	Policy 2.4.2.3 e) v) discusses the creation of neighbourhoods with parks and schools as their focal points within a five-minute walk of most residents. It is requested that "open space or natural heritage system" be one of the listed focal points. These naturalized areas can provide for appropriate focal points within a community.	Recommendation: We will add "natural heritage system" to the policy.

LSRCA		2	2.4.2.3.e.vi	Provide examples of measures that will be utilized to maintain the natural hydrologic cycle, etc.	Further direction will be provided in supplementary materials; the Official Plan provides a broader overview of our land use vision.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.4.2.3.f	As noted in Section 2.4.2.3 (f), the City is proposing that the minimum density with be 79 persons/jobs/hectare. Can the City kindly elaborate on how this is this number was finalized as a minimum requirement for Greenfield development?	This number was finalized as a minimum density target in the Land Needs Assessment completed by Dillon Consulting, which was circulated as part of a memorandum in advance of the Public Meeting held on June 2nd. Essentially, the assessment addressed the targets set by the Province to achieve 150,000 jobs by 2051 and 298,000 people by 2051; it reviewed current and projected employment and population across both the Built-Up and Designated Greenfield Areas and strategically addressed how that target could be met through a realistic approach to employment and population distribution. The analysis follows City Council's decision in October 2019 that 50% intensification would be in the Built Up Area and 50% intensification would be in the DGA in order to achieve the Province's growth targets. Additionally, in line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.4.2.3.f	Policy 2.4.2.3 f) identifies that the planned density is 79 people and jobs per hectare to the year 2051. It is understood that this was intended to identify 62 people and jobs per hectare to 2041 and 79 from 2041 to 2051; please confirm. Also, it is requested that the policy be amended to identify that the development is to be measured across the entire Designated Greenfield Area and not on a site-by-site basis.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.4.2.3.f	The Official Plan has now been changed to require 79 persons and jobs per hectare whereas it was 62 persons and jobs in the previous version. We noted previously that 62 was much too high and now it has been increased. In our opinion, the density should continue to mirror that as set out in the Growth Plan.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
Trans Canada Pole: 7735 County Rd 27	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.4.2.3.f	We understand that the City will be inserting additional wording into the Draft Official Plan that will identify density staging provisions for different phases within Designated Greenfield Areas. The current draft increases density from 62 to 79 persons and jobs per hectare without a graduated scale. We would respectfully request further clarification in order to under implications to our site.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.4.2.3.f	The draft Official Plan seeks to achieve a minimum of 79 persons and jobs per hectare whereas the Growth Plan sets out a minimum of 50 persons and jobs per hectare and lastly the current Salem Secondary Plan sets out a minimum of 52 persons and jobs per hectare. The Salem Landowners wish to maintain this minimum moving forward.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.4.2.3.f)	Designated Greenfield Areas require a minimum density of 79 persons and jobs per hectare. We understand this is an error. As noted previously, the persons and jobs per hectare calculation should conform to the Growth Plan.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.4.2.3.h	For policy 2.4.2.3 h), new applications should not be evaluated against previous approvals which conformed under previous policies. Also, the density target “test” is to be applied across the entirety of the Designated Greenfield Area, not on a site-by-site basis. It is requested that this policy be removed.	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process. At the same time, if a developer that has already received approval is interested in increasing density, we are open to this conversation. Additionally, in line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.
McCowan Ardagh Road Property (Ardagh Rd and County Rd 27)	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.4.2.3.i	Designated Greenfield Area and tenure - Policy 2.4.2.3 i) identifies that to meet the DGA density target, among other matters, new development is to provide for a range of unit types, tenures, and built form; "tenure" is not related to density and this should be removed.	Policy will be revised to read: "To meet the Designated Greenfield Area density target and to help meet housing needs, development across the Designated Greenfield Area shall provide a range and mix of housing options, unit types and built form."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.4.2.3f)	Requires 79 persons and jobs per hectare throughout the DGA. We understand that staff had intended to identify 62 people and jobs per hectare to 2041 and 79 persons and jobs per hectare from 2041 to 2051. Please confirm. Also, this policy should clearly state that the persons and jobs per hectare target is measured across the entire DGA area (as required by the Growth Plan), and not on a site-by-site basis.	In line with the Community Structure elements of this plan, development applications with a density lower than 79 person and jobs per hectare may be considered, where appropriate, if higher densities have been met in other sections of the Designated Greenfield Area. We will revise the draft Official Plan to reflect this.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.4.2.3h)	Requires an evaluation whether existing approved development can meet the new density target on vacant blocks, future development blocks, or future phases of the subdivision. The Landowners would like existing draft plan and zoning approvals, based on the existing Secondary Plan densities, to be recognized.	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process. At the same time, if a developer that has already received approval is interested in increasing density, we are open to this conversation.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.4.2.3j)	Requires all neighbourhoods in the DGA to be designed to support resource conservation and environmental stewardship “to the greatest extent feasible” and to include be practices in the use of district energy. The Landowners do not feel that the words ‘to the greatest extent feasible’ are appropriate and ask how this would be evaluated at the application stage. The Landowners also question why this policy refers to district energy where the City is not proposing the development of a district energy plant.	Suggested revision: "All new neighbourhoods and employment areas in the Designated Greenfield Area will be designed to support resource conservation and environmental preservation, protection and enhancement, and should include the best practices in the use of energy, water conservation/recycling and sustainable community planning."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.5.3.b	Requiring consistency with the City’s Urban Design Guidelines should be removed; Council can provide direction to staff on this matter. The Guidelines have not been completed and should not be elevated to the level of policy without the Planning Act direction related to policy.	Recommended revision: "All development shall conform with the relevant Urban Design Policies in Section 3 of this Plan, and should be consistent with the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines to the greatest extent possible."
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	2	2.5.5.a)	Instead of how it is currently written, s. 2.5.5 of the New OP should read: *Any change in land use or introduction of a new land use not otherwise already permitted by the underlying land use designation or existing zoning will required an amendment to the Plan…* This change simply recognizes the Zoning By-law is best suited to regulate the use of land.	This change will be made accordingly.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	2	2.5.a	Policy 2.5(a) allows for slight variation from development standards, except for variation to height and density. Allowing minor variation to provisions without requiring an amendment to the plan is a reasonable approach. Unique site circumstances can also impact height and density calculations and in our view the policy allowing slight variation should be inclusive of height and density. The City could also consider formalizing the permitted variance to height and density by specifying a limit to the permitted variation, for example, allowing for a maximum variation of up to 5% or 10%, subject to the site circumstances.	As the City focuses on meeting the significant growth targets set by the Province, we are encouraging greater heights and density and we hope you agree that this is reflected in the Plan. At the same time, the changes proposed do require careful oversight. For this reason, we will not be changing Policy 2.5(a). However, we have revised language elsewhere across the OP to allow for greater flexibility, especially as we realize the importance of context for determining appropriate heights and density.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.5.d	It is questioned why a condominium street is not permitted to connect to a condominium street as per policy	A network of private condominium streets may be permitted, as long as there are appropriate access points to public streets. The policy will be revised to clarify further: "The creation of new lots fronting onto private streets is only allowed where access to a public street is provided."

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.5.d	Requires development on condominium roads only if access to a public street is provided. Please clarify the assumed intent, is that a network of connected condominium streets can be developed provided that at acceptable points, direct access to a public street is provided.	A network of private condominium streets may be permitted, as long as there are appropriate access points to public streets. The policy will be revised to clarify further: "The creation of new lots fronting onto private streets is only allowed where access to a public street is provided."
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.5.j	Section 2.5.j) – requires a minimum of 10% of all new housing units to be affordable. In our view, this continues to be too high to achieve. A more achievable approach would be 5% of the total units across the city as a whole.	This is a City-wide target that is also provided for in the existing Official Plan; based on recent data, we are currently meeting this target.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.5.j)	Requires a minimum 10% of all new housing units in each year to be affordable. Again, this target is much too high and is not sustainable. In our view, the requirement should be 5% across the city as a whole.	The existing City of Barrie Official Plan upholds this minimum target and the target has been met. We feel confident, with the support for affordable housing provided through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy, that we can continue to work with partners to continue the progress made in providing more affordable housing in Barrie.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.5.j; 2.3.2.e; 2.3.4.iii	Specifically, we are also seeking clarification on how the 10% City-wide affordable housing requirement as set out in Section 2.5 (j) relates to the minimum 20% requirement for Urban Growth Centres (UGCs) and Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) set out in Section 2.3.2 (e) (ii) and Section 2.3.4 (iii) respectively. • When building in MTSAs or UGCs, will the development industry have to include the 10% city-wide requirement on top of the 20% area-specific requirement?	The 10% city-wide requirement would not be additional to the 20% area-specific requirement in the UGC and the MTSAs.
Al McNair		2	2.6.1	Apparently the street designations flow from the 2010 Transportation Master Plan, which staff now acknowledge is seriously out of date and is intended to be updated in the 2022 to 2025 time period. Due to this long time line, I suggest that the new Official Plan policies should NOT permit greater intensification on properties based on the road classification as arterial or collector versus local streets. My earlier submission asked the City to consider reviewing these classifications based on how they actually serve their local neighbourhoods rather than just on how much vehicle traffic they do or can carry. In the interim, intensification should only be directed to those major streets which will be designated as intensification corridors in the new Official Plan. Let us always remember that we are planning for a city that works for people and their neighbourhoods at a human scale, including natural heritage areas.	The City's focus is on strategic growth, therefore greater intensification makes sense on arterials or major collectors over local roads; at the same time, the City will be incorporating a transition policy to emphasize the need for a new development to complement the existing context of the surrounding area.

Al McNair		2	2.6.1	Mid-Rise and High-Rise buildings should not be permitted in the designated Neighbourhood Areas	Buildings in the Neighbourhood Area are allowed different heights according to street typology; local and minor collector streets can see up to three storeys, major collector and arterials up to four, and intensification corridors higher. At the same time, we have incorporated additional transition policies to emphasize the need for a new development to complement the existing context of the surrounding area.
Al McNair		2	2.6.1	There should not be a required minimum density for redevelopment in Historic Neighbourhood Areas. This would only encourage grossly out-of-scale proposals for redevelopment.	There will be no minimum density for development along local roads in Historic Neighbourhood Areas.
Al McNair		2	2.6.1	In the face of our present existential challenges of both Climate Change and the COVID-19 Pandemic, the nature of our urban residential areas may need to be rethought. There will be much more likelihood of residents working-from-home and telecommuting in the longer term. This could be hugely beneficial for our individual health as an alternative to long hours spent, physically inactive, sitting in traffic behind the wheel of a car. It will allow more time each day for our personal lives and for community involvement. It also has the potential to substantially reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by reducing commuting, as was illustrated during the first wave pandemic lockdown in the spring and summer of 2020. The long-term success of such life/work changes will also require many of us to create room in our homes for pleasant, functional work and learning spaces for all family members. This will likely increase the demand for our present housing stock at its' existing scale, rather than trying to work on laptops on the kitchen table of a small condo or rental apartment. It will likely cause us to rethink constant growth and the idea of work/life balance. That is all the more reason why we need to ensure protection of our residential neighbourhoods.	We agree that communities need to be developed as "complete" in a way that services the diverse needs of our residents. At the same time, as we plan for growth, we need to acknowledge that many people can no longer afford single-family homes, and we need to ensure that we can provide a diversity of housing types so that all our residents have a place to call home.
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	2	2.6.1.1	The property at 99/110 Anne Street South functions as a commercial plaza. The current land use designation is General Commercial and the existing zoning is General Commercial Special Provision C4-SP9 (no residential uses permitted). Because this property is already zoned for commercial uses, the owner is seeking assurances that the range of commercial uses currently permitted will be taken into consideration when the new zoning bylaw is reviewed. Further discussion and clarification on allowing commercial permissions without primary uses is requested, or broadening the range of primary uses.	The draft new Official Plan designates this property Non-Industrial Employment, and existing uses for this site will continue to be permitted. We are going to be further clarifying/allowing for this through a special provision for existing retail and commercial sites that are now designated Non-Industrial Employment. We will take care to ensure that the appropriate range of commercial uses are permitted in the new Zoning By-law.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.1.3.a)	Generally, restricts development to 3 storeys on a local road. Recommend that the words “only” before “onto” because several mixed use/medium density blocks in the DGA have multiple frontages on both arterial/collector and local roads.	Recommended revision: "Development on a lot which fronts only onto a Local Street shall be generally kept to three storeys or less."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.1.3.b) & c)	This policy restricts development to a maximum of 4 storeys if oriented towards the collector road/arterial street. Heights exceeding 4 storeys are not permitted unless on an intensification corridor. In order to achieve the higher density targets there may be instances in newly planned DGA subdivisions, where higher density blocks on a collector road would be appropriate. Recommend additional text and the end of 1.6.1.3c)i) which reads “or in an appropriate block in a DGA subdivision fronting onto a Collector Road or Arterial Street.	For a neighbourhood area designation, we believe that a maximum of 4 storeys along a collector road or arterial street is appropriate. We will consider land use designation changes, where appropriate, ahead of the approval of this plan for certain sites.
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.1.3.c	This is really the only policy within this designation that applies to Intensification Corridors. The existing Official Plan policy framework for intensification corridors is working well with the transformation of these areas into more densely populated mixed-use communities. Buildings currently under construction or approved for development along Yonge Street and Essa Road range from 4 to 8 storeys in height with ground related commercial or stand alone residential. What is the rationale for deviating from this policy approach? This policy set is accomplishing the intended function that these corridors are planned to achieve.	Some of the Intensification Corridors still abut low-rise residential, and therefore six storeys allows for intensification while recognizing the existing fabric of these areas within the Neighbourhood Area land use designation. At the same time, we will be incorporating a transition policy that enables growth in a strategic and transitional manner and may allow for up to 8 storeys. Additionally, certain sites along these Intensification Corridors have received a different land use designation, to encourage growth and higher heights in a strategic manner.
Smart Centres / 15 Harvie Rd	Mark Resnick	2	2.6.1.3.c and 2.6.1.3.d	we have made clear our intent to develop Low-Rise Residential Buildings (up to 6-storeys) along the west side of the future Bryne Drive extension (an Arterial Road) for which staff have indicated their support. Policy 2.6.1.3(c) as written would not permit development over 4-Storeys on the property as Bryne Drive is not an “Intensification Corridor”. Development to a height of 6-storeys, as stated in Policy 2.6.1.3(c) is only permitted on Intensification corridors. We request the Policies be amended to permit development to 6-storey along Bryne Drive on the property.	We have no indication that permission was given for up to six storeys. We believe that up to a maximum of four storeys is appropriate for an Arterial road. Please note that we have added a new policy highlighting that existing approvals given, before implementation of the Plan following approval from MMAH, will be upheld.
Marshall Landholdings - 15,13,11,9,5 Peel Street & 118, 98 Mulcaster St	Greg Barker / IPS	2	2.6.1.3.c.i	In the alternative of the requested medium density designation, we would request the City consider including lands adjacent the UGC under Section 2.6.1.3 (c) (i) Development Standards. This would permit lands directly abutting the UGC to develop in a transitional manner to the UGC and in a similar fashion as lands along an intensification corridor.	We have a density target to meet in the Urban Growth Centre, and we want to make sure that growth is directed into this core; therefore, with this Official Plan, as the UGC continues to build up, we prefer not to permit high density on the fringe of the UGC, especially if it would begin to conflict with the context and fabric of the existing neighbourhood.

505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street	Jack Krubnik / IPS	2	2.6.1.3.c.i	There should be more policy attention towards reducing impact rather than limiting heights, as many land uses and developments benefit from economies of scale or building efficiencies that may be greater than six storeys. Furthermore, the goal of transit-oriented development will be limited and hampered by a six storey height limit adjacent to Intensification Corridors. Some parcels are sufficiently sized to accommodate more height and density along Intensification Corridors, while also appropriately considering impact to the established Neighbourhood Area communities. Development along Intensification Corridors should also promote grade related commercial uses. However, it can be difficult to attract commercial tenants in this economic environment, without providing for more density within a development to support the commercial grade related use. High density developments best support commercial uses in developments, which in turn will support a complete community and growth along an Intensification Corridor.	Some of the Intensification Corridors still abut low-rise residential, and therefore six storeys allows for intensification while recognizing the existing fabric of these areas within the Neighbourhood Area land use designation. At the same time, we will be incorporating a transition policy that enables growth in a strategic and transitional manner and may allow for up to 8 storeys. Additionally, certain sites along these Intensification Corridors have received a different land use designation, to encourage growth and higher heights in a strategic manner.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		2	2.6.1.3.d	In Section 2.6.1.3 (d) Development Standards - mentions that the minimum requirement is 50% non-residential use for the ground floor of a low and mid-rise unit fronting a collector and or arterial road, if there is no other commercial use within 450 metres. We kindly ask that the City review this policy as this rigid provision could be problematic and hinder the development of affordable housing units.	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards … may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.6.1.3.d	Requires retail and commercial uses within a five minute walk of other retail and commercial uses (450 metres) within Neighbourhood Areas on Collector or Arterial Streets or Intensification Corridors. This will have the effect of dispersing commercial uses along a road. Commercial uses rely on synergies which include adjacency to each other. It is requested that this policy be removed or, at a minimum, be changed to 800 metres (approximately a 10 minute walk).	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards … may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.1.3.d	On what basis was mandatory ("shall") 50% ground floor retail and commercial uses determined to be required of low and mid-rise buildings fronting onto Collector and Arterial Streets and Intensification Corridors? This policy should be revised to allow greater flexibility as not every property fronting onto Collector or Arterial Streets or Intensification Corridors for a variety of reasons may not be appropriate to provide non-residential uses	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards … may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."

Smart Centres / 15 Harvie Rd	Mark Resnick	2	2.6.1.3.d	Additionally, we do not believe that, incorporating 50% non-residential uses at grade in the proposed Low-Rise Buildings on the property is necessary or viable. Depending on the final layout of the development it is possible that placement of Low-Rise Buildings on the property would be further than 450 meters triggering this requirement as set out in Policy 2.6.1.3 (d). The min 50% non-residential gfa at grade does not make sense for the property given the proximity to the extensive retail and commercial offerings along Bryne Drive and Mapleview Drive in the Strategic Growth Area. We understand the basis of Policy 2.6.1.3 (d) is contribute to building complete communities, where residents can access their most basic, day-to-day needs within a short walk from home, however, this policy is very restrictive as non-residential uses at grade may not be suitable or viable for all sites. In our view, the 450 meters requirement alone may not be the best criteria on which to determine the need for non-residential uses at grade.	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards … may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	2	2.6.1.3.d	Section 2.6.1.3.d identifies mid-rise buildings as a permitted use within the Neighbourhood Area; however, this conflicts with the definition of mid-rise buildings (7- 12 storeys, per Section 3.3.3) and the maximum 6 storey height restriction within the Neighbourhood Area.	The reference to mid-rise bulidings will be removed.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.1.3.d	Section 2.6.1.3.d) continues to require a min of 50% ground floor in low rise buildings to be non-res. The Watersand Draft Approved plan accommodates an 11 acre commercial block that will more than satisfy the commercial needs within the area. This should not apply to the Salem area.	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards … may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.1.3.d	Requires a min of 50% ground floor in low rise buildings to be non-residential where there is no existing commercial within 450 metres. As noted previously, this would continue to include singles with the way it is currently written and interpreted, which is not logical.	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards … may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.1.3.d)	Requires commercial uses on ground floor of low and mid-rise buildings where there are no existing commercial and retail uses within 450 metres. According to Section 3.3.2, low rise includes singles, semi's and townhouses. We request that this policy be revised to exclude ground related housing from the commercial requirement. IN our opinion, it is inappropriate to require singles/townhouses to have commercial uses along interior Collector Roads. Furthermore, the Hewitt's Secondary Plan was designed, draft plan approvals granted, and construction commenced on the basis that Yonge Street would provide the primary commercial uses, and that 5 interspersed arterial road neigbourhood mixed use areas would provide the balance. Those areas exceed 450 metres in distance to every house. We request that the distance be increased to 800 metres.	We are revising this policy to allow for greater flexibility, while maintaining intent -- which is to encourage walkability. Minor variations to this would also be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards … may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	2	2.6.1.3.e	The calculation of minimum density in the Neighbourhood Area (2.6.1.3.e, i.e. density based on the type of street frontage) seems overly complex at the OP level. Instead, minimum density targets for the Neighbourhood Area should be paired with policies that encourage a denser built form/lot fabric along higher-order roads.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.1.3.e	States that new development should be planned to a minimum of 50 uph on local streets and 60 uph for collector roads. These densities would preclude singles, semi's and some street townhouse development. While I appreciate that the change to 'should' from 'shall' from the 1st draft, I'm not clear what criteria would be used to evaluate when it is appropriate to develop at a lower density. The language should be clarified, because there will be many sites in the Neighbourhood Area that will not be suitable for that density.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.6.1.3.e.i and 2.6.1.3.e.ii	The residential density on local roads is identified as a minimum of 50 uph, and on Collector and above streets, the minimum is 60 uph. The densities provided are too high and preclude many types of development other than stacked townhouses or mid-rise buildings. On Collector and higher order roads, densities would be reached that are similar to those for the UGC and are well above the Designated Greenfield Density of 62 and 79 people and jobs per hectare [2.4.2.3 f)]. At 62 people and jobs per hectare, this results in a uph in the range of 25, not 50. The inclusion of the word "should" in the policy does not provide sufficient policy direction. The uph should be appropriately lowered to reflect the policy intent and the people and jobs per hectare.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.

Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.1.3.e.i and 2.6.1.3.e.ii	Section 2.6.1.3.e) i) and ii) – as noted previously, the minimum densities of 50 and 60 units per hectare are very high, especially compared to the current density ranges in the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plans. The densities within the respective Secondary Plans should continue to be respected.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.1.3.e.i and 2.6.1.3.e.ii	The Neighbourhood Area designation and policies sets out a minimum of 50 and 60 units per hectare depending on the fronting situation of the development which is much too high. The current Salem Secondary Plan sets out the range of low density residential from 20 to 40 units per hectare, which is a reasonable range of density. The Salem Landowners wish to continue using this density range.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.1.3.e.i) and ii)	Requires minimum densities of 50 and 60 units per hectare depending on the frontage of either a local or collector road. As noted above, these minimum densities are very high, especially compared to the current density ranges in the Salem Secondary Plan. The densities within the respective Secondary Plans should continue to be respected. Also, how is the density calculated given the density applying to local and collector roads? This is a very confusing and convoluted way to calculate density.	Minimum density targets will be revised so that a minimum density of 50 uph is required on arterial streets, major collector streets and Intensification Corridors, and there is no minimum density target on local roads.
164 Innisfil Street	MHBC / James Newlands	2	2.6.1.3.f	While we do not support a cap number in the Official Plan; if one is used, it is our recommendation that it be increased to 3,500 square metres.	This policy is for lands in a Neighbourhood Area. We believe the 2,000 square metre cap is appropriate and based on our modelling, you can still fit approximately 10 commercial units within a building this size. Anything larger should ideally be in a Commercial District designation. At the same time, the policy now reads "should" to incorporate some flexibility.
Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.1.3.f	Policy 2.6.1.3f) applies to Neighbourhood Areas and states that "Commercial, retail, and office (excluding Major Office) uses shall be located on and oriented towards Intensification Corridors, Arterial or Collector streets, and shall be limited to a maximum of 2,000.0 square metres on the ground floor…" In our submission, flexibility should be introduced, and we suggest "shall" be replaced with "should", in particular so that there is clarity that not every site along a Corridor, Arterial, or Collector street is required to provide commercial, retail and office uses, and to account for site specific circumstances.	This policy is for lands in a Neighbourhood Area. We believe the 2,000 square metre cap is appropriate and based on our modelling, you can still fit approximately 10 commercial units within a building this size. Anything larger should ideally be in a Commercial District designation. We have also clarified the policy and incorporated greater flexibility by using "should" over "shall."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.1.3.f)	Limits commercial GFA to 2,000m2 and states that 'additional floor area is permitted up to the applicable maximum building height". Please explain the basis for the 2,000m2 size threshold because this is not consistent with the City's current comments on large mixed-use sites. Please also add the word "commercial" after "Additional" and in front of "floor area" to clarify the intent of the policy.	This policy is for lands in a Neighbourhood Area. We believe the 2,000 square metre cap is appropriate and based on our modelling, you can still fit approximately 10 commercial units within a building this size. We have also clarified the policy and incorporated greater flexibility by using "should" over "shall."

Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.1.3.g	Policy 2.6.1.3g) states that “If a low-rise commercial plaza is being redeveloped as mixed use, then the new mixed use building shall have at least 75% of the original plaza’s commercial gross floor area on the ground floor.” As outlined in our December 16, 2020 letter, in our submission, revised wording should be considered that would require redevelopment to “strive to achieve, where possible, at least 75% of the original plaza’s gross floor area…” so as to allow for consideration of site-specific context and to provide flexibility and avoid the need for an Official Plan Amendment if the policy cannot be met. In particular, as in redevelopment scenarios of large commercial plazas, the existing GFA can be quite substantial to reproduce in consideration of modern built form objectives.	Policy will be revised to read: "If a low-rise commercial plaza is being redeveloped as mixed use, then the new mixed use building shall have, where possible, at least 75% of the original plaza’s commercial gross floor area on the ground floor." Additionally, minor variations to this would be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards … may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.10	Employment Area - Industrial: We have concerns with the restricted range of permitted uses and development standards. We request that existing use permissions be carried forward.	We will be introducing a new transition policy to confirm that existing approvals given during the development application process will be upheld. The intent of changes to the Employment Areas, including the introduction of the Employment Area - Non-Industrial designation, was meant to expand uses, while also protecting core industrial areas.
Transcanada Pipelines Ltd.	MHBC / Darlene Quilty	2	2.6.12.2	A multi-use trail is shown over the pipeline right-of-way on Map 4a. A policy should be included in Section 2.6.12.2 to reference the need to consult with TCPL in relation to any trail locations or trail development.	we will add the following policy to section 2.6.12.2(b): For any multi-use trail addition that would intersect with the Transcanada Pipelines Limited (TCPL) gas pipeline right-of-way, consultation with TCPL must be completed.
Transcanada Pipelines Ltd.	MHBC / Darlene Quilty	2	2.6.12.2.b	TransCanada should be referenced as: ‘TransCanada PipeLines Limited (TCPL)’ and all items in the section as TCPL	Changes will be made accordingly.

Transcanada Pipelines Ltd.	MHBC / Darlene Quilty	2	2.6.12.2.b	v. TCPL operates two high-pressure natural gas pipelines within its right-of-way crossing the City and is identified on Map 2 of this Plan. TCPL Limited is regulated by the Canada Energy Regulator (CER), which has a number of requirements regulating development in proximity to its pipelines, including approval for activities within 30 metres of the pipeline centreline. vi. New development can result in increasing the population density in the area that may result in TCPL being required to replace its pipeline(s) to comply with CSA Code Z662. Therefore, the City shall require early consultation with TCPL or its designated representative for any development proposals within 200 metres of its pipelines. vii. Trails on the pipeline right-of-way require approval from TCPL. Early consultation during the design process is encouraged to ensure TCPL's design requirements are met. i. In addition to the requirement for setbacks for principle buildings, structures and accessory structures, the following should be setback a minimum of 7 metres from the limit of the pipeline right-of-way: a. Private roads, driveways, parking spaces and parking areas.	These additions will be included.
52, 56, 58 Lakeside Terrace	JD Development Group / Sally Campbell	2	2.6.2	All three buildings will have a total of 479 units with two of the buildings a height of 12 storeys and one a height of 10 storeys. The designation proposed on the lands in the current draft Official Plan is 'Medium Density'. Regarding building height, this designation identifies a minimum height of 6 storeys with no indication of a maximum height provision. This is contrary to the first Official Plan draft, which noted that building height should be between 6 and 12 storeys. The proposed 'High Density' designation suggests a minimum height requirement of 12 storeys. As such, there seems to be no consideration given to which designation provides for heights between 6 and 12 storeys. Our preference is that the language from the first draft be reinstated in the second draft with respect to height permissions in the 'Medium Density' designation.	For clarity, we have added a height range to the medium density designation policies.
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.2.1 and 2.6.3.1	Is seniors' housing, assisted living and long term care homes included in the Residential category? We recommend that the various forms of seniors and assisted living/care homes be included as a permitted use in both the Medium and High Density designations.	We will add assisted living and long-term care homes to the Neighbourhood Area as well as the Medium Density land use designation.

McCowan Ardagh Road Property (Ardagh Rd and County Rd 27)	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.2.2	In the Medium Density designation, a development, as long as it is not on an intensification corridor and is within 70 metres of an NA designation (among other matters) may be permitted to have townhouses (2.6.2.2 i) and those townhouses are required to have ground floor commercial or retail if the building is on a Collector or Arterial road (2.6.2.2 e) and a mix of residential and non-residential uses is required (2.6.2.2 c) in all circumstances. However the development can be exempt from requiring commercial if it meets one of a handful of tests; mostly related to whether there is commercial close by and the site is not on an Arterial road (2.6.2.2 g) and notwithstanding policy (g) the commercial exemption policies don't apply in some areas. It is not known what the "townhouse" built form therefore is if it is required to have a mix of uses and might require ground floor commercial or retail depending on what type of street it is on; it is assumed that it is a live/work unit. It is suggested that if townhouses (without commercial) are permitted, that this be stated and it is also suggested that the commercial policies be simplified.	There are currently no policies pertaining to townhouses in the medium density land use designation. However, we will be incorporating a policy to highlight that lower heights may be permitted in this designation if the minimum density target can be met and/or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan. Additionally, regarding commercial concerns, in certain cases, minor variations may be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards … may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.2.2	We herein request a subtle modification to this policy to address the need for high density development on the subject property: a) Lands within the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area (shown on Map 1) that are designated Medium Density may be considered for development in accordance with the policies of the High Density designation in Section 2.6.3 of this Plan and without requiring an amendment to this Plan, but only if the lands designated Medium Density abut (i.e., share a common lot line with) lands designated High Density.	Lands within an MTSA would require a land use designation change from Medium Density to High Density.
52, 56, 58 Lakeside Terrace	JD Development Group / Sally Campbell	2	2.6.2.3	The three buildings result in a density of approximately 266 units per hectare. Regarding density, the 'Medium Density' designation provides for a maximum density of 125 units per hectare, whereas the first draft proposed a density of 300 units per hectare. The 'High Density' designation provides for a minimum density of 300 units per hectare. Again, there seems to be no consideration given for densities between 125 and 300 units per hectare. If the intent is for the 'Medium Density' designation to allow densities between 125-300 units per hectare then in our opinion this should be clearly indicated.	The commentator is correct in making the assumption that the Medium Density designation allows for between 125-300 units per hectare. The missing range is an oversight and it will be corrected.

17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.2.3	Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, there appears to be a significant gap in the density permitted between Medium and High Density and we encourage the City to review the maximum density permitted for the Medium Density designation, as this will greatly limit development and restrict the provision of residential units in the City.	The density range for Medium Density development shall be 125 units per hectare to 300 units per hectare.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.2.3.b)	Criteria for non-residential. Most of the land proposed to be designated Medium Density in Hewitt's, was previously designated in the Secondary Plan as Mixed Use that permitted stand-alone residential or stand-alone commercial. The Landowners request that stand-alone residential or commercial be permitted in all Medium Density sites in Hewitt's. At a minimum, the Landowners request that the criteria in b) apply to any Medium Density site regardless whether it fronts onto an Arterial Street or Intensification Corridor. The Landowners also request that planned and existing commercial uses be recognized in evaluating compliance with the criteria. At present, the policy in bi) is limited to 'existing'.	The relevant policy in the Medium Density land use section will be revised to incorporate more flexibility; rather than outright focusing on when single-use is permitted, we have focused more simply on when mixed-use is required. In addition to the revisions of the relevent policy, in certain cases, minor variations may be permitted to the policy in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards … may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.6.2.3.b.i	provides criteria where single use residential is permitted where there is "…existing commercial or retail lands within…". It is requested that this be amended to allow for planned commercial or retail (not just existing). Many developments are master planned and, as such, planned commercial or retail could be provided for which would satisfy the policy context of having such uses in proximity to planned residential.	We will revise this policy to incorporate more flexibility and be more context driven, while maintaining intent.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	2	2.6.2.3.c	As identified, the lands between Mapleview Drive East (an Arterial Road) and the NHS area to the south on the site are proposed to be designated "Medium Density". The property is near the furthest extent of the eastern edge of the City and has limited area for development due to the need to accommodate a "regional" stormwater management facility. It is suggested that a large built form in this section is not appropriate, does not provide a destinational aspect to it, nor will it be serviced by a large nearby population as the intended realignment of the Sandy Cove Creek channel abutting the property will reduce the population that would have utilized Terry Fox Drive to get to Mapleview Drive East. The planned function of Terry Fox Drive as a Collector Road has effectively been moved further east due to the upcoming creek realignment. It is requested therefore that the building height policies of 2.6.2.3 c) be amended to provide for a minimum height of three stories along Arterial streets for this location.	We will be clarifying that lower heights may be permitted in the Medium Density designation if the minimum density target can be met and/or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan.

Sean Mason / 570-586 Yonge	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.2.3.c	Section 2.6.2.3 c) Buildings shall have a minimum height of six storeys along the Arterial Street or Intensification Corridor frontage except on lands designated Medium Density within the Urban Growth Centre and Major Transit Station Area, or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan. Comment: Based on this provision, it is interpreted that the built form along the frontage of the intensification corridor will have a minimum height of six storeys and that as the property moves to the rear of the site, adjacent to the natural heritage system, the height of the built form can be reduced. Currently, as noted above, three-storey townhouses are proposed along the rear of the site which would be permitted under this proposed designation. We are requesting a meeting with staff to better understand the implementation of these policies.	We will be clarifying that lower heights may be permitted in the Medium Density designation if the minimum density target can be met and/or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.2.3.c	Only permits buildings with a minimum height of six storeys. As noted previously, we continue to request that townhouse dwelling units in various forms be permitted as of right within the Medium Density designation, in accordance with the Salem Secondary Plan.	We will be clarifying that lower heights may be permitted in the Medium Density designation if the minimum density target can be met and/or where lower heights are required to satisfy the transition policies of this Plan.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.2.3.c)	Minimum height of 6 storey's along arterial streets or Intensification Corridor and MTSA. The MTSA includes areas designated Neighbourhood Area where 6 storey's may be inappropriate. The Landowners also request that the minimum height be reduced to 3 storeys.	This policy only refers to Medium Density designations. Within an area designated Neighbourhood Area, developments fronting arterial streets can be up to four storeys, while developments fronting Intensification Corridors can be up to six storeys. Lower heights would be permitted.
Sean Mason / 570-586 Yonge	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.2.3.d	Section 2.6.2.3 (d) notes the maximum residential density for a development shall be 125 units per net hectare. Comment: The 'Medium Density' land use designation is intended to facilitate an increase of densities and built form in the City (2.6.2). The designation permits a maximum density of 125 units per net hectare (2.6.2.3.d). Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, there appears to be a significant gap in the density permitted and we encourage the City to review the maximum density permitted for the Medium Density designation, as this will greatly limit development and restrict the provision of residential units in the City, which are severely needed at this time due to an affordability crisis.	The residential density range for Medium Density development shall be 125 units per hectare to 300 units per hectare.
520-526 Big Bay Point Road / 19 Dundonald Street	James Hunter/IPS	2	2.6.2.3.d	Given the direction from the Province to meet the growth and intensification targets, and to accommodate attainable housing for an increasing population, a density of 125 uph is viewed as a restricted amount of permitted density. To achieve the built form directed by the City, the permitted density should be increased for the Medium density designation.	The residential density range for Medium Density development shall be 125 units per hectare to 300 units per hectare.

