

Morgan, Melissa

From: adbharris adbharris [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2017 5:34 PM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Cc: Deena Harris; Mary Lou Merritt
Subject: re condos at 3225-3237 New St. Burl.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Categories: Important

Hello:

I live at 3243 New St. condos, unit 7. I have read the notice that we all received.

Can you please tell me what 3-storey townhouse means?

I think: basement, below ground; main floor; upper floor for bedrooms.

Others think: no below ground level. garage at ground level, next level up: kitchen etc., 3rd level up: bedrooms.

I left a voice mail earlier today but you have been busy.

Thank you,

Deena Harris
[REDACTED]

Vraets, Lauren

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 9:52 AM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Subject: Planning application 3225-3237 New Street File 520-06/17

Importance: High

[REDACTED]

Dear Laura

My wife and I own unit 23 at 3230 New Street and our front door is directly on New Street facing this subject development. Currently we have under gone a redevelopment of New Street and the water, sewer etc replacement. It has been a trying time with the work adjacent to and on our condo property. News of this development across the street is unsettling and has been discussed with others in our condo complex. Reaction has been to not allow this further development to allowing it with a restriction that the townhomes be limited to two floors similar to the ones currently next door to the proposed development.

I am strongly in favour of allowing the development BUT only for a two story limit.

Unfortunately I am unable to attend the June meeting, but feel that my position be presented.

Yours truly

Len & Barb Tompkins
23-3230 New Street
L7N 1M8
[REDACTED]

Vraets, Lauren

From: Ralph Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2017 10:35 PM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Subject: File No. 520-06/17

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Re: Planning Application for: 3225-3237 New Street

We live at 3230 New Street and have just received the information regarding the proposal set out in the above file. We've spoken with a number of the residents at 3230 New St. And the feeling is that any increase in density from the existing 2 units will add significant congestion to this area. Since the bike lanes have been added last year the traffic is continual along New St., in both directions, making it very difficult for coming and going onto New St. Given that there will be driveways coming from both sides this will be very difficult to access lanes. As it is now, there are times when it can take an excessive amount of time to be able to go out into a lane, even on your side of the street, as no one wants to let another car out in front of them.

The addition of 11 units replacing the existing 2 units seems excessive for this area, particularly in light of the new Maranatha complex which will already be adding a large amount of increased traffic to this vicinity. Also, we believe the buildings should be NO MORE THAN 2 STORIES HIGH in keeping with the other townhouse complexes in this general area.

I hope that these comments will be taken into consideration and if you need any additional information please don't hesitate to contact us. Ralph & Carol Williams

Sent from my iPad

Vraets, Lauren

From: Elizabeth Dunlop [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, May 29, 2017 1:20 PM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Subject: 3225-3237 New Street

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

We disagree with the re zoning request for file No: 520-06/17.
New street is far too congested to handle more homes in the space of 2 single dwellings.
Our street spruce hill is becoming a race track as people try an escape the congestion of new street.
We look forward to the meeting June 8,17 and will oppose this change.
Thank you,
Elizabeth Dunlop and Brad Kramer

Vraets, Lauren

From: Beverly Watters [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 04, 2017 8:13 PM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Subject: condo complex to be built

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Ms Vraets

I am a homeowner at # 9-3243 New St. Because of this, I have reservations about some of the proposals. The density of building eleven units on a much smaller area than ours, will only result in more noise. Noise buffers like grass, bushes, trees will not be possible. Also eleven units entering and exiting next door will add greatly to the congestion on New St. It already has only two lanes of traffic and it's near impossible at times to exit the driveway. Nine units should be considered. Even nine will add to the congestion. The fact that these units have balconies rather than patios will end our privacy. These proposals need to be reassessed.

Thank you for these considerations.

Beverly Watters

Vraets, Lauren

From: iona knox [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 04, 2017 10:55 AM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Subject: Fw: planning application for 3225-3257 New st.



From: [iona knox](mailto:iona.knox)
Sent: Saturday, June 03, 2017 10:10 PM
To: lauren.vraets@burlington.ca
Subject: Fw: planning application for 3225-3257 New st.

From: [iona knox](mailto:iona.knox)
Sent: Saturday, June 03, 2017 6:07 PM
To:

Dear Ms.vraets.

