

Good evening Chairman, council members, committee members and staff.

I would like to first thank you for the opportunity to speak here tonight. I am also very proud of City and what has been achieved to date. I also recognize the amount of work and effort by staff and others to get us to where we are today.

I am Mike Hribljan resident in Ward 2 and longtime resident in the city of Burlington.

I am here as an independent delegation regarding agenda item 5.1 and would like to express my concerns with staff's recommendation. I further believe that approval of the Proposed Official Plan should be deferred till after the municipal elections.

A little background on myself, I am a Professional Engineer registered in the Province of Ontario, I currently work for a large global environmental company.

Prior to my current role I worked for 12 years as a Vice President in a national consulting engineering company, having worked on many growth management plans, master plans and environmental assessments around the province, so I have some experience in this area.

The changes being proposed from the previous official plan are extensive, and what has many of us concerned are the new population densities that are being proposed, and the mechanism to get there, namely high-rise structures in the urban core.

In-addition the justification or enabler for these densities, the Downtown mobility hub, does not make sense.

In my opinion insufficient impact and financial analysis has been completed.

The public is only beginning to understand the impacts of these proposed changes and additional consultation is absolutely required.

I would like to draw committee members attention to page 389 of the Draft Official Plan Section 12.1.5.1.2.1 part b) and illustrate what the City requires if someone, say a developer requests an Official Plan Amendment or Zoning By-law Amendment.

There are 38 items on that list! I will read a cross section of those items relevant to the downtown urban core. (Just read yellow highlights below)

12.1.5.1.2.1 COMPLETE APPLICATIONS

b) For an application for Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, plan of subdivision, or consent (other than those consent applications made for the purposes outlined in Subsection 12.1.3.2.2.1 c) of this Plan), the *City* may require the provision of additional supporting information or material required to allow full consideration of the application. The scope of the information or material required for each application *shall* be determined by the *City* and Region of Halton as part of the pre-consultation process. This information *may* include, but *shall* not be limited to, the following:

(i) Planning justification report, including employment or residential needs analysis, where required;

(ii) land assembly documents;

(iii) survey and severance sketch, prepared by an Ontario Land Surveyor

(iv) land use compatibility study;

(v) financial impact study;

(vi) park concept plan;

(vii) agricultural impact assessment;

(viii) archaeological report;

(ix) built heritage resource impact assessment;

(x) cultural heritage landscape impact assessment;

(xi) urban design brief;

(xii) conceptual site plan layout;

(xiii) architectural plans;

(xiv) 3-D model of proposed buildings;

(xv) height survey of adjacent buildings;

(xvi) angular plane study;

(xvii) shadow analysis plan;

(xviii) wind impact study;

(xix) arborist's report;

(xx) tree inventory and preservation plan;

(xxi) landscaping plan;

(xxii) grading and drainage plans;

(xxiii) water & waste water functional servicing report;

(xxiv) hydrogeology study/water budget & hydrology study;

(xxv) source protection disclosure report

(xxvi) noise feasibility study/vibration study;

(xxvii) traffic/transportation impact report;

(xxviii) *Transportation Demand Management Plan and Implementation Strategy*;

(xxix) parking justification report;

(xxx) storm water management report/functional drainage report or storm services plan and *flood plain* delineation;

(xxxi) *environmental* impact assessment;

(xxxii) top-of-bank demarcation/ slope stability assessment/ creek erosion assessment/ geomorphic study;

(xxxiii) shoreline hazardous lands studies;

(xxxiv) geotechnical report;

(xxxv) Phase I Environmental Assessment;

(xxxvi) Phase II Environmental Assessment/Record of Site Condition;

(xxxvii) landfill assessment; and/or
(xxxviii) Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines Checklist

So, this is what the city wants for an Amendment to the Official Plan, however very few of these items are covered in the new Draft Official Plan where we are talking about sweeping changes for the Downtown Core and for other areas of Burlington.

The city does not seem to be following its own requirements that it sets for others.

Let me start with Transportation, I would expect this plan to include models (virtual and mathematical) based on good planning, engineering practice and financial analysis to predict the impact of this level of development, especially in the downtown core.

I would also like to site section 6.2.10 item A. and C (Just read yellow highlights below)

6.2.10 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT 6.2.10.1 OBJECTIVES a) To manage transportation demand through the use of such means as transit, walking, cycling, carpooling, ride sharing, car sharing, bike sharing and the implementation of flexible working hours. b) To support and enhance sustainable transportation choices and discourage single occupant vehicle trips. c) To reduce traffic congestion, parking supply needs, and demand for parking spaces by encouraging non-automobile modes of travel.

First item A. What say does the city have in flex hours employees are offered in businesses?