70&76 Edgehill Drive	Darren Vella / IPS	2	2.6.2.3.d	The subject lands are designated Medium Density (76 Edgehill) and Neighborhood Area (70 Edgehill). Within the existing Official Plan, and the approval of OPA No. 32, the subject lands have development permissions for a maximum density of 255 units per hectare. Section 2.6.2.3(d) of the proposed Official Plan permits a maximum density of 125 units per hectare which is not consistent with this previous approval. An excerpt from the existing Official Plan is noted below: 4.8.23 DEFINED POLICY AREA (HH) (OPA NO. 32, By-law 2014-143) Lands shown on Schedule C known municipally as 76 Edgehill Drive and is located on the north side of Edgehill Drive, east of Anne Street North, within the Sunnidale Planning Area, shall permit a twelve-storey residential apartment building with a maximum density of 255 units per hectare, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.2.2.3 (c) of the Official Plan. Option 2 could include a revision to Section 2.6.2.3(d) of the draft Official Plan to permit a maximum density equal to or greater than 255 units per hectare within the proposed Medium density designation. My client is also not opposed to the high density residential designation in this location and would be happy to discuss this in more detail with staff.	The residential density range for Medium Density development shall be 125 units per hectare to 300 units per hectare. At the same time, existing approved development permissions will also be upheld.
390 Essa Road	Darren Vella / IPS	2	2.6.2.3.d	the subject lands possess a site specific special policy area in the approved Official Plan which reads as follows: A) Defined Policy Area (LL) – lands shown on Schedule 'C' – Defined Policy Areas legally described as Part Lot 6, Concession 13, Part Park Lot 19, Registered Plan 67, known municipally as 390 Essa Road, shall be permitted a maximum density of 220 units per net hectare, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 4.2.2.3(d) of the Official Plan. B) Schedule "C" – Defined Policy Areas is hereby amended by designating the lands legally described as Part Lot 6, Concession 13, Part Park Lot 19, Registered Plan 67 in the City of Barrie, known municipally as 390 Essa Road, as "Defined Policy Area LL", as shown on Schedule "A" attached hereto and forming part of this amendment. We herein request that this recognition for 390 Essa Road be added to Section 2.8 – Defined Policy Areas or alternatively the maximum density permissions in the Medium Density designation be increased to accommodate the approval granted for this site.	The residential density range for Medium Density development shall be 125 units per hectare to 300 units per hectare

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.2.3.d)	Maximum density is 125 uph. What category do projects ranging in density from 126-299 uph fall under? They are neither medium nor high density.	The Medium Density land use designation section will be updated to include the following residential density target: 125 to 300 units per hectare.
505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street	Jack Krubnik / IPS	2	2.6.2.3.d, 2.6.3.3.d	If Medium Density is a maximum of 125 units per net hectare and High Density has a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare, in which category does a development fit which has a density of 126-299 units per hectare? More clarification on how Medium Density works within the mid-rise building section of the OP is necessary.	The Medium Density land use designation section will be updated to include the following residential density target: 125 to 300 units per hectare.
Karen Buck		2	2.6.3	Getting Building Height Right for the Climate – A study by two UK Architectural Firms show results that height is a significant predictor of energy use, even accounting for other variables. According to their current analysis of 9 different building types – the four-storey courtyard had the lowest overall emissions after 40 years of operation. I would caution Barrie to explore this further and I am recommending that, at this time, buildings higher than 10 – 12 stories might not be the right choice for the future.	While environmental concerns are a priority for Barrie, we must balance these considerations among others, including the targets for population growth set by the Province of Ontario, which will see Barrie's population double in the next 30 years. While the study has been noted, intensification beyond 12 storeys can have a greater net benefit for the environment than many other forms of development; particularly, as building upwards means that there is less pressure to build outwards and to encroach on environmentally sensitive lands. There are a number of green building policies tied to the development of high-rise buildings (as well as other development types), which can be found in section 3.2.3 "sustainable and resilient design" and particularly in section 3.2.3.1 "green development standards."
Sean Mason / 474 & 490 Essa Road and 235 Harvie Rd	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.3.2.d	The 'Medium Density' land use designation is intended to facilitate an increase of densities and built form in the City (2.6.2). The designation permits a maximum density of 125 units per net hectare (2.6.2.3.d). Given the direction from the Province to meet the growth and intensification targets, and to accommodate attainable housing for an increasing population, a density of 125 uph is viewed as a restricted amount of permitted density and will leave sites such as this underutilized. We encourage the City to review the maximum density permitted for the Medium Density designation based on recent staff approvals (390 and 440 Essa Road), to propose a density that is consistent with the planned function particularly along intensification corridors.	The Medium Density land use designation section will be updated to include the following residential density target: 125 to 300 units per hectare.

PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.3.3.d	Prescriptive nature of the Official Plan - Many policies throughout the 2nd Draft are written in an absolute and prescriptive manner with no flexibility, very much like a Zoning By-law. An Official Plan is meant to provide broad long term policy direction and provide room for flexible interpretation of policies and goals. As written most development applications moving forward would likely require an Official Plan Amendment to proceed. For example Section 2.6.3.3 d) requires High Density development with a residential component shall have a minimum residential density of 300 units per hectare. Many sites will not be able to achieve this density on a site by site basis while others will be able to far exceed it. This should be written as a general target and not an absolute requirement. This also would remove flexibility for mixed-use buildings that are primarily commercial/office to incorporate a small residential component. Many properties within this designation may be challenged to achieve a density this high based on constraints and should not require an Official Plan Amendment if the general intent of the policy to intensify with taller built form is being maintained.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. At the same time, we are reviewing the Official Plan to determine whether some policies are better suited for the Zoning By-law or Urban Design Guidelines.
Cameron Sellers/IPS Consulting		2	2.6.4	Currently, the new OP requires a minimum density of 125.0 units per hectare within Community Hub lands (2.6.4.3 A) with a maximum of 300.0 units per hectare. Given that Community Hub lands are dispersed throughout the City in varying locations / settings / neighbourhoods, we believe the density requirements (at least the minimum requirement) should be tiered, based on their position within the City, in similar fashion to the Neighbourhood Area designation under 2.6.1.3 e) i). We recommend having a minimum density requirement for Community Hub lands adjacent to Local roads vs. those adjacent to Collector / Arterial roads, and possibly a third tier for Community Hub lands fronting Intensification Corridors.	Given the variability across Community Hub lands, we will be revising the t minimum residential density target to respond more to local context.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.4.1	Residential is only permitted as part of a mixed-use development. Within the DGA, the Community Hub designation applies to recreation centre lands, fire station lands, and school sites. The inclusion of these land use blocks within subdivisions were made as a result of requests from the City or Agencies and accordingly, if the City or Agency chooses not to purchase those sites, then the landowner should be able to develop according to the surrounding land use designations. We question the planning merits of requiring mixed use development on interior sites, which may abut a local road. The Hewitt's Secondary Plan requires that the site be planned and zoned to permit residential use in the event the school boards choose not to purchase the land. The new OP should be amended accordingly.	Recommended policy addition for 2.6.4.2. c) "Should a public service facility or institutional-type use no longer be required or no longer exist on the land designated as Community Hub, then development in accordance with the majority surrounding land use designation may be considered without an amendment to this plan."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	2	2.6.4.1.	Residential uses are only permitted as part of a mixed-use development. The Salem Landowners request that standalone residential uses also be permitted within elementary and secondary schools along with recreation centres. This was a fundamental item within the Salem Secondary Plan that not only permits residential uses but these blocks are also dual zoned in order to provide residents that will live beside these uses a clear understanding what would be permitted should those uses not ultimately be constructed and included as permitted uses.	The intent is that the residential development itself should be mixed use. At the same time, we will be incorporating a policy stating that if there are other non-residential uses within 450 m of the site, then we may consider a single-use residential development.
Park Place	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.5	Commercial District: We request: a. that permitted uses in this designation be expanded to include hotels and motels. (The only reference to hotels and motels right now appears to be in Section 8.3.1 – Celebration Spaces.) b. discussion/definition of "Commercial" c. clarification of whether gas bars/car washes fall under retail or commercial?	The designation of "hospitality and tourism" will be added to Commercial District, as well as to Employment Area - Non-Industrial. This will allow for hotels and motels. A gas bar/car wash would be permitted in the Employment Area - Non-Industrial land use designation.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.5.1	Policy 2.6.5.1 permits a range of uses in the Commercial District land use designation, however does not permit "Major Retail", which is a defined term under the Official Plan. In our submission, the intended function of the Commercial District designation would suggest that it is appropriate for large scale commercial/retail uses to be permitted, including Major Retail, and we suggest Major Retail be added as a permitted use. Policy 2.6.5.2b) does permit "large format retail (i.e. big box) as well as shopping malls". Understanding that Major Retail is a defined term, we suggest consistency with this defined term throughout the Official Plan for clarity;	We will do a review to ensure that "Major Retail" is the consistent term used for the permitted use.

Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.5.2.b	Draft Policy 2.6.5.2b) permits “large format retail (i.e. big box) as well as shopping malls”. Understanding that Major Retail is a defined term, we suggest consistency with this defined term throughout the Official Plan for clarity, including updating Policy 2.6.5.2b) to reference Major Retail;	We will do a review to ensure that "Major Retail" is the consistent term used for the permitted use.
LSRCA		2	2.6.6.1	Consider updating this section to describe more clearly the uses permitted in the natural heritage system. Suggested wording: a)Environmental conservation and preservation; b)Environmental stewardship, restoration and enhancement; c)Flood or erosion control mechanisms, if demonstrated to be in the public interest; d)Hazard management, if demonstrated to be in the public interest; e)Naturalized trails, boardwalks and interpretive/wayfinding signage installed by a public authority; and, "Low intensity" active transportation infrastructure installed by a public authority.	The section has been reviewed and updated.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.6.1 e)	Permits boardwalks or trails ‘installed’ by government or public authority. As per current draft approvals in Hewitt’s, the City requires the developers (not the City) to install the trails and receive DC credits. This policy should be revised to state “installed by or on behalf of…”.	Revised wording: "Naturalized trails, boardwalks and interpretive/wayfinding signage installed, or as permitted, by a public authority"
LSRCA		2	2.6.6.2.b.	Several features that also make up the natural heritage system are currently excluded from the list, such as natural areas abutting Lake Simcoe, watercourses, woodlands, cultural thickets, cultural meadows, corridors and linkages, and natural areas of local significance. Also, note that coastal wetlands are specific to the Great Lakes and their connecting channels (as per PPS definition) and should not be referenced in the City’s OP since there are none in the area. Suggested wording: b) The natural heritage system includes: provincially significant wetlands, other wetlands, significant woodlands, other woodlands, significant valleylands, significant wildlife habitat, habitat of endangered and threatened species, watercourses, fish habitat, natural areas abutting Lake Simcoe, areas of natural and significant interest, cultural thickets, cultural meadows, natural areas of local significance and natural corridors and linkages as well as natural hazard lands, which include floodplains, erosion hazard areas, steep slopes and unstable soils.	This section has been revised.

LSRCA		2	2.6.6.2.d	Please add “flood control in the public interest” to iii) Erosion control	We will add flood, in addition to erosion
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	2	2.6.7.1b)	Permits low impact development stormwater management facilities. Stormwater ponds across Hewitt’s are proposed to be designated Greenspace. Accordingly, the permitted uses should read “Low Impact development Faculties” and “Stormwater Management Ponds/Facilities”.	We have incorporated the terminology proposed, but please note that these uses are overall restricted across the City and that language is also incorporated. (Also note that restricted is not the same as prohibited.)
LSRCA		2	2.6.7.2.c	Trees are a more sustainable, cost efficient and environmentally friendly way to generate shade in public spaces. It’s recommended that this policy be revised to include the provision of trees as well. Suggested wording: c) The City shall install trees and shade structures along the waterfront to provide relief from the sun.	Urban forest policies are provided for in setion 6.3.2; the City encourages the planting of trees across Barrie.
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.8	It is requested that all existing land use permissions be carried forward in the New OP. For example two of PBMR's landholdings located within the proposed SEED designation currently have and are used for industrial purposes and the SEED designation proposed to remove all industrial use permissions.	The SEED boundaries found on Map 2 will be revised and the properties in question will be designated appropriately to uphold existing land use permissions.
Artenosi Developments Group: 284 + 286 Dunlop & 119 + 121 Henry St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.8	Strategic Employment and Economic District (SEED) - Our Client submitted a ZBA application for a mixed use building in May 2021. We request confirmation the proposed built form would be deemed to conform with the proposed SEED policy framework. We would request a meeting with City staff to review this further.	Existing approvals will be carried forward and we will be introducing a transition policy that states this. The mixed-used building, should the ZBA be approved, will be deemed to conform with the Official Plan.
PBM Realty Holdings / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.8.1	Can City staff confirm the permitted uses presented are in addition to the existing designation and not exclusive. PBMR's properties at 364 St. Vincent Street and 30 Alliance Boulevard have existing industrial use permissions and have tenants using the properties for industrial purposes and it is critical these existing permissions be carried forward.	The SEED boundaries found on Map 2 will be revised and the properties in question will be designated appropriately to uphold existing land use permissions.
Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.8.1.m	Policy 2.6.8.1m) indicates that “Convenience Retail as part of a mixed-use development” is permitted. “Convenience Retail” uses are not referenced under any other land use designation, whereby Convenience Retail is only permitted on lands designated Strategic Employment and Economic District. We suggest removing the word “convenience” so that the use permitted is “Retail”, and also that “as part of a mixed-use development” be removed;	2.6.8.1.m will be changed to "Retail (excluding Major Retail."
PBM Realty Holdings / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.8.2.h	Land Use Policies - Can City staff confirm the intent of this policy? It does not appear any SEED designated lands are also designated Employment Areas.	SEED designated lands are permitted in Employment Areas. The latest Map 2 now demonstrates this.

Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.8.3.b	Policy 2.6.8.3b) notes that "the height of buildings should generally be limited to 6 storeys", whereas the corresponding policy in the September 2020 draft OP indicated a maximum of 16 storeys would be permitted. The proposed building heights are a significant reduction from what was previously contemplated, and we seek clarity as to the appropriateness of such a substantial reduction. In particular, considering the SEED designation is part of a Strategic Growth Area, where significant redevelopment and growth is to be directed. Development beyond a 6 storey maximum may be appropriate to facilitate appropriate levels of growth within this node, and we suggest that revised policy be considered that would be reflective of the intent of the Strategic Growth Areas, such as directed by draft Policy 2.3.3c), which states: "Strategic Growth Areas shall accommodate higher levels of intensification, tall buildings, higher densities…" The policy does not currently permit tall buildings within the SEED designation.	The primary intent for the SEED designation is for strategic growth of employment. At the same time, we have reviewed your sites in relation to the SEED designation, and intend to change 201-211 Cundles to Commercial District. This would still allow for a wide mix of uses, would protect commercial and retail uses, and would allow the site to achieve greater intensification and height.
PBM Realty Holdings / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.6.8.3.b	Development Standards - Can City staff confirm the intent of generally requiring buildings to be limited to 6 storeys in height is meant to be flexible and if lands are located in other areas (along intensification corridors or higher order streets) that consideration for increased heights will be considered without the need for an Official Plan Amendment?	Generally, height is intended to be limited to six storeys in SEED designations as the primary focus of growth for these areas is employment.
Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.8.3.c	Policy 2.6.8.3c) requires that at least 25% of ground floor uses for buildings with frontage along an arterial or collector street contain retail, commercial or other active uses. As outlined in our December 16, 2020 letter, flexibility should be afforded to this policy to account for site specific circumstances, and we suggest revised wording be considered as follows: "The ground floor of buildings with street frontage onto arterial or collector streets should consist of…"	The requirement has been changed from ground floor area to building frontage to incorporate greater flexibility.

341 Mapleview Drive West	TALUS / Peter Obradovich	2	2.6.9.1	As such, we are pleased to see that the proposed designation is now Employment Area: Non-Industrial, however, a self-storage facility continues to not be a permitted use. We purchased these lands to build a self-storage facility. In our opinion, Employment Area: Non-Industrial is a perfect designation for a self-storage facility being that this type of use does not function fully as an industrial use. A self-storage facility does not require manufacturing or processing, it is not harmful to people or the environment or have noxious effects, and typically there are commercial uses included such as an office and the sale of packing and moving supplies as is the case in our proposed facility. Our request is that the City reconsider permitting self-storage facilities within the Employment Area: Non-Industrial designation on our subject site.	Generally, we consider self-storage to be a commercial use. We will be providing further guidance on where self-storage facilities are permitted in the new Zoning By-law.
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.9.2	Policy 2.6.9.2 indicates that Major Retail uses are to be "subject to the policies in Sections 2.6.10.2, 2.6.10.3, and 2.6.9.3". Based on a review of those sections, it is unclear the applicability of the "Employment Area – Industrial" standards to the Major Retail permitted use, as sections 2.6.10.2 and 2.6.10.3 relate mainly to industrial employment type uses.	Policy 2.6.9.2.a) is meant to apply to what is now policy 2.6.9.1.j); those land uses now permitted in the Employment Area - Industrial section. This has been changed.
164 Innisfil Street	MHBC / James Newlands	2	2.6.9.2	we have concerns with the principle of using the percentages and maximum size limits - it is our opinion that these are regulatory approaches that should not be included in the policy document and are better applied through the implementing Zoning Bylaw. The reasons and solutions follow: Despite the language in Section 10.1 d), which enables flexibility in the interpretation of numbers, the use of the word "shall" in the subsections of section 2.6.9.2, instead of "should" or "generally" places hard limits on the numbers and would precipitate an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) for any deviation from the maximums. The Zoning By-law is the better location for the numbers and the Zoning By-law process requires the same public notice procedures as an OPA. It remains our recommendation that the 25% cap be removed from Section 2.6.9.2 d. ii) and iii). It is recommended that "secondary to the principle use" is a sufficient requirement and that the section should be modified to state, "The implementing zoning by-law will establish provisions to ensure that secondary uses are secondary to the principle use." The recommended approach would have administrative benefit of taking an application having 26% of floor area being dedicated to a secondary use from an OPA and ZBA application before Council to a Committee of Adjustment application.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. We have maintained caps for site design elements that we believe to be critical for growth management, and have allowed for more expansive retail development under the Commercial District designation. At the same time, greater flexibility has been addded to the section on major retail.

164 Innisfil Street	MHBC	2	2.6.9.2.c	In Section 2.6.9.2 c) the second sentence should be deleted. This sentence selectively recites some of the permitted uses of Section 2.6.9.2 and then applies an added "criteria" of "compliment". It is recommended that this sentence be removed and that Section 2.6.9.1 stand on its own in establishing the list of permitted uses in the designation. If this sentence is to remain, it would appear to be more appropriate in the preamble to section 2.6.9.	Agree that the second sentence can be deleted. The need to preserve Employment Area lands for industrial employment uses is made clear in the preamble of section 2.6.10; whereas the supportive capacity of Emplomet Area -- Non-Industrial (to Employment -- Industrial) is made clear in the preamble of section 2.6.9.
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.9.2.d	Policy 2.6.9.2d) would restrict any new retail uses as standalone, and new retail would be required to be in association with another use in the same building. In our submission, the requirements for new retail to be associated with another use is an inappropriate standard. We suggest revised policy be considered to allow for small scale retail uses, including infill type development, within the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation;	We will be revising the retail policy section to increase clarity and flexibility. New standalone retail may be permitted on a site, but with conditions.
Park Place	IPS / Darren Vella	2	2.6.9.2.d.ii and 2.6.9.2.d.iii	Employment Area – Non-Industrial ii) A new retail use may be permitted as an accessory use to a primary permitted use listed in Section 2.6.9.1 of this Plan, but it shall be within the same building or structure as the primary use, and it shall be no larger than 25% of the gross floor area of the building/structure within which it exists; and, iii) A new retail use may be permitted as a secondary use in a multi-tenanted building, but it shall only be permitted once the primary use has been established, and it shall be no larger than 25% of the gross floor area of the building/structure within which it exists Based upon our recent experience, including current discussions with large scale users for our north lands we believe that the maximum accessory retail component should be set out as “generally in the order of 30%” so as not to preclude minor variances in appropriate circumstances.	We will be rephrasing these policies for greater clarity and flexibility.
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.9.2.e.i	Policy 2.6.9.2e)i) provides criteria for the development of Major Retail uses in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, and proposes a cap to ‘contiguous clusters’ of Major Retail Uses. As the term ‘contiguous cluster’ is undefined and unclear, we are concerned of how this policy will be applied, interpreted and implemented, including under the Zoning By-law. In our experience, a combined cap that is applicable to multiple developments under separate ownership is difficult to track and implement consistently. We suggest that Policy 2.6.9.2e)i) be removed.	We agree that this term is confusing. The recommendation is to revise as follows: "New major retail will only be permitted: i)Within a kilometre of Community Area lands, and fronting onto an Arterial Road; ii)When less than 25% of existing uses within 500 metres are major retail; "

Canadian Tire Real Estate	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.9.2.e.ii	Policy 2.6.9.2e)ii) provides criteria for the development of Major Retail uses in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, and proposes to cap individual major retail uses at 5,000 sq.m. In addition to our concerns with the appropriateness of the proposed “Employment Area – Non Industrial” designation for 75 Mapleview Drive West as noted above, the existing Canadian Tire store at 75 Mapleview Drive West has approximately 7,258 sq.m of retail space within the existing building, which exceeds the proposed maximum. In our submission, it would be appropriate to contemplate a revised maximum that is reflective of the needs of a Major Retail type use, or that policy be introduced to recognize existing Major Retail uses regardless of existing GFA, and which would permit expansion to such a Major Retail use, without need for amendment to the Official Plan;	Revised policy recommendation: "Each new major retail building must be a minimum of 3,500 of square metres and should generally not exceed 5,000 square metres. A mix of major retail and retail may be permitted, though together all uses on a site should generally not exceed a maximum of 5,000 square metres."
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	2	2.6.9.2.h)	Policy 2.6.9.2h) provides direction for the provision of sensitive land uses within the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, however it is unclear what (if any) sensitive land uses are permitted within this designation. Clarification regarding the applicability of this policy would be welcomed;	A definition of Sensitive Land Uses, which provides examples of sensitive land uses, is provided in the definitions section within Chapter 10.
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	2	2.7.1	Historic Neighbourhoods: There should be acknowledgement than a significant amount of intensification is expected within the Historic Neighbourhoods along identified Intensification Corridors, Strategic Growth Areas and lands with higher density permissions.	The expectation of some intensification is clarified in Policy 8.4.3.f, which states: "The policies of this section apply to lands designated Medium Density within the Urban Growth Centre as shown on Map 2, but are not intended to be used to prohibit redevelopment or limit intensification. The integration of new development within intensification areas that are part of historical neighbourhoods will be achieved by applying the direction provided in the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines."
LSRCA		2	2.7.5.e.v	Please include reference to the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan “where applicable”.	Reference to LSPP has been added.
Gary Bell		2	2.8.6 and 2.7.5	The defined policy area 2.8.6 would be better and more explicitly expressed as: “The Extractive Industrial overlay policies apply to this area until such time as the mineral aggregate operation on the subject lands is no longer licensed under the Aggregate Resources Act. Then the Natural Heritage System designation and polices apply.” Similarly, the reference to the underlying Natural Heritage System should be included in policy 2.7.5.	Policy 2.8.6 needs to be clarified to align with policy 2.7.5.a; additionally, as the land use designation as per Map 2 is Natural Heritage System, this can be incorporated in both 2.7.5.a and 2.8.6 to omit any interpretation that the land use designation can ultimately be changed when the Extractive Industrial overlay no longer applies.

Park Place	IPS / Darren Vella	2		For the lands adjacent to the north side of Lover's Creek we would like to explore with you whether some further flexibility in uses could be considered. For example could a hotel/motel become a permitted use in the Non Industrial and Industrial Employment areas?	We will be adding "Tourism and Hospitality" to the permitted uses in Employment Area - Non-Industrial. This would permit a hotel/motel.
Karen Buck		3	3	All New buildings should have to be Net Zero buildings. This is where the Province and Municipalities may have to work together to require this. BC requires high performance windows in new buildings and I think Barrie should, too.	In section 3.2.3.1, the following guidelines are given in relation to new developments: that they shall "provide a high level of effiency in energy consumption" (i) and that they "promote Energy Star qualified development" (xii). The requirement of high-performance windows is more appropriate for the Urban Design Guidelines (as the Official Plan is intended to provide broader land use guidelines), and this is a consideration that we will keep in mind for the future. More language in relation to net-zero initiatives have additionally been added into the plan.
Karen Buck		3	3	The management of "runoff" is very important for mitigation during "climate disruptive events" and the City must prepare for resiliency in the face of Climate Change. Protecting the sewer system is important and resiliency might also mean that downspouts should be disconnected and connected to rain gardens. Maybe we should be also looking at Green Roof solutions.	The City encourages green roofs as part of section 3.2.3.1.x; 3.2.3.1.iv encourages rainwater harvesting. Rain gardens are also listed as a permitted use under the Greenspace land use designation. These suggestions for the use of rain gardens and Green Roof solutions may also be something we can consider as draft two of the City-wide Urban Design Guidelines is developed.
Michelle Lackey		3	3.3	In regards to the built form of new development - I think greater landscape buffers and set backs need to be provided when developing or re-developing land that has existing residential properties adjacent to them. The current minimum setbacks and buffers described in the OP are not sufficient in my opinion. I also think densities need to be adhered to more strictly and stop allowing special provisions for density and height increases with new development. The community is noticing more and more development of townhomes, back to back stacks and low rise buildings being shoehorned into existing mature neighbourhoods.	To ensure appropriate transitions to neighbourhood sites, low-rise and mid-rise developments must be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from the property line, while high-rise buildings must be setback a minimum of 70 metres. Additional transition regulations also apply -- for instance a mid-rise building must include a 45 degree angular plane from the property line. At the same time, setbacks will be determined on a case-by-case basis for a development through the application process to ensure that an appropriate transition to a neighbouring site is maintained. This new draft Official Plan also sets out specific densities for different land uses in order for there to be greater confirmity and understanding of what is acceptable, which should result in fewer special provisions in the future.

17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3	As part of the Draft Official Plan, the City has included built form types and development criteria for each type (Section 3.3). It provides a level of detail not commonly found within an Official Plan and would be more appropriately located in an Urban Design Guideline document. This level of detail will result in significant barriers to development and ultimately unnecessary amendments to the Official Plan to resolve. This has the effect the slowing down the development approval process and slowing intensification efforts. It also restricts the artistic aspects of architects, urban designers, and landscape architects to create engaging and unique spaces that may not fit into the "box" that is being created by these Official Plan Policies.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. The criteria incorporated into Section 3.3 of the Official Plan have continued to be included due to their importance in achieving the type of city that stakeholders have expressed they would like Barrie to become; at the same time, we have incorporated some more flexibility into the policies. The City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines will provide greater built form guidance and will be designed to work in collaboration with the Official Plan.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	3	3.1.2.d	Speaks to Urban Design Standards and Guidelines, both of which being mandatory. The Salem Landowners request urban design guidelines not being a mandatory policy but changed to being an encouraged policy as is typical with municipal Official Plans.	We support the requirement of a Planning Justification Report and/or Urban Design Brief. At the same time, staff do recommend changing the policy to read: "Require development applications to demonstrate how relevant Attractive City objectives and Urban Design policies are being achieved through any requisite Planning Justification Report and/or Urban Design Brief."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.1.3.1	Policy 3.1.3.1 provides direction for application of the Urban Design Standards, stating "The Urban Design Standards are phrased with the terms "will" or "shall", or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies." Elsewhere, the draft Official Plan recognizes the importance of flexibility in design standards for successful and appropriate implementation, including Policy 2.5a), which states: "Slight variations from the development standards, with the exception of variations to height and density, may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City." We suggest Policy 3.1.3.1 be revised to incorporate an appropriate level of flexibility;	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Urban Design Policies are provided for in Sections 3.2., 3.3 and 3.4. For clarity, it is suggested that 3.1.3.1a) be changed to read: "Many of the Urban Design Policies are phrased with the terms "will" or "shall," or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies provided in Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4." We have incorporated some more flexibility into the Urban Design Policies, overall.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.1.3.2	Urban Design Guidelines. 1) This Section refers to a City-Wide Urban Design document but then states in a policy how the guidelines are to be read. Please consider that a policy referring to a guideline which then speaks to mandatory conformity lacks clarity and flexibility. 2) The Landowners recommend that the OP refer to the UDG document and the policies could provide high level guidance as to the goals of that document. 3) The text of a)-c) is confusing. a) requires mandatory conformity if any guideline can be achieved; however, b) states that if a guideline can be achieved with minor adjustments, then it 'must' be achieved. Finally, c) states that if it cannot be achieved then an Urban Design Brief is required. A 'policy' cannot be mandatory if the subsequent polices allow for variations. Furthermore, it is not clear what 'can be achieved' means. What is the test for which 'can be achieved' is being measured against that automatically requires mandatory compliance?	We will simplify section 3.1.3.2 in reference to the Urban Design Guidelines. At the same time, we will still emphasize that the Urban Design Guidelines shall be followed to the greatest extent possible; moreover, while the Urban Design Guidelines will maintain flexibility, if any relevant guidelines cannot be followed, then an Urban Design Brief must be completed demonstrating how the spirit and intent is maintained. Otherwise, further direction will be given in the guidelines themselves.
PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.1.3.2	Must be clear that there is flexibility in not achieving every specific guideline due to site specific circumstance but the intent of the guideline can be demonstrated through other means and that should a relevant guidelines not be achieved that it does not trigger an Official Plan Amendment.	If the relevant Urban Design Guidelines cannot be followed, then an Urban Design Brief would need to be completed demonstrating how the spirit or intent is maintained. If the relevant OP Urban Design policies cannot be met, we may consider, if justified, as slight variation -- as per policy 2.5.a. If the variation cannot be justified, an OPA would be required. Please note, we have also incorporated further flexibility into the Urban Design Policies, overall.
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	3	3.1.3.2	The Urban Design Standards in Section 3 should be removed from the OP and consolidated with the future City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines document. The standards/guidelines seem duplicative and per policy 3.1.3.2, the difference in their status is nuanced – essentially still requiring applications to evaluate and apply all guidelines subject to City approval.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. The criteria incorporated into Section 3.3 of the Official Plan have continued to be included due to their importance in achieving the type of city that stakeholders have expressed they would like Barrie to become. Please note, we have also incorporated further flexibility into the Urban Design Policies, overall. The City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines will provide greater built form guidance and is designed to work in collaboration with the Official Plan. We will also be changing the reference to "Urban Design Standards" to "Urban Design Policies" for greater clarification.

PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.1.3.2.c	Can the City confirm the interpretation of 3.1.3.2 c) is that should an applicant not be able to meet any of the specific urban design criteria presented in the City OP, through a sufficient Urban Design Brief providing rationale for why the guideline cannot be met, the development can then proceed without the need for an Official Plan Amendment? (ex, 3.3.4 a) ii) g) 70m separation from towers to low rise built form).	Section 3.1.3.2.c applies to Urban Design Guidelines, but not to the Urban Design Policies in the Official Plan. An OPA would be required for those relevant Urban Design policies in the OP that cannot be met, if proper justification is not provided (as per policy 2.5.a). We will also be changing the reference to "Urban Design Standards" to "Urban Design Policies" for greater clarification. Please note, we have also incorporated further flexibility into the Urban Design Policies, overall.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.1	Policy 3.2.1 provides general urban design standards to evaluate development applications, and will require development applications demonstrate a number of aspects, including (but not limited to): improving the City's legibility, navigability and sense of place; improving the existing urban fabric; and increasing overall connectivity. In our submission, it is not appropriate for all development applications to demonstrate the provision of certain city building elements, which may not be feasible to implement in a number of potential instances. We suggest revised wording as follows: "development applications, where appropriate, should demonstrate the following…"	Policy 3.2.1.a) will begin: "To create human scale neighbourhoods that accommodate the City's anticipated intensification and growth, development applications, <u>where appropriate, shall</u> demonstrate the following:" We have maintained the use of shall, as this is intended to be a mandatory measure; at the same time, we agree that the same approach may not be appropriate for every development and this has been addressed through the inclusion of "where appropriate."
Gary Bell		3	3.2.1	The issue of compatibility of redevelopment in established neighbourhoods is a major and re-occurring question at Council. The term compatibility in The Plan is mostly in reference between different land uses not between low density and greater intensity residential buildings. 9.5.6 Context Sensitive Intensification provides a useful policy e). City Council thru The Plan can articulate what it means to be compatible forms of new development in existing neighbourhoods. It is worthwhile for The Plan to provide as much certainty as possible to existing single detached residential owners and to development interests, as to what is and what is not acceptable height, massing, and appearance. Although it is recognized that you cannot regulate good taste.	Believe the policies do this and we will be making further revisions to reflect existing height of existing buildings as a determinant of a maximum height.

Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	3	3.2.1	Policy 3.2.1., as we understand from staff has been included to provide specific guidance in the Official Plan as a reference point for what staff view as the characteristics of over-development when evaluating development proposals. While the policy is intended for this purpose, we caution against its inclusion as the policy can also serve as a basis for appeals and objections to development that while appropriate pushes many of these boundaries as Barrie grows into a mid-size City. If the policy is to remain, we suggest Policy 3.2.1 (b) be revised as detailed below. In the 1st paragraph of 3.2.1 (b), the last sentence states, “Over-development is characterized, but not limited to the following…”. We suggest the following in its place, “Over-development may be characterized, but not limited to the following…”. • The current wording of Policy 3.2.1 (b)(iii) reads as a definitive statement against any Official Plan Amendments for height and density, which we do not believe is staff’s intent. We believe staff are merely raising a caution over excessive height or density, a small but important distinction. The Policy states, “Development that exceeds the maximum permitted height or density”. An example alternative wording is, “Development that proposes excessive height or density”.	This policy has been clarified as to the intent of over-development as a definition and to introduce more flexibility. Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. has been changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density."
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		3	3.2.1 b (iii)	we kindly recommend that Section 3.2.1 (b) (iii) be revised as the current language suggests that there should never be Official Plan Amendments (OPAs) for height or density.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. is recommended to be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	3	3.2.1.a	It is not understood how a development proposal “shall” demonstrate “improve the city’s legibility, navigability and sense of place”	Revision to Policy 3.2.1.a.i.c : "Contribute to the city's legibility (meaning the coherent organization of the built environment), navigability and sense of place." Moreover, it is also suggested that 3.2.1.a begin with: "To create human scale neighbourhoods that accommodate the City's anticipated intensification and growth, development applications shall demonstrate, <u>where appropriate</u>, the following:"
PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.1.a.i.c	It is not understood how a development proposal "shall" "improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place".	Revision to Policy 3.2.1.a.i.c : "Contribute to the city's legibility (meaning the coherent organization of the built environment), navigability and sense of place."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.1.b	Policy 3.2.1b) specifies that the City will not support “over development”, which further goes on to define what may be considered as over-development including “development that exceeds the maximum permitted height or density”, or “unwarranted variances” where an alternative built form is appropriate.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iv) will be rewritten as "Variances to the City's development standards resulting in inappropriate built form, especially where an alternative built form solution is more appropriate;" Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. is recommended to be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"

Melchior Management	Janet Foster	3	3.2.1.b	The policies identify that minor revisions to the Plan may be considered without an Official Plan amendment; however, increases to height and density will not be considered. Will an Official Plan amendment be required in instances where increases are contemplated? Also, will an Official Plan amendment be required if minimum requirements cannot be satisfied, for example minimum densities or building storeys?	Cases preventing underdevelopment are incoporated across the Official Plan, through tools such as minimum density targets. in certain cases, minor variations may be permitted in accordance with General Land Use Policy 2.5.a: "Slight variations from the development standards ... may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan if such variations are in response to unique conditions or site context, to the satisfaction of the City."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	3	3.2.1.b	relates to, among others, exceedances in maximum permitted height or density, “inappropriate built form”, “unwarranted variances” and shadow impacts. A hard approach to these matters as criteria for over development will, it is submitted, reduce design and functional flexibility and potentially usurps someone’s right to have variances considered if the Planning Act tests can be met. For example, a height exceedance for a desired design element, or higher density for the provision of more affordable or attainable built housing form. It is questioned how the City will evaluate “inappropriate built form” and it is likely that every multi-story building will have some amount of shadow impact. Also, it is not understood what the City means by identifying that development that “impacts local amenity” will not be supported.	Policy 3.2.1.c has been clarified as to the intent of over-development as a definition and to introduce more flexibility. As for "local amenity," recommendation is to change policy 3.2.1.c.ii to "Development that negatively impacts the public realm and local character."
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.2.1.b	We agree that over development does not result in good planning; however, with the current density permissions, particularly the maximum within the Medium Density designation, developers will be required to submit Official Plan Amendment applications to increase densities in order to meet the other objectives of this plan. It is recommended that subsection (iii) be deleted as good planning relates to the overall functionality of the site highlighted in (vi), not the developments proposed height and density given all the policies in this Plan related to transition and neighborhood impact.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. will be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"
PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.1.b.iii	this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. will be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"
Artenosi Developments Group: 284 + 286 Dunlop & 119 + 121 Henry St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.1.b.iii	this criteria should be removed, minor deviations from maximum height or density do not necessarily characterize over development nor should they require an Official Plan Amendment in every circumstance.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. will be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"

PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.1.i.c	Additionally the 2nd Draft contains a lot of challenging urban design verbiage/terminology that is unclear and undefined which leaves a lot of room for varying interpretation of these policies. For example Section 3.2.1 (i)(c) requires all development applications to demonstrate it will improve the city's legibility, navigability and sense of place.	Revision to Policy 3.2.1.a.i.c : "Contribute to city's legibility (meaning the coherent organization of the built environment), navigability and sense of place."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.1a)i)c)	Legibility. How are development applications to demonstrate that they 'improve the city's legibility'? What does this even mean?	Revision to Policy 3.2.1.a.i.c : "Contribute to the city's legibility (meaning the coherent organization of the built environment), navigability and sense of place."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.1b)iii)	Over-development – height/density. Request adding the words 'in the Official Plan' otherwise applications for rezoning to increase height would be automatically considered over-development.	Policy 3.2.1.c.iii. will be changed to: "Development that proposes excessive height or density"
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.2	Policy 3.2.2 provides standards to evaluate development applications, including that "all development applications shall demonstrate how the proposal contributes to…", and goes on to outline a number of criteria that includes how an application "contributes to the diversity of housing types and tenures in the neighbourhood", amongst several other aspects. In our submission, not all development applications would be appropriate to contribute towards a housing mix, or other specific criteria that this policy would require contribution towards. Flexibility should be incorporated, and we suggest revised language as follows: "Development applications, where appropriate, should demonstrate how the proposal contributes…"	Policy 3.2.2.a will be changed to: "To ensure the creation of complete neighbourhoods, developments outside of Employment Areas, where appropriate, shall generally be designed to contribute to:"
LSRCA		3	3.2.2	Part of designing for excellence requires consideration for an inclusion of natural elements. It's recommended that an additional sub-objective be included that speaks to this. Suggested wording: f) Respect the environment: incorporate natural elements and features to promote a sustainable and robust natural environment.	This is covered in policy 3.1.1.a (references to sustainability and resilience), as well as in policy 3.1.1.d
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	3	3.2.2.a	Policy 3.2.2(a) requires that "all development applications shall demonstrate how the proposal contributes…" to a list of 9 criteria set-out in the policy. The policy as written suggests that all applications need to meet all the criteria. We encourage staff to build more flexibility into this policy to reflect the reality that new development will contribute to complete communities by meeting "some or all of the criteria as applicable".	Policy 3.2.2.a will be changed to: "To ensure the creation of complete neighbourhoods, developments outside of Employment Areas, where appropriate, shall generally be designed to contribute to:"

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	3	3.2.2.a)	Requires all development applications “shall demonstrate” a number of criteria. Again, a policy that is much too prescriptive and is not achievable for each and every application. Suggest this policy be revised to be more general in nature.	Policy 3.2.2.a will be changed to: "To ensure the creation of complete neighbourhoods, developments outside of Employment Areas, where appropriate, shall generally be designed to contribute to:"
John Bartosik		3	3.2.3	Barrie will protect and improve air quality and promote energy efficiency through enhancement of the City’s tree canopy cover and vegetation to provide shade, reduce the urban heat island effect, trap pollution, and control run-off. This will be implemented through green urban design standards. In regards to your above statement why is it that development of new subdivisions continues in the manner it does by stripping away all trees, brush. wetlands and soil usually to the clay and water table? With a little research I discovered that a newlyman made creek in the annexed lands just south 100 metres from the Madelaine and Mapleview East intersection is actually drainage from a shallow subterranean lake my home and many others are sitting on top of. Tapped and excavated to surface just a short distance downhill from my home at 585 Mapleview Dr. East. My 25 foot dug well has been providing us with an abundance of clean pure water since the 1960's. The amount and quality in this aquifer is now being jeopardized. The surface of the earth has been removed as much as 20 feet in places. This twenty five hectare plot behind my home once owned by Lockmaple? developments will soon be covered with concrete and pavement. The creek will become part of a man made tunneling system running under many homes and streets slated for development as so called storm water management.	The draft new Official Plan cannot be implemented until after approval is given by City Council and then by the Province. At this point, policies in the draft new Official Plan do not apply to current developments; however, they will apply to new developments into the future.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	3	3.2.3	It is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document. For example, all development (including applications for minor variances) shall demonstrate i) passive energy design strategies, iii) use of environmentally preferable products, iv) enhancement of environmental quality, and vii) resource conservation through operational and maintenance practices, among others. It is requested that these policies be removed.	Revision to 3.2.3.a): "To support the City's sustainable design priorities, all development applications shall demonstrate how the City's sustainable design priorities are being addressed, including through:"
PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.3	it is not understood how the policies of 3.2.3 can (or should) be achieved through a land use document for example, all development (which would include, for example, minor variances shall demonstrate passive design strategies, use of environmentally preferable products, enhancement of environmental quality, and optimization of operational and maintenance practices, among others.	Revision to 3.2.3.a): "To support the City's sustainable design priorities, all development applications shall demonstrate how the City's sustainable design priorities are being addressed, including through:"

PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.2.3.1	A Sustainable Development Report is a new requirement for specific development applications. For a development application to demonstrate conformity to the Official Plan, it is unknown how these policies are to be addressed and their appropriateness in a land use planning document is questioned.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) will be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	3	3.2.3.1	It is requested that policy 3.2.3.1 be removed. Several of the criteria are not land use related (e.g. demonstrating enhanced indoor air quality and use of various building products) and some can be provided for in the Urban Design Guidelines, such as the provision of permeable pavers and drought resistant landscaping.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) should be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.
Kelly Patterson McGrath		3	3.2.3.1	GREEN CITY needs to be the overall driving force behind this plan, Barrie needs to be seen as the leader in sustainable development, caring for it's community in a healthy way that takes care of our beautiful Lake Simcoe, greenspace and attracts businesses and development that embrace that focus. Green Development Standards need to be developed quickly using best practices that already exist. We need to be very clear and firm with new developments that the City will not entertain your development unless basic criteria are met. Look to Passive House Canada. In fact, GREEN STANDARDS need to be the driving force in all areas/departments of the City. Each department could have a very specific and clear matrix that guides purchases, practices (Parks maintenance, transportation usage, idling, roads maintenance, fleet, greenhouse, native species etc.) and these GREEN standards need to be clear and shared with the residents to encourage similar behaviors that enhance and care for our City's greenspace, lands and water.	We agree that Green Standards are very important for new developments, and the green standards within the draft new Official Plan can be found in section 3.2.3.1. We will also be carrying forward green standard recommendations in the City-wide Urban Design Guidelines as well as in other City documents. One of City Council's strategic priorities is to "build a greener Barrie while mitigating and adapting to climate change."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	3	3.2.3.1	Requires a sustainable development report, including an ability to enhance indoor air quality. As noted previously, what is this and why is it required? How is a sustainable report or development for that matter able to enhance indoor air quality? Again, the use of "required" and "shall" make this policy nearly impossible to achieve and again, more flexible language should be utilized.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) should be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.

Karen Buck		3	3.2.3.1	Roofs, on all buildings should be utilized for renewable solar electricity used, first, by the building and any excess energy going to the electricity grid as a new metering contract.	In section 3.2.2.1, the following guidelines are given in relation to new developments: that they shall "incorporate green roofs into building design" (xi) and that they "maximize solar gains and be constructed in a manner that facilitates future solar energy installations" (ii)
LSRCA		3	3.2.3.1	Green Development Standards should also include the requirement for Low Impact Development as well as maximizing the use of native plants for landscaping, to the greatest extent possible. Suggested wording: m) Incorporate low impact development; and, n) Maximize the use native plant material in landscape design.	Policy 3.2.3.1.viii) already references the use of native plants in landscaping The following change will be made to Policy 3.2.3.1.x: "incorporate low-impact development and maximize permeable surfaces, including the provision of permeable driveways"
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.2.3.1.a	This comment was not addressed in our previous submission. What qualifications would the reviewers of the Sustainability Development Report hold and how much influence will they have to alter proposals? The green standards being developed should focus on those already successfully implemented by the industry rather than a Council or staff directive with no expertise. Is the City willing to have flat roofs facing south onto main roads to maximize solar? Passive housing designs can be encouraged with advanced building technologies have unintended consequences. For example, do staff have a level of knowledge to ensure that increased sunlight will not overheat residents, as this approach has been shown to be erroneous in many jurisdictions across Canada, despite good intentions of Passive Haus certifications. Rapidly changing technology and building science should not be captured in an Official Plan document.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) will be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.3.1a)	Green Development Standards. It is not appropriate to require a review of many of the items listed (i.e., air quality) when dealing with applications for OPA and ZBLA. Accordingly, the Sustainable Development Report, if it must be provided, should only be provided for Site Plan applications. Please consider the objective of this policy. The Landowners feel that it is inappropriate to require every new development to provide a Sustainable Development Report and instead, ask that you consider changing the policy to state that the Planning or Urban Design Report in support of an application will contain a section detailing sustainability in consideration of the items stated in i-ix), where appropriate and applicable. Please consider that the word 'shall' does not provide suitable Official Plan flexibility to deal with the range and scale of development applications. Not every application will achieve policies i)-xii). We fail to understand how you expect these features to be considered as part of most OPA/ZBLA applications or how providing/not these measures will be evaluated by staff.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) will be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.3.a	Policy 3.2.3a) states that "All development applications received by the City shall demonstrate how the City's sustainable design priorities are achieved" and provides a range of priorities. In our submission flexibility should be provided, since demonstrating the achievement of the priorities may not be applicable or appropriate for all development applications.	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) will be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.
LSRCA		3	3.2.3.v	It's not clear what is meant by "enhancement environmental quality". Enhancement of the natural environment?	3.2.3.v can be changed to "enhancement of the natural environment"
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.3a)	This policy states that all development application must demonstrate how the City will achieve sustainable design priorities. Request that the prescriptive language "shall' be replaced with 'area encouraged". There is no practical way that most typical development applications can demonstrate the use of environmentally sensitive products or adapting to Barrie's seasonal changes. Please explain how every development application is supposed to respond to this policy?	The last sentence of 3.2.3.1.a) will be changed to: "While justification can be made for why certain best practices are not being pursued, the report shall demonstrate how the development proposal intends to:" The document is aligned with land use planning insofar as the document will help to guide the development in Barrie of new buildings that are sustainable and green.

LSRCA		3	3.2.4.1	Part of creating a connected and vibrant public realm involves building community appreciation for these spaces. The City should consider committing to providing educational resources, such as nature interpretation. Suggested wording: To design and develop a connected and vibrant public realm, the City will: i) create resources, such as interpretive signage, to better connect residents with natural spaces and build communal appreciation for these natural assets.	The Official Plan offers a broader land-use vision for the city; however, the City would be open to considering through other means.
LSRCA		3	3.2.4.1.viii	Consider revising this statement to be more in-line with ecological terms and language. Suggested wording: h) Encourage sustainable development practices and enhancement or restoration of degraded natural heritage features (e.g. sustainable forest management, etc.)	Policy 3.2.4.1.viii will be changed to address this.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.4.5.b)	Private streets shall be designed similar to public streets. The Landowners request that this policy be revised to maintain the intent (i.e. allow for pedestrian circulation, etc.). This OP policy should not prescribe curb types (inappropriate OP level detail) and it needs to recognize that are narrower and are designed to a different, not similar, design standard.	We have removed the policy asking for private streets designed similarly to public streets. We will provide guidelines/standards for private streets through other means.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.4.5.c	Policy 3.2.4.5c) states that “Internal private streets will be used to divide large sites into a grid of blocks and roadways to facilitate safe pedestrian and vehicular movement and that frame appropriately sized development parcels. Internal private streets will be designed to interconnect with adjacent properties to create an overall cohesive and integrated circulation network wherever possible.” In our submission it is not clear as to the applicability of this policy, if the intention is for comprehensive redevelopment, and what may be considered “large sites”.	The City of Barrie has guidelines for a maximum block size. Generally, this would apply to any site larger than the maximum block size. We will also be revising the policy to read as follows: "Where appropriate, internal private streets will be used to divide large sites into a grid of blocks and roadways to facilitate safe pedestrian and vehicular movement and that frame appropriately sized development parcels. Internal private streets will be designed to interconnect with adjacent properties to create an overall cohesive and integrated circulation network wherever possible.”
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.2.4.6	Requires consolidation of amenity areas. Significant progress and flexibility has been made in Hewitt’s/Salem and in Mixed Policy areas in Barrie to recognize that consolidating amenity spaces can negatively impact site design, particularly on smaller parcels. At a minimum, please change the prescriptive text ‘shall be’ to ‘encouraged to be’.	We will be revising the policy as follows: "Amenity areas are strongly encouraged to be consolidated and centrally located, and indoor/outdoor amenity areas should be co-located wherever possible."

Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.2.4.6.a	Policy 3.3.4.6a) states that “Amenity areas shall be consolidated and centrally located”. In our submission, flexibility should be afforded to the policy, such that it may be more appropriate for unconsolidated amenity space, or in a less centralized location due to specific circumstances. We suggest “shall” be replaced with “should”.	We will be revising the policy as follows: "Amenity areas are strongly encouraged to be consolidated and centrally located, and indoor/outdoor amenity areas should be co-located wherever possible."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.3.1.b	Policy 3.3.1c) states “Blank facades facing a street, open space or park shall not be permitted”. In our submission, flexibility should be afforded to this policy to consider site specific circumstances, and we suggest revised language as follows: “Blank facades facing a street, open space or park shall be discouraged”.	Recommended change to Policy 3.3.1.b: "Blank walls facing a street, open space or park shall be strongly discouraged."
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	3	3.3.1.d	Section 3.3.1.d is in direct conflict with the City’s Engineering Standards. In particular, Transportation Planning requires that setbacks to driveways on corner lots be so far away from the intersection that it is not possible to put a ground-related building in close proximity to the intersection. While we support this policy (as-is) in the OP, this needs to be fully communicated and updated in the Engineering Standards.	We support this poicy. Following the approval of the new Official Plan, some City standards will need to be updated.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.1d)	Intersections of major streets shall be emphasized by placing buildings in close proximity to intersections and building entrances are visible from that intersection. This is a notable and agreeable policy; however, in our experience, the City’s Transportation Design Manual standards are continually changing, particularly relating to intersections. The most recent example being the requirement for very large setbacks for driveways to ground oriented housing. Discussions with City Engineering are needed to ensure this policy will be properly implemented.	We support this poicy. Following the approval of the new Official Plan, some City standards will need to be updated.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.2.c)	Requires new development to respect and reinforce the scale, massing and setback and orientation in the immediate area. Request the policy be revised to add the words “in older established neighbourhoods in the built-up area”. This policy would be inappropriately applied in DGA, MTSA, Intensification Corridors etc.	This policy is for low-residential everywhere. However, we will replace the word "reinforce" with "complement" to allow for greater flexibility. The revised policy 3.3.2.c. should then read: "In Neighbourhood Areas where new Detached Houses, Semi-Detached Houses, and Townhouses are proposed, they shall respect and complement the scale, massing, setback and orientation of other built and approved houses of the same type in the immediate area and shall be consistent with the other policies in this Plan."

Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3.2.d.	d) Where a Townhouse end unit does not front a public street but flanks a public street, the flanking unit(s) shall provide a front-yard and front-door pedestrian entrance facing the public street. Comment: We do not agree that this should be a mandatory requirement. Enhanced architectural elements can be recommended along flanking units. Front Door Entrances for townhouse units that are 4.5 metres in width is impossible to achieve on the flanking frontage.	Revised policy wording: "Where a Townhouse end unit does not front a public street but flanks a public street, the flanking unit(s) should provide a front-yard and front-door pedestrian entrance facing the public street."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	3	3.3.2.e)	Requires stacked townhouses to be designed to resemble a traditional street townhouse. The Salem Landowners request this policy be amended as stacked townhouses by their very nature of completely different than a traditional townhouse dwelling.	The policy is that stacked townhouses shall "generally resemble" a traditional street townhouse. We believe that this allows a significant amount of flexibility, while reinforcing that there should be some resemblance in design, whether one considers a modern or traditional looking townhouse.
377 Big Bay Point Rd	Brandi Clement / Jones Consulting	3	3.3.2.f	Our client, Big Bay 4 Inc., is in the process of developing the lands known municipally as 377 Big Bay Point Road with upwards of 29 Townhouses. Formal applications for a Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Condominium have not been submitted as of yet but are expected to be submitted to the City in the summer of 2021. The 2nd Draft of the Official Plan designates the subject lands as Neighbourhood Area. Based on these policies, the proposed use is permitted; however, the density of the proposed townhouse development does not meet the minimum density standard of 60.0 units per hectare considering the lands front onto Big Bay Point Road, an arterial road. The proposed development does not propose a rear yard setback of 7.5 metres as the infill site is constrained by the shape and topography of the lot. We agree with the softened language in the 2nd Official Plan Draft which notes 'should be' rather than 'shall be' as long as this is considered to be less restrictive language meaning that if for various reasons a property cannot achieve this density then an Official Plan Amendment is not required. Further, in our opinion the Official Plan should not have prescriptive language requiring a particular setback distance. We would request that the City have language suggesting how to provide appropriate buffers between new and existing development but that language identifying exact distances be excluded.	Policy 3.3.2(f) will be changed to: "To provide appropriate privacy and daylight/sunlight conditions for any adjacent lower scale housing forms, Low-Rise Buildings on a lot that abuts the rear yards of a lot with a Detached House, Semi-Detached house or Townhouse should generally be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from the property line and shall be designed with the appropriate transitions to consider a high quality of urban design per the policies of Section 3.2 of this Plan and the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines." It should also be noted that existing approvals will be upheld and that a new transition policy explicitly states this.

Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3.2.f	Low-Rise Buildings on a lot that abuts the rear yards of a lot with a Detached House, Semi-Detached House or Townhouse shall generally be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from the property line and shall be designed with the appropriate transitions to consider a high quality of urban design per the policies of Section 3.2 of this Plan and the City-wide Urban Design Guidelines. Comment: While this policy provides a specific setback requirement, which is often more suited for a Zoning By-law, we interpret this policy to have flexibility with the minimum setback as the word “generally” has been used and the policy reinforces design that provides for an appropriate transition with high quality urban design. Based this, if appropriate the rear yard setback could be less than 7.5m.	This is correct.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.2.l)	Generally, incorporate rear lanes along arterial and mixed use areas. Request that this policy be removed as there are numerous design treatments/options for development, with rear lanes being only one suitable option.	Suggested revised policy 3.3.2.i, to incorporate further flexibility: "Rear lane development is generally encouraged. On narrow lots and particularly along arterials and within intensification and mixed-use areas, rear lanes can help create attractive streetscapes and minimize the impact of driveways on pedestrian circulation and the public realm."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.2f)	Requires development be setback 7.5m from a property line. The Landowners request that the setback be removed from the OP. This is another example of overly prescriptive policy. Barrie’s Zoning By-law has not required a 7m (not 7.5m) rear yard setback going back at least to 1985, and more current standards in place in Hewitt’s permit a 5m rear yard setback. Policy 1.1.3.4 of the PPS states that appropriate development standards should be promoted which facilitate intensification and redevelopment and compact form.	Policy 3.3.2(f) will be changed to: "To provide appropriate privacy and daylight/sunlight conditions for any adjacent lower scale housing forms, Low-Rise Buildings on a lot that abuts the rear yards of a lot with a Detached House, Semi-Detached house or Townhouse should generally be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from the property line and shall be designed with the appropriate transitions to consider a high quality of urban design per the policies of Section 3.2 of this Plan and the City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines."
Gary Bell		3	3.3.3	The question that needs attention is “Where are Mid-Rise Buildings and High- Rise Buildings expected or permitted?” Are there locational criteria in The Plan for these forms of development or re-development?	The heights of buildings correspond with and are dictated by the Land Use Designations. Permissions and expectations aligns with Map 2.
LSRCA		3	3.3.3	It’s recommended that a policy be included that requires development of all greenfield areas be designed in a way that provides residents access to parks, open spaces or natural areas within a reasonable walking distance. i.e. 500 m. The City should also strive to meet this objective in already built areas or areas proposed for redevelopment.	Section 3.3.3. is now about Mid-Rise Buildings; however, the Parks Master Plan governs the greenfield areas in relation to parks. Moreover, section 3.2.2 “Complete Neighbourhood Design” speaks to the importance of connectivity to parks and open spaces.

800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	3	3.3.3.c	We request that the 45 degree angular plane requirement of "Medium Density" transitional policies be removed from the New OP as it too is overly prescriptive for an official plan. There may be instances where a good design can be achieved, but slavish adherence to an abstract angular plane cannot. In such instances, amendment to the OP would be required to allow a design to proceed. As with tower setback provisions, angular plane provisions are better suited to urban design guideline documents which permit a reasonable degree of flexibility.	The intent behind this policy is to uphold an industry standard; it is mostly applicable to infill situations, where having proper transitions is of the utmost importance, to ensure that the development functions well in the context of adjacent properties.
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3.3.h	The rooftop of Mid-Rise Buildings should include landscaped green space, private outdoor amenity space, or environmental sustainability features such as solar panels. Comment: This level of commitment for a developer to achieve is too restrictive and must include some flexibility in building design and construction.	Flexibility in the policy is maintained through the use of the verb "should include" over "shall include."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.3.h)	States that the rooftop of mid-rise building should include landscape green space, private outdoor amenity, or environmental sustainability features. The Landowners request that this policy be revised to state that the City encourages these design features.	The use of "should" over "shall" in this policy maintains flexibility, should there be a reason for not incorporating these elements.
Al McNair		3	3.3.3; 3.3.4	These definitions of building forms should be included in the definitions section of the OP, if they are to be used in this document.	These buildings are delimited by height; therefore, the preface for each section provides a definition.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.3b)i)	Requires the podium on mid-rise buildings to be 3-6 storeys in height. Please explain why a 1 or 2 storey podium is inappropriate?	The base is required to be 3 to 6 storeys in height, while elements above the base would be setback. The ratio of the base height to what's above the base is intended to reduce shadow and wind impacts and to complement the streetscape. At the same time, 3.3.b.i. suggests the base "shall <u>generally</u> be between three and six storeys"; the incorporation of the qualifier "generally" means that, given the appropriate context, an application of a building with a one-to-two storey base could be considered.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.3.3c)	Buildings should generally be setback 7.5m from the property line. Please provide the rationale for this detailed policy. In many examples in Barrie mid-rise buildings have been constructed 5 metres from the property line.	The use of the word "generally" incorporates flexibility. Policy 3.3.3.c. is: "In order to provide appropriate transitions between buildings of varying heights and privacy and daylight/sunlight conditions for any adjacent lower scale buildings, Mid-Rise Buildings on a lot that abuts the rear yars of a lot with a Low-Rise Residential building shall generally be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres..." This is a common Official Plan policy, and appears, for instance, in Vaughan's Official Plan.

PBM Realty Holdings / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4	High Rise Buildings, we have concerns with the prescriptive nature of many of the specific urban design criteria presented and proposed to be enshrined as OP policy rather than incorporated within the City's forthcoming Draft Urban Design Guidelines and Zoning By-law.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop “official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design” (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. The criteria incorporated into Section 3.3.4 of the Official Plan have continued to be included due to their importance in achieving the type of city that stakeholders have expressed they would like Barrie to become. The new City-Wide Urban Design Guidelines will provide greater built form guidance and is designed to work in collaboration with the Official Plan and the Zoning By-law.
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4	Section 3.3.4 - High Rise buildings (change to read) (a)(ii)(d) Any tower, including its balconies, should be setback from the podium by a minimum of 3.0 metres along all public street frontages to ensure an appropriate human-scaled pedestrian environment and mitigate wind impacts at street level; (a)(ii)(f) Where more than one High-Rise Building is located on the same lot, the distance between the towers at the twelfth storey and above shall be at least 25.0 metres, (a)(ii)(c) The tower of a High-Rise Building should be setback a minimum of 12.5 metres from: (I) the side property line; (2) the rear property line, and; (3) the centre line of an abutting right-ofway.	As highlighted in policy 3.1.3.1.a: "Many of the Urban Design Standards are phrased with the terms "will" or "shall," or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies provided in Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4." These policies will remain "shall" and "will" for a variety of reasons and are consistent or compare with many other Official Plans. However, we will be expanding policy 3.3.4.a.ii.c. to allow for the reduction of setbacks when a lot of adjacent to a natural area, a highway or another use where it may be appropriate to have the building closer to the rear lot line.
LSRCA		3	3.3.4.5	The City should commit to providing educational resources to the community in the form of interpretive signage. Consider including an additional policy in this section that speaks to this. Suggested wording: b) The City is committed to providing residents with opportunities for meaningful connections to public spaces and will provide interpretive signage along trails and in parks with information on the cultural and natural heritage in the area.	The Official Plan offers a broader land-use vision for the city; however, the City would be open to considering this through other means.
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4.a.ii.c	This should be written to generally apply, some sites may be appropriate for a reduced rear yard setback such as if a site backs onto a natural area, highway or other use where it is appropriate to site the building closer to the rear lot line. this should be a general policy and if it cannot be achieved other provisions to apply a buffer/transition can be applied.	Recommended change: expand policy 3.3.4.a.ii.c. to allow for the reduction of setbacks when a lot of adjacent to a natural area, a highway or another use where it may be appropriate to have the building closer to the rear lot line.

10-24 Grove Street	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4.a.ii.g	In order to provide appropriate transitions, towers should generally be setback at least 70.0 metres from low rise residential built form on lands designated Neighbourhood Areas on Map 2; however, this does not apply to those towers located within the Urban Growth Centre which will be instead be setback at least 30.0 metres.	A policy definitively regulating setbacks from residential built form is appropriate, and in part responds to resident concerns heard during the engagement phase.
Artenosi Developments Group: 284 + 286 Dunlop & 119 + 121 Henry St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4.a.ii.g	this should be a general policy and if it cannot be achieved other provisions to apply a buffer/transition can be applied.	A policy definitively regulating setbacks from residential built form is appropriate, and in part responds to resident concerns heard during the engagement phase.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.3.4.a.ii.i	Policy 3.3.4a)ii) states that "where multiple towers are proposed on the same site, tower heights shall be staggered by a minimum of five storeys…" In our submission, this policy is overly prescriptive and may result in limitations to appropriate levels of intensification, or not permit good design. We suggest revised language as follows: "Development should be designed in a manner so as to provide variation in building mass, including but not limited to staggering of building heights where appropriate".	Recommended policy change for 3.3.4.a.ii.i: "where multiple towers are proposed on the same site, tower heights should generally be staggered by a minimum of five storeys…"
10-24 Grove Street West	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	3	3.3.4.a.ii.i	this should be removed or be a general policy, no need to provide a minimum of 5 storeys of separation between every tower. Visual interest can be provided for in other ways.	Recommended policy change for 3.3.4.a.ii.i: "where multiple towers are proposed on the same site, tower heights should generally be staggered by a minimum of five storeys…"
17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3.4.ii.c	For example, Policy 3.3.4.ii.c. states that "The tower will be setback a minimum of 15.0 metres from: (1) the side property line; (2) the rear property line, and; (3) the centre line of an abutting right-ofway;". This policy will restrict potential development opportunities within the City where a site may be appropriate for tower placement however the site constraints are such that a tower does not meet one of the setback criteria triggering an OPA. It is reasonable for a development to proceed with a tower that is sited closer to a property line without an OPA where it is demonstratable that the impacts of a reduced tower setback are mitigated (such as along a rail corridor or highway).	As highlighted in policy 3.1.3.1.a: "Many of the Urban Design Standards are phrased with the terms "will" or "shall," or phrased in the active voice (rather than the passive voice), which means that every new development approved by the City must be in full conformity with the relevant policies provided in Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4." These policies will remain "shall" and "will" for a variety of reasons and are consistent or compare with many other Official Plans. However, we will be expanding policy 3.3.4.a.ii.c. to allow for the reduction of setbacks when a lot of adjacent to a natural area, a highway or another use where it may be appropriate to have the building closer to the lot line.

Park Place	IPS / Darren Vella	3	3.3.4.ii.f	High-Rise Buildings Where more than one High-Rise Building is located on the same lot, the distance between the towers at the twelfth storey and above shall be at least 30.0 metres… From our recent experience in designing and developing multi tower sites we suggest that the minimum distance between towers should be 25m. This requirement is in place within several large urban centres throughout the Golden Greater Horseshoe and creates a desirable built form. We would also request consideration within the Plan that any deviation from these requirements could be supported by an in depth Urban Design Study.	We feel that 30 metres distance is appropriate; for instance, the distance between towers in Toronto is required to be 25 metres … as our urban scale is more moderate, we feel that having 5 metres more between towers is appropriate.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	3	3.3.4.ii.g	It is requested that High-Rise Building policy 3.3.4(ii)(g) dealing with minimum setbacks of towers from “Neighbourhood Areas” be removed as this design parameter is not appropriate for an official plan. Rather, this type of language is best incorporated into urban design guidelines. We recommend that any required setback for towers in MTSA’s, SGA’s or Intensification Corridors be the same as apply to towers in the Urban Growth Centres, being suggested 30 metres or less dependent on other design parameters as may be specified in the urban design guidelines and in context with local site conditions.	The policy has been changed to:"In order to provide appropriate transitions, towers will be setback at least 70.0 metres from low rise residential built form on lands designated Neighbourhood Areas on Map 2; however, for towers located within the Urban Growth Centre or a Major Transit Station Area, an appropriate reduction to the minimum setback from low rise residential may be considered." As high-rises are essentially only permitted in MTSAs, SGAs and the UGC, allowing lower permissions for everything would stray to far from intent. This will be further regulated through the Zoning By-law.
Canadian Tire Real Estate / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.3.5	Policy 3.3.5 states “The following urban design standards apply to Single Storey Employment Buildings: a) Single Storey Employment Buildings are those buildings exclusively located within Employment Areas and are generally low-rise in form, including but not limited to warehouses, distribution centres, and manufacturing or assembly facilities.” With the permissions for major retail in the Employment Area – Non Industrial designation, clarity should be provided that the Policies are not applicable to Major Retail uses.	Policy will be revised to read: "While Employment Areas may see a range of building types, single storey Employment Buildings are those buildings exclusively located within Employment Areas and are generally low-rise in form, including but not limited to warehouses, distribution centres, and manufacturing or assembly facilities."
LSRCA		3	3.3.5.2.1.b.vii	Please consider the inclusion of direction pertaining to SWM storage facilities beneath park space (i.e. tanks under soccer fields)	The Official Plan offers a broader land-use vision for the city; however, the City would be open to considering this through other means.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	3	3.3.6.b	Policy 3.3.6b) would require retail uses to provide a variety of building heights as part of the same building. In our submission, this policy provides an inappropriate standard for building design that would promote inefficient standards for development. We suggest that this draft policy be better suited as an urban design guidelines, or that revised wording be considered which allows for flexibility.	Suggested revised wording for 3.3.6.b.ii: "For major retail development as a grouping of multiple stores, the individual stores shall create visual interest and avoid monotony through variation in built form. For instance, individual stores should vary in height and roofline, and different stores should have exterior materials indicative of the store/merchant/tenant."

