

From: Phil Fedosiewicz [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 1:39 PM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Subject: 2087-2103 Prospect St. [REDACTED]

Hi:

I have concerns about this application. Could you please include me on any future updates and mailings regarding this development.

Thank-you, Phil Fedosiewicz
[REDACTED]

April 20, 2018

Dear friends and fellow tenants,

It seems that our homes and property are once again under siege at the hands of Welwyn. The City of Burlington has given us until April 26th to submit our written comments to the Senior Planner, and I hope that you will take a moment of your time to do exactly that. Your comments can be sent by mail, dropped off or emailed. More information is on the reverse of this page.

We all have our reasons why we do not want the demolition of the existing townhouses and construction of "High Density" walk-ups to happen. In case you're looking for more, here are some of my thoughts. Please put your thoughts in your own words and don't copy these verbatim.

- We already have insufficient parking with the existing "Medium Density" designation, according to Welwyn. Where will the new tenants park?
- According to ABC Towing, they have never been commissioned by Welwyn to either monitor or tow vehicles from our parking lot, and visitors are regularly parking in tenant's assigned spaces with no recourse.
- Noise, dust, mud and general inconvenience will wreak havoc for ALL tenants during construction (we see what's happening next door). We will be living in a construction zone 24/7 for 2 years.
- Our beautiful old-growth trees in the back will all be destroyed. The saplings that Welwyn replaces them with after construction won't grow to that splendor during our lifetimes. Save our trees, Council!
- The view for north-facing tenants has been ruined by the sprawling Fairview condos & cranes. We used to be able to enjoy the view of the escarpment! Enough "High Density" construction in Burlington!
- Welwyn already can't seem to afford or manage the basic needs of the existing tenants (ie. general facilities maintenance, emergency and routine repairs, vandalism, exterior maintenance including landscaping, lighting that is regularly maintained inside and in the garage/lockers, working laundry machines, snow removal before tenants have to leave for work, repaired speed bumps that their own plows destroyed, effective security, etc.). How can they possibly finance this new money-grab, and at whose expense?

We have less than one week to make our points in writing. Please see the reverse for more information.

Thank you for making your voices heard. Let's put a stop to this before it is too late.

*This very wrong if you people, to over crowding
"If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem." US ALL
they don't clean weekly and if there are some
accidents happen they do not answer and after 5 P.M.
they are very cruel not to have both all the time
"Elevators". They do not wash the floors every.
We have had A Super since they bought this
Builds.*

April 20, 2018

Dear friends and fellow tenants,

It seems that our homes and property are once again under siege at the hands of Welwyn. The City of Burlington has given us until April 26th to submit our written comments to the Senior Planner, and I hope that you will take a moment of your time to do exactly that. Your comments can be sent by mail, dropped off or emailed. More information is on the reverse of this page.

We all have our reasons why we do not want the demolition of the existing townhouses and construction of "High Density" walk-ups to happen. In case you're looking for more, here are some of my thoughts. Please put your thoughts in your own words and don't copy these verbatim.

- We already have insufficient parking with the existing "Medium Density" designation, according to Welwyn. Where will the new tenants park?
- According to ABC Towing, they have never been commissioned by Welwyn to either monitor or tow vehicles from our parking lot, and visitors are regularly parking in tenant's assigned spaces with no recourse.
- Noise, dust, mud and general inconvenience will wreak havoc for ALL tenants during construction (we see what's happening next door). We will be living in a construction zone 24/7 for 2 years.
- Our beautiful old-growth trees in the back will all be destroyed. The saplings that Welwyn replaces them with after construction won't grow to that splendor during our lifetimes. Save our trees, Council!
- The view for north-facing tenants has been ruined by the sprawling Fairview condos & cranes. We used to be able to enjoy the view of the escarpment! Enough "High Density" construction in Burlington!
- Welwyn already can't seem to afford or manage the basic needs of the existing tenants (ie. general facilities maintenance, emergency and routine repairs, vandalism, exterior maintenance including landscaping, lighting that is regularly maintained inside and in the garage/lockers, working laundry machines, snow removal before tenants have to leave for work, repaired speed bumps that their own plows destroyed, effective security, etc.). How can they possibly finance this new money-grab, and at whose expense?

