June 5, 2015

City of Burlington
420 Brant Street, Planning Dept.

Regarding #1350 Waterdown Road & The Proposed Church Application

"Good Morning!" I/we are not opposed to the church, but the applicant made no mention that the proposal met with our "Part V - North Aldershot Planning Area", Central Sector, Page 5 of 37, Policies & K) Page 4 of 37, (iii) max 40% impervious surface & retention basin + (vi) roof line including the tower to be "compatible" with the ten 'ranch style' homes, the monster houses are unlawful & contrary to our zoning bylaw "guidelines"! & (viii), (ix), (x), (xi), (xii), (xiv).

Church Roof Line @ 9.5" = 31 ft
Adjacent Home on Craven = 16 ft - (Diff @ 15 ft)

Bell Tower 7.5" + 9.5" = 55.77 ft
Adjacent Home on Craven = 16 ft + Diff (@ 49.77 ft)
No church not "compatible" with our Burlington official plan bylaw 116-1986!

R.S.V.P.
Regretfully

As of Jan 12, 2016!
No reply.

RECEIVED
Jan 19 2016

CITY OF BURLINGTON
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Regarding the Proposed Church @ 1350 Waterdown Road, Burlington Ont.

1. Their 16 Page Rezoning Application, Page #7, 2nd Paragraph "The Grindstone Creek runs north & south through the westerly portion of the site."
   Is not correct. Grindstone Creek flows through "Hidden Valley Subdivision" (1/2 mile away).

2. The last paragraph on page #15 the wording "compatible" See Bylaw 116-1986 "Site Plan Application Guidelines" page #27, Sect. 11.5 & sect. 11.4 to be indicated on proposal plans, "No Tower!"

3. The total "Person Count" for All Rooms to be shown & parking spaces to conform for 509 + Library & Kitchens & Lounge Areas.

4. The proposal indicates that the rainwater "run off" from the parking lot, drive area & church roof will be directed to the little ditch at the rear of #1340 to #1314 Nevarco Dr. But it is flooded up to the wire fence of #1324 after a storm.

R.S.V.P. Respectfully
To BUDDINGTON CITY HALL @ 420 BRAND ST,
Attn Lisa Stern @ Plan Dept, PAGE #1

Good Morning Lisa!

Thank you for your letter of Jan 22/2016.

My letter of June 5, 2015 was to elaborate on various items that our planning dept.
has ignored for years! (Until I shook them up & chopped off the roof of
Next to our fire)

Your #1 Item: "Height of 3rd fits into the landscape - Ref. 9th line of print (vi)
compatiable - ignored?"

Your #2 Item: "Direct storm water into the ravine @ rear of site"

My letter Jan 12, 2016, Item #4 is in
Direct Contradiction of my statement!

If you look @ our land use map #1350
Waterdown Road is upstream!
After a storm this little 2'6" wide x 12" deep ditch has flooded the back yard from fence line on the east to the fence line on the west (110 ft)
The cause is that for 60 yrs trees 24' tall are now 95 ft, tall! Have your staff
have a look & clear it if out. It's also illegal, (natural watercourse blocked)
THE BLOCKED DITCH FROM PARNIN ROAD @ THE 403 THAT HAS CAUSED THE PONDING HAS BECOME A SWAMP! THE FLOODING MY GARDEN IS LONG GONE & MY RIDING LAWN-MOWER GETS STUCK IN THE MUD & THE AREA SOUTH OF THE DITCH TO THE FENCE 30 FT +/- IS ALSO NOW A SWAMP!

AS A TAXPAYER, CHOP MY TAX & DO NOTHING OR CLEAN UP THE BLOCKAGE & LEAVE MY TAX ALONE
Thanks for your email. I am not asking for the Church development to be postponed, I am asking for access to the Church be made available from two entrance ways, Nevaric & Waterdown Road, since both of these roads exist already this should be possible.

Craven, Rick
City of Burlington & Region of Halton
Councillor, Ward One
905-335-7600 ext. 7587 | Rick.Craven@burlington.ca

Connect with Councillor Craven

Subcribe to Councillor Rick Craven’s monthly newsletter at rick.craven@burlington.ca

While I sympathize with the residents on Nevarc, I am a resident of Waterdown Road. There is increasing traffic backlog due to insufficient road restructuring. Until Waterdown Road has completed its upgrade I believe it is a mistake to have the church’s driveway only assessable via Waterdown Road. When the Go station comes in, when school or city buses stop, garbage trucks stop there can be as many as 15-20 cars back-up. Sometimes it takes me 5 minutes to turn left...
from Old Waterdown Road onto Waterdown Road. This area is also a hotspot for deer to run across the street.

It still never ceases to amaze me why all the governments, local, provincial & federal are always talking about air quality (bylaws about idling cars etc.), the environment and then don’t think things through such as this, bike lanes etc. Yes you are accomplishing your goal of slowing traffic down but in the process you are contributing to the demise of the environment with car emissions and traffic back ups. For once could it be done correctly, road widened first, church built second and access to/from church to both Waterdown Road & Nevarc.
Good Morning Lisa Stern! Thank you for your letter of Feb 9th, 2016, but we are more concerned about my Item #2 of my letter of Jan. 25, 2016 regarding Bylaw 116-1986, Site Plan Applications, Page 20 & 27, 11'6" to 11'5" roof lines to be the same line! As all these one floor homes, all the large homes are not legal! (The house @ #1324 had to chop off 10 feet off the roofline as per 116-1986 to comply)

P.S. We built our house in 1954, picked up the 13th permit for $50.00 at Town Hall @ Greensville (No Plans Required), & built 100% of it! (Not one outsider including heat, plumbing, wiring, framing, roofing, masonry @ Age 22, complete in 6 mo. No mort.

P.S. 13 if you wish TATAFN
July 9, 2015

Re: 1350 Waterdown Rd
Para. 3, 4 & 5

Good Morning,

You and I have a problem regarding a roll of plans you submitted to the City of Burlington to erect a house at 1350 Waterdown Road.

Prior to construction or shortly after, I visited the City of Burlington’s Building Department and asked to look at the plans submitted for the house with 16 foot ceilings and a projected roof line above the roof line of our roof line of over 16 feet, which makes my ‘ranch style’ affordable home look like a chicken coop. The property value shrunk to just over $200,000!

Further, as per our Professional Engineers Act Bill 123, Section 20, you were or should have been acting as a Trustee for your client, the owner of the land and proposed occupant of this house, you failed him.


Also, see copy of Page 5 of our Official Plan Booklet Regarding Implementation, as well as a photo of the monster barn that you foisted onto your client and me, knowing that it was contrary to our ‘Site Plan Requirements and Urban Design Guidelines (By-Law 116 – 1986) Booklet’, available for free at the front counter of the Planning Department.

Therefore, I have no other choice but legal action against you for $200,000 and all costs associated with the devaluing of our home by your actions, or chop ten feet off the roof of your house.

If your greedy lawyer advises you to take action against me (to line his pockets for years to come), I will counter sue both of you for ten times that amount and I always win!

Fax me your reply to my letter within ten days with your comments prior to my legal action.