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	3	3.4h)	Pervious surfaces in surface parking lots to the “greatest extent possible. Please replace the word “shall” with “encouraged to”. Also, the words ‘greatest extent possible’ are inappropriate. Who decides what is possible and using what criteria?	Suggested revised wording: "Where possible, surface parking lots shall incorporate the use of pervious surfaces."
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	4	4.7	The Parking solutions identified in Section 4.7 identify that as a minimum, request for a reduction in parking spaces will be in accordance with the City’s Cash-in-lieu of Parking Bylaw. It is difficult to find this Bylaw on the City Website. The policies regarding parking should explain the Cash-in-Lieu of Parking Bylaw or identify a link that can be used to view the Bylaw.	The Official Plan, at this time, is not a document designed to hyperlink to other documents. At the same time, we will review the location of the Cash-in-Lieu Parking By-law on the City website to make sure that it is easily accessible.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	4	4.0 and throughout	The Polices of Section 4 and other polices throughout the plan establish a clear direction to implement Complete Streets. The achievement of complete streets, in our view, must be balanced and flexible to respond the local and planned urban contexts. To that end, we encourage the City to make use of positive city-building policies, particularly the policies in section 4.0, which aim to “transform how people move around and through Barrie”. Further, we strongly encourage the City to explore integrating the numerous policies that promote Complete Streets, resulting in new language that allows for right-of-way widths to be reduced in urban contexts. For example, Policy 4.2 (b) requires streets in Barrie to be designed as “Complete Streets” to provide for all modes of travel including pedestrian zones, cycling zones, and vehicular zones. For sites located within an Urban Growth Centre, we strongly feel we can meet these objectives within reduced right-of-ways, as demonstrated in other municipalities.	Policy 4.2.b. states that "streetscapes shall be designed to generally consider the following complete street zones as per Figure 3 below." The word "generally" maintains flexibility, allowing for some variance according to urban context when justified. Please also note policy 4.2.3.1.l: "Consider, in certain cases, a reduced setback width, or reduced street pavement where a reduced setback width is not possible, for streets that are part of the complete street network, in order to facilitate wider sidewalks, the addition of cycling lanes, transit priority lanes and/or other geographic needs."

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	4	4.1.1.e	In general terms, the underlying principle of the Mobility policies is to promote a reduced dependency upon automobiles through the establishment of a comprehensive mobility network which places emphasis upon both public transit and active modes of transportation, namely walking and cycling. Section 4.1.1 (d) states that the intent is to achieve a modal split of 12 percent as of 2041 . Clarification is sought as to how this metric is to be measured relative to other modes of transportation. Is it the intent of the Plan that other modes of transportation, namely transit and active modes, will represent the balance, some 88 percent, of movements within the City of Barrie?	This policy will be taken out as it is confusing and also implicit in policies prioritizing active transportation. Further direction will come from the Transportation Master Plan.
Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	4	4.1.1.i	Throughout Part Four of the draft Plan, reference is made to development of an ACES mobility network. It is respectfully submitted that, to afford readers an improved understanding of the intent of the policy statement in question, the initial reference, specifically in Section 4.1.1 (i), should be to the creation of an Automated Connected Electronic Shared mobility network if, in fact, that is what is intended by the policy statement in question. It would also be of benefit to the reader if some form of guidance could be provided as to the means by which this objective will be achieved, for example by means of the introduction of car pooling and ride share facilities. This would avoid the need for the reader to refer to the Transportation Master Plan as inferred by the introductory statements provided in Section 4.1.	Agree that the acronym should be spelled out on first reference (Autonomous, Connected, Electric, Shared). As this is an objective, not a policy, it is more stating the City's intent to advance in this direction. Preparing for autonomous vehicles is an endeavour that will take place through much more planning, and as policies are adopted, these will be shared and communicated publicly. I should also note the addition of policy 3.4.i: "To prepare for the widespread use of electric vehicles, the City will investigate and plan for the installation of Level II EV charging stations at parking stalls across the city, including for residential, commercial and industrial buildings."
Karen Buck		4	4.2.1	I am very supportive of “Complete Streets” that would be accomplished by new and complete networks for active transportation. The new networks would have to be built with an emphasis on “safety” through separation from car traffic to really engage the public to leave their cars at home and ride or walk to work year round.	This section has been revised to read: "The concept of complete streets is a transportation and design philosophy that requires streets to be planned, designed, operated and maintained to enable safe, convenient and comfortable travel and access for all users and abilities regardless of their mode of transportation." Safety for cyclists therefore will be encouraged and ways of further providing this safety will be investigated. Other policies in this chapter additionally speak to designing, where feasible, separate bike lanes.
LSRCA		4	4.2.1	The use of Low Impact Design should be included with the design principles for the mobility network. Suggested wording: f) Incorporate Low Impact Design elements into the road right of way, wherever feasible.	This policy has been added to section 4.2.3.1 (policy O).

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	4	4.2.1.a) v)	Requires avoiding the use of window streets. Why are window streets to be avoided? Engineering standards will preclude multiple connection points to collector or arterial roads which is where this condition is typically utilized. This means you are looking for reverse frontage, through lot or flankage conditions, which are not desirable. This policy should not be included in the Official Plan.	We believe that functional design is possible without the implementation of window streets. At the same time, we will revise policy 4.2.1.a.v. to read: "avoid, where possible, cul-de-sacs and window streets."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.2.1a)ii)&iii)	80-100m block depth. The Landowners feel that artificially restricting block depth 80-100m will unnecessarily reduce development opportunities in the Secondary Plan area. 150 metres is more appropriate. Please consider removing the 80-100m depth requirement in its entirety, or at least move it to the Urban Design Guidelines document.	The use of "generally ensure" at the beginning of the policy allows for some variability. If you want to vary from the suggested length and depth for streets and blocks, then you will need to demonstrate how the variance still meets the objectives of walkability.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.2.1a)v)	Avoid 'window streets'. Window streets have been an acceptable design option throughout the design of Hewitt's/Salem. Please explain why this is to be avoided. The Landowners request that the words "Window Streets' be removed from this policy.	We believe that functional design is possible without the implementation of window streets. At the same time, we will revise policy 4.2.1.a.v. to read: "avoid, where possible, cul-de-sacs and window streets."
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	4	4.2.3.1	Numerous policies within the OP are very detailed and prescriptive (e.g. 4.2.3.1 identifies details like minimum street tree planting distances, or the number of houses on a street before dual sidewalks are required). This level of detail is not appropriate at the OP level and should be directed towards the City's engineering standards and/or zoning by-law. Implementation is an issue as an OPA would be required if the standard could not be achieved, regardless of how minor the deviation may be.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. The criteria incorporated into Section 4.2.3.1 of the Official Plan have continued to be included due to their importance in achieving the type of city that stakeholders have expressed they would like Barrie to become. Our intent has been to design them to work in coordination with the Zoning By-law and the City's engineering standards. Staff have also reviewed these policies, and in some cases made changes to incorporate greater flexibility and to ensure appropriateness.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.2.3.1.b)	Requires sidewalks on 2 sides of the street in most areas. This matter was discussed at length during the preparation of the Hewitt's/Salem Secondary Plans and Council established policies in those Plans that detail the dual sidewalk requirement. The decision on dual sidewalk requirements are reviewed during the Conformity Submission where dual/single sidewalk streets are illustrated on the Pedestrian Circulation Plan. The Landowners request that the current process continue and that the words "generally be" at the beginning of this policy. It is important to avoid a policy interpretation that would result in dual sidewalks on most locak streets, as this would require large budget increases to the City for snow clearing/maintenance, and asset management (replacement). Adding dual sidewalks on most local streets also reduces off-street parking, creates additional servicing/utility conflicts, and significantly adds significant hard surfaces/runoff from an environmental and stormwater management perspective.	Suggested revision: 4.2.3.1.b) shall read: "Provide sidewalks on both sides of all collectors and arterial roads, and in some cases local streets, as per the in-effect Transportation Demand Management plan or future City standards." The revision to the policy provides more flexibility, and should address the concern stated.
LSRCA		4	4.2.3.1.b.ii	The amount of compaction required to facilitate sidewalks has a negative impact on street trees and their ability to establish and reach maturity. Maintaining sidewalks is also costly for the City (i.e. snow clearing, repairs, etc.). Consider opportunities to reduce the amount of sidewalk in residential areas. Suggested wording: b) ii) Residential streets with less than 50 dwelling units along the entire length of street or for streets that terminate in a dead-end.	The guidelines regarding sidewalks follow City standards. If/when we update City standards for sidewalks, this will be a consideration.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	4	4.2.3.2	Requires private roads to have the same standard as a public road. As noted previously, this defeats the purpose of having condominium tenure. The Salem Landowners request this policy be removed. If the issue is related to a homeowner not understanding the difference between a condo road and a public road, we suggest that a home buyers map would help to educate the purchaser on the differences.	We have removed the policy asking for private streets to be designed similarly to public streets. We will provide guidelines/standards for private streets through other means.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.2.3.2a)	Private condo streets will generally incorporate the same standards as public streets. The Landowners request that this policy be removed because it is unreasonable to require private roads to be developed to the same standard as public roads. This policy will lead to less efficient design, and worse, to the complete elimination of condominium roads. We understand that this policy was developed in response to complaints from condominium homeowners. Please consider alternative responses such as requiring the preparation of a 'Condominium Information Map' that educates condo buyers. This would be similar to the 'Community Information Map" prepared for each subdivision to education purchasers.	We have removed the policy asking for private streets to be designed similarly to public streets. We will provide guidelines/standards for private streets through other means.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	4	4.3.1.2	Sets out a number of standards for arterial roads. As noted above, this policy will seek to restrict access which will limit the ability to create a flankage situation thereby requiring either through lots or reverse frontage (also discouraged).	Section 4.3.1.2 has been clarified and updated. We seek to restrict access to arterial roads for a number of reasons; the preference for residential along an arterial is to have side yard frontage or direct frontage with rear access.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	4	4.3.1.2.q.vii	Policy No. 4.3.1.2 (vii) states "If the City has identified a street a part of the complete street network, reconfiguration resulting in a reduced street pavement width (to facilitate wider sidewalks and/or the addition of cycling lanes and/or transit priority lanes) may be explored with the City's Engineering Department.". We request that the City expand and prioritize this policy, emphasizing that in Urban Growth Centres, a smaller right-of-way width should be a priority in design and implementation of Complete Streets. We encourage the City to explore best practices in other municipalities, which include portions of the pedestrian clearways being provided on private property, seamlessly incorporated within a redevelopment of a site.	This policy has been updated to account for variances that may be needed in certain contexts. Please see policy 4.2.3.1.l.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	4	4.3.1.3	Speaks to collector roads. Same comment as above.	These policies have been clarified and updated. We seek to restrict access to collector's roads for a number of reasons, but the restrictions are reduced in comparison with what's required for Arterial Streets.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.3d) & e)	Requires development to have direct street frontage, and only where this is not feasible, that side yards can face a street. 1) Policies d) and e) have duplicate elements. 2) Please clarify the 'feasibility' criteria? 3) The intention of this policy is not clear as it would appear to require more driveways (rather than side lots) on a collector road which is contrary to the direction provided by the City's traffic Department. 4) This policy would also reduce lotting efficiency. 5) The Landowners request removal of these two policies.	These policies been clarified and updated and the duplicative elements removed.

Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	4	4.3.1.4.d	Section 4.3.1.4.d requires that sidewalks in certain areas be "substantially widened beyond the City standard". This is very open ended and may not be suitable in all locations, e.g. sidewalks in front of ground-related housing in Neighbourhood Areas within the MTSA. This policy should be revised to speak to the potential need for wider sidewalks in this area, and rely on updated City standards that provide an acceptable range of widths to be used based on the circumstance. And perhaps this is more appropriate to be included in Urban Design Guidelines.	Suggested revision to policy: "Where appropriate, sidewalks on Local Streets shall be substantially widened beyond the City standard in Strategic Growth Areas, the Urban Growth Centre, Major Transit Station Areas, and around transit stops."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.4a)i)	Require grid street patterns while recognizing constraints. The Landowners request that the word 'grid' be replaced with 'modified grid' which is appropriate and consistent with the policies in the Hewitt's and Salem Secondary Plans.	Suggested revision to policy: "Be oriented in a grid or modified grid, while accounting for topographical constraints, the desire for solar orientation or other special considerations including but not limited to connections to adjoining subdivisions."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.4d)	Local street sidewalks shall be substantially widened beyond City standard in SGA's, UGC, MTSA's and around transit stops. The Landowners request that this policy be removed because there is no apparently flexibility (hence the language 'shall be') and there are local street locations where widened sidewalks would be unnecessary and would not meaningfully enhance pedestrian movement (i.e. local ground related housing within Neighbourhood Areas that are within an MTSA). If this policy remains, the words "shall be" should changed to "may be" and the criteria for considering same should be included.	Suggested revision to policy: "Where appropriate, sidewalks on Local Streets shall be substantially widened beyond the City standard in Strategic Growth Areas, the Urban Growth Centre, Major Transit Station Areas, and around transit stops."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.5	Laneway policies. The Landowners request that the word 'Public or Private" be placed in front of "Laneway" and rewritten to include public laneway policies. The cross section in this section should match the public laneway standards developed and approved for use in Hewitt's and Salem. The Landowners object to any laneway policy (private or public) that requires dual sidewalks as illustrated in Figure 8.	The laneway image has been removed to avoid interpretation that a laneway must have dual sidewalks. The aim of this section is to set out the intent for laneways overall, though we have aimed for greater flexibility where appropriate. The preference is to have these policies lay out the vision for both public or private laneways.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.5	Figure 7 Laneway Streetscape. Request that the Laneway figure be revised to show one, not two, pedestrian zones. Dual pedestrian sidewalks are unnecessary in private developments, increase condominium maintenance fees, and reduce design efficiency.	The laneway image has been removed to avoid interpretation that a laneway must have dual sidewalks

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	4	4.3.1.6.3.h	requires cycling storage lockers, racks, shower facilities, and repair apparatus in mixed-use buildings, residential apartment buildings, institutional, and office buildings. It is submitted that a land use plan should not be dictating uses interior to a building.	Cycling storage does impact land use; just as parking does. At the same time, the policy will be revised to be clearer and more flexible, with more specific language being reserved for the Zoning By-law. Suggested policy revision: "Through bicycle parking and facilities standards within the Zoning By-law, the City will require proponents to plan and provide cycling facilities for mixed-use buildings, residential apartment buildings, institutional use buildings and office buildings."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.3.1.6.3h)	Requires cycling facilities such as lockers, shower facilities and tire repair apparatus in mixed use buildings, residential apartments, etc. These matters can be encouraged; however, please advise what section of the Planning Act you are relying on to require internal uses within a building.	Cycling storage does impact land use; just as parking does. At the same time, the policy will be revised to be clearer and more flexible, with more specific language being reserved for the Zoning By-law. Suggested policy revision: "Through bicycle parking and facilities standards within the Zoning By-law, the City will require proponents to plan and provide cycling facilities for mixed-use buildings, residential apartment buildings, institutional use buildings and office buildings."
LSRCA		4	4.3.2.1	To better support the urban forest canopy, a policy should be included that requires street trees for all new streets as well as existing streets. Suggested wording: m) Ensure that street trees are incorporated into the design of any new streets and also planted along existing streets where space allows.	Policy 4.2.3.1.c speaks to providing a “planting and furnishing zone”... this would include the planting of street trees. Moreover, section 6.3.2 is dedicated to Urban Forests, and reinforces the City’s commitment to the planting of additional trees. We will also be looking into establishing an urban tree canopy target after the proper study is completed.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	4	4.3.2.c)	Speaks to the street system being coordinated with Block Plan and Plan of Subdivision approvals. Is the City intending to implement a Block Plan process?	The policy in question has now been removed.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	4	4.3.j	As a final comment on Section 4, Policy 4.3(j) states “Approval of new industrial, commercial and institutional development including new educational facilities, or other public service facilities shall be subject to the provision of adequate transportation service for all modes of transportation including public transit, active transportation and automobiles….”. We seek clarification how staff will assess ‘adequate transportation service’, especially for infill development where the roads and surrounding context are already established a may limit opportunities.	Through our Transportation Master Plans, we will continue to address transportation needs as the City grows; therefore, an evaluation will be made of transit needs with intensification and infill in mind.

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	4	4.5.a	Concern is expressed from the perspective of the future use and development of those lands situated adjacent the northerly limits of Dunlop Street, between Highway No. 400 and Anne Street. The concern follows from Section 4.5.1 (a) which states that ... "industrial uses shall be directed to lands adjacent the freight supportive corridors ... ". When one considers the policies applicable to lands designated as a Strategic Growth Area, where intensification of the built form is a key planning principle, relative to the policies applicable to a Strategic Economic and Employment District and those policies applicable to lands adjacent a Freight Supportive Corridor, the future direction for the use of the lands developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza is somewhat ambiguous and leads to a degree of uncertainty. In order to recognize the intent of the policies applicable to the Dunlop Street West - Anne Street Strategic Growth Area, it is suggested that Section 4.5.1 (a) be modified insofar as is necessary to recognize the use and development of those lands situated adjacent the northerly limits of Dunlop Street, between Highway No. 400 and the intersection of Dunlop Street West and Anne Street, for a range of residential, retail and personal service commercial, and, other non-industrial forms of land use in accordance with the policies applicable to the Strategic Growth Area.	Suggested policy revision: "Industrial uses shall be directed to Employment Area lands adjacent to the freight-supportive corridors to capitalize on the nearby rail lines and terminals and road infrastructure to efficiently move goods over long distances."
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	4	4.6.1.f	The obligation in s. 4.6.1(f) of the New OP, which requires a transportation demand management program for all site plan approval applications for office uses greater than 2000 square metres or buildings with greater than 50 residential units is unduly onerous. This requirement should be removed and transportation planning completed on a scale larger than the individual site.	Policy will be revised to read: "The City will require the preparation and implementation of a transportation demand management program for development applications based on the thresholds identified in the City's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines. The transportation demand management program shall:"
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.6.1f)	Requires a Transportation Demand Management Program for all Site Plan applications consisting of more than 50 units or 2000m2 of office space. 1) This policy would lead to the inappropriate development of hundreds of different Transportation Demand Management Programs. 2) The Landowners request that this policy be removed as it exceeds the statutory authority under Section 41 of the Planning Act.	Policy will be revised to read: "The City will require the preparation and implementation of a transportation demand management program for development applications based on the thresholds identified in the City's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines. The transportation demand management program shall:"

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	4	4.7.d	It is requested that in the suite of City considerations for reducing parking standards, that provision of affordable housing and neighbourhood level commercial be added [4.7 d)].	One of the policies in this section states that "The City may consider reduced parking requirements by … establishing context-sensitive parking requirements that respond to diverse settings, including but not limited to…" Therefore, this policy would be appropriate for further encouraging the reduction of parking standards for affordable housing. Moreover, policy 6.4.2.e.v. states that "consideration will be given to alternative parking ratios" in affordable housing cases.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		4	4.7.e and f	As currently written, Section 4.7 (e) and (f) requires cash-in-lieu in all circumstances where reduced parking is requested. This could translate as a disincentive to reduce parking, especially where the reduction is appropriate or minor. • As such, when a development proposal and a request for a parking reduction is supported by a parking justification study, will the City consider removing the CIL requirement? If not, we do recommend that the City reconsider the language in this policy in order to allow for the review of these reductions on a case-by-case basis, and when findings of technical studies support the request for a parking reduction, that the City move forward without the CIL requirement. • In addition, will CIL be applied to requests for parking reduction on affordable housing projects or municipal projects?	Suggested policy revision for 4.7.e: "Parking reductions may be permitted in all land use designations, in accordance with the City's Cash-in-Lieu of Parking By-law." If an agreement is made to waive Cash-in-Lieu parking requirements, this would be honoured. It is also recommended that policy 4.7.f begin: "The City reserves the right to require cash-in-lieu of parking ..."
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	4	4.7.e and f	Parking Solutions - Please confirm if a ZBA or MV is achieved for a reduced parking requirement, that the City is in support of cash-in-lieu is not required. It is our understanding cash in lieu of parking is only required where the requested reduction is beyond what the City is willing to support.	Suggested policy revision for 4.7.e: "Parking reductions may be permitted in all land use designations, in accordance with the City's Cash-in-Lieu of Parking By-law." If an agreement is made to waive Cash-in-Lieu parking requirements, this would be honoured. It is also recommended that policy 4.7.f begin: "The City reserves the right to require cash-in-lieu of parking ..."

Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	4	4.7.e and f	Policies 4.7 (e) and (f) appropriately permit parking reductions in all land use designations. This permission, however, is qualified as being in accordance with the City's cash-in-lieu of parking by-law. The same policies also require, at a minimum, that cash-in-lieu of parking be paid where a reduction is sought. While requiring cash-in-lieu of parking is an appropriate tool in specific circumstances, it is not in our view, appropriate to require it in all circumstances and that is not how the City has historically, in practice, applied the cash-in-lieu of parking by-law. It is our understanding that the application of cash-in-lieu of parking is the opposite of what is proposed and only applied occasionally. To do otherwise, will serve as a disincentive to reduce parking, even where it is appropriate and justified by a parking justification report.	Suggested policy revision for 4.7.e: "Parking reductions may be permitted in all land use designations, in accordance with the City's Cash-in-Lieu of Parking By-law." If an agreement is made to waive Cash-in-Lieu parking requirements, this would be honoured. It is also recommended that policy 4.7.f begin: "The City reserves the right to require cash-in-lieu of parking ..."
79 Collier	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	4	4.7.p	confirm this policy would not apply to 79 Collier as the property has been out of City ownership for approximately 5+ years.	This policy only applies to City-owned properties that may be candidates for redevelopment moving forward; if a property has already been sold by the City, the policies would no longer apply.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	4	4.7e)	Requires payment of CIL to reduce parking requirements. Request that this policy be limited to the UGC.	Suggested policy revision for 4.7.e: "Parking reductions may be permitted in all land use designations, in accordance with the City's Cash-in-Lieu of Parking By-law."
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	4	general	There are many excellent provisions regarding transportation planning and transit infrastructure. However, similar to concerns with Section 3, many of the requirements may not be practical given the size and urban fabric of Barrie and the City's limited public transit infrastructure. Further, the ongoing maintenance costs must be carefully and comprehensively evaluated, particularly with respect to snow removal requirements/costs.	This feedback is appreciated. At this time, as the comment does not recommend any specific changes to policy, we will simply note that the suggestion has been registered.
LSRCA		5	5.3	This section references the natural heritage system and describes it as being identified as Environmental Protection areas on map 3, but also as identified within the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. It's not clear what's meant by "as identified within the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan", please clarify.	Will be changed to: "The city's Natural Heritage System is comprised of a network of features and areas which are identified as Environmental Protection areas on Map 3 of this Plan, and which receive protection through the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	5	5.5	As noted previously, the Salem Landowners request that Section 5.5, ecological offsetting policies, be removed from the document. Any required offsetting will be undertaken by the LSRCA and as such, there is not a need for policies related to this in the Official Plan.	We will be keeping the reference to ecological offsetting policies in the Official Plan; at the same time, we will clarify that these are not City of Barrie policies, but that the City supports them as "established thorugh local conservation authorities through the development process as part of achieving environmental sustainability."

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	5	5.5	The Hewitt's Landowners request that the ecological offsetting policies found in Section 5.5 be removed from the Official Plan. We understand that these policies were included at the request of the LSRCA. In consideration of the changes through Bill 229 that alters the powers of the Conservation Authority, the Hewitt's Landowners do not feel that an LSRCA offsetting program is appropriate for inclusion in an Official Plan.	We will be keeping the reference to ecological offsetting policies in the Official Plan; at the same time, we will clarify that these are not City of Barrie policies, but that the City supports them as "established thorugh local conservation authorities through the development process as part of achieving environmental sustainability."
LSRCA		5	5.5	This section would benefit from additional details and direction regarding which types, sizes, quality, etc. of features offsetting requirements would apply to. Additional clarification should be provided for where features must be replaced (i.e. elsewhere in the City) and at what ratio (i.e. 2:1 area for woodland, 3:1 area for wetland). Clarification should be provided for whether offsetting applies to the loss of vegetation protection zones and buffers. Clarification should be provided for whether cash-in-lieu would be accepted. If yes, how would this value be determined? Further discussion with LSRCA regarding how the City is envisioning the implementation of policies in this section would be welcome and beneficial to both parties.	We have emphasized in the write-up that these offsetting policies are not ours, but that our role is to uphold and support any offsetting policies by local conservation authorities. Therefore, we would be supportive of whatever offsetting policies and approaches you uphold.
NVCA		5	5.5	Section 5.5 deals with offsetting, and provides a fairly generic and appropriate overview of its potential use in the development process. The proposed approach to offsetting mainly references Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authroity's (LSRCA) policy, which is reasonable given that NVCA's document remains in draft. However, the text is sufficiently open-ended to support NVCA's requirements for offsetting where appropriate.	We intend to clarify this section to state that these are not City policies, but the City supports offsetting policies provided by the governing conservation authority.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	5	5.6	Please provide confirmation that the parks policies in 5.6 adhere to the Hewitt's Landowners' executed Master Parkland Agreement with the City; if not, please amend accordingly.	These policies guide the City's future parks planning and does not require change on behalf of the development industry. However, if there are specific policies in the Master Parkland Agreement that are in conflict, please do identify them for us. Additionally, "Master Parkland Agreement" will be added to the list of documents provided for in 5.9.1.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	5	5.6	Parks policies. 1) The policies do not reflect the executed Master Parkland Agreement between the City and the Hewitt's landowners. 2) Please clarify if additional Parkland is being request for the Post-2031 settlement area lands.	These policies guide the City's future parks planning and does not require change on behalf of the development industry. However, if there are specific policies in the Master Parkland Agreement that are in conflict, please do identify them for us. Additionally, "Master Parkland Agreement" will be aadded to the list of documents provided for in 5.9.1.

DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	5	5.9	Section 5.9 of the draft Official Plan speaks to Parkland Dedication. Throughout this section, the total “gross” land area is referenced in the calculation of parkland rate. Parkland is not typically calculated with non-developable land (e.g., environmental features) included in the equation. Net calculations are the standard across the board, as natural heritage area and other non-developable features are just that: undevelopable and typically not used to generate parkland. Accordingly, we ask the City to amend this policy to clarify parkland calculations are made on developable land.	By-law 2017-073, Cash-in-lieu of Parkland, simply refers to the "land"; Policies 5.9.1. c and d will be changed to similarly refer to "the land" over "gross land area." Moreover, to align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.9.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.9.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	5	5.9	Parkland dedication. Please clarify if additional parkland dedication will be requested by the City for the expanded settlement area lands. The mapping does not show any additional requirement, and the Master Parkland Agreement extends only to the 2031 settlement boundary limits.	Additional dedication of parkland will be done according to the Planning Act at a future date.
LSRCA		5	5.3.1.f	A goal of 20% tree canopy cover is too low. Literature suggests that the minimum forest cover at a watershed scale should be no less than 30% (How Much Habitat is Enough?, Environment Canada). Considering that tree canopy cover also includes non-forest areas (street trees, park trees, private trees), the goal should be increased to at least 30% if the City’s objective of protecting and enhancing the natural heritage system is to be realized. While a 30% goal may seem daunting, there is much that can be accomplished by engaging private landowners to assist with meeting this goal.	Section 6.3.2 Urban Forests states the commitments to expanding the urban tree canopy, and to protecting the stock of existing trees to the greatest extent possible.
LSRCA		5	5.3.1.j	To better discourage the preemptive removal of natural heritage features in advance of a development application, the City should consider including an additional policy that would address and prevent this from happening. Suggested wording: o) Development and site alteration shall be prohibited prior to the approval of a development application. Where a natural heritage feature has been altered or removed by unauthorized development or site alteration, the feature will be conservatively classified, treated as though it was still in place and be subject to the polies of this Plan. Impacted areas shall be restored to the satisfaction of the City, in consultation with the applicable Conservation Authority. Neighbouring Municipalities (i.e. York Region) have a similar policy and it is a very useful tool.	Policy 5.3.1.j addresses this: “To ensure the effective management and retention of the features and functions identified on Map 3, a Natural Heritage System feature will not be reclassified to a lesser level of protection if the feature is intentionally damaged or destroyed. The restoration and rehabilitation of the Natural Heritage System feature, to the satisfaction of the City and applicable Conservation Authority, may be required.”

Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	5	5.3.2 and 5.5.2.5	The policy references in 5.3.2.c, 5.3.2.g and 5.5.2.5.d appear to be incorrect.	Policy 5.3.2.c needs to be revised to point to "the pemissions outlined in 5.3.2 (d)." Policy 5.3.2.g needs to be revised to point to "the process outlined in 5.3.2(f)". The wording in 5.5.2.5.d will be changed to: "The Phosphorus Budget referred to in 5.5.2.5(c) must demonstrate..."
LSRCA		5	5.3.2.2.b	In order to maintain the natural heritage system, breaks and disconnect between features should not be supported. Consider including an additional policy that would prevent this from happening. Suggested wording: Development shall not be permitted if the resulting development would create a disconnect or break in the natural heritage system.	A break or a disconnect would be a negative impact; therefore the request is covered within policy 5.4.2.2.b.
Mark Doherty		5	5.4 and 5.5	I'm writing to you, as I understand this to be an opportunity to voice my opposition to the proposed development at 521 Huronia Rd. Ultimately my neighbors and I all share the same stance about this proposal and the destruction of – what we on Loon Avenue know to be - a very significant wetland. Perhaps unlike my neighbors though, I would like to only ask you why? Why is this a consideration?	The protection of wetlands is primarily provided for in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 of the new draft Official Plan. Moreover, different types of wetlands are classified as Environmental Protection Areas, which receive additional layers of protection. Please refer to Map 3, which delineates which areas receive EPA protection. Additionally, section 2.5.2. states that "any lands shown on Appendix 1 as located within the boundary of a Conservation Authority are also subject to the policies of those authorities." The policies in the draft new Official Plan will be enforced once the draft plan is adopted by Council and approved by the Province. In the meantime, the current Official Plan policies continue to regulate the protection of wetlands.

Megan Pagonis		5	5.4 and 5.5	There are a barrage of developments that continue to be proposed to cut as deeply as possible into these areas. Not only will this affect the amount of wooded and protected land in our city, it affects our ground re-charge and flood plain water management. A good example is the property south of Loon Ave. There is a request for development on a significant woodland edging the wetland. These have long been protected, and clearly the edge of the current neighborhood was designed with this in mind. The backyards of the houses along Loon Ave. are 30-31 meters away from the wetland - this is not a coincidence. The recommendations of the conservation authority in general state that there should be a minimum 30M buffer. So why are we allowing developers to buy these lands for a low price only to challenge and push the conservation authorities to bend these rules to push further and further into these areas? I do not understand why certain development locations are chosen when there are many other pockets that could be developed that don't involve massive tree cutting/de-forestation, and sucking all the ground water out around a wetland to make underground parking possible for 140 new town houses. I would like to see a City plan that stops this from cutting into what little we have left.	The protection of wetlands is primarily provided for in Sections 5.4 and 5.5 of the new draft Official Plan. Moreover, different types of wetlands are classified as Environmental Protection Areas, which receive additional layers of protection. Please refer to Map 3, which delineates which areas receive EPA protection. Additionally, section 2.5.2. states that "any lands shown on Appendix 1 as located within the boundary of a Conservation Authority are also subject to the policies of those authorities." The policies in the draft new Official Plan will be enforced once the draft plan is adopted by Council and approved by the Province. In the meantime, the current Official Plan policies continue to regulate the protection of wetlands.
LSRCA		5	5.4.1	There should be an introduction for this section that provides some explanation for why there are two separate overlays for the natural heritage system in the City.	The policies are listed in Section 5, but the overlay is referenced in Section 2 because of the importance of this overlay to land use planning.
LSRCA		5	5.4.1.d	Any increases to the natural heritage system would be based on incorporating features that warrant being protected. Increases may also support the City's goal of growing the urban canopy copy. It's recommended that wording be revised to not restrict increases to the natural heritage system. Suggested wording: "… Authority, nor shall such minor modifications result in any significant decrease in the size of the Natural Heritage System."	Increases to the Natural Heritage System are not restricted by the policies in section 5.4.1.

NVCA		5	5.4.2	In general, it is recommended that the OP review thresholds and criteria for assigning tiered EPA designations to woodland features within the City. The current rationale for assignment of EPA 1, 2, and 3 to various woodland features is not clear throughout Section 5.4.2, and does not appear to be consistently applied in Map/Schedule 3. Some specific considerations: oSection 5.4.2.1 states that an EPA1 designation is assigned to Significant Woodland over 10ha. However, in the absence of comprehensive Significant Woodland mapping for the municipality, there may be value in assigning this designation to all woodlands over 10ha. oFurther to the above, 10ha may be an excessive area threshold for this most restrictive designation, especially in a large and growing urban center. In scenarios where woodlands are demonstrably 'significant', it is recommended that the area threshold for inclusion into EPA1 be 4ha. oThe OP provides no definition or criteria for identifying when a woodland feature should be considered a Significant Woodland. Given the relative lack of woodland cover within the City limits, a targeted exercise may be warranted to identify Significant Woodlands on an applicable schedule.	We have reviewed this section in light of these comments and made some changes for better oversight. As highlighted in the preface to the Definitions section 10.2: "If a term is defined in a Provincial document, the City has carried forward that term into the Plan to ensure consistency. Any other terms defined by the City are listed here, and if they are not listed here then the definition that appears in the Zoning By-law shall apply." As additionally stated in the preface to the Definitions section: "Any other terminology has its regular, customary meaning. If clarification is needed, then it should be sought from the Director of Development Services." Additionally, please note policy 10.1.c) "Where new information becomes available, for example, through floodplain mapping, Natural heritage System mapping, or as a result of more detailed environmental Impact Study (EIS), the most up to date Environmental Protection Area mapping shall take precendence ... under these circumstances, mapping or development limits may be amended without this Plan." We are willing to work with conversation authorities to provide mapping updates longer term.
LSRCA		5	5.4.2.1	As the EP Areas – Level 1 resources represent the most valuable components of the natural heritage system, consider including a policy that dictates minimum vegetation protection zones (VPZ) for specific features. Recommended minimum VPZs include: Provincially Significant Wetland – 30 m Non-PSW or unevaluated wetland – 15 m Woodland – 10 m Watercourse – 30 m Lake Simcoe Shoreline – 30 m Cultural meadows and cultural thickets within the natural heritage system or abutting protected features – 5 m It would also be helpful to provide guidance with respect to green infrastructure within the outer 50% of the larger VPZs.	Further guidance would be provided through the Environmental Impact Study.