We have less than one week to make our points in writing. Please see the reverse for more information.

Thank you for making your voices heard. Let's put a stop to this before it is too late.

RE: PARKING AT BACK FROM BACK DOOR TO STEPS - THE CONCRETE WALKWAY IS CRUMBLING - IN PLACES DIFFICULT TO WALK ON.

"If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem."

THIS BUILDING USED TO BE VERY CLEAN - BUT NOT NOW

TWO ELEVATORS WERE INSTALLED - BUT MOST TIMES ONLY ONE IS BEING USED - OTHER IS NOT IN USE - THEY DO NOT USE BOTH AT ALL TIMES - CAUSING WAIT TIMES -

VISITOR PARKING IS NOT UP TO PAR - NOT ENOUGH SPOTS.

EVERYDAY THE NOISE FROM BUILDINGS - CRANES - NOT TO MENTION THE DUST & DIRT THIS IS CAUSING - COST OF PARKING \$10.00 PER MONTH - RENT INCREASE UP \$40.00 PER MONTH

From: Betty Boudreau [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 09, 2018 5:22 PM
To: McInnes, Suzanne; Betty Boudreau
Subject: 2087-2103 Prospect St File # 505-09/17 & 520-19/17

Dear Suzanne

I was hoping to make the neighbourhood meeting tonight regarding this matter but my schedule does not allow
I would like to express my opinion on this proposal.

In short, I do **NOT** support further building in this extremely condensed space. I live in 2095 Prospect street building facing the property which is CURRENTLY under construction for the past year. It has been a complete inconvenience and disappointment. I used to look out at many beautiful trees and green space and now all I see is a parking lot and drive ways with nothing but construction noise, vehicle noise, car horns going off, dirt, dust and inconvenience.

There are only a few trees remaining and this proposal is suggesting to basically strip ALL of the trees and any green space this property has.
It is my firm believe and a known fact that for the mental well being of anybody, one needs a peaceful dwelling WITH green space and trees and fresh air.

STOP packing us in like sardines.

This area is already overpopulated. BURLINGTON IS LOOSING ITS CHARM. We are not TORONTO.

Furthermore the parking is abysmal for this property. There are already TOO many people for the number of parking spots. By putting in more units in the back, it will only make matters worse.

Money would be better spent on better maintenance and management of this building.

Further construction in this area would NOT be appreciated by anybody in this area. We are already over saturated with construction.
PLEASE do not approve further construction in this area particularly for 2087-2103 Prospect

Thank you for your consideration
B

From: Craig Van Wiechen [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 6:41 PM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Subject: Planning Application for 2087-2103 Prospect St. Resident Feedback

Good evening Suzanne,

I'm responding to a request for feedback on the proposed development plans for 2087-2103 Prospect St. (File 505-09/17 & 520-19/17). I'm a tenant currently renting from the eight storey apartment building at 2095 Prospect St.

As I believe the townhouses and apartment building share a common parking lot, I'm concerned that this development would have a large impact on where all tenants are able to park. We currently all have assigned parking, and the parking lot does not have the capacity even for visitor parking, so the large addition of the proposed townhouses can very likely cause limited parking space availability in the future for any new or current tenants.

In addition, parking availability may also be affected during the construction of the proposed townhouses, and will be difficult to manage with crews and equipment arriving and leaving. Also, demolition has the risk of causing damage to any nearby parked vehicles, in addition to the ongoing dust and noise that will impact the many residents of the apartment building.

Please let me know if I can clarify any feedback that I have given. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to share my views.

Have a great day,
Craig Van Wiechen

From: Linda Savage [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 11:54 AM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Cc: Cindy Savage
Subject: Re: File: 505-09/17 & 520-19/17

Planning Application for:2087 - 2103 Prospect St

The situation at 2095 Prospect is critically challenged for enough parking. Most people here have 2 cars and some 3.

