

PB-80-16

Delegation correspondence

File #520-02-1, 505-08-04

Albert Faccenda

From: "Albert Faccenda" <afaccenda1@cogeco.ca>
Date: Friday, November 18, 2016 11:28 AM
To: "Tellier, Jamie" <Jamie.Tellier@burlington.ca>; "Mary Alice" <maryalicestj@cogeco.ca>
Subject: Re: Shoreacres Study

Hi Jamie / Mary Alice,

Having spoken to Marie Alice and her husband Ron. We have discussed and generally agreed to the changes in Zoning regulations as follows. A Floor Area Ratio to be further reduced to a ratio of 0.40:1 on Lots 70 feet and over. No FAR. on the smaller lots as 25% lot coverage is already very restrictive. Garage can protrude 5 feet out to create some articulation. Shall provide photos of beautiful homes in Roseland, Shoreacres and Indian Point that have these features. Rear 2nd floor balconies gone on privacy issues. 120 m provision for creation of lots in Character Areas is to be removed. Ron and Marie Alice suggested increase the floor area for 1 1/2 stories to 32% from 30% to encourage these homes being built. I agree. I also had a chance to speak with Councillor Craven and told him we were talking to the Shoreacres folks. I believe he preferred a reduction in height as well in Indian Point. I think these changes can be applied to both neighbourhoods. The majority of Indian Point residents did not want any changes. But these are very reasonable for all sides. Reached out to Roseland folks as well, wish me luck...

From: Tellier, Jamie
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 4:04 PM
To: 'Mary Alice' ; 'Albert Faccenda'
Subject: Shoreacres Study

Hi Mary Alice / Albert,

Hope all is well. My understanding is that you have come to an agreement on proposed zoning regulations for Shoreacres Character Study.

Please send me an itemized list of these agreed upon items for consideration in our next report.

Thanks.

Jamie Tellier MCIP RPP

Manager of Urban Design
 City of Burlington | Planning Division
 Planning and Building Department

T: 905.335.7600 x7892
 F: 905.335.7880
 E: jamie.tellier@burlington.ca

This message, including any attachments, is privileged and intended only for the addressee(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate the information contained in this email/fax. If you have received this email/fax transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone, fax or email and permanently delete this email from your computer/shred this fax, including any attachments, without making a copy. Access to this email/fax by anyone else is unauthorized. Thank you.

Albert Faccenda

From: "Albert Faccenda" <afaccenda1@cogeco.ca>
Date: Monday, December 12, 2016 7:14 PM
To: "Ron Fleming" <flemingelectric@cogeco.ca>
Subject: Re: [SPAM] Re: Shoreacres Study

Hi Ron can you give me a call just want to touch base for tomorrow. Home all night 905 961 6060

Thanks

From: Ron Fleming
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2016 1:06 PM
To: 'Mary Alice' ; 'Tellier, Jamie'
Cc: 'Albert Faccenda'
Subject: RE: [SPAM] Re: Shoreacres Study

We will need to add, area covered by the foundation, regardless if it is "livable space " or not . This will apply to the FAR and the lot coverage.

From: Mary Alice [mailto:maryalicastj@cogeco.ca]
Sent: October 27, 2016 11:53 AM
To: Tellier, Jamie
Cc: Albert Faccenda; flemingelectric@cogeco.ca
Subject: [SPAM] Re: Shoreacres Study

Hi Gentlemen. I am in Tucson right now - return late this Saturday so if I have forgotten anything Albert or Ron, please include.

Jamie, thank you. Please do consider including the following which were agreed upon at our meeting when we reviewed the complete PB doc.

We agreed on

1. .45 to .40 F.A.R.
2. strongly support as per the report that yard privacy be paramount through no 2nd storey balconies
3. no severing of properties within our Character Study area - only properties larger than (700???) square feet can be considered for severing
4. garage designs can extend up to (four???) feet in front of the home (addressing Roseland new builds on larger than our Character Study lots)

That's it, correct Albert and Ron??

Jamie, you know how Ron and I feel. Albert understands this as well. It was helpful to go through the document and hear Albert's points as a builder. Thanks Albert!

If I have forgotten anything, I will review my notes and send them your way upon my return home. I do sincerely hope that these 3 minor yet reflective and respectful modifications will be included. I added the fourth (the 2nd storey balconies) because we are all in agreement with seeing it included ... happy to see it included!

