



# BURLINGTON DOWNTOWN

Friday May 18, 2018

Lisa Stern, MCIP, RPP  
c/o City of Burlington Planning Department  
426 Brant St, P.O. Box 5013,  
Burlington, ON L7R 3Z6

Dear Ms. Stern:

On behalf of the Board of Directors for the Burlington Downtown Business Association (BDDBA) I would like to provide the Association's comments on the proposed development by Reserve Properties at 401,403,405,409,411 & 413 Brant Street, 444,448 and 450 John Street and 2002 and 2012 James Street.

We request that you consider the BDDBA's comments in preparation of your staff report for the Public Hearing at the Planning and Development Committee in July 2018.

The Burlington Downtown Business Association is a not-for-profit organization representing a membership of 435 business and property owners within the Business Improvement Area.

BDDBA representatives attended the Neighbourhood Meeting on this proposal at the Burlington Lion's Club on May 1, 2018. We have also reviewed the applicant's presentation and background studies submitted in support of the proposed development. Our comments on the present application are informed by the Board-approved "Guiding Principles" (Appendix A).

### Commercial Space allocation:

According to the development proposal the applicant is recommending a building with approximately 597 meters squared of ground floor commercial space.

Striving to create an **OPTIMUM COMMERCIAL MIX** is a key platform of our vision. This is underscored by the principle that "*New development should accommodate a range of commercial uses and should not cause a net loss of commercial floor area in the downtown*".

Our property database records an approximate commercial square footage of 3,650 meters squared for the present property. The applicant's proposal to develop 597 meters squared of commercial is a difference of approximately 83%

The Association supports new mixed-use developments that maximize the amount of commercial space in the building envelope and provides, at a minimum, the same amount of commercial floor area that existed prior to redevelopment of a property.





# BURLINGTON DOWNTOWN

## Parking allocation:

According to the development proposal the applicant is seeking to provide 212 on-site parking spaces to service the 227 residential units. This is to be accommodated through the development of five levels of underground parking.

As such, the proposed parking supply would accommodate parking for 93% of the units in the building (*assuming one space is provided to any specific unit*). The current parking requirements for residential parking in the Zoning By-law do not require any of the spaces provided to be designated for residential visitors. Similarly, the subject site is within the Defined Parking Area which exempts all non-residential properties from providing on-site parking.

The BDBA believes that our Downtown is now and should also remain a **UNIQUE DESTINATION** in the City of Burlington. A sustainable parking strategy is a fundamental part of creating a unique, positive downtown experience for residents, businesses, tourist and customers.

The Association and its membership are strongly invested in exploring opportunities to increase public parking in the downtown, where appropriate. We encourage development that is self sufficient for parking and meets minimum zoning requirements

The minimum parking ratio for developments in the Downtown Mixed-Use Centre Zone is 1.25 spaces per unit. The BDBA supports this ratio.

Further, a self-sufficient development with both a commercial and residential component should give due consideration to the provision of on-site parking for visitors and maintenance/service vehicles. A recommendation could include a requirement of 1.0 parking space that is designated for visitor vehicles for every 25 units

An additional recommendation includes the provision of 1.0 parking space that is designated for maintenance vehicles that are servicing the site for every 75 units. Service vehicles must obtain a visitor (service vehicle) parking permit. These spaces should also be the same dimensions as an accessible parking space to allow for unloading and loading of equipment and to accommodate the larger service vehicles.





# BURLINGTON DOWNTOWN

## Preservation of Heritage Assets:

Burlington's downtown business area contains several important cultural heritage resources. Collectively they contribute to our community's sense of community and support a vibrant tourism industry.

The BDBA has learned that the subject site includes two (non-designated) heritage buildings: 401 Brant Street- home of Kelly's Bake Shoppe and 444 John Street (Albert Schmid Jeweller). Both of these buildings and their occupying tenants are important to the small business ecosystem Downtown.

The Association's Statement of Principles includes a theme that reinforces **BLENDING OLD AND NEW** as the key to our identity and is underscored by the principle that "*Downtown must embrace its future and remember its past*".

We are pleased with the component of the development proposal that intends to maintain the heritage facades of the existing buildings and incorporate the same into the proposed building design. This includes the one storey podium proposed to align with the existing buildings at 401 Brant Street and 444 John Street to reinforce the existing street wall.

We appreciate that accommodating growth can put pressure on these heritage resources through development and site alteration. It is necessary to plan in a way that protects and maximizes the benefits of these resources that make our communities unique and attractive places to live.

We trust that these comments, based on BDBA's Guiding Principles will add value to your staff report on this proposed development. The BDBA anticipates working positively with the City of Burlington's Planning & Building department, and the property owner. The Association believes that all parties share the common goal of expediting this development and minimizing the amount of vacant space in this key intersection of our Downtown

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Eade  
Chairperson, Board of Directors  
Burlington Downtown Business Association



## **APPENDIX A: Guiding Principles - Burlington Downtown Business Association**

In January 2017 the Board of Directors for the Burlington Downtown Business Association (BDBA) approved a three-year Strategic Plan: *Focus 2020*. The Plan reaffirmed the organization's stated commitment to serve, lead and together build a prosperous downtown business community.