It was proposed by someone at the meeting on April 12 that should the new buildings be erected, to install more bike racks and public transit be the solution. As we are an aging population in this area, and the idea of taking away precious space for parking is ridiculous as is the idea that we, over 60, 70, and 80 years old take up riding our bicycles to the grocery store, senior centre or the Go station. How would our tenants with walkers get around? At this point there are still no access ramps or automatic door opening devices for these residents. There are no wheel chair parking areas, or visitor parking areas.

The solution would for 2095 would be to remove the terrace, lower the under ground level by 6 ft. rebuild the terrace extending it northward to create an additional 35 to 40 parking spaces on the top level.

The solution for the 2 new buildings is a 2 level adjoining parkade under the proposed buildings.

Regarding trucks to access the rear property, an additional driveway would have to be created, once again removing all the beautiful old growth coniferous trees. There is not enough room on the western side of the building to allow residents to use their balconies. The area for police and ambulance service would be challenged and inadequate.

Frankly, I sincerely hope the proposal is squelched and never happens in my lifetime. I'm sick of all the dust, confusion and noise of having to live this way.

A resident of 2095 Prospect St.

From: Janessa Friesen [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 5:23 AM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Subject: Written Comments Against File: 509-09/17 & 520-19/17

As someone who lives in the 8 floor apartment I am against File: 509-09/17 & 520-19/17 for several reasons:

1) We are already dealing with a large townhouse construction project to the right of the building which is already causing noise complaints and messy roads and driving delays burdening our quality of life. By adding another construction project would only further exacerbate the situation. It would make a living here unbearable!

2) Despite what this plan is proposing, there is no way there is enough parking for that kind of development. There is already not enough parking as it is for the residents of the apartment complex. We can't even have guests park here without there being an issue about bylaw parking tickets or being towed; and trying to get a "guest permit" is a joke. If I wanted to invite my mom over for dinner tonight there's no time to get a guest permit and there is no street parking. I've heard rumors there are 1 to 2 guest spaces for parking but no one knows where they are and clearly they are never available because the parking lot is always full. So I know for a fact that adding a handful more spaces will not hold the 80 or more people with cars they are looking to cram into all these new units. And even if they were to repave the lot, where would we be supposed to park during that time? There is no nearby alternate overnight parking for us as parking on the street is not allowed and getting in and out of our homes would be a nightmare.

3) There are several repairs around the apartments that really should be attended to before they go building a bunch of new places. For example I still have to haul my trash all the way down several floors and then across the parking lot in the winter to have to try to heave it into a dumpster. The building should have a proper garbage chute; and it did once so I'm sure it can be fixed. Also the large pine trees out by the parking lots do not seem to get tended to. There are tons of Pine needles and tree sap that are constantly falling and ruining the paint on my car. They should really take those down or at the very least provide coverage from them so they do not damage the cars. There should also be better snow removal. Right now whoever's doing it does not do a very good job. Just this winter alone I got stuck in the snow twice!

I beg of you, please, from the bottom of my heart, do not allow any more construction projects in and around our building. I am sure there are several other open lots in other areas of the city that would benefit from new developments, but this is not one of them.

Thank You For Your Time.

From: Jeannette St Aubin [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, April 21, 2018 9:04 PM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Subject: PLANNING APPLICATION FOR: 2087-2103 Prospect St, File: 505-09/17 & 520-19/17

I would like to say that I do not want to see the townhouses demolished and replaced with 2 more buildings that will comprise of 50 units. That means a need for minimum 50 new parking spots if not more. This property doesn't have adequate TENANT or VISITORS parking as it is. It will create more traffic going through the initial parking area and even more traffic for the school zone.

As a tenant of Welwyn Properties I believe that this whole property is poorly managed as it is now without adding anymore tenants. The parking lot isn't plowed on time for tenants to leave for work in the morning and is not plowed at all the rest of the day. We don't see much salt applied to the side walk, front entrance, underground parking ramp and backstairs. Even though we finally got new elevators installed, most of the time only one works and it doesn't seem urgent to the Welwyn Properties to get the elevator fixed. The people at Welwyn Properties are not efficient at getting things fixed or replaced, so giving them more tenants to look after doesn't seem the way to go. May I suggest that the Welwyn Properties get themselves an on sight superintendent that might help.