I would like to advise the city of some problems re the above application.\ I have a corner lot right beside the proposed "garbage storage and pick up area" I think you would agree it would make my patio life most unpleasant with the stench and noise not to mention the rats and other vermin it would attract. In our complex we keep our garbage in our garages which is sanitary and not offensive and noise to our community.

I hope you will give some consideration to this plan as I am an outdoor person and the prospect of a garbage dump 30 ft from my patio is very disturbing and depressing,.

Thank you, Iona Knox. 2-34243 New st

Vraets, Lauren

From: Mary Lou Merritt [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 04, 2017 5:48 PM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Subject: 3225-37 New St. FILE 520-06/17
Attachments: 3225 (AutoRecovered).docx

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Hello

Here are more questions that I would ask at the meeting on Thursday but will give your committee a chance to answer sooner.

I cannot open any of the files today as it comes back too big for my WORD program and yet last week I could open most of them but could not read diagrams because of the smallness of the numbers.

Thanks

Mary Lou Merritt

[REDACTED]

June 4, 2017

Mary Lou Merritt 6-3243 New St.

3225-37 NEW ST. PROPOSED 11 TOWNHOUSE UNITS

FILE 520-06/17

Many of us would like to see changes made to the proposed plan as we live in the townhouses next to this development.

1. Many mature trees will be removed and we would suggest a good row of cedars a foot or two higher than our wooden fence between their entrance road and our fence. It would help with pollution and noise from cars. Other tree placement should be mostly coniferous so acting as a year round noise buffer and good appearance. Many birds will lose their homes because of this destruction.
2. No place to pile snow after storms unless less townhouses built allowing more green space and not all cement echoing noise and heat.
3. Garbage bin at the end of their entrance road will be noisy and possible rats. The residents could keep the garbage in garages as we do and put out on New St. This would not require a truck to go in to lift bins in the shed and the danger of backing out. Shed

too close our patios and doors may be left open by mistake with so many residents using.

4. Allowing changes in density would be a mistake going from 40 to 55 on some pages in their plan which varies. Too noisy and too many cars getting in and out of New Street. Should be a place for seniors as most of the area is now. Too busy an area to have children and too many steps for seniors as townhouses now planned.
5. Comparing file **520-02-16** opposite the library recently approved to this application there were three houses to be removed and City approved 11 townhouses rather than 12 requested. The builders used Wellings Planning Consultants also. Are the properties comparable size wise? We would like to suggest 8 or 9 units.
6. Why was a **shadow study not done** when these units will be taller than ours with our basement underground not **above** as they propose for their development?
7. Why underground water storage? Drainage and grading? Will they have open drains like the ones we have? A lot of water in the hydro right of way effects this area so excellent drainage is required.
8. Allow no window air conditioning units. Only outside units. In their suggestion buildings Type D gets an outside AC unit included but Type C buyer must install themselves. They should all be installed.
9. 6 rooftop patios on New Street with higher buildings take away privacy from three of our unit's patios facing their property and will be noisier with rooftop BBQ's, socializing, etc.
10. Maybe some explanation of traffic report numbers.

11. Picture 5 East does not show our units beside them only shows New St facing east. Also 5 South shows high school that is not seen from New St.
12. **BURLINGTON TAILORS** property is included in their planning when the business has refused on several attempts to purchase their property. Why when they have no intention of selling? This information should be removed from their application as it is misleading.
13. **For some reason I cannot open the files today to look at more items.**

Vraets, Lauren

From: olafzagorda [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2017 11:20 PM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Subject: Planning Application Comments for 3225-3237 New Street, File Number 520-06/17

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Hi Lauren,

Just a few quick comments about the proposal for 3225 - 3237 New Street.

- I reside almost directly across from the proposed site, and the two lots have been run down for a quite some time now, however building a huge out-of character monstrosity is not a just solution. The design is unsightly and doesn't fit in with the neighborhood at all. The homes look very commercial and will erode the quaint nature of New Street.
- Most importantly, I found out that there will be around 40 trees that will be removed, I was under the impression that the City of Burlington was a city committed to the environment, and putting 40 mature trees on the chopping block for big business is not what's right. How does the city justify this? The developer can always find another more suitable lot to meet his needs, but the trees will never be restored to the same capacity.
- Traffic is already a problem in the area, and adding this many units will only add to the bottleneaking and increase pollution. The streetscape has been green for so long, and if these townhomes are built, they will be far too visible which will be an eyesore for everyone.
- There is already a massive unattractive retirement home under construction in the area, which is also adding to the very un-eco friendly building practices of high buildings right next to each other without any greenery.
- The point of urbanization is not to cram as many people into as little land as possible and get rid of virtually all green space. A 11 unit 3 story townhouse complex requires at least 2 acres of land to adequately house residents and have enough room for yards. The proposed plan will be way too close to the street and will look absolutely atrocious. (Maybe the developer should present a new design that fits into the area a bit more, nothing modern)
- The best solution would be for the developer to look into land closer to the city and keep huge developments out of the suburbs.