LSRCA		5	5.4.2.1	Consider including policies that provide direction for any relocation of watercourses. Suggested wording: e) Watercourses shall generally be maintained in their existing locations. Where a development proposal seeks to relocate a watercourse, it must be demonstrated that the relocation will maintain the existing function of the watercourse, will result in a net ecological gain and will not negatively impact the natural heritage system. f) Any relocation or significant alteration of a watercourse must incorporate natural channel design and be supported by a Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment. g) Any relocation of a watercourse must be in compliance with Conservation Authority regulations, and any other applicable Provincial or Federal regulations. The above policy suggestions may also belong in Section 5.5.2	Policy 5.5.1.a.iv) seeks to restrict development in or near watercourses; therefore, it would be weakened by additionally including a policy about the relocation of a watercourse. At the same time, policy 5.5.1.a.i) states the City will "work in partnership with adjacent municipalities and the Conservation Authorities, provincial ministries, the Health Unit and other partners to develop practices that maintain and improve the quality and quantity of lakes and watercourses." Therefore, as part of this partnership, if a watercourse would need to be relocated, the City would work in partnership with the LSRCA on this, to ensure compliance with regulations and the suggestions set out here.
NVCA		5	5.4.2.1	Section 5.4.2.1 provides the most strict layer of Natural Heritage policy protection (EPA 1), and includes most Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs), and 'Non-provincially Significant Wetlands' greater than 0.5ha. However, no explicit policy protections are afforded to wetland features below the 0.5ha threshold. To ensure consistency with Conservation Authority regulations, wetlands below the 0.5ha area threshold (as recognized now or through a development process) should be afforded policy protection, i.e. designated as EPA 2 or 3.	"Wetlands less than 0.5 hectares in size" has been added to EPA level 3

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	5	5.4.2.1.d	Of particular significance is Section 5.4.2.1 (d). If the intent is to refer to the designation which will apply upon adoption of the proposed, new official plan, the reference should simply be to the designation on Maps 1 and 2 of the Plan. If this is not the intent of the wording, clarification is requested. Based upon our review of the policies applicable to the Environmental Protection Areas, and more specifically the Bunkers' Creek watershed, the ultimate intent is to provide for restoration of the watercourse to a naturalized state, wherever feasible and practical. Achievement of this objective will only be possible upon redevelopment of the lands affected. By way of example, should proposals be introduced which envisage redevelopment of the lands to the southeast of Highway No. 400 and/or in the vicinity of the intersection of Dunlop Street and Anne Street, for high density, multi-storey structures consistent with the Strategic Growth Area policies of the draft document, a portion of the lands could be developed as an open space linkage which accommodates the restoration of Bunkers Creek. Such a scenario simply serves to emphasize the need to require that a Secondary Plan be advanced by the City.	This has been clarified that the land use designation would be found on Map 2.
LSRCA		5	5.4.2.2.a	Based on the above comment and the need to provide stronger protection to natural areas still remaining in urban areas, Level 2 features should also be revised to include the following: Woodlands 0.5 ha > 4 ha Woodlands within 30 m of a Level 1 or other Level 2 feature Locally significant natural areas Minimum vegetation protection zones and connectivity linkages	We will add “Woodlands within 30 m of a Level 1 feature into Level 2”; but keep “Woodlands within 30 m of a Level 2 feature in Level 3.” “Minimum vegetation protection zones and connectivity linkages” is already included in this section. Since “woodlands between 4 hectares to 10 hectares” is included in this section (while “significant woodlands” of the same size are level 1), it makes sense to keep “woodlands 0.5 to 4 ha” in level 3 – they still receive protection. As Level 3 is focused on “locally significant features” as per its definition, it makes sense to keep “locally significant natural areas” in Level 3.
LSRCA		5	5.4.2.2.a	Please clarify what is meant by “other watercourses”. Permanent and intermittent watercourses should be considered Level 1 features. Does “other watercourse” refer to ephemeral watercourses? Headwater drainage features?	As watercourses received protection under Level 1 features, the reference will be removed under Level 2.

LSRCA		5	5.4.2.2.b	In order to maintain the natural heritage system, development that would result in features being down classified should not be supported. Consider including an additional policy that would prevent this from happening. Suggested wording: Development shall not be permitted if the development would result in a feature no longer being considered significant or no longer being able to maintain its current Environmental Protection Areas level classification.	Features being shut down would be a negative impact; therefore, the request is covered within policy 5.4.2.2.b.
LSRCA		5	5.4.3.b	Note that a 30 m vegetation protection zone (VPZ) (buffer) applies to woodlands within the Lake Simcoe watershed in the "annexed lands". A 10 m VPZ applies to woodlands outside of the watershed (i.e. NVCA jurisdiction). Please revise this policy to reflect this.	The policy specifies "a 30.0 metre buffer from the edge of the woodlands within the Lake Simcoe watershed" – as the municipal boundary now includes the annexed lands, the policy would govern this area. A 10 m buffer also has been included to woodlands outside of the watershed.
LSRCA		5	5.5.1.g	Note that Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority Ecological Offsetting Policy (not Plan) applies only to the Lake Simcoe watershed. The policies in the Official Plan should clarify that offsetting would apply to features within the City, regardless of watershed.	There is no incorrect reference here, as the reference has been taken out. The City would work with LSRCA, should ecological offsetting be required. As per this section, policies would apply city-wide.
LSRCA		5	5.5.2	Consider including a policy commitment to not support the piping of watercourses and to seek out opportunities for daylighting any that are currently piped, as well as restoring degraded and disconnected systems. Suggested wording: g) Not permit the piping of any watercourses or headwater areas. h) Seek out opportunities to restore existing piped watercourses at the surface. i) Seek out opportunities to restore degraded systems and remove barriers to fish passage.	Policies 5.5.2.1.b(i) already references increasing/improving fish habitat. We can add in the following policy to 5.5.2.1.b: "Seek to avoid piping watercourses or headwater areas and seek to restore existing piped watercourses to a natural state."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	5	5.6.2.5.c	Policy 5.6.2.5c) identifies that "Urban Squares shall be between 0.2 hectares and 1.0 hectares…". In our submission, it is unclear as to the need for such a rigid policy in the Official Plan for the size of Urban Squares. We suggest flexibility be incorporated to be able to respond to the needs of the community, and suggest the following revised language: "Urban Squares should be planned to be approximately 0.2 ha to 1.0 ha in size";	Recommended policy revision: "Village Squares should be between 0.2 hectares to 1.0 hectares …" Please note that the title "urban squares" has been changed to "village squares" to align with existing terminology.

Barb and Brian Tansley		5	5.7.1	Further development along the waterfront should not be allowed.	Barrie's waterfront is designated as Greenspace, and, as set out in 5.7.1, it will be protected and managed in an environmentally responsible manner for future generations. Development adjacent to the waterfront will be permitted according to the land use designations set out on Map 2, but any development along the waterfront shall achieve a standard of design excellence in order for there to be proper integration. Moreover, the Province has designated Barrie's downtown, including lands adjacent to the waterfront, as an Urban Growth Centre. Urban Growth Centres are areas designated by the Province to see greater intensification and house a significant amount of job and population growth. As Barrie has a duty to grow responsibly as the regional centre for Central Ontario, the downtown will indeed be seeing greater intensification. This should also help us bring more affordable housing options to Barrie.
Megan Pagonis		5	5.7.1	Second, the building heights around the waterfront should have cut offs. I don't want to see what happened in Toronto to happen in our city. I moved out of Toronto for a reason 10 years ago. I didn't like how tall every building kept getting. It makes it feel like the city towers over you, and it is not nearly as welcoming as our current building heights are around the water. I don't want to see the waterfront shaded out because they can build many units for a huge premium because they overlook the water. Let's not forget the shorter buildings that stayed within height restrictions at the time that were supposed to have those views. Let's not forget that it is not only the residents of the buildings surrounding the waterfront that should be able to enjoy that space. I have also lived in Vancouver for a few years and can assure you Barrie has a similar feel when you are near the water - the city limits on building height makes a difference to the ambience. It is not menacing, it is enjoyable.	Barrie's waterfront is designated as Greenspace, and, as set out in 5.7.1, it will be protected and managed in an environmentally responsible manner for future generations. Development adjacent to the waterfront will be permitted according to the land use designations set out on Map 2, but any development along the waterfront shall achieve a standard of design excellence in order for there to be proper integration. Moreover, the Province has designated Barrie's downtown, including lands adjacent to the waterfront, as an Urban Growth Centre. Urban Growth Centres are areas designated by the Province to see greater intensification and house a significant amount of job and population growth. As Barrie has a duty to grow responsibly as the regional centre for Central Ontario, the downtown will indeed be seeing greater intensification. This should also help us bring more affordable housing options to Barrie.
LSRCA		5	5.7.1.a	Consider including some additional points that speak to the importance and function of the waterfront as part of the City's natural heritage system. Suggested wording: xiii) The waterfront is in an important component of the natural heritage system and will be managed in an environmentally responsible manner. xiv) Opportunities to naturalize portions of the shoreline along the waterfront will be pursued in balance with providing visual and physical access to the water.	These have been addressed in policies 5.6.3.a.i and xi.

St. Mary's Catholic Cemetery	Catholic Cemeteries and Funeral Services - Archidocese of Toronto / Richard Hayes	5	5.7.2	The City of Barrie Official Plan 2051, Draft 2 suggests that "Cemeteries, when they are in a location to provide connection to the open space network, greater mobility network and/or active transportation network may be acknowledged by the City as opportunities for passive recreation trails for pedestrians or cyclists." This proposed planning principle is incompatible with the requirements of cemetery operators under the Funeral Burial Cremation Services Act, 2002 (FBCSA) that "quiet and good order are maintained in the cemetery at all times." Futher CCFS in its operating By-laws expressly forbids all sporting and recreational activities within the property including, but not limited to cycling, skateboading, roller blading, running and dog walking.	Suggested revised wording: Cemeteries may be acknowledged by the City as opportunities for passive recreational trails for pedestrians or cyclists where compability with existing requirements governing cemeteries exists and when they are in a location to provide connection to the open space network, greater mobility network and/or active transportation network.
LSRCA		5	5.8.c	Note that opportunities to enhance connectivity of the natural heritage system are not currently shown on Map 6. Is the intention to revise this map in the near future to identify these locations? It's recommended that opportunities to reconnect the natural heritage system where there are breaks and gaps be pursued and that these locations/areas also be shown on Map 3.	This is a commitment on behalf of the City; as stated in policy 5.7.a, we would look at Map 6 to identify opportunities. The intention is not to currently demonstrate these opportunities on Official Plan maps, but we are committed to enhancing connectivity in the future.
LSRCA		5	5.8.d	This policy should be expanded to also include arterial and connector roads. Suggested wording: During the planning of infrastructure projects, the City will enhance connectivity between Natural Heritage Systems across Highway 400, arterial and collector roads to accommodate the movement of animals and native plants across….	Policy 5.7.d will be changed to: "During the planning of infrastructure projects, the City will identify opportunities to enhance connectivity between Natural Heritage Systems, especially across Highway 400, to accommodate the movement of animals and native plants across the city where development and/or development is proposed." This leaves open addressing other opportunities for the movement of animals/native plants.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	5	5.9.1	Policy 5.9.1 establishes the cash-in-lieu of parkland policies. We seek clarification that these polices align with the City's cash-in-lieu of parkland by-law. As one example, Policy 5.9.1(d) states that a rate of 2% of total gross land area applies to all non-residential development but is silent on Institutional uses. If we are to assume 5.9.1(d) includes Institutional uses then the policy does not align to the cash-in-lieu of parkland by-law which requires a rate of 5% for Institutional uses.	To align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.8.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.8.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	5	5.9.1.c and 5.9.1.d	it is requested that reference to the 5% residential and 2% commercial cash-in-lieu rates be amended from “gross” to “net”.	By-law 2017-073, Cash-in-lieu of Parkland, simply refers to the "land"; Policies 5.9.1. c and d will be changed to similarly refer to "the land" over "gross land area." Moreover, to align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.9.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.9.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	5	5.9.1.c and 5.9.1.d	please confirm that the site is not required to pay cash-in-lieu of parkland as it has been satisfied through the Master Parkland Agreement.	This is correct.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	5	5.9.1.c)	Parkland Calculation shall be at the rate of 5% of the total gross land area. The Landowners request that the words “gross’ be replaced with ‘net’. Parkland is not given for natural heritage lands or on lands that cannot be developed for other reasons such as gas pipelines (TransCanada) or where significant archaeological resources remain on-site. There is no statutory authority under the Planning Act to require the calculation on ‘gross’ land area.	By-law 2017-073, Cash-in-lieu of Parkland, simply refers to the "land"; Policies 5.8.1. c and d will be changed to similarly refer to "the land" over "gross land area." Moreover, to align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.9.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.9.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	5	5.9.1.c) & d)	Speaks to calculating parkland based on 5% & 2% of the total gross land area. As noted previously, this should be on a net basis as natural heritage features or other major infrastructure would not be included in the calculation. Furthermore, there is no definition of “gross land area” in the Official Plan in which to determine what is included and excluded from the calculation.	By-law 2017-073, Cash-in-lieu of Parkland, simply refers to the "land"; Policies 5.8.1. c and d will be changed to similarly refer to "the land" over "gross land area." Moreover, to align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.9.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.9.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		5	5.9.1.d	We are also requesting clarification on if Policy 5.9.1 (d) aligns with the CIL Bylaw? If not, does the City have plans to revisit the CIL Bylaw?	By-law 2017-073, Cash-in-lieu of Parkland, simply refers to the "land"; Policies 5.8.1. c and d will be changed to similarly refer to "the land" over "gross land area." Moreover, to align with the Cash-in-lieu of Parkland By-law, 5.9.1.c will be changed to: "The provision of new parkland for all new commercial and industrial developments shall be at the rate of 2% of the land"; 5.9.1.d will be changed to: "The dedication of parkland for all new developments that are not commercial or industrial shall be at the rate of 5% of the land."

LSRCA		5	5.9.1.g	In additional to a requirement for parkland to be conveyed to the City, there should be a policy that also requires the conveyance of lands that contain the natural heritage system. It should speak to the requirement for land to be conveyed in good condition. This may involve the removal of refuse and debris, management of invasive species, ecological restoration, etc. The City should not be liable for existing management issues/challenges that exist in the natural heritage system currently in private ownership. Suggested wording: The City shall seek to acquire lands on which the natural heritage system is located, as a condition of development approval. Any land containing natural heritage features that is required to be conveyed to the City shall be in good ecological condition and be free of all encumbrances.	This section (now 5.8.1) speaks to parkland policies specifically.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	5	5.9.1.k	Further, Policy 5.9.1 (k) states," the City may consider alternative means for establishing new parkland and parkland improvements, including, but not limited to: iii) Seeking partnerships, conservation easements, and/or joint provision of land." We seek clarification on the underlined phrasing. Are the underlined phrases in reference to what is also commonly known as Privately-Owned Publicly-accessible Space ('POPS')? If yes, we suggest using this term as it is a more commonly known description that would be appropriate to include in the policy.	I believe that POPS would be included, however believe policy intent also includes forms other than public-private; therefore policy 5.8.1.k should be revised to state: "iii) seeking partnerships, conversation easements, and/or joint provision of land, for instance through the Privately-Owned Publicly Accessible Space model (POPS)."
Dino Di Gregorio		6	6.6	My comment is that the storm drain just south of my house is getting plugged up by winter sand and salt residue and cigarette butts. Storm management should have a look at it to make sure its cleaned out. I have not seen it done recently or when the watermain was installed. The next issue, my complaint, happens every year and we try to sweep up the residue that settles in front of our driveway due to a dip in the road. It was supposed to be repaired over 2 years ago when the watermain improvement line was installed on our street, but the repair never happened. I even spoke to the Barrie roads supervisor overseeing the watermain install and he assured me that when the curbs and road would be redone after construction finished, our curb would be cutout and replaced at the proper level to avoid a dip, before the road was paved. NOT DONE, the dip is still there, in winter the water freezes in front of our driveway and then the salt and sand residue, I hate repeating myself.. We are getting tired and annoyed to clean this mess up every spring.	While there are policies regulating the development of infrastructure (for instance policy 6.6.4.a states that new developments shall utilize generally accepted Best Management Practices in stormwater management), the Official Plan is a broader land use document that does not impact current protocol for the management of storm drains and watermains. It is best to register this complaint with Service Barrie.

LSRCA		6	6.6	The description of municipal infrastructure should also include green infrastructure (i.e. street trees, landscaped strips, open space, natural heritage features, LIDs, etc).	A policy has been added to section 6.6.1 regarding green infrastructure and alignment has been included throughout section 6.6.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	6	6.3.1.d)	Encourages the use of district energy systems. As noted previously, is the City of Barrie constructing a district energy system?	As per the policy, the City supports and encourages a district energy model; it does not require the implementation of this model. Therefore, flexibility remains should developers choose not to pursue the approach. There is also flexibility in terms of how this type of system can be set up -- it does not necessarily have to be a municipal-wide initiative.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	6	6.3.1.d)	Encourages the use of district energy systems. To our knowledge the City is not planning on developing same. The Landowners request that this reference be removed.	As per the policy, the City supports and encourages a district energy model; it does not require the implementation of this model. Therefore, flexibility remains should developers choose not to pursue the approach. There is also flexibility in terms of how this type of system can be set up -- it does not necessarily have to be a municipal-wide initiative
LSRCA		6	6.3.2	This section should identify the current tree canopy in the City and also speak to the goal for tree canopy cover (recommend 30% for the goal instead of 20% - see comment above).	As stated in policy 6.3.2.b, the City will "strive to expand urban tree canopy coverage by partnering with other interested agencies." The decision was made to not ultimately state a target in the Official Plan, however we are committed to this work and to further establishing parameters through other means apart from this document.
LSRCA		6	6.3.2.a	Privately owned trees make up a large portion of the City's tree canopy. Consider including some direction for developing a private tree bylaw for that would restrict the removal of large trees from private lands without good cause or justification. Funds gathered through this type of permitting process can then be redirected to tree planting initiatives elsewhere that would help bolster the urban canopy. Suggested wording: The City may pass a by-law under the Municipal Act that would restrict the removal of large trees from private property.	As stated in policy 6.3.2.b, the City will "protect the stock of existing trees to the greatest extent possible." This leaves open the possibility of establishing a By-law restricting the removal of large trees (in fact, the City is looking into this currently). Moreover, policies 6.3.2.f requires "a tree protection plan that identifies, preserves, and compensates for tree removal."
LSRCA		6	6.3.2.e	This policy should clarify that where an Ecological Offsetting Strategy is required for the loss of woodland, additional tree compensation will not also be required.	The policy is flexible enough that it can align with an Ecological Offsetting Strategy. Thus, we would direct the proponent to work with the LSRCA on meeting the appropriate Ecological Offsetting policies.

Ann Krueger / Westside Evangelical Lutheran Church		6	6.4.1	On behalf of my congregation and myself, I commend the city for including needed changes to help our vulnerable homeless population. Specifically I commend you on the new section, 6.4.1 Vulnerable Populations which says: "The City will support and establish, where appropriate, the facilities for providing temporary emergency shelters, as well as cooling and warming stations throughout the City." However, that does not include all basic needs. The provision of 365/24/7 public washrooms and drinking water throughout the City is greatly needed. Please include those needs in the updated Official Plan.	Policy 6.4.1.a will be revised to: "The City will seek to understand, protect, and plan for the unique needs of equity-seeking groups and vulnerable populations, such as the provision of publicly accessible washrooms and drinking water."
John McLean / Grace United Church		6	6.4.1	The congregation of Grace United Church wishes to express its support of the inclusion of section 6.4,1 Vulnerable Populations in the second draft of the City of Barrie's Official Plan. In particular, we are in agreement with: "The City will support and establish, where appropriate, the facilities for for providing temporary emergency shelters, as well as cooling and warming stations throughout the City." We would also advocate for the inclusion in this section, the provision of 365/24/7 open public washrooms and drinking water throughout the City.	Policy 6.4.1.a will be revised to: "The City will seek to understand, protect, and plan for the unique needs of equity-seeking groups and vulnerable populations, such as the provision of publicly accessible washrooms and drinking water."
Marla Tomlinson		6	6.4.1	The prices of rent in Barrie are outrageous. Basement apartments are going for over $1600 these days, and there aren't many to find. I am a single mother who has a very good job (RVH) and I almost can't afford the rent in my current home. With the lack of rental buildings, there is a huge lack of supply. Landlords are taking advantage of this and asking for rent that is more than it should be. Are there plans for more rental buildings to go up? We have a lot of condo buildings in the works, but we need straight rentals.	There are plans for more rentals in Barrie as part of the Affordable Housing Strategy. The Official Plan is a broader land use planning document, and sets some overarching guidelines for Affordable Housing. Actual implementation of these guidelines and more detailed goals and targets are set elsewhere, primarily through the Affordable Housing Strategy.
SCATEH / Jennifer van Gennip		6	6.4.1	To this end, we ask that you also add year-round, 24/7 public washroom and drinking water access. Our current public washrooms are limited, they are not winterized, and even in the summer months they close overnight. There is a growing awareness of the need for 24/7/365 public washroom access, for vulnerable populations and also as a best practice for designing accessible communities.	Policy 6.4.1.a will be revised to: "The City will seek to understand, protect, and plan for the unique needs of equity-seeking groups and vulnerable populations, such as the provision of publicly accessible washrooms and drinking water."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	6	6.4.1.c	is worded such that housing to be provided within the City for the “entire population” is attainable. It is requested that this be removed. The policy can be re-characterized as supporting the provision of housing across the whole housing continuum.	While we appreciate this suggestion, this policy guides the City's actions and we are focused on making housing attainable for the entire population.

Karen Buck		6	6.4.2	Kudos to Staff and Council for setting aside “affordable housing” in many of the residentially zoned areas. I would also like to see an opportunity for “new” housing types..like tiny houses and new allowances for use of shipping containers for housing construction. Tiny houses are being built so that those with limited resources can live affordably in their neighbourhoods. The Official Plan could also promote Council working with Habitat for Humanity to provide Net Zero housing as another alternative to “affordable housing options. I think there is also an opportunity to have price adjusted units for sale and rent so that there is a mix of different individuals and families living together in “affordable housing options” being offered by the City.	While the intent of the Official Plan is to set out the City's general direction for supporting affordable housing, these are certainly good suggestions and can be taken into consideration through the City's Affordable Housing Strategy. We are also actively working with partners to get more affordable housing built, and the Official Plan does provide for this in policy 6.4.2.b: "The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, private developers, as well as community groups, to provide innovative affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing."
Kelly Patterson McGrath		6	6.4.2	We need to be better at attracting true affordable housing developers and partnering with existing ones like Redwood Park Communities, this is a priority and needs to be addressed completely in the OP. Let’s do better. Care for and house our homeless and ensure that rent is affordable for all.	This suggestion is aligned with policy 6.4.2 (b): "The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, private developers, as well as community groups, to provide innovative affodable housing options, including deeply affordable housing." Currently, we have partnered with Redwood Park Communities on some developments and we look forward to continuing this relationship. The City's Affordable Housing Strategy is the key document guiding the implementation of affordable housing programs and tools in Barrie.
Leslie Warren		6	6.4.2	I am watching many classic boarding houses disappear into this raging RE market. The city CAN play a role in communicating that boarding is NOT an evil. That it is legal per your current bylaws. etc. But your new ancillary permitting scenario is actually only going to load up on higher ticket rental dollars. I see nothing on the horizon that actually addresses real people budgets of $900 per month. Nothing. THAT is what is affordable to many EMPLOYED people.	We agree with you that there is a housing affordability crisis in Barrie and that we need a range of solutions available to ensure affordable housing across the spectrum of incomes. Programming to guide the affordablility of rentals in Barrie is part of the Affordable Housing Strategy. While the Official Plan is a broader land use planning document, Policies 6.4.c and 6.4.2.b outline the City's mandate to make available affordable housing for all people in Barrie.

SCATEH / Jennifer van Gennip		6	6.4.2	In Draft Two, we see the addition of the term “attainable” but this is an undefined term that could be interpreted as either above or below “affordable.” For this reason, we again recommend deeply affordable housing as a sub-definition within the affordable housing targets. If this cannot be enforced for targets, we feel it would at minimum be an appropriate threshold to use to determine eligibility for the City’s incentive programs such as the CIP. A suggested definition would be: “a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low- to moderate-income households, or 80% of average market rent, whichever is lower. Annual household income will be based upon the most recent Census of Canada statistics for the City of Barrie which is updated every five years, with low- to moderate-income households defined as an annual household income in the lowest 40th percentiles.” (As opposed to the 60th percentile.)	In the definitions section of the Official Plan, Affordable rental housing is defined as the least expensive of: i) a unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or ii) a unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area. Therefore all references to affordable rentals throughout the OP follow this definition. Additionally, it is recommended that a reference to deeply affordable housing be incorporated into the preamble of section 6.4: "As part of preparing Barrie for the future and ensuring social and economic resiliency, the City needs to take measures to ensure that attainable housing options are available to all residents (<u>including for those in need of deeply affordable housing</u>), that access is provided to public service facilities…
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	6	6.4.2	Given the changes to property value and rental rates over the last 5 years, it is recommended that through this Official Plan process the City update their affordable housing benchmark to provide a clear understanding to the development industry what will be deemed affordable.	As part of the Affordable Housing Strategy, we continue to track and benchmark both progress and affordability rates; this document is available to the public and updates on progress will continue to be made publicly available.
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	6	6.4.2	It is also our recommendation that in order to accomplish this ultimate goal, particularly for those required to supply 20 percent affordable housing within their developments, that public/private partnerships will be necessary. The challenge in accomplishing this goal will be the fact that the greatest percentage of affordable housing units are planned to be provided in built forms that have the highest construction cost value. It is recommended that Section 6.4.2 be amended to include additional language as follows: b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies<u>, private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing.	Agreed. Policy will be revised as follows: "b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies<u>, private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	6	6.4.2	This section sets out some very restrictive affordable housing policies. The Salem Landowners request the affordable housing policies be revised to encourage the addition of affordable housing units rather than being so prescriptive.	Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan; the existing OP also maintains a 10% target for affordable housing, which has been met. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies.

PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	6	6.4.2	We are concerned with the implications of these policies and request they not be prescriptive. We recommend the City establish policies which enable the collection of revenues for the provision of City sponsored affordable housing. We understand the City recently established a task force to formulate cash-in-lieu of affordable housing policy to be implemented moving forward and suggest the City include this within the affordable housing policies as an alternative to every site providing affordable units. There are various affordable housing target policies in the Plan including but not limited to policies 2.5.(j), and Section 6.4.2. Policy 2.5 (j) requires 10% of all new housing in the City to be affordable, policy 6.4.2 (e)(iii) requires development with more than 40 dwelling units to demonstrate the provision of affordable units and policy (iv) requires all new medium and hig h-density land use designations to provide 10% affordable units across a ra nge of unit sizes including 3 bedroom units or larger, and policy 2.3.2 (e) (iii) requires at least 20% of housing units developed in the UGC satisfy the criteria for affordable It is suggested that this policy does not recognize that various projects, in their totality, are being developed as affordable housing projects and thus contributing to the City wide mix of 10%. These policies have the potential to contribute to a lower amount of attainable units if affordable housing units are required on a project by project basis.	Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan; the existing OP also maintains a 10% target for affordable housing, which has been met. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies. The City is contemplating further tools to achieve and incentivize more affordable housing through its Affordable Housing Strategy. To affirm our committment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: "b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, private developers, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing." While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means.
Leslie Warren		6	6.4.2	Talk talk talk about affordable housing. But it is not defined. Anywhere. As for these words: shared accommodations, co-ownership housing, co-operative housing, community land trusts, land lease community homes, affordable housing, and inclusive and accessible housing for people with special needs Only one question: when? and for how many?	The City of Barrie's Affordable Housing Strategy tracks the development of different types of affordable housing and guides the implementation of different programs and tools to achieve more affordable housing. As for the definition of affordable in the draft new Official Plan, it is given in section 10.2 "Definitions." Affordable: a) In the case of ownership housing, the least expensive of: i) Housing for which the purchase price results in annual accommodation costs which do not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or, ii) Housing for which the purchase price is at least 10 percent below the average purchase price of a resale unit in the regional market area; or, b) In the case of rental housing, the least expensive of: i) A unit for which the rent does not exceed 30 percent of gross annual household income for low and moderate income households; or, ii) A unit for which the rent is at or below the average market rent of a unit in the regional market area.

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	6	6.4.2.d	requires ALL ground related housing to include options for purchasers to have two units in the main building, or an additional ancillary structure. With the OP policies providing hard maximum densities and requirements for parking per unit, it is requested that this policy identify the desire for optional second units, but that the option not be a requirement for every unit.	Second Suites will not be a requirement; however, the design option shall be made available, so that -- should the purchaser want a second suite in the relevant development -- the installation of one would be seen as possible.
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	6	6.4.2.d	It is unclear how the requirements of policy 6.4.2.d (i.e. builder options for second dwelling units) will be applied. Specifically, this will need to be transitioned and/or only required for new development applications to account for existing development plans that may not have included lot sizes or home model packages to accommodate safe and attractive second suites (e.g. side yard setbacks for discrete entryways, space in the floor plan for a separated entryway, etc.)	This would only be required for new development applications.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	6	6.4.2.d)	All ground related development shall include design options that provide purchasers the ability to have two residential units. The Landowners request the modification of this policy to require a condition in all draft plan approvals containing more than 40 single detached units, to require the Builder to offer turn-key second suite packages in some of their units. This approach is in place in Hewitt's and there has been significant uptake of Second Suites as a result.	Second Suites will not be a requirement; however, the design option shall be made available, so that -- should the purchaser want a second suite in the relevant development -- the installation of one would be seen as possible. We can additionally look into expanding the Hewitt's pilot project regarding second suites.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	6	6.4.2.e	Policy 6.4.2e) would require that all development applications be supported by an Affordable Housing Report. In our submission, the list of materials that would be considered appropriate to facilitate development should be refined through preconsultation, as there are numerous types of development that would not warrant an Affordable Housing Report, such as those applications proposing strictly nonresidential uses. We suggest revised policy be considered.	Policy will be revised to read: "Development and redevelopment applications occuring outside of Employment Areas and through Draft Plan of Subdivision, Draft Plan of Condominium, Site Plan Or Part Lot Control, shall be supported by a Housing Affordability Report, which will be prepared in accordance with the City's current Terms of Reference, and will provide an opinion by a qualified professional as to how the proposed development or redevelopment provides housing to meet the needs of current and future residents."

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	6	6.4.2.e	requires an Affordable Housing Report, by a qualified professional, for every development and redevelopment. It is requested that this be removed. This adds another layer on to applications, and suggests that a report would be required for an addition of a unit in a dwelling (redevelopment). The policy framework provides sufficient parameters for the City to work towards provision of affordable housing, as well as government initiatives such as the work of the City and the County of Simcoe for provision of affordable units. The City has a way to track this information and it is understood that the City is meeting, or close to meeting, various of its affordable housing targets. Also, much of the affordability price point lags by about 12 to 18 months and is thus potentially out of date when it is being considered.	Policy will be revised to read: "Development and redevelopment applications occuring outside of Employment Areas and through Draft Plan of Subdivision, Draft Plan of Condominium, Site Plan Or Part Lot Control, shall be supported by a Housing Affordability Report, which will be prepared in accordance with the City's current Terms of Reference, and will provide an opinion by a qualified professional as to how the proposed development or redevelopment provides housing to meet the needs of current and future residents."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	6	6.4.2.e)	Requires an affordable housing report. Request the words 'shall' be replaced with 'may' which provides flexibility depending on the nature of the application or, more importantly, if the applicant is proposing the required amount of affordable housing – which would render a study unnecessary.	Policy will be revised to read: "Development and redevelopment applications occuring outside of Employment Areas and through Draft Plan of Subdivision, Draft Plan of Condominium, Site Plan Or Part Lot Control, shall be supported by a Housing Affordability Report, which will be prepared in accordance with the City's current Terms of Reference, and will provide an opinion by a qualified professional as to how the proposed development or redevelopment provides housing to meet the needs of current and future residents."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	6	6.4.2.e.iii	Policy 6.4.2e)iii) would require that development applications that propose 40 dwelling units or more demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units. In our submission, the policy should introduce flexibility, and we suggest that the text "will be required to demonstrate" be replaced with "are encouraged to provide."	Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies, while also grappling with stewardship. To affirm our committment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: "b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, <u>private developers</u>, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing." While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means.

969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	6	6.4.2.e.iii and 6.4.2.e.iv	require all development with 40 residential units or larger to demonstrate the provision of affordable housing units, and that in certain classes of development, three bedroom units or larger are to meet the definition of affordable. These policies have the potential to result in these units being subsidized by the remainder of the units in a project and no guarantee can be provided that these units will remain affordable through resale (especially if large in size). The City has various other policies and mechanisms to rely on for the provision of affordable housing units including using viable incentives. It is requested that these policies be removed.	Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies, while also grappling with stewardship. To affirm our committment to work with the development community in the Official Plan, policy 6.4.2.b will be revised to read: "b) The City will explore partnership opportunities between the County of Simcoe, housing providers and agencies, private developers, as well as community groups, to provide innovative, affordable housing options, including deeply affordable housing." While the Official Plan sets out our broader vision for Barrie, we will continue to communicate the processes for affordable housing requirements through additional means.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	6	6.4.2.e.vi	Incidentally, though under the affordable housing policy heading, s. 6.4.2(e)(vi) of the New OP does not relate to affordable housing and should be deleted.	Agreed; this policy should not be here and will be removed.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	6	6.4.2.iii	6.4.2.iii) – this policy should encourage the demonstration of affordable housing as opposed to requiring it.	Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan; the existing OP also maintains a 10% target for affordable housing, which has been met. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	6	6.4.2.iv	6.4.2.iv) – min target of 10% of affordable units within medium and high-density residential designations continues to be too high. The standard should be 5% within these designations across the city.	Affordable Housing is a priority for the City of Barrie and these policies build off of what was set in motion in the existing Official Plan; the existing OP also maintains a 10% target for affordable housing, which has been met. Therefore, we firmly believe through the advancement of programs and partnerships, we can work together to successfully follow through on these policies.
LSRCA		6	6.5.1.2	This section should also reference Ecological Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (ESGRAs) as they follow the same policy regime. This section should also reference LSRCA's Water Budget Offsetting Policy.	The City would work with LSRCA, should the water budget offsetting policy need to be applied. This would be determined through the Environmental Impact Study, Risk Assessment or Hydrogeological Assessment, and thus the policy does not need to be specifically referenced.
BILD - Simcoe Chapter		6	6.6.4.b	Furthermore, in Section 6.6.4 (b) Stormwater Management – the Plan mentions that Stormwater is to be controlled on site. BILD recommends that this policy be revised to allow for centralized facilities that service a larger tributary planning area, as is normal practice.	Policy 6.6.4.b will be clarified to ensure understanding of the use of the term "control" in that the City shall maintain control of any stomwater on site, without precluding the possibility of a larger system through which stormwater is managed/controlled in the City. Recommended wording: "The City maintains the right to control stormwater on site."

PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	6	6.6.4.q	any "development and site alteration" within a wellhead protection area requires a risk assessment. It is recommended that the policy is changed to "may" at the discretion of the City/delegated Risk Management Officer.	Risk is always required to be assessed in a wellhead protection area. If there is a case where we wouldn't need a risk assessment, we could scope this out based on site specific applications.
LSRCA		6	6.6.5.b	This should also reference the MECP Guidelines as well as applicable Conservation Authority Guidelines (i.e. LSRCA Technical Guidelines for Stormwater Management Submissions)	MECP guidelines will be added.
LSRCA		6	6.6.5.l	Where existing storm water management ponds were originally designed as online systems, a commitment should be made by the City to take these facilities offline. Suggested wording: Where existing stormwater ponds are online, they shall be retrofitted to separate the facility from the watercourse, where feasible.	This section governs new major developments; the City is committed to best practices and LID development, and agrees that retrofitting existing stormwater ponds where feasible is a best practice.
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	8	8.3.2	policy 8.3.2 may require an applicant for development to provide a place making brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required and the brief is to identify or map connections to planned or existing community gathering places and activities and opportunities for enhancing these gathering places and provide improved connections; it is submitted that these places may not be on the proposed development lands, no criteria is provided and this provides for additional study and cost to development proposals.	There is no requirement within the policy for a placemaking brief.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	8	8.3.3.a	requires that development proposals shall identify opportunities for the inclusion of public art. It is submitted that the prescribed nature of this policy is not appropriate and would pertain to classes of development, such as minor variances, as well as others.	The policy maintains flexibility by emphasizing that "proposals shall identify oppportunities for the inclusion of public art" rather than requiring public art as part of a development. At the same time, the recommendation is to integrate further flexibility into the policy by stating that public art "is encouraged to connect to, celebrate and honour Barrie's diversity, multiculturalism, Barrie's historical figures, and Indigenous and Métis histories."
Al McNair		8	8.4.1	Historic Neighbourhood areas should not allow development greater than 3 storeys, in order to maintain compatibility with abutting existing dwellings and their surrounding neighbourhoods. Barrie's East End shows many examples of historically compatible intensification which does not exceed 3 storeys in height.	While our focus will be on maintaining compatibility with abutting dwellings and their surrounding neighbourhoods, at the same time we are required to plan for growth strategically; for the most part, development in Neighbourhood Areas, excepting on higher order roads, will be limited to three storeys. There are also additional protections for Historic Neighbourhood Areas to ensure compatibility.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	8	8.4.2.b) and i)	Speaks to archaeological resources. This Ministry of Culture looks after archaeological resources and therefore any policy suggesting the deeding of artifacts and the development of lands containing resources, should all be deferred to the Ministry as they are the approval authority for such things.	Under the Planning Act, the municipality can be the approval authority. However, policy 8.4.2.b) will be further revised to highlight the support of the Ministry: "As supported by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, development shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved." A slight revision will also be made to policy 8.4.2.i) to accommodate for the deletion of policy k: "Where archaeological artifacts of cultural heritage value or interest are discovered in the course of an archaeological assessment in support of a development application, the City may encourage the licensed archaeologist to request direction from the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries to deposit the artifacts at no charge in an appropriate public or Indigenous institution, under Section 66(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	8	8.4.2.k)	Requires that archaeological artifacts be 'deeded' at no cost to the appropriate public authority. The Landowners ask that this policy be deleted because it cannot be implemented. Specifically, artifacts cannot be deeded, and in the case of archaeological resources, there are Ministry licensing requirements associated with cataloging and storing same.	This policy will be deleted as its intent is covered in other policies within Section 8.4.2.
Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	8	8.4.3	Policy 8.4.3 relates to Historic Neighbourhoods, which we understand are identified on Map 8 of the draft OP. Prior to development, Policy 8.4.3 would require a Historic Neighbourhood Character Impact Evaluation, in addition to the Heritage Impact Assessment according to draft Policy 8.4d). Based on our review, the Historic Neighbourhoods do not appear to align with designated Heritage Conservation Districts or other Heritage assets as established by the Heritage Act. We request clarification, and are unclear as to the need of such heritage evaluation for lands that are not recognized by the Heritage Act. We suggest revised policy be considered to clarify that heritage assessments would only be required for lands that are within or adjacent to properties or areas designated under the Heritage Act.	In order to maintain the cultural heritage of Barrie, we maintain that it appropriate to require, in certain cases, assessments/evaluations for properties that are not designated under the Heritage Act. Further direction on this evaluation will be given through documententation outside of the OP.

Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	8	8.4.d	Policy 8.4d) would require a Heritage Impact Assessment prior to development of lands identified on Map 8. Based on our review, the Historic Neighbourhoods do not appear to align with designated Heritage Conservation Districts or other Heritage assets as established by the Heritage Act. In our submission, it is inappropriate to require a heritage impact assessment for a broad area of lands that are not identified as having heritage value under the Heritage Act. We suggest that draft policy be revised to clarify that a heritage impact assessment will only be required for lands that are within or adjacent to properties designated under the Heritage Act, or that the draft policy be removed.	In order to maintain the cultural and historical fabric of a neighbourhood, we maintain that it appropriate to require evaluations for properties that are not designated under the Heritage Act. Further direction on this evaluation will be given through documententation outside of the OP.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	9	9.1	The New OP would be improved by language setting out how to resolve discrepancies between conflicting development parameters, for example the differing height and density provisions in the Medium Density" designation and the overlay policy areas such as the MTSAs, Strategic Growth Areas ("SGAs") and Intensification Corridors.	The following policy will be added to Section 2.5 "General Land Use Policies": All General Land Use policies have been designed to complement the Section 2.3 policies guiding community structure elements. Should any policies conflict, the City shall make a context-sensitive decision, based on good planning principles, regarding which policy prevails.
759 Yonge Street / Yonge GO Village	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	9	9.1	As the City is aware, the Yonge GO Subdivision is zoned for a master planned community. Not only is zoning in place, but development is already underway. Currently, Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the Subdivision are serviced. The construction of new homes has started in Phases 1 and 2 and improvements are underway at two new parks. We are of the opinion that the development of the Site must proceed based on the existing zoning, unimpacted by the New OP. Transition policies inserted into the New OP would make this understanding clear and avoid future confusion. Accordingly, we request that the New OP include policies that have the effect of recognizing established development entitlements in situations such as ours.	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process.

PBM Realty Holdings / McCowan Ardagh Road / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.1	The 2nd Draft contains no transition regulations as an implementation tool. It is therefore unclear how ongoing development applications at various stages of the development approval process will be impacted when the New Official Plan comes into force and effect. At a minimum, we request a transition policy which confirms that applications deemed to be complete at the date of adoption of the City's new OP will be deemed to conform with the new OP and that any associated/ implementing applications (i.e. a site plan which implements and zoning amendment, or a plan of condominium built in conformity with an approved site plan) are similarly transitioned. It is noted that Policy 9.5.2(m) has been included that deems draft approved subdivisions conform to the Plan. It is requested a similar policy be included to acknowledge other existing approvals and ongoing development applications that have been deemed complete.	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process.
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.2	It is requested that the City include within any recommendation to approve the New Official Plan a blanket waiving of Section 21 (2.1) of the Planning Act to allow for processing of Official Plan Amendments within 2 years of the adoption of the New Official Plan, otherwise it could potentially freeze a landowners ability to undertake a new development project for a period of 2+ years.	We will be following the legislative requirements set out in the Planning Act.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	9	9.4.2.2.	Policy 9.4.2.2 outlines a list of studies that may be required to be submitted in support of an application, including subsection s), which states: “Urban design brief, including site context and block plan, in accordance with the demonstration plans (see the Appendix for example demonstration plans).” The meaning of the requirement for a submission to be “in accordance with” the demonstration plans is unclear. We suggest revised wording be considered. Further, in our submission it is not appropriate for demonstration plans to form a part of the Official Plan, and the demonstration plans may be better suited for inclusion in the Urban Design Guidelines.	We will shorten 9.4.2.2.u to only "urban design brief."
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	9	9.4.2.2.1	Policy 9.4.2.2.1 identifies a list of submission materials that are requirements for mid-rise buildings, including a site context/block plan and pedestrian wind study. In our submission the submissions materials required for a mid-rise building submission is overly extensive for this type of built form. We note that as identified by Policy 9.4.2.2.2, the specific submission materials required for mid-rise buildings are the same as what would be required for a tall building. We suggest that revised wording be considered as follows: “development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may require the following”, and that subsections a) and d) be removed.	The recommendation is to incorporate flexibility by changing the statement to: "Without prejudicing the other submittals and studies that will be determined through a Pre-Consultation Meeting, development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may be required to including the following:"

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.4.2.2.1	Every mid-rise application must be accompanied by a Pedestrian Wind Study and Sun/Shadow Study. The Landowners ask that the word “must’ be replaced with ‘may’ because not every 6-storey application should require a wind study or sun/shadow study, particularly in greenfield areas.	The recommendation is to incorporate flexibility by changing the statement to: "Without prejudicing the other submittals and studies that will be determined through a Pre-Consultation Meeting, development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may be required to including the following:"
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.4.2.2.1 and 9.4.2.2.2	Speaks to “at a minimum” and “must”, the studies required for a mid-rise building. A mid-rise building in the Salem Secondary Plan lands is different than within the built boundary and these studies may not be necessary. Perhaps this should be revised to reflect the difference.	The recommendation is to incorporate flexibility by changing the statement to: "Without prejudicing the other submittals and studies that will be determined through a Pre-Consultation Meeting, development applications for Mid-Rise Buildings may be required to including the following:"
McCowan Ardagh Road Property (Ardagh Rd and County Rd 27) / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.4.2.2.t	Placemaking brief- policy 9.4.2.2(t) may require an applicant for development to provide a placemaking brief. There is no criteria as to when and why it is required.	Placemaking briefs would be for development/redevelopment of sites critical to the City's cultural understanding and identity.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.1	A critical policy that is found within the Salem Secondary Plan but has been left out of the draft document is one that advises prospective developers whom are non-participating landowners that they must become a member in good standing with the group, prior to the submission of a development application. The Salem landowners respectfully request this policy remain.	Recommendation is to add the following policy to section 9.5.1: "Landowners in the Designated Greenfield Areas shall become a member of the governing landowners association prior to the City accepting and processing a development application."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.1	The Hewitt’s and Salem Secondary Plans contain policies that require landowners to be signatories to the respective Cost Sharing Agreement prior to development approvals. The only related policy that appears in the new OP is in Section 9.5.11d) that allows the use of a holding provision until the developer enters into a Cost Sharing Agreement. Consistent with current practice, the Landowners request that a new policy be included in Section 9.5.1 of the new Official Plan that requires landowners to be a member in good standing of the respective Landowners Groups prior to the City accepting/processing any development applications.	Recommendation is to add the following policy to section 9.5.1: "Landowners in the Designated Greenfield Areas shall become a member of the governing landowners association prior to the City accepting and processing a development application."
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	9	9.5.11.d	Specific policies requiring landowners within these Secondary Plan areas to join the associated cost sharing agreements prior to approval of a subdivision, condominium plan or rezoning have been removed. While policy 9.5.11.d identifies entering into a cost sharing agreement as a potential condition for a Holding Symbol, this does not require such a condition to be applied and comes too late in the process. The OP must include a policy that landowners must be members in good standing with the respective landowner group as a condition of the pre-consultation or conformity exercise, i.e. prior to accepting/processing any development applications.	Recommendation is to add the following policy to section 9.5.1: "Landowners in the Designated Greenfield Areas shall become a member of the governing landowners association prior to the City accepting and processing a development application."

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.11.d	Requires the use of a hold symbol for the requirement of entering into a cost share agreement. In our view, landowners should be required to be a member in good standing with the Salem Landowners Group prior to the submission of development applications to the city. We request this be included in the Official Plan.	Recommendation is to add the following policy to section 9.5.1: "Landowners in the Designated Greenfield Areas shall become a member of the governing landowners association prior to the City accepting and processing a development application."
Trans Canada Pole: 7735 County Rd 27	IPS / Darren Vella	9	9.5.2	We have significant concerns with the substantial difference between phasing permissions between Phases 2 and 3. Development in Phases 3W, and all subsequent phases, is not permitted until 60 percent of the land in the preceding phase, being Phases 2E or 2W, as identified on Appendix 2, is subject to a registered M-Plan or equivalent level of approval, as determined by the City. This wording significantly differs from lands within Phase 2 which requires 60% of Phase 1 lands being approved draft plan of subdivision, approved draft plan of condominium, or registered site plan. Under the proposed policy framework, Phase 3 landowners would require Phase 2 lands to be within a Registered MPlan or other similar approvals. This will significantly alter the timing in which Phase 3 lands can commence Planning Act applications and will ultimately leave the City with a significant building permit gap between Phase 2 and 3 if Phase 3 lands cannot begin their planning process until 60% of phase 2 lands are registered. We request confirmation from the City that the Phasing Plan remain consistent between all Phases in the Secondary Plan areas. We would request that the wording utilized in 9.5.2(i) be used to describe the sequence of phasing in 9.5.2 (iii).	The phasing policies in the draft new Official Plan were deliberated after careful consideration to better align the development process with the supports needed for growth; the process should not result in delays on the City's end.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	9	9.5.2.a.i	states that a condition of Final Approval is occupancy. It is requested that this be removed. With a subdivision, for example, occupancy happens after issuance of a building permit, and a building permit is typically only issued after Final Approval. If the intention is to state that occupancy cannot occur until after Final Approval, it is suggested that the policy be re-worded.	After reviewing this policy, it was determined that it is not appropriate in the Phasing section (9.5.2); however, please note that we will be expanding the Development Agreements and Final Approval Section (9.4.2.8) slightly.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	9	9.5.2.e	Moving from one phase of development to the next should be expedited once appropriate growth management considerations have been met, which primarily should be focused on ensuring that the required infrastructure is available to support growth.	We agree that movement into subsequent development phases should be tied to growth management considerations, which do include a focus on required infrastructure, as per Policy 9.5.2.f. However, for the holistic and sustainable growth of Barrie, we must also take into account other considerations.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.2.h	Requires Sub-Watershed Impact Studies be completed prior to the next phase of development. The SIS for the Salem Secondary Plan encompassed all of the Phase 1, 2 and 3 lands within the current Salem Secondary Plan. The SIS should only be required for those identified as Phase 4 in the Salem area.	If Sub-Watershed Impact studies have already been completed for Phase 1, 2 and 3 lands, then as per the policy, a Sub-watershed Impact Study would only be needed for Phase 4 lands.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.2.i.iii and 9.5.2.i.ii	Policy 9.5.2i)iii) requires that 60% of Phase 2 East to be registered prior to approvals proceeding in Phase 3 East and then Phase 4 East. Long before the 60% registration timeline is achieved, the vast majority of infrastructure will have already been constructed to support development across all of the East phases. The Hewitt's Landowners believe that this policy will result in delaying the approvals/construction in Phases 3 and 4 East that will be relying in part on already constructed infrastructure. The Landowners request that the phasing requirements noted in 9.5.2i)ii) apply to all Phases.	The phasing policies in the draft new Official Plan were deliberated after careful consideration to better align the development process with the supports needed for growth; the process should not result in delays on the City's end.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	9	9.5.3	It is requested that the requirement in policy 9.5.3 to review impacts to the City tax base in relation to subdivisions, the requirement for traffic calming, and the requirement for vegetation removal only within 30 days of grading, be reconsidered. With respect to vegetation removal, the Migratory Bird Act, in effect, only allows tree removal during the fall and winter months, and grading normally cannot occur during that time period. Further, development of large sites typically cannot occur within 30 days of vegetation removal. It is requested that these policies be removed or, in the case of vegetation removal, that the policy be amended to provide for an alternative approach to the satisfaction of the City.	Traffic calming requirements will remain. However, it is recommended that policy 9.5.3.j.ii) will be changed to: "Where possible, removal of vegetation shall not occur more than 30 days prior to grading or construction;"
McCowan Ardagh Road Property (Ardagh Rd and County Rd 27)	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.5.3	Subdivision policies - it is requested that the requirement in policy 9.5.3 to review the City tax base in relation to subdivisions, requirement for traffic calming, and requirement for vegetation removal only within 30 days of grading be reconsidered. Further, the lapse date policies of 9.5.3 (i) should include provision for extensions.	It is recommended that policy 9.5.3.j.ii) will be changed to: "Where possible, removal of vegetation shall not occur more than 30 days prior to grading or construction;" it is also recommended that a provision for extensions will be included in policy 9.5.3.i: "Approval of draft plans of subdivision may include provisions which require a subdivider to sastisfy certain conditions prior to final approval an registration of the plan of subdivision. The developer will be required to satisfy these conditions within a specified time period, following which the draft plan approval will lapse if the conditions are not satisfied. Extensions may be provided."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	9	9.5.3.i	In policy 9.5.3 i), the lapse date should include provision for extensions.	It is recommended that a provision for extensions will be included in policy 9.5.3.i: "Approval of draft plans of subdivision may include provisions which require a subdivider to sastisfy certain conditions prior to final approval and registration of the plan of subdivision. The developer will be required to satisfy these conditions within a specified time period, following which the draft plan approval will lapse if the conditions are not satisfied. Extensions may be provided."

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.3.j	Requires vegetation removal not occurring more than 30 days prior to grading. This is not achievable and should be removed.	It is recommended that policy 9.5.3.j.ii) will be changed to: "Where possible, removal of vegetation shall not occur more than 30 days prior to grading or construction;"
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.3j)ii)	Restricts removal of vegetation outside of 30 days prior to grading/construction. The Landowners request that this policy be removed because it is already contained in the LSPP (S.4.20-DP), and that policy intends to prevent erosion. Given tree removal restrictions under the Migratory Birds Act, there is no practical way to develop large greenfield sites within 30 days of tree removal; however, conformity with the LSPP policy can be maintained by preventing stump removal until closer to earthworks commencing.	It is recommended that policy 9.5.3.j.ii) will be changed to: "Where possible, removal of vegetation shall not occur more than 30 days prior to grading or construction;"
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.5.4	Plan of Condominium: We do not agree with or understand the mandatory ("shall") policies regarding the types of condominium considerations contained in subsections a), b) and c). Subsection d) should also acknowledge condominium exemptions as permitted by the Condominium Act.	Revisions have been made to this section, in part with consideration to the comment.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.4	Provides various condominium tenures. As noted previously, why is vacant land condominium not noted? This is another viable option which has been used successfully elsewhere.	This section has been rewritten to further clarify policies. All condominium types stated under the Condominium Act and Planning Act will be considered for application.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.4	Lists 3 plan of condominium types. The Landowners request that the types of condominiums not be referenced, and a single set of policies be developed. Alternatively, the City should then reference every condominium type, including Vacant Land Condominium's which have been successfully developed in Barrie.	This section has been rewritten to further clarify policies. All condominium types stated under the Condominium Act and Planning Act will be considered for application.
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	9	9.5.4.1	Condo Conversion policies identified in Section 9.5.4.1 are not consistent with Section 2.5.1 where conversion of rental units to ownership require replacement at a ratio of 1:1. If there is a healthy rental market and has been healthy for preceding years, replacement of rental units may be considered onerous.	The conversion rate is 1:1; but as stated in policy 2.5.e.iii) applications for a condominium conversion shall comply with the policies in section 9.5.4.1.
79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	9	9.5.6.b	The policies of 9.5.6 (Context Sensitive Development) appear to state that infill is a form of intensification and shall be on a lot created between two existing lots that are approximately 150 metres or less apart and that the parcel of land should be in keeping with the existing and anticipated development in the area. It is submitted that the policy could be interpreted that higher order intensification cannot take place as infill development.	Policy 9.5.6.b) will be deleted.

Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited / Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	9	9.5.6.b	Policy 9.5.6b) states that “The distance between the existing lot lines in an infill situation shall be approximately 150.0 metres or less”. It is not clear as to the meaning or intent of such a policy, and would request clarification as to applicability and interpretation.	Policy 9.5.6.b) will be deleted.
Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	9	9.5.6.b	Policy 9.5.6 b) states “The distance between the existing lot lines in an infill situation shall be approximately 150.0 metres or less. We seek clarification on the intent of this policy, why it is included, and how it will be applied.	Policy 9.5.6.b) will be deleted.
Al McNair		9	9.5.7	Site Plan Control should be required for any residential expansion on an existing lot where the building footprint is increased by more than 20% or where landscaping provisions or protection of natural heritage features/functions are required.	Site Plan Control will be required for developments that would occur on properties located within the designated Site Plan Control area. We will also be further specifying that increased oversight will also be needed for special context areas.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	9	9.5.7.1.j	Section 9.5.7.1(j) which pertains to site plan control is unclear. To improve clarity, we suggest the following wording: … exterior design of buildings, sustainable design elements on any adjoining municipal boulevards/rights-of way (modification underlined) The recommended wording makes it clear that this policy is referring to the municipal property, which we believe is its intent.	To improve clarity, the policy will be changed to: "To address design elements on the exterior of and surrounding a building, including, but not limited to: character, scale, appearance, massing, design features, roof pitch, materials and screening of rooftop mechanical and electrical equipment, and sustainable design elements."
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	9	9.5.7.b	Policy 9.5.7 b) identifies that applications NOT subject to site plan control are required to provide elevations; it is assumed that elevations are required for applications which ARE subject to site plan control. Please amend or provide a rationale as to why non-Section 41 applications require elevations.	Policy 9.5.6.b will be revised; the intent of the policy is to ensure regulation for context sensitive areas.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.7b)	Requires elevations for buildings not subject to site plan control. Elevations should be required for buildings subject to SPC. Request removal of the word ‘not’.	Policy 9.5.6.b will be revised; the intent of the policy is to ensure regulation for context sensitive areas.
Canadian Tire Real Estate/ Choice Properties REIT and Loblaw Companies Limited	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	9	9.5.9	Policy 9.5.9 states that “When reviewing an application for Minor Variance, the Committee of Adjustment will also consider the relevant policies of this Plan and all of the following criteria: a) That the variance would not cause substantial detriment, hazard, or annoyance that would detract from the character or amenity of nearby properties, and the resultant development would not adversely affect the traffic and parking conditions in the area”. In our submission, the policy should be revised to “all of the following relevant criteria”, since traffic and parking conditions may not be relevant for the particular variance (e.g., minimum setbacks).	Policies related to minor variances will be revised; we will stick to the four tests of the Planning Act.

Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	9	9.5.9	Draft Policy 9.5.9 states that "When reviewing an application for Minor Variance, the Committee of Adjustment will also consider the relevant policies of this Plan and all of the following criteria: a) That the variance would not cause substantial detriment, hazard, or annoyance that would detract from the character or amenity of nearby properties, and the resultant development would not adversely affect the traffic and parking conditions in the area". In our submission, that this policy is overreaching and unnecessary, given that the assessment of Minor Variance Application the governed by the prescribed tests in the Planning Act.	Policies related to minor variances will be revised; we will stick to the four tests of the Planning Act.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	9	9.5.9	Sets out policies related to Minor Variance applications. The Planning Act sets out the four tests in which an application has to be examined. This section should be amended to be reflect the Planning Act and not create new test within this draft document.	Policies related to minor variances will be revised; we will stick to the four tests of the Planning Act.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	9	9.5.9.a	The conditions included in policy 9.5.9a) cannot reasonably be met as terms such as 'annoyance' are too broad and remain undefined. Tests which are not outlined and prescribed through the Planning Act cannot have a reasonable place in this document and so are not in keeping with legislative requirements.	Policies related to minor variances will be revised; we will stick to the four tests of the Planning Act.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	9	9.5.9a)	New test a: cause a substantial detriment, hazard or annoyance that would detract from the character or amenity of nearby properties. The Landowners request removal of this policy because 'detriment' and 'annoyance' are inappropriate OP policies.	Policies related to minor variances will be revised; we will stick to the four tests of the Planning Act.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	9	block plans (mainly section 9, but also throughout)	There are numerous references to Block Plans without any explanation as to what these are, or where the City intends to require them. We suggest this language be removed as these references are unnecessary given that all lands are either within the built-up area (and will be subject to demonstration plans as shown in Appendix 3) or have been comprehensively planned in the Greenfield area through the Salem and Hewitt Secondary Plan processes and therefore no Block Plan should be required prior to development. To resolve this concern, we request that the City include a site-specific policy that states that the subject lands will not be required to undertake a Secondary or Block Plan prior to, as a requirement of, or condition of development approvals (draft plan of subdivision and zoning bylaw amendment).	Block Plans show the site and how a proposed development fits within the existing and/or planned surrounding fabric and context. We reserve the right to request a Block Plan where needed; if comprehensive planning for a site and the surrounding area is in place, we may not require one.

LSRCA		10	10.2	The following definitions would benefit from additional clarification. Suggested wording provided below. Natural Heritage Features and Areas – include wetlands (non-PSW and unevaluated), woodlands (non-significant), locally significant natural areas, cultural thickets and cultural meadows. Woodlands: treed area, woodlot or forested area, other than a cultivated fruit or nut orchard or a plantation established for the purpose of producing Christmas trees (ORMCP). By using the ELC definition of "Forest", it would restrict woodlands to treed areas with >60% cover. Many of the woodlands in the natural heritage system are not this dense. Many are woodlands with 35 – 60% cover.	It should be noted that Natural Heritage Features is defined in the body of the Official Plan, therefore having a definition in section 10.2 is duplicative. The definition to Woodlands can be revised.
LSRCA		10	10.2	Please provide a definition for Stormwater Management Facilities. This will assist with conversations during the approval process regarding what is or is not accepted within the outer 50% of a VPZ to a natural heritage feature.	A definition of Stormwater Management facilities has been added.
PBM Realty Holdings / 79 Collier / Artenosi Developments Group / 10-24 Grove St	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	10	10.1.e	The use of discrete bulleted permitted uses within a land use designation is a very specific way of listing uses and must be utilized properly. For example, does the term "Residential" include seniors or student housing? We are concerned with the restricted list of employment and commercial uses. Additional expansion of the permitted use lists is recommended.	As highlighted in policy 10.1.e: "uses quoted under definitions in each of the land use categories should not be considered all inclusive. They are intended to illustrate the general intent of the policy."
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	1	It is noted that boundary revisions to the Urban Growth Centre established by the Growth Plan are proposed. Please identify the rationale for such revisions.	The Urban Growth Centre boundaries were revised due to limited development potential east of Essa Road and the presence of cultural heritage resources. At the same time, part of Allandale remains as an MTSA, which will also see intensification, but not at the same scale as the Urban Growth Centre.
Gary Bell		Maps	1	The existing mix of uses, greater intensity of residential uses in some parts, and greater traffic along all of Blake Street, (classified as Arterial with a 41 m ROW), make it functionally an Intensification Corridor. This should be acknowledged on Map 1. A designation of Strategic Growth Area would be appropriate and prescriptive for the section starting at and including at the Commercial District at Johnson Street out to Penetanguishene Road.	The level of intensification forecast for Intensification Corridors would not be suitable for Blake Street; therefore, it will remain classified as an arterial.
Gary Bell		Maps	1	The north part of the lands along the west side of Highway 400 north of Harvie Road is designated Commercial District on Map 2 Land Use. To be consistent and clear it should be designated Strategic Growth Area on Map 1 Community Structure.	The revision to the Strategic Growth Area on Map 1 will be made.
Gary Bell		Maps	1	There is a long existing employment and commercial area along Blake Street east of Johnson Street and particularly near Penetanguishene Road which could be recognized on Map 1 for desired Strategic Growth.	The level of intensification forecast for Intensification Corridors would not be suitable for Blake Street; therefore, it will remain classified as an arterial.

Ballymore	Keith MacKinnon / KLM	Maps	1	Map 1 identifies the Ballymore lands as part of the Major Transit Station Areas (MTSA). The policies related to the MTSA state it is for all lands that are within a 10-minute walking distance to the GO Train Station located north of Mapleview Drive, east of Yonge Street. Given the Ballymore location, we believe these lands do not meet the 10-minute walkable criteria and should be removed from the MTSA hatching.	We are adjusting the boundaries for the Barrie South MTSA, with this in mind.
Sean Mason / 570-586 Yonge	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	1	The rear of 586 Yonge St has been left out of the Strategic Growth Area on Map 1 and should be modified to include these lands with the remainder of the property.	The propery at the rear of 586 Yonge should now be included in the Strategic Growth Area.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	1	The natural heritage system limits between the Crisdawn and Unilock lands south of Salem, west of Essa do not reflect the approved limits. The natural heritage limits have been reflected on the natural heritage plans provided previously. As noted to staff, we will provide the approved limits.	As mentioned by email, once the approved limits are provided, we will make this change. In the meantime, please also note policy 10.1.c) that allows for NHS changes to be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will always take the most up-to-date, approved information.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	1	A park is missing on the Watersand Phase 2 lands at the terminus of Exell Avenue. This is consistent across many of the schedules.	This update has been completed.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	1	As noted previously, we request the streets and street names for the Phase 4 and employment lands east of Highway 400 be removed as they are not consistent with what will be ultimately shown in future draft plan of subdivision applications.	We include a disclaimer in the legend stating that "roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	1	Please explain how you arrived at the limits of the Barrie South Major Transit Station Area.	The boundary of the MTSA was established based on the Traffic Zones, and this was illustrated back in October 2019 in our Land Needs Assessment report. The boundaries for the MTSA were proposed at that time; however, we will be revisting the boundaries given on the map.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	1	DGA hatching is missing from the south-east corner of Hewitt's.	The Designated Greenfield Area boundary has been updated and extended to the City limits.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	1	The MTSA overlaps with Neighbourhood Area lands which have vastly different density expectations.	We are revisiting the density target for the Barrie South MTSA, as well as the boundaries.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	Maps	1	We have noted an error in which a portion of our client's lands have been excluded from the Designated Greenfield Area ("DGA") in Map 1 of the Draft Official Plan and request this be corrected to include these lands as part of the DGA.	DGA boundary adjusted to be extended to the City Limits, as the Settlement Boundary Area has been proposed to be extended there too.

Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	2	It is recommended that the City consider implementing pockets of Medium or High density designations to be scattered throughout the City in the Neighbourhood Areas and other areas, where intensified uses, taller buildings/higher densities, already exist and are considered compatible with adjacent uses. By including the existing medium and high density residential uses in the Neighbourhood Area designation appears to downgrade their land use intensification ability and renders their existing uses non-conforming (given Neighbourhood Area maximum building heights of 3 and 4 storeys.) Designating these sites/pockets of Medium or High density land uses would recognize their current existing higher density uses, allow for greater intensification potential, possibility to introduce non-residential uses, and recognize their underlying permitted zoning of apartment dwellings, zoned, RA1 and RA2. The Neighbourhood Area land use designation does not allow for the recognition of existing higher density uses and does not distinguish future high and low density residential uses.	We have reviewed the sites in question and have determined that a change to medium or high density would be inappropriate, given the surrounding neighbourhood context. At the same time, we have implemented a new policy section -- 2.5.6 "existing approvals" -- which upholds all existing approvals and permissions given to a site. This would apply to the sites in question.
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	2	The Plan identifies that the High Density land use designation is to be used in growth areas, Urban Growth Centre and the Strategic Growth Areas; however, on Map 2, Land Use, the only area where the High Density designation is identified is the Urban Growth Centre, the Osmington site at Hwy 400 and Essa Road and at Essa Road and Mapleview. The City should consider more High Density land uses in other areas of the City that can support taller buildings and higher densities such as the Major Transit Station Areas and near Commercial Districts.	This is the first Official Plan to really address Barrie's growth over the next 30 years and we want to ensure that growth is strategic, organic and manageable. At the same time, this will not be the only Official Plan between now ant 2051, and as growth continues we may revisit where high density is allowed.
Barb and Brian Tansley		Maps	2	Big Bay Pt Rd map2 We are opposed to putting intensification areas into existing residential neighbourhoods. It appears to be planned medium density and we are concerned the increased density and heights 6-12 stories is just too much. There’s also concern that already approved construction sites could increase density and height restriction beyond what’s already planned.	Where there is a medium density development planned that will abut a residential neighbourhood, we will ensure that proper transitions and appropriate development limits will be put in place to allow for proper integration within the neighbourhood.

Cecilia Lee/ 599 Dunlop Street West		Maps	2	The land we own is 599 Dunlop Street West, at the corner of Dunlop Street West and Tiffin Street. It is located at the entrance to Barrie on the west side. My land is now grouped under Employment Land - Non Industrial, along Dunlop Street W and Employment Land - Industrial for the area next to it.. The net impact is that these new land use designations do not permit residential. Currently, we have zoning approval of C4 which includes a residential component. It was acquired prior to the creation and subsequent approval of the new Official Plan 2051. Even though we can still sell our land as C4 before the zoning by-law is changed, we have to put our sale on hold with this uncertainty. I am requesting that our land be recognized/honoured for our current privilege which includes a residential component and will be grandfathered in the new Official Plan 2051 and new zoning by-law.	We will now be allowing those sites previously zoned commercial that are now receiving an Employment Area -- Non Industrial designation to maintain all permissions, excepting residential, for the Commercial District designation too. We will also be upholding existing permissions.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	Maps	2	The Draft OP proposes to designate the Site as “Medium Density” and “Neighbourhood Area” as shown to the left. Informed by the current “Commercial General” designation, our concept for the Site has long incorporated commercial development as a cornerstone, complimented by adjacent residential uses at the key Yonge / Mapleview intersection. Request: That the “Commercial District” designation apply to the entire Site. As part of the ongoing development of the Site, we recently attended a site plan pre-consultation meeting with the City to discuss our intentions regarding commercial use on a portion of the Site. While we will be pursuing commercial development on parts of the Site, we acknowledge the ‘overlay policy’ objectives of the City to encourage significant medium and high density residential development near Yonge Street (Intensification Corridor) and near the GO Station (Major Transit Station Area / Strategic Growth Area). Given the size of the Site we believe objectives for intensive residential development can be achieved in conjunction with the planned commercial development and that this is best accomplished with a “Commercial District” designation.	We have designated the entre site Commercial District, which prioritizes commercial development, but encourages a mix of uses, including residential.
Gary Bell		Maps	2	There is a long existing employment and commercial area along Blake Street east of Johnson Street and particularly near Penetanguishene Road which could be recognized on Map 2 for Commercial or Employment- Non-Industrial intent.	The Neighbourhood Area designation allows for commercial uses, including small scae office, as well as retail along an arterial street such as Blake. Therefore, we feel that the designation is appropriate, as it will also help maintain the existing neighbourhood fabric and context.