Please do not approve this application.

Jeannette & Ray St Aubin

[REDACTED]

Burlington, ON

[REDACTED]

From: Lisa robertson [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 11:01 PM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Subject: File: 505-09/17 and 520-19/17

Dear Suzanne,

I currently live at 2095 Prospect street (building right in front of the proposed application). This building is owned by Welwyn Interests Inc and Id like you to read the following concerns I have before proceeding.

MAINTENANCE: This building (even though it may be old) has completely turned into a slum. There are so many repairs that need to be taken care of. Lights are out, it doesn't get cleaned and general repairs don't get made. At one point we had 3/5 washing machines out of service and NO ONE came to repair them for at least 6 weeks. There have been break-ins (while I understand it's not Welwyn's fault) but repairs to broken doors (and walls) weren't fixed for months! Last year a pane of glass broke and it took them 1 week to replace it. ONE WEEK!!! The cleanliness of this building is disgusting. There is NO ONE here to clean.

ELEVATORS: While I understand they tried to fix the elevators which are really old, all they did was give them a shiny makeover. One is always out of service and getting repaired all the time. that leave this 8 story building with 1 elevator all the time. Not good

ALCOHOLIC: There is an alcoholic who is drinking Listerine and leaving empty (and full) bottles all over the property. Many of us have brought this to Welwyns attention and they have done NOTHING. I'm finding empty bottles of Listerine on the grass, in the locker rooms, and general communal lobby. They can't even clean up this mess in and around this building and want to make money on a new building?!

PARKING: What are you going to do about parking? there is already a parking shortage and they/you want to cut spaces?! where are we going to park? there are many people in this building that are a 2 car/household and are resorting to parking at the park. We were threatened to be towed by ABC towing if we parked in a spot that wasn't ours. All to find out that for the last 1.5 years there hasn't been a contract with ABC. they cannot bully us this way.

I understand that you might not be able to do anything with the above issues. Could you forward my concerns to ANYONE in the city of Burlington that can deal with the above complaints.

Something has to change. I understand from other tenants that the Fire department has been called over issues AND the city of Burlington. Something has to give. Someone has to sit down with Welwyn and explain to them how our building and a potentially new proposal needs to be maintained.

Thank you for listening to me,
Concerned Tenant

Planning Application for: 2087 – 2103 Prospect Street, Burlington ON
File: 505-09/17 & 520-19/17

Attention: Burlington City Building Department
PO Box 5013
426 Brant Street
Burlington, Ontario L7R 3Z6

██████ Prospect Street
Burlington, Ontario L7R 1Z2

April 17, 2018

Suzanne McInnes, Senior Planner

Please accept this letter as my written comments as per the City invitation regarding the above File.

It would seem that the Planning Justification Report weighs heavily on the move to intensify the population and so housing in the confines of the city core. Since 2005 my address has had two cars and one truck vandalized, garbage cans stolen, an attempted break in, a real break in and theft 5 doors to the east and mail tampering next door.

Our reaction to these events is to have the locks upgraded and all the lower level windows reinforced with a clear vinyl film to strengthen the windows against breakage. This was costly. Since the mail tampering the local police recommend that we install video surveillance cameras and locking mailbox.

Increasing the population density may attract more of these criminal events and lead to a fortress mentality. The shop that repaired our vehicles did the last one free. The owner was embarrassed and said, "This is not my Burlington".

The Site Planning & Elevations Report leaves my immediate neighbors on Prospect and Maplewood concerned about the flow of surface water and the effect on the already high water table. Our home has had the sump upgraded to attempt to respond to this historical high water table at a great expense and still this house is on its fourth pump replacement due to burn out. Recent heavy rain events will become the new norm.

The Noise Feasibility Study was done with some conjecture over a short period of time. As a thirteen plus year resident it must be pointed out that the noise already outside our townhouse just east of the primary access route to the 2087 Prospect has created excessive noise and vibration in our home. It took the threat of a Police Report to get the garbage and recycling trucks to slow down but other delivery vans ignore the speed bumps that cause this noise and vibration. If this Fire Route will become the road to demolition and construction our home's foundation is at risk for vibration damage. Noise and vibration can only increase with the addition of more

cars and trucks accessing the proposed townhouses. There is an Industry Vibration Standard that addresses the limits to intensity, frequency and amplitude of these events. This standard has already been written in some municipality's by-laws.