Embedded in *Focus 2020* is the acknowledgement that immediate and longer-term intensification of the downtown will result in demographic changes that will impact our membership of 435 members. Our goal is to stay ahead of the curve by managing, influencing and adapting to these changes.

We believe these principles can immediately be considered as a resource to City of Burlington's Planning staff as new development applications are submitted for review and comment.

Our principles rest on five main themes: creating a unique destination, active placemaking, telling the story of our business community, blending the "old" and the "new" and striving for an optimum commercial mix. Each of these themes is underscored by a guiding principle.

We believe that our Downtown is now and should also remain a **UNIQUE DESTINATION** in the City of Burlington. This is underscored by the principle that Downtown must be a "*year-round attraction that is walkable and inviting*". This principle could translate into policies that:

- Promote year- round activities and animation that support art and culture in all corners of the Downtown
- Investigate opportunities for pop ups and farmers/Christmas markets to reinforce the downtown as a place to visit and explore
- Explore opportunities to increase public parking in BDBA, where appropriate. Encourage development that is self sufficient for parking and meets minimum zoning requirements

**PLACEMAKING:** This is underscored by the principle that "*The downtown streetscape should be green, cohesive, and include strategic places for people to gather, meet, and linger.*" This principle could translate into policies that:

- Require an implementation strategy that builds on the downtown streetscape guidelines and identifies key public gathering places, open spaces, and applicable design features in the downtown
- Validates the City planning regulatory framework that ensures new developments provide appropriate building setbacks that allow for enhanced and animated public spaces.
- Necessitates a better working relationship with the municipality to establish a list of BDBA placemaking initiatives that could be subject to "community benefits" through Section 37 funding.

Striving to create an **OPTIMUM COMMERCIAL MIX** is also a key platform of our vision. This is underscored by the principle that *“New development should accommodate a range of commercial uses and should not cause a net loss of commercial floor area in the downtown”*. This principle could translate into policies that:

- Support new mixed-use developments that maximize the amount of commercial space in the building envelope and provides, at a minimum, the same amount of commercial floor area that existed prior to redevelopment of a property.
- Develop a strategy to recruit businesses and market commercial floor area on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of mixed use buildings

The Burlington Downtown Business Association believes that having an acting hand in **TELLING OUR STORY** is important as the people of Burlington reflect on the health of our unique business district. This theme is underscored by the principles of *“Vibrancy and distinctiveness: our key competitive advantages”*. This principle could translate into policies that:

- Promote the downtown as a place that is special, eclectic, and remains the anti-mall experience. A small business incubator.
- Develop creative strategies that focus on attracting people from the waterfront experience and into the downtown business community (apps, enhanced wayfinding, and directories).

Finally, the theme that reinforces **BLENDING OLD AND NEW** is the key to our identity and is underscored by the principle that *“Downtown must embrace its future and remember its past”*. This principle could translate into policies that:

- Promote assets (like Village Square) that exemplify unique architectural features and succeed in representing Burlington’s rich history.
- Participate in Sign By-law revisions to ensure signage in the downtown is cohesive and reflects its unique context.
- Encourage the ground floor of buildings to be pedestrian oriented and building podiums that integrate with historic features of the downtown (where applicable)

This is the Board’s list of the elements that we believe are too important and too valuable to be compromised as we build the downtown of the future. The Burlington Downtown Business Association thanks The City’s Planning Department for the opportunity to provide valuable input into your review of the present development application.

## My Observation - The Big Issues

### #1 PARKING, PARKING, PARKING

- 409 Brant .93 spots per unit vs required 1.25 spots per unit. NO VISITOR or COMMERCIAL BUSINES PARKING Spots - WHERE WILL EVERYONE PARK ?
- The Mattamy James & Elizabeth development has 158 units & a total of 83 Parking spots – the presentation says 51 Owner parking spots & 32 Visitor parking spots - .52 Parking Spots per Unit ???
- 421 Brant approval – I have no idea what was approved for parking spots – Less than 1.25 spots per unit ?

### #2 NO CITY GUIDELINES FOR MINIMUM PUBLIC SPACES, PUBLIC GATHERING PLACES OPEN SPACES FOR PEOPLE TO GATHER, MEET & LINGER.

- Development & Planning for Public Open Spaces, Gathering spots & Inviting Streetscape in the absence of a Firm City Vision & Non Negotiable City Minimum Guidelines for Tall Buildings & the Downtown Core is necessarily All One Off , Ad Hoc by the Developer
- This issue is a VERY Key Issue for Burlington Citizens & has not been proactively addressed up front.
- By Design this creates a push back by the Planning Department to pretty much every Developer downtown proposal & sets Planning Department up for an adversarial dialogue with the Developer. In the absence of strong, firm City Guidelines a design which leads to Conflict vs Collaboration.

