

January 26, 2018 Meeting
Room 305
City Hall

In Attendance from the City:

Rick Craven, Ward 1 Councillor (RC)
Kathi Laufman, Ward 1 Councillor's Assistant (KL)
Lola Emberson, Senior Planner, Development Review (LE)

In Attendance from the Havendale Neighbourhood Advisory Committee:

Nicole Dolson (ND)
Ed Dorr (ED)
Lawry Ellis (LE2)
Joyce Tidball (JT)
Susanne Tristani (ST)

- All present were introduced to LE
- LE informed the group that they had received initial reports from the departments and that additional information was required from National Homes (NH)
- LE is working on the information report
- LE is trying to schedule the Mandatory Statutory Meeting (MSM) for March 6, 2018
- ED asked about the 180 day time frame that allowed the developer to appeal to the OMB if the MSM is not held within the 180 days, which in our case would be February 26, 2018. LE understood the concern, but in her experience the developer does not appeal to the OMB provided that the City is working through the adjudication process of their application. There is a 6-8 month backlog at the OMB to hear appeals, so there is not a lot of benefit to appealing to the OMB.
- ED suggested that in any event, LE should contact the developer to discuss this and see, and LE responded that the planning department and NH have had ongoing dialogue, and they are aware of the March 6 tentative date.
- ED then asked about which reports LE had received back. LE said that there was a meeting with NH in December where they reviewed comments received, and that some studies performed by NH needed some revisions. Specifically, LE mentioned Traffic, Storm Water and Environmental Impact studies were being updated. Once the planning department gets that information from NH, they will recirculate it, and see how the new information impacts the comments.
- ND asked if the revisions impact the 180 day deadline for the OMB appeal, and LE said that they have no impact, but again, the developer so far seems satisfied with the progress being made on its application and isn't likely to go to the OMB
- RC asked if the revisions currently being worked on will be finalized by the March 6 MSM date, and LE said no. JT and LE2 asked what kind of information would be provided at the MSM if all the revisions have not been completed. LE said that there would not be a detailed list, only that the comments from the various departments would not be provided until the required information had been received.
- ND then asked if the original NH proposal would be brought forward at the MSM. LE indicated that all information is on the website, including the overview of policy at the MSM.

- RC and LE clarified that there is no recommendation from planning or council at the MSM, just a status report on the application. All of council will be at the meeting, and they can state what they like and don't like and it will become part of the public record.
- ED expressed concern about NH doing their revisions by March 6. LE replied that they had not done their revisions, she expects to receive them mid to late February. The MSM is set, it keeps the process moving and allows council to see the proposal, and also allows the public to speak and express opinions. RC made it clear that a recommendation from the planning department can take a long time after the MSM, depending on the proposal.
- ND asked why the 180 day deadline exists, if the recommendation can take so long thereafter, and RC and LE explained that the City has to adjudicate every proposal they receive, and the deadline gives some leverage to a developer if the City drags its feet. ED expressed concern about not having our meeting within the 180 day period, and RC said the NH had met with the mayor and said that their intent was to cooperate with the City. LE also feels that NH is being cooperative in her dealings with them. She finds that there are long timelines in getting comments back from departments due to the technical nature of most applications, so she finds that it usually goes beyond the 180 day deadline.
- LE and KL provided information on how to access all the information regarding the proposal that is on the website. www.burlington.ca/2100Brant is how to access it.
- ED asked LE if she had seen the position paper prepared by the Havendale Neighbourhood Advisory Committee (HNAC). LE said she has read everything, but hasn't yet done a detailed analysis of the proposal, but she feels at this point that there will be some redesign. ED mentioned that we recognize how busy she is and how many files that she is dealing with, and that we want to know that our concerns taken seriously. LE says that she sees no point wasting a lot of time on the details of the application until all of the revisions are in.
- RC asked Lola if she felt that the application was reasonable. Her response was, "I would have expected a higher density proposal." This was based on the size of the property and its location on Brant St. ED clarified that only half of the parcel of land was usable for development.
- ND mentioned that a subgroup of the HNAC had met with NH a few months ago and had suggested possibly changing the proposal to include a 6 or 8 storey building facing Brant Street in order to lower the density on the more westerly part of the parcel, but keep up the numbers that NH wants. RC said that the City would support a 6 or 8 storey building on Brant, as Adi Developments had agreed to a similar idea along with townhouses in Aldershot, and LE2 mentioned that NH is looking at doing this with their property in Aldershot. ND and ED mentioned that the downside of this is that it is more expensive to build.
- LE mentioned that the Parks department is looking for a park in the development, so she is awaiting how that will be addressed before looking into the details. ED mentioned that there could also be a retention pond for storm water that could be used by the golf course. LE thought all were good ideas, but said that the density was NOT HIGH.
- ND said that while the density is not high by city standards, it is not compatible with our neighbourhood. In addition, all of the buildings proposed by NH are multiple storey dwellings and feedback she has received is that the proposed units are not good for young families, seniors or the disabled. She stated that Burlington has the highest % of older people in the area, the worst transit, and the smallest quantity of age friendly housing. If we are developing Burlington, we should be developing the type of housing that Burlingtonians need, which is more one level housing.