The speed bumps recently installed on Prospect have had even less effect on traffic speed and noise. Most vehicles with suspensions engineered for ride comfort do not slow down at all. Those who do proceed so slowly risk rear collisions by overtaking vehicles. The repeated slowing and acceleration has lead to more traffic noise and increased vehicle exhaust. It is difficult to gauge traffic speed when backing out of our driveway because oncoming vehicles now go at a wide range of speeds. All of this is happening close to a public school and park.

The Waste Management Study calls to question the potential increase in waste water production volume and required capacity given all the proposed and ongoing intensification of Prospect.

With the prolonged redevelopment of the property just west of this proposal and future work on 2087 Prospect makes one wonder how children friendly will this area be?

Parking in all of this area is inadequate no matter what studies say. There is no place for extra vehicles in the area. The church across the road has been patient but often time vehicles are left there days at a time because the present parking is inadequate for 2087 now. There is no overnight parking in the park near by.

Whose vision of the city is the above? Could it be politicians, business, OMB or the town councilors and lastly the people of Burlington?

Respectfully

James (Jim) W. Skinner B.A., M.Ed.

Retired Captain and Fire & Life Safety Educator

From: Patrick Osborn [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, April 21, 2018 1:11 PM

To: McInnes, Suzanne

Subject: Planning Application for: 2087-2103 prospect st. File number 505-09/17 & 520-19/17

Dear Suzanne McInnes,

I write this letter in response to Planning Application for: 2087-2103 Prospect st. File 505-09/17 and 520-19/17.

In its current state I am completely against the above change to the area due to Welwyn's lack of current management and maintenance of current buildings and parking. I am not one that is against progress, but Welwyn has not addressed current building problems which will compound if approved in its current state. Welwyn interests should not be allowed to build anything in the area until its current substantial building and parking problems are rectified. 2095 prospect st. was at one point a community, not perfect one but one that felt cared for by its owners. Now it feels like a slum, run by slumlords.

Since it has taken ownership it has made improvements, but continues to ignore parts of the building falling into disrepair. Maintenance and parking have become a nightmare, the laundry machines and units haven't been repaired and left to sit for months, security has not been improved despite new cameras.

In regards to repairs and maintenance under Welwyn, my unit has shoddy windows that have not been repaired or cleaned in 2 years, even though requests have been made. My patio door has not been fixed though brought up multiple times, security doors, both front and back entrances, breaks often and left for weeks at a time allowing anyone can enter the buildings, putting all residences at risk. This will become more of a problem as more people move in and have access to our parking and building.

Snow removal was practically absent this winter season, leaving residence to walk unsafely to their cars sometimes days at a time. Because the people living here are a community we took up the charge to clear walkways so that others can make it safely to their cars.

Additionally Welwyn has not address the growing recycling problem, there are not enough containers for all the waste for this building. It is not uncommon for recycling units to be full by mid week and overflowing soon afterwards.

Parking, the building currently does not have ANY visitor parking, which is unbelievable, and something Welwyn is aware of but unwilling to address. Compounding the problem is the lack of enough parking for current residence. Residence have had to make requests of the Church across the street for visitor parking, which is now ticketing cars. Lastly the parking lot is in disrepair, speed bumps have been left destroyed by their snow removal crews, and not repaired, and potholes are become in common place.

Laundry Room, has currently 3 washers down, leaving them unplugged and sitting for months at a time, while they raise prices on the remaining machines.

Please ask yourself, if a company is willing to do this to current residence, what will happen when the density of the area, which is not sustainable in its current form, increases 3-4 fold? What will happen to current residence when Welwyn's focus is on this new project, leaving this building to continue rotting away slowly but surely.