### #3 THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE CARRIAGE GATE DEVELOPMENT LAST FALL AT CAROLINE / JOHN & ELIZABETH IS A **BIG** PROBLEM.

- City Council approval for the Carriage Gate development has become the Benchmark by which all subsequent Downtown developments are modeled.
- Glen Wellings who is the main Planning Consultant on most of the Downtown Developments basically confirmed that 2 or 3 times in his answers last night at the Public Meeting for 409 Brant.

### #4 COMMERCIAL SPACE FOR 409 BRANT IS 70% LESS THEN CURRENT PROPERTY USES. THIS IS A DIRECT CONTRADICTION OF ALL OF THE WORDS IN THE CITY'S OFFICIAL PLAN JUSTIFICATION FOR INTENSIFICATION OF THE DOWNTOWN CORE & THE MOBILITY HUB DESIGNATION.

- The amount of Commercial Space in 409 Brant needs to be fixed.
- Is it the same issue for 421 Brant ?

## The Good From Last Nights Meeting

- # 1 Tami from the City ( don't know her last name or title but she appeared to be a Director level advised the following :
- The Space across from City Hall Civic Square is envisioned to be a Public Gathering Space encompassing the Frontage at James & Brant North ( 421 Brant ) & South ( 409 ) Brant sides to form part of that Public Gathering Place – My Question – has enough space actually been captured from \$09 & 421 Brant to make this a “ Real Public Gathering Place “ when Brant St is not closed off ?

## My Views On The Developers Asks for Amendments

1. Reduce # of Parking Spaces – FIRM NO must meet 1.25 spaces per unit.
2. Reduce Setbacks – NO – would negotiate some on this to get Much more Public Space at Brant & James.
3. Increase Height – FIRM NO – Would negotiate WITH PUBLIC INPUT for Public benefits Offset from new OP 11 stories to allow up to 17 stories.
4. Increase Density – NO – per #3 logic.
5. Reduce Minimum Amenity Area – I'm not fussed on this one. As long as it was a reasonable size.
6. Commercial Area – Require an Increase in Commercial Space from current levels. Require BDBA Input , Recommendation & Concurrence.

## Experience



### Director - Independent External Board Member

Director - Tangerine Bank, Scotia Mortgage Corporation, Scotia Trust.

Dec 2013 - Jun 2017 • 3 yrs 7 mos



Member of the Board of Directors - Independent External Director of Tangerine Bank of Canada, Scotia Mortgage Corporation, Scotia Trust.



### Director - Independent External Board Member

Director - Scotia Life, Scotia General Ins, National Trust, Montreal Trust

Dec 2013 - Jun 2017 • 3 yrs 7 mos



Member of the Board of Directors - Independent External Director of Scotia Life, Scotia General Insurance, National Trust & Montreal Trust.

Roynat >

### Chairman of the Board of Directors

Roynat Capital

Mar 2014 - Feb 2016 • 2 yrs



### Senior Vice President, Automotive Finance & Indirect Lending

Scotiabank

Jan 2003 - May 2014 • 11 yrs 5 mos

Executive Office Toronto



### Vice President, Automotive Finance & Indirect Lending

Scotiabank

May 1994 - Jan 2003 • 8 yrs 9 mos

Executive Office, Toronto







## NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING COMMENT SHEET

Subject:  
Address:  
Files:

stop building development/modify it to less floors

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

Ensure building code of 4-8 stories of old plan is followed. To ensure the feel of a community and not just to reach a quota.

How can we stop this development?  
↳ How can we modify it to fit the 4-8 story.

~~How can we~~ What can we do to stop this developer from destroying our downtown core.



**From:** Tahira Badre []  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 04, 2018 6:59 PM  
**To:** Stern, Lisa  
**Cc:** Meed Ward, Marianne; info@engagedburlington.ca  
**Subject:** Planning Application File #505-01/18 & 520-01-18 Brant, John & James St.

I received notification of the upcoming Neighbourhood Meeting to be held May 1, 2018 at the Burlington Lions Club regarding the above application. Based on past attendance of meetings, I don't hold much hope of my opinions making any difference. The vision of city planners and council is for an entirely new Burlington downtown, populated by modern high rise buildings.

This new proposal reinforces my feelings of despair over the super-intensification threatening our downtown. Attached is a letter I sent to Lola Emberson after the AGB meeting regarding the Mattamy Homes Martha St. development application. The nightmare grows.

Karen Campbell

Build a Better Burlington.....who's vision will prevail?

What we are witnessing here is the result of what happens when people in power are motivated by self-interest, with a "what's in it for me" attitude. The vision of our current city planners, developers and Council, with the exception of Marianne Meed-Ward, is to completely change the face of our downtown. They want to turn Burlington into a mini Toronto with high rise glass and concrete towers lining our streets and waterfront. They don't care what the residents want for their city.