Marshall Landholdings - 15,13,11,9,5 Peel Street & 118, 98 Mulcaster St	Greg Barker / IPS	Maps	2	Under the current Official Plan, the lands are located partially within/adjacent the Urban Growth Centre (Schedule I). Through previous discussions between City staff and the owners, it was understood the subject lands may develop in accordance with the policies of the UGC given their proximity to the UGC. As was the case with the first draft, the second Draft City of Barrie Official Plan, Map 2, identifies the subject lands as being within the Neighbourhood Area designation. The subject lands and the general surrounding area is currently comprised predominantly of existing or planned medium density development within the RM2 zone. There is very little development exhibiting existing low density character, nor would current zoning of this area permit new low density development. This area is not recognized as having existing nor planned low density development. The lands are also adjacent the UGC and lands proposed to be designated as High Density and as such it is anticipated that infrastructure capacity exists or is planned in proximity to the site which could be used to accommodate higher (ie medium) density developments. Given the proximity to the UGC, there is an expectation and a requirement that the area is expected to experience significant physical change in order to accommodate anticipated development which would alter the character of the area. Request: it was understood and agreed that the medium density designation is intended.	We have surveyed the site in detail and given the neighbourhood context, the current land use designation is appropriate. Under this Official Plan, the site may see up to 4 storeys along Mulcaster.
505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street	Jack Krubnik / IPS	Maps	2	Our intention in this Official Plan Review if to justify the consideration that 505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street is uniquely positioned for more intensification, taller heights, and more density than has been attributed to it within this Official Plan review. The site is located on an Arterial Road, has a size of approximately 2.7 ha, and has significant frontage along both a watercourse and Yonge Street, which has been identified as an Intensification Corridor. Given this backdrop, and the policy intent of the New Official Plan, particularly related to growth management and Intensification Corridors, we feel that the subject site would be more appropriately designated as Medium or High Density in Official Plan Map 2 – Land Use Designations.	The land use designation for this site will be changed to Medium Density.

70 Pioneer Trail	Brandi Clement / Jones Consulting	Maps	2	A Pre-Consultation meeting was held on December 3, 2020 to discuss a proposed Site Plan consisting of 19 single detached dwellings (File No. D28-052-2020). A formal application for Site Plan Control will be submitted to the City in the summer of 2021. An OMB decision approved a total of 19 single detached dwellings on the lands. Permitted average densities within the current Residential designation include low-density residential uses between 12 and 25 units per net hectare. The approved concept of 19 units provides for a density of approximately 9 units per net hectare (19 units / 2.17 ha). Based on these policies, the proposed use on the subject lands as permitted by the OMB is permitted; however, the density does not meet the minimum density standard. The minimum target of 50.0 units per hectare can be difficult to achieve where other policies must be met such as respecting existing character, having regard for natural heritage features, intensification policies, topographical features and property configuration. Further, the EPA-Level 1 designation is too restrictive for the subject lands which has been approved by the OMB for development. We respectfully request that the City review the minimum density targets for lands designated Neighbourhood Area in the draft Official Plan to provide for a greater range, revise the language to be less restrictive to allow for greater flexibility, and identify the existing OMB decision on these lands.	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process. The minimum density target for local roads in a Neighbourhood Area will also be removed.
Allandale Centre / 367-371, 375, 389, 393 Yonge Street	Street Properties / Luisa Di Iulio	Maps	2	Site currently in an Intensification Node and on an Intensification Corridor and designated "General Commercial." The site hosts several one-storey commercial and office buildings. The site is proposed in Draft 2 of the new OP to be designated Neighbourhood Area. We would request that the properties be re-designated to "Medium Density" and that a higher height be provided for this site than the current proposed Medium Density policies for the following reasons: the site remains located on an intensification corridor; the site has a greater depth than is characteristic of many underutilized parcels of land on Intensification Corridors, thus providing for appropriate depths for transition to the adjacent low density neighbourhood; the site is within walking distance of a school, commercial, parks and trails; as a land assembly, the site provides ample opportunity to allow for at grade amenity space, commercial and landscaping.	Existing permissions for the site will be maintained, as per a new poicy introduced to section 2.5. At the same time, we feel that the current land use designation is appropriate for the area.

McCowan Ardagh Road Property (Ardagh Rd and County Rd 27)	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	Maps	2	It is requested the lands on the Site identified as Neighbourhood Area be designated Medium Density on Map 2 in order to reflect this intended built form. This request was included in letter to City dated December 22, 2020. We believe Medium Density would be a more appropriate designation for the site as the site has a constrained developable area, is not immediately adjacent to any other built form and is somewhat isolated. Maximizing the density on the site in the context of the surround area would make efficient use of the site and allow for a greater variety of built form in this area of the City which predominately consists of single detached dwellings on the south side of Ardagh Rd and further to the east.	Intensification in this area would be difficult to service by transit; the Neighbourhood Area designation respects the surrounding context for the area.
10-24 Grove Street West	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	Maps	2	Our Client's primary concern with the 2nd Draft of the New Official Plan is that it does not clearly identify or carry forward the existing OP and ZBL permissions that exist on their lands. As the City is aware these lands received site specific OPA and ZBA approvals back in 2018. Our Client acquired these lands in early 2021 and have been actively working through the site plan approval process for a large purpose built rental project. It is requested that the property be identified on Map 2 as a Defined Policy Area and all site specific permissions be recognized and carried forward within Section 2.8 - Defined Policy Areas.	The intent of the Official Plan is not to supersede existing approvals; we will include a transition policy in the new Official Plan that recognizes existing approvals for developments still going through the application process.
Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	Maps	2	Our review of Map2, entitled Land Use Designations, indicates that there is a note on the schedule which reads ... "All land use designations extend to the centre line of the street and up to the highway right-of-way where appropriate." To avoid any confusion as to the intent of the foregoing note on Map 2, it is suggested that reference should be made to the highway right-of-way existing as of the date of adoption of the proposed (new) Official Plan. Clarification is also sought in relation to the phrase "where appropriate" as this suggests that situations may exist where the designations are not to be interpreted to extend to the centreline of the street or up to the highway right-of -way. This is of particular significance in the context of lands in the vicinity of Dunlop Street West and the Highway No. 400 corridor.	We have revised the disclaimer on the map to provide greater clarification.

265 St Vincent Street	Mark Blair	Maps	2	I would like to formally provide a submission requesting my property at 265 St Vincent Street be designated Medium Density (orange) in the third draft of the City of Barrie's Official Plan (OP). Factors supporting this reclassification from Neighbourhood Area (yellow) to Medium Density (orange) include: - it is a large land parcel at the intersection of a 4 lane arterial road (St Vincent) and a collector road (Grove St), with frontage along both roads - It is strategically located within 1.5 km of Georgian College & RVH, 2km from Downtown Barrie, & has easy and quick highway access, & bus routes servicing the property - The intersection it is located in has a gas station, & a 4-story apartment building, with more 3-4 story apartment buildings within a block of this intersection on Grove Street going West, representing a transitioning area for density-appropriate growth - Having a medium density designation that will allow 6+ stories instead of a limit of 4 stories, will facilitate the city's goal of increasing density-based housing supply quicker and sooner, as an increase in density designation will facilitate me attracting interest in developing my property sooner, instead of continuing to operating it as a chiropractor office, which due to its valuable location and the lack of housing in Barrie, is no longer the highest and best use of this site.	We have reviewed the site, and given the surrounding neighbourhood context and that the site is not in an intensification area, we believe that a limit of four storeys is appropriate.
Smart Centres / 15 Harvie Rd	Mark Resnick	Maps	2	We request that the Land Use Designation on Map 2 Land Use Designations for the eastern portion of the property between future Bryne Drive extension and Highway 400 be changed from "Employment – Industrial" to "Employment – Non-Industrial". The change in designation is requested as the "Employment – Non-Industrial" designation affords greater flexibility of land uses which we desire, inclusive of a range of Employment uses including Office, major retail, and industrial uses such as distribution, manufacturing, and warehousing. This desired flexibility was not offered in Employment designations established in the first draft of the Official Plan.	We have reviewed the site, and the land use designation has been changed to Employment Non-Industrial.
52, 56, 58 Lakeside Terrace	JD Development Group / Sally Campbell	Maps	2	Upon review of the policies of the draft Official Plan as proposed, the subject lands should be designated 'High Density' to recognize the current permissions, densities and building heights on the subject lands. Anything less than this would limit the development potential of our property.	We have reviewed the site, and the land use designation has been changed to high density.

Ballymore	Keith MacKinnon / KLM	Maps	2	In the event that the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies are replaced with new City-wide land use designations and policies, we ask that Blocks 1-16, 22, 23 and 32, all-inclusive on the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan should be designated Neighbourhood Area. Only Block 24 which is located on the south side of Kneeshaw Drive in the south portion of the property should be designated Medium density. That Map 2 be revised to redesignate the draft approved blocks on the north side of Kneeshaw from Medium Density to Neighbourhood Area while leaving the larger block with frontage onto Lockhart designated as Medium Density. This will allow Ballymore to provide a range of heights, housing types and densities.	We have revised the site's land use designations; Blocks 1-16, 22, 23 & 32 are now Neighbourhood Area; and Block 24 is Medium Density.
St. Joseph Developments (Dunlop and Miller Drive)	DSF / David White	Maps	2	The Dunlop Street frontage is currently designated General Commercial in the existing Official Plan and zoned C4 by By-law 2009-141. This commercial designation is proposed to be eliminated for my client's lands and replaced by an Employment Non-Industrial designation. This proposed designation is effectively a down designation which removes a number of critical uses. The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation has a strange assortment of permitted uses that would appear to be out of character for the site and surrounding area. The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation will not permit the appropriate development of the site with uses that are realistic and practical and which represent good planning for a "gateway" to the City. We request that the existing Commercial designation continue on this site or in the alternative the site receive a special site specific designation that permits all of the existing commercial uses.	This and other sites that were formerly "General Commercial" and are now Employment Area - Non-Industrial. These sites will now receive the permissions in the Commercial District designation, excepting for residential. Existing approvals will also be upheld through a policy addition to section 2.5.

Sean Mason / 405 Essa Road	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	2	Under the current policy framework, it is our opinion that the subject property should be considered for medium density with new policy considerations under this designation. It is our opinion that a greater extent of the Essa Road corridor should be marked for greater levels of intensification. There are many examples of recent approvals that have not been adequately identified on Map 2. 440 and 390 Essa Road are two examples with recent approvals that should be designated more appropriately in the medium or high-density designations (i.e. densities greater than 125 uph). The subject lands lie directly across the street from 390 Essa Road. A pre-consultation meeting has already taken place for a proposed mixed-use building that would not align with the Neighborhood Area designation. A Neighborhood meeting has also been scheduled and this application is planned to be deemed complete in advance of the new Official Plan being adopted. The medium density designation would allow for a greater opportunity for the City to accomplish intensification goals, develop transit supportive densities and offer opportunities to create more attainable housing in areas where services are within walking distance. The subject lands also lie within a 10-minute walk to an underutilized municipal park (Harvie Park) and Trillium Woods Elementary School.	We will be adding a qualifier to the policy on intensification corridors in Neighbourhood Areas that may allow for up to 8 storeys. Moreover, existing approvals will be upheld in the Official Plan, once implemented.
Sean Mason	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	2	Given its location at the intersection of Hurst Drive (arterial road) and along the railway corridor, the property lends itself to medium density residential development along the railway corridor. The lands slope toward the railway corridor and based on preliminary site design concepts, a six-storey building could be placed into the slope providing a six-storey height profile on the east (Hurst Drive/Rail Line) with a four or five storey profile on the west. The remainder of the site will transition with a lower density built form (i.e. townhouses) toward the rear of the site adjacent to the existing neighborhood. Tollendale Village, located along Hurst Drive just north of the site, possesses a dense built form that can be complemented by this proposal. We respectfully request that this site be a candidate for the medium density designation.	We have reviewed this site in-depth, and the permission of four storeys is appropriate for this area.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	2	Exell Avenue is shown as a collector road west of Reid Drive. Given that it does not go anywhere, this section should be removed and should be shown as a local road only.	Exell Avenue will continue to show as a collector in its entirety. We have reviewed this with Transportation and this continuation is needed to support active transportation infrastructure.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	2	A road pattern with street names for the lands on the south side of McKay Road West and County Road 27 are not accurate and should be removed.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	2	The street pattern and street names for the lands on the south side of McKay Road East and should be removed.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	2	The NHS limits are not correct on the Crisdawn lands south of Salem, west of Essa Road.	As mentioned by email, once the approved limits are provided, we will make this change. In the meantime, please also note policy 10.1.c) that allows for NHS changes to be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will always take the most up-to-date, approved information.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2	515 Mapleview Drive East (BEMP Property)(D12-431): The 'medium density' block on the BEMP property (Mapleview Drive and Madeline) does not reflect the approved draft plan and zoning.	We have reviewed the site and believe the designation to be correct. Changes were completed as per the latest plan submitted for red-line revision. Blocks 257 & 258 from Draft Plan D12-431 are identified as mixed use blocks. The two blocks were designated as Medium Density. The zoning for the two blocks is Neighbouhood Mixed Use.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2	989 Yonge Street (ASA Development): The north-east corner of Lockhart Road and Yonge Street is designated "Neighbourhood Area". This area should be designated "Medium Density".	We have reviewed the site, and have changed the land use designation to medium density.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2	750 Lockhart (Ballymore): In the event that the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies are replaced with new City-wide land use designations and policies, Ballymore requests that Blocks 1-16, 22, 23 and 32, all inclusive on the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan should be designated Neighbourhood Area. Only Block 24 which is located on the south side of Kneeshaw Drive in the south portion of the property should be designated Medium density. Additionally, ALL figures and/or maps in the new OP should be revised to show the alignment for Collector Road Kneeshaw Drive (including the roundabouts) as per the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan.	Kneeshaw Drive has been aligned to correspond with the latest plans received. We have also revised the site's land use designations; Blocks 1-16, 22, 23 & 32 are now Neighbourhood Area; and Block 24 is Medium Density.
Park Place	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	2	The designation proposed for the SW corner of Bayview/Harvie Rd. is Non-Industrial Employment. The size, 8,451 msq. and location of the site does not readily lend itself to development under these policies. We are of the view that the site should be designated as Commercial District to allow for development as planned and permitted under the existing OP designation and zoning. As you may know our client has entered into an agreement of purchase and sale for these lands and the beneficial owner has filed a pre-consultation application. Current plans envisage a modern car wash and convenience retail development. We would like to ensure that this project does not have any future policy obstacles.	We will be expanding permissions for the Non-Industrial Employment area. Moreover, existing approvals will be upheld once the Official Plan is implemented.

Cedar Links Golf Course / 611 Huronia	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	2	Upon review of the Official Plan framework, we would respectfully request that the subject lands be considered for the Employment Area – Non-Industrial Designation. The subject lands are located on the periphery of the employment area and are not located on a Freight Supportive Corridor. The location of the subject lands can serve as a buffer along with the existing commercial plaza to the west from heavier industrial uses.	Cedar Links Golf Course will maintain its current designation. The site just north of Cedar Links Golf Course (571 Huronia; the northeast corner of Huronia and Mapleview) will be changed to Employment Non-Industrial.
571 Huronia Rd	IPS / Kyle Galvin	Maps	2	Upon review of the Official Plan framework, we would respectfully request that the subject lands be considered for the Employment Area – Non-Industrial Designation. The subject lands are located on the periphery of the employment area and are not located on a Freight Supportive Corridor. The location of the subject lands can serve as a buffer along with the existing commercial plaza across the street to the south west from heavier industrial uses.	The site just north of Cedar Links Golf Course (571 Huronia; the northeast corner of Huronia and Mapleview) will be changed to Employment Non-Industrial.
17-27 Jacobs Street	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	2	It is our opinion that based on the location of the subject site relative to the Major Transit Station and the unique characteristics of the subject lands make it more suitable for the High-Density Designation for several reasons. 1. The subject site is in an important location to support growth and will play a pivotal role in intensification initiatives for the City and the ability to strive towards creating a more complete community. 2. The subject site is near Essa Road. Essa Road is a main arterial road and transit priority location. This is a location in which high density development should be considered. 3. The subject lands are in close proximity to Highway 400/Essa Interchange. 4. It is understood that among others, the Medium Density designation is to provide a transition area from the High Density Areas to Neighbourhood Area Designated lands. The subject site is located approximately 62m from the nearest Neighbourhood Area designated lands which allows for ample transition from High Density to Neighbourhood Area Designation. The development of high density residential is appropriately buffered from Neighborhood Areas where transition and lower densities would be considered more appropriate. 5. Placing high density in this location is not viewed as negatively impacting abutting developments and would permit a built form that is similar to the land uses that have been recently approved adjacent to the site.	We have reviewed the site in depth, and believe the existing land use designation is appropriate for the area, given the surrounding neighbourhood context. Medium Density will allow for up to 12 storeys. At the same time, existing approvals will be upheld.

61 Big Bay Pt. Rd: CW Bellrose GP	R.G. Richards / Ron Richards	Maps	2	The designation proposed for the Site in the draft official plan is Non-Industrial Employment. The size (8,451 msq.) and location of the Site does not, in our opinion, readily lend itself to development under these proposed policies. We are of the view that the site should be designated as Commercial District to allow for development as planned and permitted under the existing OP designation and zoning.	We have reviewed the site in detail, and believe that the Non-Industrial Employment land use designation is appropriate. At the same time, the Non-Industrial Employment land use designation has been revised to allow for some expanded permissions.
545 Dunlop St. West: AGC Developments	David S White/DSW	Maps	2	The Dunlop Street frontage is currently designated General Commercial in the existing Official Plan and zoned C4 by By-law 2009-141. This commercial designation is proposed to be eliminated for my client's lands and replaced by an Employment Non-Industrial designation. This proposed designation is effectively a down designation which removes a number of critical uses. The proposed Employment Non-Industrial designation will not permit the appropriate development of the site with uses that are realistic and practical and which represent good planning for a "gateway" to the City. We request that the existing Commercial designation continue on this site or in the alternative the site receive a special site specific designation that permits all of the existing commercial uses.	For sites such as the one referenced by the commenter, while the designation will remain Employment Non-Industrial, all Commercial District permissions -- excepting for residential -- will apply.
19 Dundonald Street	James Hunter/IPS	Maps	2	Blake Street is adjacent to the subject lands and is identified by the Official Plan as an 'Arterial Street', where up to four (4) storeys of height is permitted under the Neighbourhood Area designation. However, a site located at 1 Blake Street to the south of the subject lands has been included in this designation, despite an existing building height of eight (8) storeys. We encourage the City to closely examine the surrounding area and accurately reflect the land use designations, based on existing built forms.	We have changed 1 Blake Street to Medium Density to recognized the existing height of eight storeys on the property. At the same time, this area not within an intensification corridor, and the subject property in question is within a historic neighbourhood with adjacent low density uses. Given this, we believe the Neighbourhood Area designation to be appropriate.
19 Dundonald Street	James Hunter/IPS	Maps	2	As overviewed under Section 1.0, we are requesting the City consider applying an alternative designation on the subject lands to align with the proposed application and intended land use for this location, more specifically the 'Medium Density' designation. Based on our review of the draft Official Plan, the Medium Density designation is the most appropriate designation for the subject lands, as discussed in the following section.	We have reviewed the site in depth. Given that the subject property is within a historic neighbourhood with adjacent low density uses, we believe the Neighbourhood Area designation to be appropriate.

70&76 Edgehill Drive	Darren Vella / IPS	Maps	2	Given that 70 Edgehill is directly abutting 76 Edgehill, and is the last property along Edgehill Drive, it is respectfully requested that 70 Edgehill possess the same designation at 76 Edgehill. This will ensure a comprehensive plan can be developed for both parcels without the need for further amendments to the Official Plan. 70 Edgehill is an excellent candidate for medium or high density development based on its buffer from surrounding low density residential uses and its adjacency to other high density approvals and structures. Furthermore, Edgehill Drive contains a number of medium and high density developments which are currently incorrectly designated Neighborhood Area in this Draft of the Official Plan. These existing buildings should be placed in the medium or high density category in the next draft of the Official Plan.	We have reviewed the property in depth, and will be redesignating the site as Medium Density.
JohnMark Holdings_220 Mapleview Drive East	MHBC / Wes Crown	Maps	2	the best planned use for the subject property would be the "Employment Area – Non-Industrial" designation. Changes to Map 2 of the Draft new Official Plan would be required.	The property's land use designation will be changed to Employment Area -- Non-Industrial.
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	2	The sites at 35 Blake Street and 7 & 15 Vancouver Street are currently occupied by 3 and 4 storey buildings designated Residential and zoned Residential Apartment Dwelling RA1-2 and RA1. Seeking consideration for a Medium Density designation to recognize existing apartment uses and the potential for future intensification on sites that are already built at higher densities than that envisioned by the Neighbourhood Area designation.	The sites will retain their Neighbourhood Area designation, as Medium Density would not be appropriate given the surrounding area context. At the same time a policy will be introduced in section 2.5 that upholds existing permissions; therefore, all previous height permissions will be upheld should redevelopment take place on the site.
Michelle Lackey		Maps	2	Why are the vacant lands south of Loon Ave/East of Huronia Road (ie Lovers Creek Ravine) being considered for residential zoning, when they have been identified as EP Level 1 and are adjacent to a Provincially Significant Wetland and sit upon a significant woodland? Parts of these lands are currently zoned for light industrial and agricultural uses which would likely be more appropriate for the environmental impact of these lands than residential. I think their designations shoud remain as they are now OR, the city should consider re-zoneing them to Environmental Protection or Greenspace.	The new official plan will not come into effect until it is approved by Council and then by MMAH. Therefore, we must uphold any rezoning that happens ahead of the implementation of the Plan. At the same time, no matter what the zoning is for a property, EP Level 1 designations prevail and the EP Level 1 land will remain protected.
Sean Mason / 570-586 Yonge	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	3	In addition, the rear of 586 Yonge St is incorrectly designated Natural Heritage System, EPA-Level 2, on Map 3 which should be modified to align with the Natural Heritage System mapping on Maps 1 and 2, and recognize the previous approvals granted which established the development limits to the extent that the Natural Heritage lands were dedicated to the Conservation Authority.	This change will be made accordingly.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	3	The Natural Linkage Area shown between the Crisdawn and Unilock lands south of Salem, west of Essa Road are not correct.	As mentioned by email, once the approved limits are provided, we will make this change. In the meantime, please also note policy 10.1.c) that allows for NHS changes to be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will always take the most up-to-date, approved information.
Cedar Links Golf Course / 611 Huronia	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	3	Through the development process associated with the previous employment conversion request, the Natural Heritage features on site were walked with MNRF and LSRCA and ultimately surveyed to delineate their boundaries. We would request that Map 3 be revised to reflect these boundaries in the next draft of the Official Plan.	Please provide the documentation from the LSRCA and MNRF to confirm their agreement and then we will make this change. Furthermore, please consider policy 10.1.c), which allows for NHS, floodplain and EIS changes to be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will take the most up-to-date, approved information.
19 Dundonald Street	James Hunter/IPS	Maps	3	On Map 3 (Natural Heritage Protection Overlays), the subject lands include a 'EPA – Level 3' classification. These resources are identified as being more regionally or locally significant features and supporting components of the Natural Heritage Resource network. The subject lands have benefited from extensive environmental work being completed for a pending Zoning By-law Amendment application on the lands. As part of the assessments, it has been concluded that the subject lands can be developed without negligible impacts on the existing features or abutting features. Through the pending ZBA application, justification will be provided through environmental studies/assessments to support removal of the Level 3 overlay on the subject lands.	Existing approvals will be upheld by the Official Plan, once implemented, as per a new policy added to section 2.5. Furthermore, please consider policy 10.1.c), which allows for NHS, floodplain and EIS changes to be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will take the most up-to-date, approved information.
NVCA		Maps	3	Map Schedule 3 identifies an area of land at the western end of Ardagh Road (north side) as EPA2, which adjoins a broader area of EPA1. The area of EPA1 represents the present area of Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) as mapped by the province. However, most or all of the adjoining area of EPA2 is recognized as wetland by the NVCA and, for planning purposes is considered to be a part of the broader PSW. The discrepancy in designations in this location represents an issue because, although the EPA2 designation recognizes the significance of the feature, it potentially permits development pending the results of site-specific study (EIS). Through various past pre-consultations, NVCA has notified applicants that development within the wetlands in this location will not be supported. It is recommended that the City use this OP update as an opportunity to refine the EPA1/EPA2 in this location to capture the full extent of wetland area. Mapping has been attached to this email to illustrate the area of field-verified wetland in this location. Data layers can be provided upon request.	These changes have been made.

800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	Maps	5	Related to the foregoing we also note that Map 5 of the New OP shows a 41 metres right-of-way for Mapleview Drive across the frontage of our Site, whereas the Schedule E of the existing OP shows this as being a 34 metre right-of-way. The right-of-way width across our Site should be left at 34 metres.	The right-of-ways provided and updated in the new Official Plan are in accordance with our most recent Transportation Master Plan and MTO's guidelines. Though we have also made some updates through the proper EA approvals avenue and will provide a disclaimer on Map 5. We realize appropriate right-of-way widths are an ongoing, broader conversation and we will continue work on this.
Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	Maps	5	We are unaware of any updates to the Transportation Master Plan or Environmental Assessment with respect to the proposed improvements to Dunlop Street West which have identified the need for a 55 metre (i.e. 180 foot) right-of-way over the section of Dunlop Street West between Anne Street and Cedar Pointe Drive. Accordingly, we question the justification for the increase from 41 to 55 metres in the absence of an update to the Environmental Assessment for the improvements to Dunlop Street West between Anne Street and Ferndale Drive. Given the significance of this issue, we confirm our request for a copy of the comments provided by the Ministry of Transportation in relation to the draft of the new official plan. Should this information and the documentation or reports upon which Council relied in determining that a 55 metre right-of-way was appropriate not be forthcoming, please advise as to the reasons for the requested documents and related information being withheld. we confirm our request for copies of the comments provided by the Ministry of Transportation in relation to the draft of the Official Plan as well as copies of the documentation referred to by Staff during the course of the May 19, 2021, public open house in relation to the proposed right-of-way width of Dunlop Street West between Anne Street and Cedar Pointe Drive	We have been advised that the requested documentation has been provided.

Smart Centres	Mark Resnick	Maps	5	We ask that the City not take a “one size fits all approach” with respect to road widenings, and although this new maximum ROW width is protected for Arterial Roads in Map 5 of the Draft Official Plan Amendment, we request that the OPA include allowances for reduced / alternative ranges on roads within the Urban Growth Centres and the Strategic Growth Areas . This is further demonstrated in Policy 4.2(d) which states “the City may establish sub-typologies for streets to respond to the community structure and different land uses and guidance will be provided in the Urban Design Guidelines.” While we are supportive of the general intent of this policy, we request this policy be expanded to more explicitly permit reduced dimensions for protected right-of-way widths within Urban Growth Centres. The same principles should be reinforced in the Urban Design Guidelines when they are prepared. We request that the road widening policies for Arterial Roads, located in Urban Growth Centres in the Draft OPA be modified to reflect the intentions of the City’s policies for Complete Streets, and further, we would like to review appropriate road widths with Transportation Staff.	The right-of-ways stated are needed by the City. However, there is a policy addition that states that in some cases reduced setbacks will be contemplated -- this would include those contexts that the commenter has referenced.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	5	Exell Avenue, west of Reid Drive, is shown as a 24m collector road. Given it terminates at a neighbourhood park, it is our opinion this should be identified as a local road.	Exell Avenue will continue to show as a collector in its entirety. We have reviewed this with Transportation and this continuation is needed to support active transportation infrastructure.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	5	Fenchurch west of Ball Gate should be 24m, not 27m as per the approved draft plan and existing Hewitt’s Secondary Plan.	We have reviewed this with Transportation, and we will be changing the right-of-way width to 24 metres.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	5	Sheppard Drive east of Madeline Drive is a local street, not a 27 m collector as per the approved draft plan of subdivision and existing Hewitt’s Secondary Plan.	The right-of-way widths for Sheppard have been updated on Map 5. The map is guided by the most recent Transportation Master Plan, MTO guidelines and EA approvals. We realize that right-of-way widths are an ongoing conversation and we will continue to work on this.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	5	Lockhart Road is identified as having a maximum road width of 34 metres. The Landowners request that the widening reflect the approved Environmental Assessment and negotiations with the City concurrent with draft plan applications. This includes 34 metre width west of Yonge Street and 34 metres in width tapering to 27 metres in width east of Yonge Street.	We are showing the mid-block right-of-way width agreed to with the land owners group. Where possible, we are also showing additional requirements reflective of approved EAs where the widening is in excess of the mid-block width. Map 5 Is also guided by the most recent Transportation Master Plan and MTO guidelines. We realize that right-of-way widths are an ongoing conversation and we will continue to work on this.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	5	Mapleview Drive is shown as being 41 metres in width to the 20th Sideroad. Similar to point D4.a above, the widening of Mapleview tapers to 34 metres.	The right-of-ways provided in the new Official Plan are in accordance with our most recent Transportation Master Plan as well as MTO guidelines and EA approvals. We realize appropriate right-of-way widths are an ongoing, broader conversation and we will continue work on this.
Gary Bell		Maps	6	It would be useful to repeat the Mixed-Use Trails Off Road from Map 4A Mobility on Map 6 to show how the Parks and NHS areas are connected.	The trail layer from Map 4A has been added to Map 6.
HIP Development	MHBC / Trevor Hawkins	Maps	6	The proposed Map 6 identifies two portions of the site as "Park." It is not clear why any portion of the lands is identified as Park, as the lands are approved for a residential development and a community institutional use (YMCA). We ask that the mapping be corrected to remove the "Park" designation from the lands. This request was previously made in our first submission, however the mapping has not been revised.	This change has been completed as per the latest approvals for the site.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	6	The neighbourhood Park, which terminates at Exell Avenue is not shown.	The park has been added, as per the parks master plan for Salem.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	6	The Stormwater Management Pond on the south side of Walker Street, immediately east of the NHS does not exist and should be removed. This should be consistent across all of the schedules.	The stormwater management pond has been removed as indicated.
Barb and Brian Tansley		Maps	7	Drinking water intake protection area zone 2 map7 Conflicts with plans for strategic growth area Yonge and Big Bay Pt Rd Well head protection at Yonge ,Minet's Point and Hurst also conflicts with Strategic growth area . So how can our drinking water be protected if there's so much construction over such a large vulnerable area?	The policies pertaining to the protection of drinking water intake are found in Section 6.5; the relevant policies will be applied to all protection area zones, regardless of location.

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	Maps	7	Based upon a review of Map 7, there are no areas specifically identified as Groundwater Recharge Areas. Rather, the policies set out in Section 6.5.1.2 state that a significant groundwater recharge area is an area identified as such by any public body for the purposes of implementing the Provincial Policy Statement, an area as may determined by way of an assessment report required under the Clean Water Protection Act, or, an area so defined by the Conservation Authority. It follows that lands could be identified as a Groundwater Recharge Area without the need for an amendment to the Official Plan. As a result, affected land owners would not have any right of appeal concerning the inclusion of their property holdings within a ground water recharge area. The effect of the foregoing policy statements is to infer the designation of lands as a Ground Water Recharge Area by means of other instruments and/or decisions made by public bodies. Given the proposed policy framework associated with the use and development of lands determined to be within a Ground Water Recharge Area, it is submitted that Map 7 should be revised to clearly delineate and/or clarify the extent of existing, identified Ground Water Recharge Areas referenced in Section 6.5.1.2. In the event that areas are identified as a Ground Water Recharge Area in the future, such areas should be	We will ensure that ground water recharge areas are captured. As we are also adding in highly vulnerable aquifers onto the map, we will likely be breaking Map 7 into a Map7a and a Map7b in the future.
NVCA		Maps	7	Previous comments have been addressed, however we note the following that Section 6.5.1.2- Groundwater Recharge Areas states: "Significant groundwater recharge areas are reflected in Map 7 which are meant to improve or restore the quality and quantity of groundwater in these areas and the function of the recharge areas". It is noted that the significant recharge areas and highly vulnerable aquifers are not outlined in the referenced map 7.	We will ensure that ground water recharge areas are captured. As we are also adding in highly vulnerable aquifers onto the map, we will likely be breaking Map 7 into a Map7a and a Map7b in the future.

Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	8	Please explain the rational for the Boundary expansion of the Historic Neighbourhoods from those recognized in the Historic Neighbourhoods Strategy that introduce the Kempenfelt and East End Neighbourhoods where there is no overlap with the Urban Growth Centre. Please consider development objectives to be discussed at the presubmission stage in order that the applicant understands what is expected in the built form, or exemption from the requirements.	The expansion of the historic neighbrouhoods beyond those recognized in the current Official Plan was done on the request of the Heritage Barrie Advisory Committee, comments from the public, and Ward Councillors. The intent of these comments is to protect existing cultural heirtage resources and historic character. The majority of the lands included within these new historic neighbourhoods are within the Neighbourhood Area designation, and as such the built form or development policeis of the Neighbourhood Area designation and policies of the Historic Neighbourhoods are commensurate and complementary. Additioanal policies have been added to the Neighbourhood Area designation to protect the residential and low rise character of these areas.
Gary Bell		Maps	8	Celebration Space in legend of Map 8 needs attention.	Spelling correction has been made.
Gary Bell		Maps	8	How was the northern limit of Historic Neighbourhood East End determined not to include Strabane and Melrose Avenues?	The northern limit of the boundary is based on a historic plan. We will be changing the boundary to Strabane Street on the north end to accommodate the historic nature of the area more appropriately.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	Maps	8	gathering space is proposed on the property. The approved Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies provide for parks, open space areas, village squares and natural heritage areas secondary plan wide, and there has been a detailed and integrated collective landowner approach for these "common spaces", including exchange of payment for these uses. The proposed OP should honour this long and detailed arrangement, and thus, the gathering space should be removed from the site. The policies identify that gathering spaces are to be provided in medium and high density areas [8.3.2] whereas this proposed gathering space is located in a Neighbourhood Area designation. The general location is also identified in the existing Secondary Plan for a stormwater management facility.	Recommendation is to further clarify policy 8.3.2.a as not all gathering spaces are found in medium and high density areas: "Gathering spaces include traditional municipal parks, as well as modern spaces found more in medium and high density areas (such as urban squares). All gathering spaces should be well-designed and appropriately programmed." Many of the municipal parks across the city have been identified as gathering spaces. Gathering spaces are intended to pick up parks, and some stormwater facilities intended to be open to the public for walking. Therefore, the intent of a gathering space should align with the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policies, even if it is a new term.