What is the business case for car sharing, is this even feasible, and can this kind of business survive?

Does cycling reduce vehicle traffic or simply reduce ridership on public transit?

Do bike lanes offer a safe year-round mode of transportation or congest traffic adding to greenhouse gases?

Then item C. What are those other non-automobile modes of travel intended here? A bus from the "downtown bus stop? A bicycle in January? This does not seem like a plan.

Are you expecting someone paying \$.5M and more for a downtown condo, then plan for them to take a bus or ride a bike to work, run errands, attend appointments after work? I get it if they are going to the GO station.

How many people living in downtown condo's commute to the GO station today? How many use a car to get to work, today? How many walk to work, today? How will this change over the duration of this plan? All this can be addressed in models.

For the record, I walked here tonight, we also have 7 bikes at our home for 3 people. My wife cycles to work April through October when the weather is nice, my son works part-time at a local cycle shop and I ride for exercise and occasional errands on weekends. Both my wife and I still need a car each to get to work and do everything else life requires.

Let me read a couple more sections from the draft official plan.

Section 7.1.5.2 Tall Buildings part f) (Just read yellow highlights below)

7.1.5.2 TALL BUILDINGS

a) *Tall building* policies are applicable across the entire City, but it is anticipated that the majority of new *tall buildings* will be developed in Primary Growth Areas, where feasible, and other areas in which they are permitted by an *Area-Specific Plan*, a comprehensive Zoning By-law or site-specific policies in effect as of the approval date of this Plan.

b) The *City shall* ensure that *tall buildings* fit within their surrounding context, limit potential *adverse impacts* and achieve design excellence.

c) *Tall building* elements *shall* step back from the *podium* along all public street frontages to reduce the *adverse* visual and environmental *impacts* for the pedestrian environment such as sunshadowing.

f) *Tall buildings shall* be designed to minimize *adverse impacts* of wind

channeling, shadowing and the interruption of sunlight on the *streetscape*, neighbouring properties, parks and open spaces and natural areas.

All good design practices, but no details on how.

The reality is that a tall building will cast a shadow, the only way to reduce the shadow is to reduce the height.

Committee is being asked to approval a plan with no information of the impact of shadowing on existing buildings and existing neighbourhoods.

We all know wind “channeling” is a major issue in cities, I would ask where are the studies of the proposed plan at build out and impact on adjacent neighbourhoods.

Wind “channeling” is really a misnomer, its wind acceleration caused by down draft effects and air being squeezed between two adjacent tall buildings then speeding up.

What happens as storms are more frequent and stronger because of climate change. None of this information is in the official plan.

I'll select another environmental impact, here is what the draft official plan says in Chapter 7 related to Design Excellence: (Just read yellow highlights below)

CHAPTER 7 – DESIGN EXCELLENCE

Page 7-15

Draft Official Plan

April 2017

Chapter 7

(vi) *tree* protection measures and planting of non-invasive *trees* and other vegetation, in accordance with Section 4.3, Urban Forestry, of this Plan;

(vii) storm water quality and drainage measures, in accordance with Subsection 4.4.3 of this Plan;

(viii) identification of appropriate snow storage areas to reduce the *adverse impacts* of salt and de-icing practices;

(ix) waste management facilities in accordance with the Region's requirements; and

(x) bird-friendly design measures for glass buildings and buildings adjacent to the Natural Heritage System and the Lake Ontario shoreline.

The Burlington beach strip is a migratory corridor for birds such as, warblers, wrens, thrushes, humming birds and many others. Lights and reflective surfaces from high-rise buildings attracts birds, confuses them at night when they are migrating.

There is really no way to mitigate the impact that high lit, reflective buildings have on migrating birds, aside from turning off the lights. So, what does this mean? Again, no details.

In-fact if you look at the rendering in Appendix C of this committee report you will see tall glass clad, reflective building which did not follow the proposed official plan.

There are many other policy and objective statements in our draft official plan that lack detail, clarity or are simply confusing.

Lots of what I would call “motherhood and apple pie” statements with little substance.

I would personally have a hard time approving this plan if I did not understand the impacts and repercussions, no analysis, no numbers, business case analysis, no engineering.

I'll to wrap up by, again referencing the draft official plan from the introduction in Chapter 11:
(Just read yellow highlights below)

At the core of democratic government are two pillars that also form the basis of effective citizen engagement:

1. That government belongs to the citizens within its political boundaries, and
2. That the inhabitants of a city are citizens with the rights and responsibilities of citizenship based on justice, human rights, fundamental freedoms and rule of law.

I therefore think that before anything is approved on this matter, citizens need to be heard and much more information circulated. Because of the sweeping changes proposed, I would like to see approval of the plan deferred till after the November election to make sure we get this right – what is the rush?