Common sense is dismissed altogether as they try to justify their reasoning. Shadow and wind studies have to be made to try to show that the negative effects of high rise buildings won't be overly detrimental. Solid objects create shadow.....the taller the object, the longer the shadow reaches. Common sense. High rise buildings are not 'slender towers' by any stretch of the imagination. The CN Tower is slender. High rise buildings block the sun and the sky, sitting them upon podiums does not make them less intrusive to pedestrians. Common sense. Developers argue that their particular building will not create much of a shadow. Put the buildings in a row, which is what ends up happening after the first building is put up, then you have a long wall of continuous shadow.

As for wind studies, they may sound good in theory, but don't work in reality. I know by personal experience. I lived on Maple Avenue for 8 years. A wide four-lane road. Once the high rise Strata building was completed directly across from my property, the wind changed dramatically. You could feel the force of it increasing the closer you got to Strata as you walked along Maple Ave.. My front yard was constantly littered with garbage blown in from the street. Blue box day was horrendous.

It would be refreshing to see developers who propose projects that enhanced the surrounding neighbourhoods and showed the utmost consideration for the people who would be living in their buildings. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Profit is the bottom line, get all you can and move on. How many units can you squeeze in, what's the least number of parking spaces you can get away with, the least number of visitor parking spaces? I used to have people from the Strata building knocking on my door asking if I'd rent out a parking spot on my driveway. Downtown parking is already a problem that is only going to get worse with each new high rise.

Businesses have left the downtown because of lack of parking for their employees and customers. People will not shop where they cannot conveniently park, common sense. It is obvious that the small downtown bus terminal is NOT a “mobility hub” and is being used as an excuse to intensify.

At the recent meeting held at the AGB, the developer was asked how he could possibly justify his high rise project as following city guidelines being ‘compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood’. He calmly answered that the surrounding neighbourhood of the near future will be completely compatible. I spoke to him privately after the meeting, asking about erecting buildings similar to Buntin’s Wharf or The Baxter. He said some people don’t like the stucco look. He said high rises will make the downtown more exciting and vibrant. Then, in further conversation, he said he doesn’t go to the Sound of Music Festival or RibFest because it’s too crowded!

Burlington is privileged to be a waterfront city. Why are the city planners and council not appreciating, valuing and protecting this beautiful, natural location? The Lake District in England was preserved because Beatrix Potter was able to outbid developers trying to buy up farmland. It is a huge tourist draw now. Currently, people travel here to experience the open atmosphere of our downtown waterfront. That will disappear if the only lake views we get are ‘corridors’ looking down the streets.

Village Square.... An old-style European village in the middle of downtown Burlington! What a pleasure to walk through the cobbled streets and feel like you’re in another world. What a tourist draw it could be! Why allow it to be dwarfed and diminished by surrounding high rises? If our lovely, heritage atmosphere of the downtown is allowed to be destroyed because right now big money can be made in real estate deals, shame on you all.

Karen Campbell  
Elizabeth St. Burlington

**From:** Carlos Rengifo []  
**Sent:** Monday, June 04, 2018 1:19 PM  
**To:** McInnes, Suzanne  
**Subject:** Files: 505-01/18 & 502\_01/18

Hi Suzanne,

I was walking down to the lake as I do with my family every weekend in the summer and I was surprised to see a proposal for a residential building on Brant street. Especially in front of city hall! I was very surprised that this is even possible.

Burlington is unique in so many ways, especially Brant street (downtown Burlington). I feel that building a condo on Brant would take away from something special that Burlington has. Let alone the construction and the traffic of building this condo. In short, I do not think this is a good idea. Please keep me informed if there is a future meeting or information session regarding this build.

Thanks for reaching out to the community,

Carlos Rengifo

**From:** Paul Ruse []  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 02, 2018 1:13 PM  
**To:** Stern, Lisa  
**Subject:** 409 Brant St. application by Reserve Properties Limited

Lisa,

Please accept this follow up to last night's public meeting. Aside from residents' concerns for over-intensification in this area, which I agree with, I have some concerns about the developer's plans as presented. I believe that both ingress/egress should not be to James Street. This is already an extremely busy block from John to Brant and the approved Carriage Trade development, not to mention others, will only intensify this issue. I would think utilizing John St. for egress from the underground will help to some extent. I also have concerns relating to the two-thirds reduction of existing commercial space and would suggest including the second floor as available commercial or office space.

I also take issue with Mr. Wellings' remarks regarding solutions for parking, traffic, event, and pedestrians in the area. The statement that "downtowns are a busy place and people just need to cope with it" does not strike me as something I would expect to hear from a planner. I could understand if he was referencing congested areas in Toronto, but I do not believe Burlington is at the point where we are ready to throw our hands up because all is lost. I was reassured to hear from you that the statement by Mr. Wellings is not that of Burlington planning staff.

Lastly, I would like to comment on proposed resident parking. I have been to four public meetings regarding core development in recent months and not one developer has proposed enough parking for their own residents or visitors. How can this become the norm after hearing the complaints from countless citizens and delegates about the lack of parking in the downtown area? It's time for a developer to do the "right thing" and provide adequate parking for their development. Something so simple would go a long way in gaining credibility with residents. Bring the height down so that at least you are not contributing to the problem. I think this is truly the only path forward before we all just have to "cope with it".