I don't wish to be completely negative, but growth for the sake of growth, is poor decision making. And you don't build a healthy community by ignoring its current problems, hoping and praying they will go away. I would be happy to welcome new neighbours under the right circumstances, that being, the above addressed and maintained. Welwyn has not proven to me or most of this building that they can maintain its current building requirements let alone future responsibilities. Help us, we need your support to fix our current problems before you add new ones to the area.

Regards,
Patrick T. Osborn
2095 Prospect [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 3:18 PM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Subject: Planning Application File Nos. 505-09/17 & 520-19/17

Dear Ms. McInnes,

I'm writing to you today as a concerned tenant who has lived at 2095 Prospect Street for 14 years. My view from the [REDACTED] floor faces north across our parking lot to the subject townhouses, which may face demolition under this proposal. The reasons for my concern are so many that I'm not sure where to begin, but I will attempt to be as succinct as possible.

During my time in the building, I have seen it change ownership several times. It was called Prospect Park Apartments when I moved in. Now, under the latest ownership, it's Welwyn Interests Inc. (see the difference?). Welwyn has made it obvious from the very beginning that they bought this property to make money: their first order of business was to fire both our on-site Superintendent and Maintenance person. There was no on-site personnel hired to replace them. The building has since declined from a clean and well-maintained building to one that is neglected. So are the needs of the tenants. Emergency responses and repairs are delayed or non-existent, concrete is crumbling on the back deck and stairs, half of our laundry machines have been broken for months, vandalism has increased, grounds maintenance and timely snow-removal is at their convenience, water is turned off at least one day/month for water repairs that never seem to fix the problem, interior lighting isn't maintained, elevators (even new) regularly go out of service for days at a time, and the list goes on and on. If Welwyn can't provide for the basic needs of their existing tenants (mostly elderly and afraid of speaking up in case they get evicted), what is our future when there are even more of us on the property? And how can they possibly finance this endeavour when they can't adequately look after their existing building?

Just as important is the issue of available parking. Welwyn has made it clear that there are not enough parking spaces for the existing tenants, and in fact, arbitrarily revoked my above-ground parking space (included in my lease) because I was already paying for an underground spot, and they needed the above-ground space for other tenants. I had no say in the matter. Make no mistake; they only wanted to be able to charge \$70/month to new tenants for it's use. Further, we were told that ABC Towing was monitoring and towing illegally parked cars, however ABC says that they do not have such a contract with Welwyn, and will not tow intruder vehicles. As a result, tenants' parking spaces are being hijacked by visitors, because we have no Visitor's Parking, and they have no recourse. So now, with this proposal for a High Density designation, I have to ask: where on earth are the new tenants going to park if the existing ones can't even count on coming home to their assigned and empty space?!

Finally, I need to voice my concerns about the construction in general. I feel like I've been living in a construction zone for the past several years already, due to the erection of the Fairview condos as well as the demolition and reconstruction project going on next door. It should be

noted that I used to have a view of the Escarpment, but now I only see towers and cranes outside of my window. I used to see a community of townhouses and beautiful old-growth trees next door and now its just mountains of dirt waiting for new brownstones to be built. I'm so disheartened by what's happening in my community with all of the new High Density projects. And I don't think that I can bear to see those stunning mature trees surrounding the existing townhouses at 2095 cut down for the sake of greed; those trees are why we used to be called Prospect "Park" Apartments.

But that's just the tip of the iceberg, Ms. McInnes. I implore you to consider the effects of the noise pollution on top of what I have already described to you, in addition to the terrible echo that the north-facing tenants have to deal with. The trucks next door are coming and going 12 hours per day, 6 days a week with their clean fill. Soon it will be noisy new construction with the same hours. They don't care how many people are currently inconvenienced by the noise and mud as long as they get paid. My summer is already ruined by the booming, beeping, clanging and echoing sounds next door, and it hasn't even started. I've already described the existing strain on our parking lot, we just don't have the space for trucks to be coming and going at this building. And what about the safety of tenants who park in the underground lot, with trucks barreling back and forth? It's already a hazard, since Welwyn's own plow destroyed our speed bumps, and there are no mirrors to assist when exiting the lot up the ramp, nor signs asking drivers to yield to us.