Thank you!!!

Vraets, Lauren

From: Vraets, Lauren
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2017 1:06 PM
To: 'Daniel Bozuk'
Subject: RE: 3225-3237 New Street File No.: 520-06/17

Good afternoon Daniel,

Thank you for your emailed comments dated June 21, 2017 regarding file 520-06/17 (3225-3237 New Street).

Your comments will be considered in the preparation of our report to the Planning & Development Committee of Council. A copy of your correspondence will be included in the report. Please note that the report will be posted on the City's web site.

The Planning & Development Committee will hold a Statutory Public Meeting in accordance with Section 34 of the Planning Act to consider this application. You will be notified of the date and time of the Public Meeting.

If you have any further questions with respect to this application, please feel free to contact me at the phone number or email address noted below.

Lauren Vraets

Planner II, Development Review
Planning & Building Department
City of Burlington
426 Brant Street, Burlington L7R 3Z6
Phone: 905-335-7600 Ext. 7536
Email: lauren.vraets@burlington.ca



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Daniel Bozuk [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2017 8:25 AM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Subject: 3225-3237 New Street File No.: 520-06/17

Hi Lauren,

I live at 3219 New street and we spoke briefly at the meeting for the the properties being rezoned at 3225-3237, I do have a couple concerns about the project.

1. I feel the height of these buildings is too high for the area and the back ones in particular.
2. The distance from property to my lot line is also a concern, if they are going to be that high I feel they need to be a farther distance from my lot at 3219 New Street. I have a pool in yard and I don't want look out and see a 30 ft wall 10 ft from lot line.
3. When the properties are completed I would also want know what the exact fencing and landscaping package along my lot line and thiers.
4. I also think 11 units is too may too fit on that property

Please let me know if you receive this and if this format is fine or do need it on a specific form.

Thank you,

Daniel Bozuk, Associate
Sales Representative, ROCCA SISTERS & ASSOCIATES

MEET ME NOW: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

ROCCA SISTERS & ASSOCIATES
OUR RELATIONSHIPS RECOMMEND US IN REAL ESTATE
Royal LePage Burloak Real Estate Services, Brokerage
3060 Mainway, Suite 200, Burlington Ontario L7M 1A3

[REDACTED]

CONNECT WITH US

- - - -

This information is directed in confidence solely to the person named above and may not otherwise be distributed, copied or disclosed. Therefore, this information should be considered strictly confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately via a return email for further direction. Thank you for your assistance.

To unsubscribe from electronic communication, please reply back to this email with word "UNSUBSCRIBE" in the subject line.

Vraets, Lauren

From: Roma Bilyk [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2017 12:26 PM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Subject: Planning Application for: 3225-3237 New Street File:520-06/17

Dear Ms. Vraets,

I was unable to attend the meeting on June 8th and am unable to attend the up-coming meeting. However, I would like to submit my feelings on the proposed application. I have no issue with the building of additional townhouse units along this stretch of New Street if they are kept to a similar height as other condo/townhouse units along the street. We have already had the addition of a six storey apartment/condo building added to the street which has changed the look of the neighbourhood. It will also add to the amount of traffic on New Street which seems to have grown tremendously since reducing this stretch of New Street to one lane in either direction. The noise levels have increased as well.

Building townhouses that are three stories will certainly change the ascetic look of the neighbourhood. It appears that these units will also not be set back from the street to any great degree as there is not a lot of land available there. This would mean that there would be these tall structures jutting out amongst the other structures already in place.

I do hope that consideration will be given to the height of these structures. I know that I am not the only resident in this area that objects to this.