Sincerely,  
Paul Ruse

**From:** Penny Hersh [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 02, 2018 9:51 AM  
**To:** Stern, Lisa  
**Cc:** Meed Ward, Marianne  
**Subject:** Re: Development - 409 Brant Street.

Lisa,

Good morning. I attended the public meeting last night at the Lions Club, and left with a hope that perhaps the City planners will actually not only listen to what the residents are saying but actually hear and act on some of the suggestions.

I live downtown. I purchased a Unit at Bunton's Wharf on the 7th floor and after 3 years sold it and moved to 360 on Pearl. This time around I was more experienced. I moved to get away from the noise of the Music Festival when the windows of my unit actually vibrated from the bass. I moved because of the poor ventilation from the Restaurant below that constantly sent Thai fumes into my unit. I moved because the noise from the outdoor patio's and Spencer Smith Park in the summer made it impossible to have any quiet in the unit. Traffic, the motorcycles made it impossible to open the windows.

If developers are going to build in the downtown the City really needs to have to increase what is considered the present "CODE", that builders build to. Once the development is completed all these issues become the problem of the condominium owners, and the City Noise By-Law Officers. Allowing patios to have live music will acerbate the problem as restaurants compete to have their music heard, and patrons will have to talk over this music.

There are no visitor parking spaces in Bunton's Wharf, The Baxter and 360 Pearl. If they were included in the original plans to the City, they were sold off to prospective owners. By the time the owners take control of the building 1 year later these spots are gone. Does the City not come back to enforce this?

To consider a development that does not even allow for 1 parking spot per unit is a disaster. We are not Toronto, we do not have a transit system that will accommodate people who do not want to own a car.

To have a 3 bedroom unit at 1200 square feet is absolutely ridiculous....along with only 1/3 of the commercial space. How can there be a "community" if people cannot walk to amenities. The argument by the developer that commercial units presently don't have designated parking spots is ridiculous. They have not mentioned that it is not the same game....presently there is no tower of units with hundreds of people in that area.

Glass is a very poor insulator both in the winter and the summer. At 360 we have floor to ceiling windows - I need air-conditioning in the winter, and on cold days one has to stay far away from the windows as the cold air sweeps in. Can only imagine what the traffic noise would be like in these proposed units.

PB-67-18 APPENDIX G – Public Comments

When I purchased my unit at 360 on Pearl I paid extra to double insulate the walls abutting my neighbours units as I learned from my experience at Bunton's Wharf, I could hear my next door neighbour talking on the phone and her television. TO CODE IS JUST NOT GOOD ENOUGH.

At Strata, another Molinaro Development the heating system that was touted as a selling feature had only been leased by the developer, the owners had to have a special assessment to buy out the system for \$1,000,000.00.

You should also be aware that at 360 on Pearl all unit owners had to pay for the removal of all the KITEC plumbing that was banned prior to the construction of our building.

Everyone knew that once the development on 421 Brant Street was approved that this would open up the flood gates. I don't blame the developer....it is the City who decides what is acceptable. The mantra "the province made us do it" is wearing thin. along with "we lost at the OMB because of our current official plan". The reason the City lost at the OMB is because the legal team was unable to defend its official plan, and the Province dictated intensification, but it was the City who decided where.

Where is the City's responsibility in all this. Let's hope that the planning department and Council looks past worrying about defending itself at LPAT and plan for a City that really works for the residents. A community that takes quality of life into the scenario.

Please include me in any information on this development.

Thank you

Penny Hersh

**From:** Phyllis Donohue []  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 15, 2018 3:53 PM  
**To:** Stern, Lisa  
**Subject:** File 505-01/18 & 520-01/18

May 15, 2018

Good afternoon Ms Stern,

I am writing to you in response to the Neighbourhood Meeting I attended on Tuesday, May 1 regarding the development application for [409 Brant Street](#).

I was shocked and saddened by the overall tone of the meeting as well as the lack of information provided. No concrete information was provided and very few questions were answered.

The City Staff and the Developer had very few answers to questions and very little information on studies that were being conducted to educate the public to make an informed decision on the development and variances being applied for. Not even the date for when this applications 210 days were up, could be provided. Instead we were give the answer of “some time in August”. Given that this is a fairly important date, doesn't it seem odd that not one person on the City side or the Developer side could tell us what that date was?

The City was not able to provide even vague timelines for when studies on traffic impact, transportation, or noise would be complete - and they certainly did not commit to having them complete before this application would expire. How can an informed decision be made about such impactful building and development, if we do not have all of the necessary information?

The City was also unable to provide numbers related to the Provincial Growth Target that could justify such dense development in our Downtown Core. When asked how close Burlington already is to meeting those targets, no one could say. No one could say if building Mid-Rise condos instead of High-Rise condos could also allow Burlington to meet the target. If Burlington is able to meet the Growth target by developing mid rise condos then why not do that? I believe in the development of Burlington, but not by such intense measures if they are not truly necessary.