Dunlop Village Plaza: 304 Dunlop Street West	John McDermott	Maps	8	Given that the Dunlop Village Plaza is isolated and disjointed from the established residential communities to the east of Anne Street, south of Highway No. 400, north and south of Dunlop Street, and, that it is not demonstrative of a valuable cultural heritage resource or group of historic buildings and/or streetscape, it is submitted that the subject lands and adjacent properties fronting upon the northerly limits of Dunlop Street West do not meet the criteria for inclusion within the West Village Historic Neighbourhood. Accordingly, on behalf of our Client we request that the boundary of the West Village Historic Neighbourhood be re-evaluated and that the lands located at 304 Dunlop Street West, which are developed in association with the Dunlop Village Plaza, not form part of the Historic Neighbourhood referred to as West Village.	While the subject lands themselves may not have buildings that have cultural heritage value, the site is within a historic neighbourhood context as it rears onto lots that fronts onto Henry Street. Henry Street has a historic streetscape. This streetscape is reinforced by historic buildings on Anne St. This means that any development occuring on 304 Dunlop St. west will need to have regard for the historic streetscape of Henry Street. When treated as a whole vs an individual parcel, 304 Dunlop Street indeed forms part of the West Village historic neighbourhood.
HIP Development	MHBC / Trevor Hawkins	Maps	8	Similarly, Map 8 identifies what appears to be the former Red Story Field as a "Gathering Space." Given the approved zoning and the ongoing Site Plan application, we request that the lands be removed from Map 8.	This request has been addressed.
Al McNair		Maps	8	I suggested previously that this neighbourhood should extend northerly to the designated Strategic Growth Area along Bell Farm Road and Georgian Drive. A suggested map of this boundary is attached to my earlier submission.	Following a site visit to the area of the proposed boundary, staff determined that extending the boundary of the East End Historic Neighbourhood beyond Strabane Ave is not appropriate.
518-524 Tiffin St. W.	Shelagh and Harold Ois	Maps	1 and 2	We propose that the vacant lots (518-524) again be included in the planned DGA Employment Area, as it had been in the 2018 OP and as laid out in Schedule B, 2018. This would provide land use flexibility to these properties going forward consistent with the planned DGA Employment Area that they abut in this new OP draft 2. The inclusion of the lots in the DGA Employment area is also consistent with the development of a heavier transportation pathway along Tiffin St. W. In contrast to Schedule B of the 2018 Official Plan, there are several lots, including 518-524, that have been left out of the Tiffin St. W. DGA Employment area (Map 1, 2021, Land Use - Industrial, Map 2, 2021), and have been included strictly as part of the DGA Natural Heritage System and Greenspace (Map 1and 2, 2021). It also seems contradictory that these properties, as they are interpreted in the Draft 2 OP, will abut a freight corridor and will be exposed to increased traffic and an increase in road salt. Given the heavy regulations on land use and development for EP land, it will be a challenge for small landowners to actively participate in mitigation efforts necessary to reduce chloride (Map 7, 2021) to protect Barrie's clean drinking water from the increased winter salt application (6.5.1.3, 6.5.1.4) from the proposed Tiffin St. freight corridor. In fact, any desirable future development in the surrounding area will be hampered by the EP designation of these properties, given the strict environmental regulations	Changes to properties 518 to 254 Tiffin Street have been made as requested; the new land use designation is Employment Area -- Industrial. Map 3 has also been updated to change the NHS to Level 1 with permissions. 530 and 538 Tiffin Street were also included in these changes.

Canadian Tire Real Estate	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	Maps	1 and 2	Canadian Tire does not support the general intent of the revised Draft Official Plan policies to facilitate the transition of 75 Mapleview Drive West into an Employment Area Designation, whereas the lands are currently designated "General Commercial" under the in-effect Official Plan, which is reflective of their existing commercial function. Accordingly, it is our position that the land use designation proposed by the September 2020 Draft Official Plan, being the "Commercial District" designation, is more appropriate for 75 Mapleview Drive West and is more consistent with the existing land use, which is for entirely commercial purposes including a Canadian Tire store, gas bar, and Beer Store. The proposed Employment Areas land use designation does not align with the current function of these lands, and would limit and restrict the uses that are existing on site, being Retail and Major Retail.	We will be adding a policy to Employment Non-Industrial that allows for sites such as yours to retain the permitted uses given under the Commercial District designation, excepting for residential.
Maverick Development Corporation	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	Maps	1 and 2	A fundamental aspect in the Second Draft Official Plan that Maverick does not support is the proposed "Employment Area – Non-Industrial" designation applied to the Maverick lands at 406 and 436 Bryne Drive, 52 Caplan Avenue, and 60-70 Mapleview Drive. The proposed designation is not consistent with the current or intended commercial function of these lands or general area, and reduces the range of land use permissions currently afforded to the lands under the in-effect "General Commercial" land use designation. It is unclear to us why staff have determined that the lands located on the westerly side of Bryne Drive should be redesignated "Employment Area – Non-Industrial". It appears to us that a more natural division between the existing commercial uses and the existing industrial area/uses (to the west) would be the westerly limits of the Maverick Lands, as per the in-effect OP and Zoning By-law mapping. It is our position that the Maverick Lands should be considered the same as the lands directly to the east (across Bryne Drive), which are proposed in the Second Draft to be designated as "Commercial District", and within a "Strategic Growth Area". Importantly, the methodology used by the Land Needs Assessment does not consider any of the Maverick lands as Employment for the purpose of evaluating the City's existing employment land base, noting "that the employment land supply has been carried out in accordance to the guidelines in the Growth Plan, 2019 and the LNA Methodology." There is	We will be adding a policy to Employment Non-Industrial that allows for sites such as the one referenced by the commenter to retain the permitted uses given under the Commercial District designation, excepting for residential. The intention of Employment Non-Industrial is to provide a buffer between Employment Areas and non-employment areas, and thus you will be able to develop according to a much more expansive list of permitted uses than properties within the Employment Area -- Industrial designation.

Melchior Management	Janet Foster	Maps	1 and 2	Seeking City's consideration of expanding the Strategic Growth Area boundary to include the lands located at 299 Lakeshore Drive and to designate them Commercial District or Medium Density consistent with the lands on the south side of the intersection of Minet's Point and Lakeshore Drive, therefore recognizing their potential for creating future strategic growth in this area.	The lands north of Lakeshore, on the corner of Minet's Point, can become Medium Density and we can extend the SGA boundary to include them.
505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street	Jack Krubnik / IPS	Maps	1,2	The appropriate levels of intensification for areas abutting Intensification Corridors is greater than that envisioned within Neighbourhood Areas in the Draft Official Plan. Lands abutting Intensification Corridors should be reconsidered for Medium and High Density designations.	There are a combination of lands abuting Intensification Corridors, and some of these lands are designated medium and high density. At the same time, we have kept significant portions of lands abuting Intensification Corridors as Neighbourhood Areas, to recognize the fabric of these areas as primarily made up of low-density residential. At the same time, Neighbourhood Areas fronting onto an Intensification Corridor may be able to see greater heights, as long as appropriate transitions are in place.
Al McNair		Maps	2, 3	This mapping needs to be thoroughly re-examined to ensure that the small but important parcels of natural heritage lands in older Barrie are protected to the maximum. The recently annexed lands have much better protection and are much more robust than the more fragmented natural heritage system in the older city. For example, the ravine areas southeast and southwest of Vine Crescent should be designated Natural Heritage System, NOT Neighbourhood Area or Medium Density.	We would only be able to revise Natural Heritage System boundaries through a comprehensive and planned update, or through individual development applications. We are open to both in the future, but currently we do not have the authority to undertake this exercise on our own.
David O'Brien		Maps	2, 3 and 8	I wanted in the public record that there is a registered archeological site at the south west corner of Harvey Road and Hwy 400. It is known as the Molson Site and registered as BcGw-27 with the Province of Ontario. I am concerned that on Map 2 of the plan this area is listed as land use Industrial employment. It is also indicated on Map 3 to be EPA 3, but this covers a much larger area than the Molson site. There is also no indication of the Molson site on Map 8 that covers Historic features. I believe this is a mistake that can lead to the loss of this recognized and valuable feature within Barrie if it is not acknowledged in the Official Plan. Can you make an effort to recognize the existence of the Molson site and make efforts to protect it.	Section 8.4.2. contains archaeological assessment policies. No development on the site would occur without an archaeological assessment and conformity with the Ontario Heritage Act.

Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2, 3, 6	953 Mapleview Drive East (Mapleview South): The limits of the Sandy Cove Creek are in the final stages of realignment approval and tendering for construction has been released. Please update the NHS mapping to reflect the new channel alignment.	The alignment has not yet been approved. Once there is approval, these changes can be made. Please note policy 10.1.c, which states that NHS, floodplain and EIS changes can be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will take the most up-to-date, approved information.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2, 6	Mapleview Drive East (Crisdawn/Pratt Hansen) (D12-426): i. The neighbourhood Park boundary on the Pratt subdivision (Hewitt's Gate Subdivision) at Prince William Way/Lally Terrace, is not consistent with the Master Parkland Agreement. It is correctly shown on Map 8. ii. A Village Square is missing as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement east of the NHS area on Winery Way. It is correctly shown on Map 8. iii. A park is missing on the south portions of the lands closer to Lockhart as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement. It is correctly shown on Map 8.	Changes are being made to be consistent with what is shown on Map 8. The land use designation has been changed to Greenspace for each park indicated.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2, 6	883 Mapleview Drive East (Bulut): There are no 'Natural Heritage System' lands on this property, which is draft plan approved.	The land use designation for this area has been changed to Greenspace, where appropriate.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2, 6	979 Mapleview Drive East (Sandy Creek Estates): Parkland missing as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement. It is correctly shown on Map 8.	The land use designation has been changed to Greenspace, as per the master plan agreement.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	2, 6	620 Lockhart (Mattamy Homes): A park missing on the south portions of the lands closer to Lockhart as shown in the Master Parkland Agreement. It is conceptually correct on Map 8, but the configuration does not reflect the approved Conformity Plan. Please update and revise.	The land use designation has been changed to Greenspace, as per the master plan agreement.

Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	Maps	2a	In the Salem Secondary Plan, the Land Use Map (Schedule 8C) identifies a future school site on the Ruby Red Maple lands with an asterisk. The Land Use Map on the new Draft OP now identifies this school as a specific area with the Community Hub designation. While we do not object to identifying this general location for a potential future school, there should be acknowledgement that the subdivision layout and best location for this school has not yet been determined and a guarantee that no OPA will be required to adjust the location or size of the Community Hub area. The Community Hub land use designation has been applied to the potential future school and community centre locations in the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary plans. While updates were made to the Community Hub policies since the last draft OP, the new draft policies still do not provide adequate flexibility or appropriate transitioning in circumstances where the School Board or City decide to not construct said school or community centre. The lands should be permitted to develop in accordance with the adjacent land use designation to ensure that the development is appropriate for the community. In particular, requiring non-residential uses or a mixed-use development with a residential density of 125-300 units per hectare (i.e. between medium and high density development) may not be compatible with the surrounding area and land use designation, particularly in the Neighbourhood Area. We request that the underlying designation on this school site remain as low and/or medium density consistent with the immediate adjacent designation	We will be adding a policy into the Community Hub land use designation that emphasizes that if no institutional use is on a site, then development may take place in accordance with the land use permissions for neighbouring sites.
505, 511, 515, 533 Yonge Street	Jack Krubnik / IPS	Maps	3, 6	However, public access to these parks and the natural heritage system needs to be better aligned with municipal planning for growth. To achieve this, the City of Barrie should place higher density land use designations adjacent to, or in close proximity to, parks and the natural heritage system. The existing practice of low density uses adjacent to parks and the natural heritage system further engrains issues of access and inequity in the planning process, whereby wealthier owners of detached residential dwellings can afford access to the health and educational opportunities of natural areas.	We appreciate this comment and its intent. At this time, as no direct policy suggestion for the Official Plan has been given, we simply attest that the comment has been registered.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	4a	Watersand Commercial Block is now designated as a Network Hub. Section 4.4.2.2.a advises the City Shall direct medium and high density development around these hubs. The commercial block does not have medium or high density residential uses nor does the surrounding land uses. As a result, and noted previously, this should be located on the east side of Veterans Drive along the Employment blocks. (Map 4A)	The draft plan for D12-423 show a commercial area that is currently zoned NMU. The draft Official Plan proposes that these lands accommodate additional uses and density over the long term. This increace in density and use is envisioned to generate and support increased transit ridership over the long term. As such, a mobility network hub is appropriate in this general area.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	4a	A Future Salem Mobility Hub is identified at the SW corner of McKay Road West and Veterans Drive. This parcel is draft plan approved with commercial uses at that corner. This should be located on the east side of Veterans Drive along the employment lands.	To ensure greater accuracy is reflected, the location of the Network Hub has been moved to the road intersection.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	4a	The road pattern and street names as noted above, should be removed on the south side of McKay Road West and County Road 27 and on the south side of McKay Road East.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	4a	All trails shown should be identified as conceptual only.	Map 4a includes the following note: "Roads, trails and cycling networks within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change." Therefore, these trails are identified as conceptual.
Canadian Tire Real Estate	Zelinka Priamo Ltd. / Rob MacFarlane	Maps	4A	Map 4A of the Official Plan labels two features as “Commuter Cycling Network (On – Road)”. We seek clarification if the intent is for the separate features are to be labelled differently.	Map 4a will be changed so that there is only one cycling network listed.
Sean Mason / 429 & 431 Little Avenue	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	4B	The lands are within the Neighborhood Area (Map 2) and on a local road (Map 4B) (Little Avenue). The current Official Plan, Schedule D Roads Plan, identifies this stretch of Little Ave, from Yonge Street to Hurst Drive, as an arterial road. On Schedule E Road Widening Plan, it is identified as having a road right of way width of 27m, which is consistent with the draft Official Plan Map 5. Little Ave is a significant connection corridor from Yonge Street to Hurst Drive. It is our opinion that this stretch of Little Ave should remain an arterial road. We are requesting that this modification be made to 4B.	Little Avenue, between Yonge Street and Hurst Drive, has been changed to an Arterial.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	4b	Reid Drive south of Salem and McKay Road between Reid Drive and Veterans Drive should not be identified as a “Freight Supportive Corridor”.	The Freight Supportive Corridor has been removed.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	All Maps	A park is shown on the southside of Walker Street, immediately east of the NHS system which is not consistent with the draft approved plan of subdivision.	The land use designation has been changed to Neighbourhood Area; the park has been removed on the other maps.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	All Maps	A park is not shown on the Watersand Phase 2 lands, north of McKay, west of Reid Drive	This change has been made.
St. Joseph Developments (Dunlop and Miller Drive)	DSF / David White	Maps	All Maps	The City has been provided with correspondence from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry indicating that the Provincially Significant Wetland designation previously shown on part of the St. Joseph’s property has been removed. We are therefore requesting that the Natural Heritage System designation be replaced with an appropriate development designation.	The presence (or lack thereof) of NHS features needs to be confirmed through an EIS that is accepted by the City and the appropriate Conservation Authority. Please also note Policy 10.1.c), which states that NHS, floodplain and EIS changes can be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will take the most up-to-date, approved (through the proper avenues) information.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	All Maps	As noted previously, Exell Avenue which is a proposed collector Road extending into the Watersand Phase 2 area (north of McKay Road West, west of Reid Drive), is not required as does not go anywhere. This should be shown as a local road in its place.	This road segment remains a collector, as the width is needed for active transportation infrastructure.

Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	All Maps	As noted previously, all maps have road configurations for the future employment (Watersand) and residential (Watersand) lands, with street names, that do not make sense in their makeup and should not be shown as the lands will not be developed in that format.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."
Gary Bell		Maps	All Maps	Harvie Road over Highway 400 has been correctly shown on Map 4A Mobility and it should be similarly shown on the other Maps.	Harvie Road and the surrounding roads have been adjusted as needed, to reflect current alignment.
Ballymore	Keith MacKinnon / KLM	Maps	All Maps	Additionally, ALL figures and/or maps in the new Official Plan should be revised to show the alignment for Collector Road Kneeshaw Drive (including the roundabouts) as per the Ballymore Draft Approved Plan. A copy of the Draft Approved Plan is attached for ease of reference.	Kneeshaw Drive has been aligned to correspond with the latest plans received.
Great Gulf (9 Mile) / Rainsong / Ruby Red Maple	Trish Elliott	Maps	All Maps	On the Rainsong Phase 2 lands (i.e. NW corner of Lockhart and Yonge), the street network on all maps and appendices does not match the layout on the Conformity Plan that was approved by the City in 2020. While these are still proposed streets, the OP should reflect the most updated information.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change."
Trans Canada Pole: 7735 County Rd 27	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	Appendix 1	A review of the revised mapping Schedules reveals that on Maps 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 the natural heritage/hazard features have been removed in Draft 2 based on Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Case Number PL140770, 140771, 140772. I would like to note that Appendix 1 – Conservation Authority Areas still identifies an NVCA Floodplain in error. Given the previously agreed upon changes of removing the natural heritage/hazard features, this floodplain area should also be removed. The NVCA was also involved in the previous Board hearing in which the revisions proposed were accepted by their office. It is requested that the NVCA Floodplain be removed in its entirety from the subject property.	The NVCA Floodplain data is updated by the Conservation Authority; we only use it for reference. However, to accommodate the commenter's request, we have outlined the area and made the appropriate change.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	Maps	Appendix 2	We request that the City move the Dorsay Phase 3 lands into Phase 2 and that the Phase 4 lands become Phase 3. There does not appear to be a need for a fourth phase.	Phasing changes have been completed so that Phase 3 lands have been incorporated into Phase 2; and so that some Phase 4 lands, as appropriate, have been incorporated into Phase 3.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	Maps	Appendix 2	Appendix 2: Phasing Maps -- colours in the legend are wrong; don't match up with phases for the "East area"	The mapping symbology and legend have been revised.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	Maps	Appendix 2	It is assumed that north of the NHS area the site is identified as being in Phase 1 and Phase 2. The Appendix should be revised to reflect that the area north of the NHS area is in Phase 1 in accordance with the existing policy framework [Hewitt's OP policy 9.7.3.2 e)]. It is noted that NO pumping station is required as per the policies of this section.	The boundaries have been revised in light of the Natural Heritage System lands.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	Maps	Appendix 2	It is assumed that the portion of the site above the NHS area is proposed to be partly in Phase 1 and partly in Phase 2, and the lands south of the NHS area are proposed to be in Phase 2.	The boundaries have been revised in light of the Natural Heritage System lands.

Trans Canada Pole: 7735 County Rd 27	IPS / Darren Vella	Maps	Appendix 2	Appendix 2 identifies the subject lands split between Phases 3 West and 4 West (Figure 2). The southern portion (approximately 25.0 hectares) is under Phase 3W, while the northern portion (approximately 12.0 hectares) is Phase 4W. It is unclear why 12.0 hectares of land is placed into Phase 4W. My experience with phased development within Secondary Plan areas is that the delineation of phases generally follows the ability to deliver infrastructure, major roads, natural heritage features, major concession/property lines, etc. In this circumstance, none of the identified features exist between Phase 3W and 4W on the Trans Canada site. The proposed phasing plan places the subject lands in a scenario where two separate Plan of Subdivision applications will be required. This in my opinion, would not result in the best planning outcome given that such a small parcel remains in Phase 4W. Furthermore, infrastructure that would be required to develop Phase 3 lands will also support Phase 4 lands based on its limited size and configuration. It is requested that the Phase 3W boundary be enlarged to extend to the limits of Essa Road which is a logical boundary to terminate Phase 3 W on the Trans Canada Pole site.	The boundaries will change so that the entirety of Trans Canada Pole is contained in Phase 3W.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	Maps	Appendix 2	Similar to above, the lands identified as Phase 4 West should have the road pattern and street names removed.	The following note is included on maps: "Roads within the undeveloped designated greenfield area are conceptual and subject to change." Only roads from draft approved plans of subdivision will be revised.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	Maps	Appendix 2	The Phasing numbers do not match the colours in the legend.	The mapping symbology and legend have been revised.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	Maps	Maps 2 and 3	As previously requested, Section 2.7.4 Natural Heritage Protection: The Natural Heritage System limits identified on Map 2 and 3 of the Draft Official Plan do not reflect the detailed ground-truthed information that we currently have with respect to DIV's lands. We implore that the natural heritage mapping on the subject lands be revised to reflect our fieldwork – we will provide a plan for the City's use.	When it comes time for a development application on this site, the Natural Heritage work will be reviewed at that time. Please note Policy 10.1.c), which states that NHS, floodplain and EIS changes can be amended to the map without an amendment to this Plan. We will take the most up-to-date, approved (through the proper avenues) information.
Kelly Patterson McGrath		n/a	Communications Suggestion	Show us that all of the plans and documents that are currently in play or being worked on – GHG, Active Transportation Master Plan, Climate Action Plans, Stormwater Climate Action Fund etc. are all linked and connected to the OP – is there an overall matrix that shows these connections and how they feed each other and that they are not being worked on in isolation of the OP or visa vera.	These plans are not being worked on in isolation; all departments have reviewed the OP and provided commentary to bolster alignment. Furthermore, future master plans, for instance, will specifically be guided by the Official Plan.

Kelly Patterson McGrath		n/a	Communications Suggestion	We need to do better at engaging the public's feedback in this City. We need to look to other City's like Ottawa, and their best practices for engagement. What do they do differently to get the engagement level that they get?	We appreciate the suggestion of Ottawa as a comparitor and agree that public engagement is critical and we continually strive to find more effective ways of engaging the community. For this most recent round of engagement on draft 2 of the Official Plan, we advertised the Open House and Public Meeting through social media, through the newspaper, via radio, through a press release and through reaching out via email to community groups and via email lists. We will continue to review options for improving engagement and welcome any specific suggestions you may have for spreading the word.
Kelly Patterson McGrath		n/a	Communications Suggestion	The Plan is 210 pages long using language that is often jargon based - it is daunting and complex. The general public need to see something that is clear and easy to understand. When we do provide feedback, that important feedback seems to have not been heard. We did not get a summary of the most recent concerns/feedback and have them addressed (2020). Barrie's 2019 engagement feedback was summarized but not linked to any changes made. SOLUTION - I would look to the (Ottawa) New Official Plan FAQ's as an example of completing the feedback circle here. The questions are all answered, Barrie's community engagement questions and concerns have not been answered or Is there any where to see that the changes have been implemented or at least addressed in the FAQ's for all of this process from the beginning. (in email provides links to Ottawa's engagement communications)	We hope that this comment matrix provides more transparency for how comments are received and reviewed. We recommend that the public compares the commitments made in this comment matrix with the tracked-changes working version of the new Official Plan.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	Feedback	The Hewitt's Landowners request that Council and Staff consider and support the scheduling of a 2nd Statutory Public Meeting for the fall of 2021.	A public meeting will be scheduled for the fall, though it will not be statutory.
LSRCA		n/a	General	Please ensure the final document is an accessible document and a navigable PDF with a clickable table of contents and bookmarks.	This will be done with the final draft version.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	General	While improvements have been made since the first draft, we continue to feel that the Official Plan contains many numerical, overly detailed, and prescriptive (i.e., shall be) policies that eliminate the interpretive flexibility needed to successfully implement this new Official Plan. Unless changed, the nature of these prescriptive policies would lead to regular Official Plan Amendment applications to accompany future development proposals.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.

DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	n/a	General	We request that the City remove overly prescriptive policy and development requirements from the Official Plan, and rather provide general guidance to make the intent of the Official Plan clear. Specifically, policies specifying setback requirements, locations of street trees, sidewalk widths, area or context driven height and density requirements, and similar policies should be simplified or removed in favour of more detailed planning process which will appropriately determine these requirements.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop “official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design” (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.
Alex Remonde		n/a	General	Witnessing Molson park drive change to mapleview, the bars change hands downtown and the ever reaching hand of expansion grow across simcoe enlightens me to the fact that change is inevitable but the right kind of change is crucial. Barrie as it stands today sits on a precipice, to fall in line with other communities that uphold economic growth above all other or to preserve the jewel we have been given. I realize the pressures to stimulate and grow economy are ever present but the desires of the community that built us to this point and their views should not be ignored now.	The views of the community are very important and public engagement has helped to drive the development of this draft new Official Plan, including the development of each section (these were based on themes prioritized by the community). As the Official Plan continues to guide the development of future documents (such as future master plans), a transparent engagement process will continue to be prioritized before anything is approved.
PBM Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	n/a	General	All Prescriptive design related policies through the New OP should be written as "should generally" or "are encouraged to provide," etc in order to clearly state the City's design objective while not requiring an Official Plan Amendment each time an objective cannot be fully achieved on a site.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop “official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design” (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	General	We request that you reconsider the attainability and built form implications of the densities noted in the Official Plan. We also note that units per hectare is an ineffective planning tool when assessing density on sites that are small, infill or are medium/high density. Accordingly, we recommend that you consider using Floor Space Index as a more precise tool to understand and implement the intended built form.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop “official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design” (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction.

LSRCA		n/a	General	It would provide greater clarity if several terms used throughout the document were better defined. Consider including definitions for the following terms: Public utilities Environmental Impact Study Vegetation Protection Zone Hydrological features Valley lands Riparian area Infrastructure Hydrogeological Report	We have added some terms into the definition. Additionally, as highlighted in the preface to the Definitions section 10.2: "If a term is defined in a Provincial document, the City has carried forward that term into the Plan to ensure consistency. Any other terms defined by the City are listed here, and if they are not listed here then the definition that appears in the Zoning By-law shall apply." Our use of other terms in the Official Plan for those terms highlighted are consistent with the definitions provided by the Province. We have also made the decision not to provide definitions for required studies. As additionally stated in the preface to the Definitions section: "Any other terminology has its regular, customary meaning. If clarification is needed, then it should be sought from the Director of Development Services."
LSRCA		n/a	General	The terms Environmental Impact Study and Natural Heritage Evaluation are interchangeable; however, it's recommended that only one of these terms be used throughout the document to prevent any confusion. For example, if Environmental Impact Study is used throughout, a definition for this term should be included which specifies that this document may also be referred to as a Natural Heritage Evaluation.	5.5.2.1.c) is the only reference to a natural heritage evaluation. We will take this out.
Al McNair		n/a	General	An Official Plan amendment should be required for any redevelopment or expansion of any such sites in Neighbourhood Areas.	An Official Plan amendment would be required for any developments requesting an exemption from the policies of the OP.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	n/a	General	Overall, policies continue to be very prescriptive with lots of "shall" and very difficult to read and interpret. Official Plans are supposed to be guiding documents with "motherhood policies" and use more of "should" and "may".	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.
Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	n/a	General	As you know, an Official Plan is a guiding document that provides flexibility and interpretation with policies which generally direct how and where the City should grow. The draft Official Plan is completely opposite wherein it is very prescriptive and removes any flexibility inherent within the plan. The issue with such a prescriptive document is it will ultimately require private developments to amend the document regularly. In our view, when a document leads to regular amendments being filed, it is a sign the policies are not effective.	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	n/a	General	As noted in the previous submission, the document remains very difficult and cumbersome to read and interpret. There continues to be too many sections and sub sections that it is confusing. In addition, there is a substantial amount of urban design terminology used within the document, which are better suited to be included in the Urban Design Guidelines. Based on this, the Salem landowners are of the opinion the document should continue to be simplified.	We have worked on reducing the overall size of the draft Official Plan and making it simpler between Drafts 1 and 2. We will continue to look out for opportunities to further simplify the document, without affecting clarity.
HIP Development	MHBC / Trevor Hawkins	n/a	General Confirmation	As the Barrie Central development has already submitted a Site Plan application and is in the process, confirmation should be provided to such applicants, in the form of transition policies that such applications will continue to be processed under the current policy and guideline framework notwithstanding the potential introduction of new guidelines and the policies in the Second Draft of the Official Plan.	The Official Plan will not be adopted by Council or submitted to MMAH for some time yet; those applicants who have received Site Plan approval will be permitted to continue under the conditions that have been agreed upon. At the same time, a transition policy can be included in the Official Plan.
DIV Development_1080 Lockhart Road	MGP	n/a	Secondary Plan Policies	The continuity of the planning from the Hewitt Secondary Plan and its area specific policies must be recognized in the Official Plan for the subject lands, either through the reinsertion of a separate chapter like the City's current Official Plan or by including all Hewitt Secondary Plan policies in the areas specific policies in appropriate sections of the Draft Official Plan 2051.	The guiding philosophy of this draft new Official Plan is "One City, One Vision, One Plan." As Barrie continues to grow into a mid-sized city, the intent is to integrate all ares within the city comprehensively. We have integrated the Secondary Plan policies to the best of our ability into this Official Plan, and have also taken note of your other suggestions. We feel confident that we can continue to work with landowners within the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas to achieve build out smoothly and successfully.
Wastersand Construction, Wormwood Developments, Perthshire Developments	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	n/a	Secondary Plan Policies	As noted previously, the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas are not that old and are currently being implemented after being approved in 2016 by the OMB (now LPAT). Why remove all of these policies when only one current landowner has applied for an Official Plan Amendment in the Hewitt's Secondary Plan area? All other landowners have complied with the policies in the plan to seek their current approvals.	The guiding philosophy of this draft new Official Plan is "One City, One Vision, One Plan." As Barrie continues to grow into a mid-sized city, the intent is to integrate all ares within the city comprehensively. We have integrated the Secondary Plan policies to the best of our ability into this Official Plan, and have also taken note of your other suggestions. We feel confident that we can continue to work with landowners within the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas to achieve build out smoothly and successfully.

Salem Landowners Group	KLM Planning / Keith MacKinnon	n/a	Secondary Plan Policies	As noted previously all of the approved plans did not require an amendment to the Secondary Plan and given that development is still proceeding, the landowners feel it is important to keep the Secondary Plan largely intact.	The guiding philosophy of this draft new Official Plan is "One City, One Vision, One Plan." As Barrie continues to grow into a mid-sized city, the intent is to integrate all ares within the city comprehensively. We have integrated the Secondary Plan policies to the best of our ability into this Official Plan, and have also taken note of your other suggestions. We feel confident that we can continue to work with landowners within the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas to achieve build out smoothly and successfully.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	Secondary Plan Policies	The Hewitt's Landowners feel that the implementation of an entirely new policy framework at this time is inappropriate, and request that the Hewitt's Secondary Plan policy framework be maintained and included as a distinct Section in the new OP.	The guiding philosophy of this draft new Official Plan is "One City, One Vision, One Plan." As Barrie continues to grow into a mid-sized city, the intent is to integrate all ares within the city comprehensively. We have integrated the Secondary Plan policies to the best of our ability into this Official Plan, and have also taken note of your other suggestions. We feel confident that we can continue to work with landowners within the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plan areas to achieve build out smoothly and successfully.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	Servicing Capabilities	Please provide the master servicing and utility analysis that demonstrates that there is servicing capacity to support the densities noted in B2. Tens of millions of dollars of infrastructure have and are continuing to be constructed to support the Hewitt's Secondary Plans and the Landowners are concerned that widespread replacements/upgrades of brand-new infrastructure would be required to support development at the proposed required densities.	This analysis is currently being conducted as part of our Municipal Comprehensive Review. The results of this analysis will be available publicly as part of a staff report to go to Council.
Karen Buck		n/a	Throughout	I enjoy living in my neighbourhood in Barrie because past initiatives have given the neighbourhood good access to park areas and there are also natural areas that have been kept to ensure that the natural environment is a living functioning part of the City. The upcoming Official Plan should be strong on land conservation and protect the natural functioning of the environment. Save natural area, protect water quality and Lake Simcoe.	We agree that we need to protect our environment, including our natural areas, our water quality and Lake Simcoe. There are policies focused throughout the draft new Official Plan focused on this, and I would call attention in particular to Section 5, Planning a Waterfront and Green City, and Section 6, Planning a Resilient City.
Gary Bell		n/a	Throughout	The terms will and shall in the Official Plan should be consistently used. Shall is directive and mandatory. Will is less so. Most policies refer to the City as the subject of actions. There are only a few policies which indicate that Council shall, may or will take or not take a particular action. Perhaps the distinction, if any, between the City and City Council could be indicated in the Foundations preamble, or the reference to Council in the policies should be changed to the City.	We can undertake a review of where/when City Council is mentioned and where/when the City more broadly is mentioned, and the verbage attached to any action being directed by the City and City Council. A distinction between the work of the City and the work of City Council could be given in the foundation section (p. 3 of the preamble).

Gary Bell		n/a	Throughout	Are the Salem and Hewitt's Creek Secondary Plans and detailed policies fully integrated and included in the new OP?	To the extent that the growth management strategies guiding the Salem and Hewitt's Secondary Plans are included in the new Official Plan, they are fully integrated. The actual policies however may not be identical.
969, 979, 989 Mapleview Drive E / Sandy Creek	Kelly Lagace / Crystal Homes	n/a	Throughout	Reference to tenure should be removed throughout the document.	Where appropriate, we will replace tenure with housing "options."
PBMR Realty Holdings	MHBC / Andrew Edwards	n/a	Throughout (especially in Section 3)	The City's New Official Plan should build in greater flexibility to allow applications that deviate from specific design requirements to proceed without the need for an Official Plan Amendment at the discretion of City staff. The City's Draft New Official Plan provides many specific design criteria that are more consistent with provisions found in the City's Zoning By-law. By enshrining these in the City's Official Plan without flexible language it will require many applications moving forward to also apply for an Official Plan Amendment, even for something seemingly minor such as providing 49% ground floor non-residential uses instead of 50% (2.6.1.3 d).	The Growth Plan states that single-tier municipalities should develop "official plan policies that identify the minimum density targets and … identify densities, heights and other elements of site design" (5.2.5.5.). The designations in the draft Official Plan are in accordance with this direction. Where specific targets, metrics and guidelines have been given in the Official Plan, we have done so because of the weight and importance of these guidelines in fulfilling the priorities set by the public, by City Council and by government.
800 Yonge Street, 658 and 662 Mapleview Drive / 624 Yonge Street	Armel/ Chris Corosky/ MHBC	n/a	Urban Design Guidelines	In our view, it is important that the proposed new urban design guidelines be reviewed in connection with the New OP. Since the new urban design guidelines are not expected until fall 2021, the New OP should not be adopted at least until then.	We plan to release to commenters on the Official Plan a working version of the Urban Design Guidelines, in conjunction with the working tracked-changes version of the Official Plan. From there, a full new draft of the UDGs will be developed.
Hewitt's Creek Landowners Group	Jones Consulting Group / Ray Duhamel	n/a	Urban Design Guidelines	Request that these be provided in tandem with the release of the 3rd draft of the Official Plan. There is a mandatory requirement to implement the Guidelines and a lack of clarity at what, if any, flexibility will be afforded in implementing the UDG (Policy 3.1.3.1a).	We plan to release a working version of the Urban Design Guidelines for review in the fall, in connection with a tracked-changes working version of the new Official Plan.
Melchior Management	Janet Foster	n/a	Zoning By-laws	Has the City envisioned what the implementing zoning bylaw will look like when recognizing and permitting mixed uses? How will the existing zoning permissions currently afforded to properties be maintained? Will the City pre-zone lands or is rezoning to be applied on an individual site basis.	We are currently in the process of starting the update to the Zoning By-law. The questions you ask regarding mixed uses and existing zoning permissions are pertinent, and we will be addressing them. Moreover, there will be public engagement in conjunction with the Zoning By-law update, to ensure both that there is transparency and that you are able to provide feedback on what may or may not work.