Thank you for your consideration. I would appreciate receiving the recommendation report when it is available. My address is:

R.L. Bilyk
Unit 18-3230 New Street,
Burlington
L7R 1M8
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Regards,
Roma L. Bilyk

Sent from my iPad

Vraets, Lauren

From: Mary Lou Merritt [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2017 12:00 PM
To: Vraets, Lauren
Cc: Beverly Watters; Colin Malley; Deena; Iona Knox; [REDACTED] Kathleen Hodgson; [REDACTED] Mary Lou Merritt; [REDACTED] Wim Klyn
Subject: 3225-37 NEW ST 11 condo townhouses File 520-06/17 SEPT 26 meeting

Categories: Important

Hi

1. Further to all my previous contacts with you a big concern of course is the proposed garbage bin, trucks coming in to empty, noise, smell, rats, residents placing garbage and chatting. Our 13 residents place garbage after 7pm on Sunday evening on NEW ST. and it is picked up early Monday morning.
2. Noise and pollution – plant mature cedars along fence line. Replace our wooden with another wooden fence and put on property line as it is behind our line about one foot. Try to leave more of existing mature trees along fence. Plant as many coniferous trees as possible for year round appearance.
3. Where will they pile snow. Build 2 less houses, have more green space and space for snow piling as it must not go along the wooden fence.
4. Change in design with a main floor bedroom would encourage seniors rather than families as not an appropriate place for children, bikes, busy street, etc.
5. Traffic on New St. is terrible now with only 2 lanes and this complex will add probably 16 more cars and the new Marantha apartment building opening soon will create a lot more traffic in the area.
6. Rooftop patios on the six units on New St take away privacy from our units backing on to this new complex. Prefer they have ground level patios

Thank you

Mary Lou Merritt

3237 New Street,
Burlington, ON
L7N 1M9

lauren.vraets@burlington.ca

October 4, 2017

Good Morning Ms Vraets,

I am writing to share my thoughts about the development going up on 3225-3237 New Street. I have seen the plans and am really concerned about the amount of concrete and the lack of trees in the proposed plan. The way the plan is put together leaves no room for the large native tree species that currently grow there and only proposes very small landscaped plots. I have heard but not seen that north of Fairview, there are areas of just concrete jungle and the people I have spoken about this are worried that this will be the way of things. I realize that the city to make money and I respect that but I want to point out that trees, save huge amounts of money.

The value of trees to people living in urban environments (see a series of articles in Toronto Star in 2015) and the benefits to city and business coffers has been well documented. A really comprehensive study conducted in Toronto recently outlines the importance of trees to health, happiness, justness, and other more broad based studies have focused on the benefits to commerce, economy, community and the environment that trees provide.

<https://www.thestar.com/opinion/commentary/2015/07/27/want-healthier-more-just-city-plant-trees>

<https://www.guardian.com/cities/2016/oct/12/importance-urban-forests-money-grows-trees>

www.treepeople.org/resources/tree-benefits

www.care2.com/causes/50-benefits-of-trees.html

www.bluegreen.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Benefits-of-Urban-Trees.pdf

www.oprah.com/spirit/shin-rin-health-benefits-of-walking-outside/all

<https://www.td.com/document/pdf/economics/special/UrbanForestsInCanadianCities.pdf>

I have included the td study because it shows as to a lesser degree that trees have financial value because of the enormous savings they provide cities. I included this because in discussion about concrete jungles with you, you said that the city had a focus on making money and I am suggesting that keeping the trees that are already here is a major move to keep your money given the tremendous benefits trees provide. I also asked you about several trees that were old. One is over 100 years. I asked not because I wanted to see it cut down but that I would like to see it preserved because trees that old have much more benefits to the city in terms of oxygen given off for people, shade for heat, protection from cold and wind, the carbon they take out of the air, the pollution they remove from the air, and their beauty and calming effects, etc. I was hoping the city would keep these trees as they are on city property.

Toronto has realized quite after the fact just how important trees are and have a paper they have put out called "Every Tree Matters. It is on their website. Burlington is a medium sized city and they have time and space to ensure that as many of the trees as possible stay on the property when properties are being built on. I noticed that on the 5 story high rise at the base of Cumberland and New, all the trees were cut down even though the building was nowhere near them. Because of the benefits trees provide, people feel the needless loss of these trees.