The City was also unable to show maps or provide information about where our new Urban Growth Area actually is. When questions arose about why we need such a large development right in the middle of our city, why could it not be in a location where it wouldn't stand out and dwarf the City Hall and buildings around it. The City could not show us where the Growth Area actually is. This information seems pretty basic and I find it odd that not one of the members of the City staff on hand could provide such information.

The developer was unable to provide answers for almost any question asked of them. They seemed condescending and out of touch with the needs and character of our city. They provided no details relating to how their development plans might be altered if they were not granted permission to go ahead on their long list of variances that they have applied for. If they have no Plan B and can provide no other options, then what was the purpose of this meeting, other than for them to once again show us that they have no regard for the character of our City and a disregard for zoning bylaws and building codes. They do not want to fit into our City, they want to stand out and make as much money as possible by not just asking for a small height variance, but by asking to triple the height standard. They want to increase the FAR by more than double. The inability or desire of the developer to answer questions or provide options leads me to believe that they have no intention of trying to adhere to the reasonable building standards and bylaws that are already in place. They could not answer the very simple question of “what benefits to our community does this development provide?” If no one can answer this very simple question, then why are we even considering this development?

Neither the City nor the Developer were at all concerned about the issues residents are concerned about relating to noise, traffic, and parking. This tells me that the City and the Developers are out of touch with our community or they simply do not care about the negative impacts that these developments could bring. Parking downtown will not stay “Status Quo” once these buildings are built. There are no visitor parking spaces being built and there will be an intense growth in population. Parking in Burlington is already a joke, barely meeting the needs of the community as it is. Traffic in and around downtown is already congested and difficult to navigate during peak rush hour times and the “glorified bus stop” on John Street can hardly be provided as an answer to people being more likely to use transit. The Bus Stop is not a Mobility Hub and the fact that the City keeps referring to it as one is incorrect. The Growth Plan defines major transit station areas as the area within a 500m radius (10 minute walk) of any existing or planned **higher order transit station** within a settlement area or around **a major bus depot** in an urban core. Major transit station areas that are particularly significant for the regional rapid transit system are recognized as mobility hubs in the RTP. The bus stop on John Street does not meet this criteria and therefore should not be considered a Mobility Hub or transit solution when discussing development plans in Burlington.

I believe the application for the development at [409 Brant Street](#) should be denied unless the developer can actually adhere to the zoning bylaws set out. The list of variances that have been applied for make no sense for Burlington. We will lose 2/3 of our commercial space, we will gain intense traffic and parking problems, and the skyline and personality of our unique city will be destroyed. If people wanted to live in a City of High Rise Condos, they would already be living in Toronto. People live in Burlington because of its charm and its character. In no way shape or form do any of these large high rises fit into our growing city.

I also question why these changes to Official Plans and Zoning Bylaws are happening at such a rapid pace and right before an election. It would seem Council is trying to

push things forward quickly so that they cannot be undone or altered if there is a new Council elected in the fall.

Burlington is a great City, let's keep it that way and Grow Smart instead of just Growing Bold.

**From:** Jill Donohue [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 15, 2018 2:52 PM  
**To:** Stern, Lisa  
**Subject:** Development File 505-01/18 & 520-01/18

Good afternoon Lisa,

I am writing to you in response to the Neighbourhood Meeting I attended on Tuesday, May 1 regarding the development application for 409 Brant Street.

I will begin by expressing my disappointment in the overall tone of the meeting as well as the lack of information provided. This was the first time I was available to attend one of the meetings regarding the Growth and Development plans for our city and frankly, I would have been embarrassed if I had been one of the staff involved in planning for and presenting during this event.

It seemed as though absolutely no information was provided to the public that was of any use or that answered any of the numerous concerns and questions that were brought forward. Neither the City Staff nor the Developer could answer questions or provide information on studies that were being conducted to make an informed decision on the development and variances being applied for. They could not provide the date of when the 210 days for this application would expire, and they could not speak to alternatives if approval for variances were not granted.

For example, when asked about *when* the City would be able to provide information and findings from studies related to traffic, transportation, noise, and parking, they were unable to provide even a vague timeline. This leads me to believe that the city has every intention of making decisions related to intense development that will alter our city forever, without having all of the relevant and necessary information to make an informed decision. How is this best for Burlington?

The City was also unable to provide numbers that could have justified such dense development in our Downtown Core. Apparently there is a Provincial Growth target number that Burlington is working towards in terms of population growth - but no one from the City could tell us what that number was, or how close we already are to achieving it. They couldn't answer as to whether or not the development of 8-10 story buildings throughout the core could achieve our growth target, thus making these massive, unwanted buildings unnecessary. They could not even provide a map that showed the new borders for what was considered the new Urban Growth Area in our city.