- TRAFFIC - ED raised the issue of the access from the development onto Havendale. RC said that this is a non-starter, that there is no way that there won't be a road onto Havendale from the subdivision. LE mentioned that the traffic impact study will determine whether Havendale can handle the additional traffic. RC said the City is aware of the traffic calming issues in the neighbourhood. ED suggested that making the access one way might be a compromise. LE mentioned that because Brant Street is a Regional Road, that Halton Region and the City are looking into the traffic impact study.
- ND said that while all due diligence must be done, she is very skeptical about how the studies are being done, as the one NH presented to HNAC was not very well done. RC suggested that we have a representative from traffic at the next meeting. ND said that closing the road from Havendale should be open to discussion, but RC said that he does not want to mislead anyone, and while there are valid concerns, he wants to be honest. ND said that the light at Brant and Havendale is so slow that many residents choose to drive up Fairchild to Upper Middle Road to access Brant Street from there and that residents of Fairchild are very concerned about the increase in traffic on their street. LE2 said that the light at Havendale does not provide decent access to go north due to the length of the light and the crossing guards during school hours. RC then posited that if we improve the access at the light, won't that just attract more traffic? LE suggested that the traffic study should deal with that. JT and ND both stated that traffic is a serious issue, and the proposal as is will be terrible for traffic in the neighbourhood.
-
- STORMWATER -ED then brought up stormwater issues. He feels that we are not stressing the importance of this, as we now have a field that absorbs all the water, but when we pave this, there will be stormwater issues. LE said that the engineering department has asked for additional information and she suggested that there are some lower impact stormwater management options being considered such as permeability, bio swales and low flow out (not sure I got all of those correct!). RC stated that the rules are clear – you cannot dump stormwater on anyone else. JT said that she had a phone conversation with the Wellington Green condo president Carol Booth and she indicated that stormwater, and flooding were the main issues raised when they had two meetings with RC. RC agreed that this is a concern and he had met with them as well. ND mentioned that there is flooding after storms on Havendale at the base of Belgrave and Fairchild already. RC said that he understood the concerns, and stated that city planners have told him that today they would never build a development like Tyandaga because of the change in grade and the ravines, but now we just have to work around it.
- ELECTION – LE2 asked about the impact of the upcoming municipal election on the proposal. RC said if anything, it may slow it down the decision if it hasn't been completely adjudicated by the summer. LE2 asked if NH did provide all the necessary information before the summer, could the decision be made before the summer, and RC said it could happen, or not.
- HOUSING TYPES – ND asked how dealing with the drainage could impact elevations of the homes, especially if there are underground systems. Will it make the buildings taller? She also stressed the importance of varied housing types that will meet the needs of the community i.e. stacked, single level townhomes to improve accessibility, bungalow townhomes as NH could charge significantly more for these as they are a desirable product in Burlington. She also stressed the importance of aesthetics, as this seems to be of low priority, but it shouldn't be. She is aware of many empty nesters leaving Burlington due to lack of the housing that they want.
- OTHER – JT asked if LE had received the first draft from all of the departments, and LE indicated that she had. RC asked how certain the March 6 date for the MSM was, and LE said that she would know for certain on Wednesday, January 31, 2018. RC said there will be a report by planning 10 days before the MSM. ED asked if there would be a limit on the number of delegations that are allowed to speak, and RC replied that there is no limit, but it helps to have a spokesperson that represents a group. JT

stated our desire to be prepared. RC then explained that the final result after all the information has been adjudicated is the FINAL RECOMMENDATION REPORT prepared by the Planning and Development Committee, which is LE's professional planning opinion. Council has to decide whether to agree with that opinion or not 10 days later. The public can speak at either meeting, the one where the Final Recommendation Report is presented, or the one where council votes.

- ST felt it necessary to impress upon LE, since she has only recently become the planner on the proposal, that we feel strongly that this proposal is not in character with our neighbourhood and object to it as is. She made clear that the residents bought their homes believing that the area was zoned for far less density and are quite upset. RC reiterated that all proposals must be adjudicated, and ND replied that we understand that but many Burlington residents are feeling disenfranchised based on other decisions made by council. RC feels that the downtown 23 storey building situation has been politicized and that we shouldn't look to that as what will happen with our proposal. Council DOES turn down applications and there are significant legal fees as a result. The March 6 meeting is just a continuation of negotiations.
- RC stated that he felt that dealing with the smaller group was much more productive, and that we should allow LE to prepare her information report and then have another meeting after March 6, and include someone from the traffic department. ED suggested inviting members from other departments as well if we have issues. RC also recommended inviting people from the Wellington Green group to our next meeting. ED also stated that we are concerned about the planning department's stance since at the original public meeting, Roz (didn't get last name) the Supervisor of Planning, stood up and said that she had meetings with NH and recommended to them that they propose higher density, and ND said that Roz had been advised by City Council to tell NH that. RC said that in broad terms, that is correct but now in detailed discussion, there is the opportunity to push back.
- JT asked if we would be informed of any changes that might come in before March 6 in order to update our position paper, but LE stated that it would be better to have all the information in first. NH has to revise a number of studies to take into account comments made from some of the departments e.g. environmental asked NH why they have suggested a 7.5 m buffer against the protected lands vs a 10 m buffer. NH has to address these issues. According to LE all of the information is on the website (only submissions from NH are on the site). If we subscribe to the site, we will be sent notifications of the changes made.
- ND indicated that she would forward LE information about awards available to developers who build more accessible housing.