On a personal note, I came from Toronto, stressed out and unhealthy. I moved into 3237 not because of the house as it is in bad shape but because of the trees as I know from the work I do that trees and animals found associated with trees provide tremendous health benefits and I have recovered. Being in the back yard, drinking in the air (heightened concentration of oxygen and emitted phytoncides released from trees into the air that helped my brain work better – research available to support that) and listening to the birds and smiling at the antics of the chipmunks saved me.

A little note. It is important for indigenous trees to stay and to be planted in new subdivisions because they keep the ecosystem Burlington is a part of strongest. Invasive species that landscaping companies carry only weaken the ecosystems so they cannot provide maximum benefits to the urban cities they are invasive species in. It is my understanding, however, that there are some landscaping companies that do provide indigenous species but there is a lot of savings in leaving the trees that are there on the property already.

Thank you for your time. I know this is long.

Sahlaa Morris.

NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING COMMENT SHEET

Subject: Zoning By-law Amendment Application
Address: 3225-3237 New Street
Files: 520-06/17

Please Indicate Below Any Comments or Special
Concerns You May Have About This Project

This project is not for the benefit
of New Street - it seems to
solely be for the financial benefit.
If it was about "beautifying
New Street's landscape", why not
follow the present zoning by-laws
and abide by the density and
storey limits? It would make
more sense to build less homes -
it is not that big of a space,
and with this proposal each
unit will be cramped and dense.
There will be too many cars.
People, on average, work
similar hours (9-5) and this
will add to the morning and

evening rushes.

Burlington is a suburb, not
an area which is normally
congested.

I would prefer for either these
units to be 2-storey units,
or single homes.

The zoning by-laws should not
be amended.

Beautifying an area is not
destroying mature trees and nature,
especially since they won't even be
Burlington replanted on the
property.

Please deposit in the comment box when you
leave or mail to:

Attention: Lauren Vraets
City of Burlington
Planning and Building Department
426 Brant Street
P.O. Box 5013
Burlington, Ontario L7R 3Z6
or E-Mail to: lauren.vraets@burlington.ca

NO LATER THAN: June 22, 2017

(Please **FULLY** complete this section, if you
wish your comments acknowledged.)

Name: MONIKA ZAGORDA

Address: 3194 NEW STREET

City: BURLINGTON

Postal Code: L7N 1M8

(Optional)

E-mail: _____

Notice of Collection of Personal Information

Personal information is collected under the authority of the **Planning Act**, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13 and may be contained in an appendix of a staff report, published in the meeting agenda, delegation list and/or the minutes of the public meeting and made part of the public record. The City collects this information in order to make informed decisions on the relevant issue(s) and to notify interested parties of Council's decisions. It may also be used to serve notice of an Ontario Municipal Board hearing. Names and addresses contained in submitted letters and other information will be available to the public, unless the individual expressly requests the City to remove their personal information. The disclosure of this information is governed by the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.M. 56. Questions about this collection and disclosure should be directed to: Coordinator of Development Review, Planning (905) 335-7642

NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING COMMENT SHEET

Subject: Zoning By-law Amendment Application
Address: 3225-3237 New Street
Files: 520-06/17

Please Indicate Below Any Comments or Special
Concerns You May Have About This Project

THE TRAFFIC IS BAD ENOUGH ON NEW ST, SINCE WE WENT
DOWN TO 2 LANES, AND I DON'T FEEL WE CAN HANDLE
ANY MORE CONS. SO MY ANSWER IS NO!!
WHERE ARE THEY GOING TO PUT THE SNOW?

NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING COMMENT SHEET

Subject: Zoning By-law Amendment Application
Address: 3225-3237 New Street
Files: 520-06/17

Please Indicate Below Any Comments or Special
Concerns You May Have About This Project

New St. definitely needs to go back to 4 lanes. The bike lane does not get used, as there is a bike path in the park land. Traffic is a problem and it is only going to get worse. Cars turning right off of Cumberland is going to be a congested mess.

also, it will be a shame to have to cut down those mature trees.

DO NOT WANT TOWNHOUSES BUILT. TAKING AWAY TOO MUCH BEAUTY OF NATURE.

NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING COMMENT SHEET

Subject: Zoning By-law Amendment Application
Address: 3225-3237 New Street
Files: 520-06/17

Please Indicate Below Any Comments or Special
Concerns You May Have About This Project

this plan is not for family living