The developer was not able to provide any details relating to how their development plans might be altered if they were not granted permission to go ahead on their ridiculous list of variances that they have applied for. This leads me to believe that they have no intention of trying to adhere to the reasonable building codes and bylaws that are already in place. They could not answer the very simple question of "what benefits to our community does this development

provide?” If no one can answer this very simple question, then why are we even considering building such a monstrosity?

Neither the City nor the Developer were at all concerned about the issues residents are concerned about relating to noise, traffic, and parking. This tells me that the City and the Developers are out of touch with our community or they simply do not care about the negative impacts that these developments could bring. Parking downtown will not stay “Status Quo” once these buildings are built. There are no visitor parking spaces being built and there will an intense growth in population. Parking in Burlington is already a joke, barely meeting the needs of the community as it is. Traffic in and around downtown is already congested and difficult to navigate during peak rush hour times and the “glorified bus stop” on John Street can hardly be provided as an answer to people being more likely to use transit. The Bus Stop is not a Mobility Hub and the fact that the City keeps referring to it as one is incorrect. The Growth Plan defines major transit station areas as the area within a 500m radius (10 minute walk) of any existing or planned **higher order transit station** within a settlement area or around a **major bus depot** in an urban core. Major transit station areas that are particularly significant for the regional rapid transit system are recognized as mobility hubs in the RTP. The bus stop on John Street does not meet this criteria and therefore should not be considered a Mobility Hub or transit solution when discussing development plans in Burlington.

I believe the application for the development at 409 Brant Street should be denied unless the developer can actually adhere to the the zoning bylaws set out, where development should stay within the 4-8 story range. None of the variances that have been applied for benefit our downtown core and the citizens of Burlington. We will lose 2/3 of our commercial space, we will gain intense traffic and parking problems, and the skyline and personality of our unique city will be destroyed. The people of Burlington do not want to live in a concrete jungle, that’s why they live here and not in Mississauga or Toronto. If developers want to build 24 story buildings, then they should do so where it makes sense, and where people want them.

It appears the City is trying to push numerous bylaw and zoning changes that benefit only developers and not its citizens through to approval before the election this fall. It seems, even though their studies are not complete and real concrete benefits to our community cannot be provided, that all the City is concerned about is tax dollars. What other reason could there be to rush such drastic and over-intense development in what was, and no longer will be “the best mid-sized city in Canada”?

If the City is actually listening to it’s citizens, as they say they are, if they are actually paying attention and not just paying lip service, then they will slow down and rethink such dense and intense development. Instead of just “Growing Bold”, maybe we should be “Growing Smart”.

Jill Donohue  
A Very Concerned Citizen

**From:** Wayne Banner [<mailto:> ]  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 27, 2018 7:59 PM  
**To:** McInnes, Suzanne  
**Subject:** 24-storey bldg at Brant/James/John

Dear Ms McInnes,

This proposal is an awful idea. Why is the city so hell-bent on sucking the livability out of this town? Are you so oblivious to the constant, awful traffic? Is having a few busy restaurants worth that cost? Have none of you given any thought to the traffic that will emanate from those 3 towers at the Fairview GO station? And you seek to worsen it? Do you really believe that all these people will ride bicycles and walk?

So many questions, and I doubt not a single honest answer, as I suspect you people are determined to build your empire. Whatever the cost.

For God's sake, make this block a low-rise, something the rest of Burlington can live with.

Regards,  
Wayne Banner

PB-67-18 APPENDIX G – Public Comments

-----Original Message-----

From: [noreply@burlington.ca](mailto:noreply@burlington.ca) [<mailto:noreply@burlington.ca>] On Behalf Of Leslie  
Sent: Tuesday, March 06, 2018 1:01 PM  
To: McInnes, Suzanne  
Subject: 409 Brant St. Development

Hi Suzanne,

I was wondering if you could direct me to a pedestrian study on the effect of the traffic in this application.

Thanks  
Leslie

-----  
Origin: <https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/409-brant.asp>  
-----

This email was sent to you by Leslie<[leslie@insitedesign.ca](mailto:leslie@insitedesign.ca)> through <https://www.burlington.ca>

PB-67-18 APPENDIX G – Public Comments

-----Original Message-----

From: Linda [<mailto:> ]

Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 2:59 PM

To: McInnes, Suzanne

Subject: 409 Brant St

Let's just stop this madness. Please!

Some of the most interesting and appealing streetscapes on Brant St are being replaced by bland, uninspiring high rise buildings which are destroying what we have in the downtown.

If we wanted to live in an over developed featureless city we would have gone elsewhere!

These towers are two a penny, nothing appealing about them.

Think about what will be lost to Burlington.

These developers are motivated only by the desire to make a profit.

Let's not let them take Burlington from us.

Linda Anderson.

**From:** Kathryn Kerr []  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2018 12:36 PM  
**To:** McInnes, Suzanne  
**Subject:** Downtown Burlington development

Hello Suzanne -

I would like to add my voice to the chorus of residents who care about Burlington's downtown core.