Sincerely,
Mary Alice

Sent from my iPhone



Library of Links



Please click on the oak leaf beside each title to link to the web page.

-  [**Roseland Community Organization on facebook**](#)
-  [**Burlington Gazette**](#)
-  [**City of Burlington**](#)
-  [**City Hall Directory**](#)
-  [**St. Luke's Precinct**](#)
-  [**Roseland Heights Community Organization**](#)
-  [**Roseland Heights Community Organization on facebook**](#)
-  [**Sounds by the Shore \(A Burlington history\)**](#)
-  [**Who we are, where we've been, and where we're going**](#)
-  [**Inventory of Properties Heritage Burlington**](#)
-  [**Roseland Images August 2012**](#)
-  [**Burlington Historical Society Images of Roseland**](#)
-  [**Burlington Historical Society**](#)

Roseland resident in a huff – feels her community is being stifled by Heritage Burlington.

Start Download - PDF Now

Convert From Doc to PDF, PDF to Doc Simply With The Free On-line App! Go to fromdocstopdf.com



By Diane Gaudaur

BURLINGTON, ON May 15, 2013. I understand that Heritage Burlington met yesterday evening and that there was a 6 to 3 vote to support the severance at 3083 Lakeshore Road.

I further understand that derogatory comments were made on the record and offhand about Roseland and the Roseland Community Organization. We are duly incorporated as a non-profit organization to resist egregious development in our neighbourhood, and unapologetically so. We have the right to exist for our own purposes. We are not 'anti-severance' but we are against egregious development. We have well over 100 members. We have further 'non-member' support from other Roseland residents.



Diane Gaudaur, president of the Roseland Community Association discusses the kind of community they want during a Neighbourhood Character Study, part of the Official Plan Review. The community does not see the Councillor Dennison request to sever his property as fitting in with the character of the community.

I complained earlier about Jeff Sutcliffe writing an inflammatory and erroneous letter to the editor in the Burlington Post. As a voting member of Heritage Burlington, I feel he should not be inflicting his personal views on the public when there is an active and pending Application for Minor Variance. I understand he not only voted, but was forceful in suggesting that it be brought to a vote and also made comments about our organization. When I complained about his behaviour earlier, I was told he was a private citizen expressing his views. I suggest that everyone at City Hall is a private citizen, but that there should be an appropriate code of conduct when dealing with City business.

That there seems to be none for Committee members is unacceptable. Meetings should be conducted by the Chairperson and in a professional manner. I am told that this was not the case. That there should be questions of procedural issues pertaining to voting and to whom this vote should be expressed to, is clearly unprofessional.

Mr. Sutcliffe has a clear public stance on the rights of property owners. The purpose of this committee should be to protect and respect Heritage in Burlington, not to rubber stamp demolition permits and other issues which they vote on. This Committee has long been disrespected by the public, and continues to be so by a significant number of city residents.

This decision is clearly in defiance of the Staff Report in the Application, with clear and unambiguous judgments by Planning on the appropriateness of this severance from a heritage perspective.

It is difficult enough to undertake opposition to severances. It is even more challenging on many levels when the applicant is our Ward Councillor. We now proceed to the Committee of Adjustment, one of whose members I understand to be a developer and all voted in by the Ward Councillor.

I am appalled that there was no procedure in place for dealing with an application and further that it was not dealt with within the same time frame as other Staff reports. Furthermore, one's personal agenda should not be the driving force behind the Committee's action or non-action.

This committee needs a complete overhaul. Members should be there to protect Heritage not undermine it. If having property rights activists and developers on the Committee is for the sake of balance, I suggest that this is an approach that is not working.

The culture at City Hall should remember why they were hired, nominated or elected to be in the positions they are in. Residents and all parties deserve to be treated respectfully and fairly.

Diane Gaudaur is the President of the Roseland Community Organization.



Ward 4 Councillor Jael Dennison discusses the "character" of the Roseland with residents who don't want to see the severance to his property he is seeking approved.

[Return to the Front page](#)

Like One person likes this. [Sign Up](#) to see what your friends like.

Share this:

[Facebook](#) [Google](#) [LinkedIn](#) [Email](#) [Tumblr](#)



How to flush belly bloat



May 16th, 2013 | Category: [News](#)

3 comments to Roseland resident in a huff – feels her community is being stifled by Heritage Burlington.