I have lived in Burlington for 17 years, in the downtown core for the past 7. I see myself as a bit of a world citizen and somewhat 'rootless' - my parents were pastor/ educators in Argentina where I spent most of my childhood, and my husband and I lived in Israel for many years where we pastored an International church and where we raised our family. Burlington is the first city where I've (we've) put down roots.

I must say I love the community character and small town feel of Burlington. The fact that the city has retained the open waterfront is such a wonderful contrast to, say, Oakville, where only private homes in the downtown have access to the lake.

Of course the new high-rise development in Burlington, (and proposals for more), is causing me some concern. When I read the reference to the "Vancouverization" of Burlington I could identify. I lived in Vancouver for a few years where the construction of high-rise condos was multiplying - in fact it was exponential growth! On the rare occasions when the sun did shine the rays never seemed to reach the sidewalks. The downtown is in perpetual shade. I hate to think this will happen to Burlington.

I realize that land values are getting higher and higher. Development is a given. However, that is why cities have Councils and Planning Committees with long-term vision. (I often wonder why development doesn't begin with the building at the corner of Ghent and Brant - aka "The White Elephant").

Surely development can take place in a measured way that protects the historic character and the beauty of the downtown core.

Sincerely,

Kathryn

**From:** LESIA LANE []  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 11, 2018 8:59 PM  
**To:** McInnes, Suzanne  
**Subject:** 409 Brant St

Hi Suzanne

I want to make known my concerns about 409 Brant Street.

The current OP is that document that provides the guidelines for developments TODAY in the downtown core. The application for 409 Brant St is made TODAY. The development contravenes the guidelines set forth in the current OP. It is not within the 4-8 story guidelines. The proposed plan can 'inform' development but is not 'determinative'.

This development should not be allowed to proceed.

Furthermore I am against the development at 421 Brant street as it as well is outside the scope of the current OP.

Regards

Lesia Lane

The existing Official Plan is in force and effect until the Region approves our proposed new plan some 12-18 months from now.

The proposed plan can “inform” development but is not “determinative.”

**From:** Elaine O'Brien []

**Sent:** Sunday, February 11, 2018 4:12 PM

**To:** McInnes, Suzanne

**Cc:** Dennison, Jack; Taylor, John; Craven, Rick; Lancaster, Blair; Mailbox, Office of Mayor Rick Goldring; Sharman, Paul; Meed Ward, Marianne

**Subject:** 24 storey building proposal

Dear Ms McInnes

I am adamantly opposed to approval of a 24 storey building at 409 Brant when the current Official Plan states 4-8 storeys.

Anything more than the 4-8 storey maximum, for reasons too numerous to mention, will contribute to the already regrettable over intensification of downtown by creating a canyon of towers.

This is uninviting for walkers, hides the sun, contributes to transportation chaos, is unaffordable for the average person, decreases access to amenities, and destroys the ambience of the area.

Citizens are overwhelmingly against this type of unnecessary development which is *not* mandated by the province for the core, since we can meet our targets through planned intensification around the 3 Go Station Mobility hubs.

More vision is needed on the part of the City of Burlington in order to maintain an inviting downtown which can be accessed by all.

Elaine O'Brien

**From:** joe gaetan []  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 10, 2018 12:27 PM  
**To:** McInnes, Suzanne  
**Cc:** Meed Ward, Marianne  
**Subject:** 409 Brant St. Development

Hello Suzanne: Are you able to confirm that this application exceeds the height permissions of both our current and proposed Official Plans and By-laws?

Regards,

Joe Gaetan

**From:** Judy []  
**Sent:** Friday, February 09, 2018 4:05 PM  
**To:** McInnes, Suzanne  
**Cc:** Meed Ward, Marianne  
**Subject:** 24 storey's across the street from city hall

**PLEASE**, no more high rises on Brant St. or downtown.

The site currently permits 4 storeys, up to 8 with community benefits. The city's proposed new draft Official Plan proposes 17 storeys. Please enforce the current height restrictions of 4 storeys up to 8 with community benefits. The majority of residents are pushing for the approval of the OP be postponed until after the election.

It appears that the planning department and council are in a hurry to approve the OP with high rises because they know it won't pass after the election.

Brant St will lose the small retailers because they won't be able to pay the high rent.

Please don't let downtown be over populated and have more congested traffic than what we have now..

We don't object to change, we just want it done in moderation.

Judy Gilbert  
Ward 2

PB-67-18 APPENDIX G – Public Comments

**From:** Craig Gardner [[mailto:](#) ]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 09, 2018 3:18 PM  
**To:** McInnes, Suzanne  
**Subject:** Proposed 24 floor building on Brant south of James

Hi!

Just heard of the proposal from Marianne Meed Ward. Very excited, vcan't wait to see hsoverl  
in ground same as with 23 floor building north of James. Will bring some people and some life  
to downtown Burlington. It Is about time. I have been a rtesident for going on 33 years now.

Very exciting times ahead for the city.

Craig Gardner

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10