Please don't allow this nightmare to happen on our property? Not now. Hopefully never. But certainly not until Welwyn proves that they can afford to commit to their existing tenants' needs first.

I apologize, I really did try my best to keep my letter brief, but my passion on this issue seems to have overtaken my attempts at brevity. If you would like to meet in person, I can show you some recent videos taken from my balcony so that you can have a better perspective from my POV (unfortunately, the files are too big to attach to an email). I promise you, I'm not this verbose in person.

Thank you for reading. I can be reached at this email address, or on my cell at [REDACTED].

Sincerely,
[REDACTED]

From: sheena dwinnell [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 7:31 AM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Subject: Prospect Development

Suzanne McInnes, Senior Planner
via e-mail: suzanne.mcinnnes@burlington.ca

Dear Ms. McInnes:

I am writing in response to a letter I received regarding the application by Welwyn Interests Ltd. for a By-law Amendment for the replacement of eight existing rental units with 50 stacked townhouse units on the property municipally known as 2087-2103 Prospect Street in the City of Burlington.

The purpose of my letter is to provide you with reasons why this application should not be approved. I am one of the residents living in the existing rental units and thus directly affected by this application. In addition, I do not have the means to obtain legal counsel with expertise in these matters, so I will do my best to provide you with information I hope you will take into consideration when rendering your decision.

Currently the "subject property" has an 8 storey apartment building and 8 rental townhouse units on the land. There are a number of concerns regarding the impact this application will have on those residents (in part) as well as myself personally.

PARKING

Zoning By-Law 2020 requires a minimum of 2.00 spaces per unit and Welwyn is asking that it be reduced to .94 spaces per unit. With the existing tenants, there is insufficient parking with the current by-law. I myself only have a parking permit for one space and visitor parking is always "full". The current landlord does little to nothing to enforce parking spaces, or have vehicles illegally parked in tenants spots towed away. How is it possible that they expect to add more spaces when they cannot even manage the existing spaces in a meaningful way?

In their application, they are also asking to reduce visitor parking to a standard of 0.18 spaces per unit, where the Zoning by-law requires a minimum of 0.35 spaces per unit. I'm not exactly sure what this means in terms of # of visitor parking spaces, but it sounds to me like they want to reduce it, when the existing standard is already insufficient, so I fail to see how you can reduce the spots and add more tenants and be able to provide sufficient visitor parking. This is not a doctor's office or a "business" that provides visitor parking - the spots used for visitor parking is for friends and relatives to come and visit - often overnight. It is not the type of "visitor's parking" where the visitor is in/out briefly. The visitors are parking for several hours or for overnight and it is not currently sufficient.

Zoning By-law 2020 stipulates a maximum density of 100 units per net hectare with a net increase in 10 units per net hectare with an additional 3% in covered parking. The application is asking that it be increased to 118.45 units per net hectare. This goes above and beyond the "growth".

Essentially, there will be 42 units added to the existing space when the current landlord(s) cannot even manage the property (parking) appropriately for the current tenants. There is insufficient space for the current tenants and reducing the parking "spaces" so that you can squeeze in some more will still be insufficient when you add 42 units.

PROPOSED UNITS

The firm that developed the Report for Welwyn, obviously has worked with larger cities like Toronto and Mississauga where they have crammed people into the smallest units possible to provide additional units to accommodate the need. They want to come and change all the by-laws that this great City has developed -- to prevent such "cramming". For instance, they are asking to amend By-law 2020 which requires a minimum amenity area of 25.0 sqm per bedroom, to 9.14 sqm per bedroom. That is utterly ridiculous. It is OBVIOUS they are trying to develop units that are suitable only to single people or couples with one child - that child having little more than a closet for a bedroom.

There is no need, nor should the City acquiesce to requests to change totally appropriate By-laws to start making its citizens live in dwellings that house them like sardines in a can. The population growth does not justify minimizing standards of life to that extent.

WELWYN INTERESTS LTD.

I have had conversations with tenants from the apartment building that is managed by Welwyn Interests Ltd. and they can't seem to manage general maintenance of the facilities such as lighting, working laundry machines, proper snow removal (early am before tenants have to leave for work), emergency and routine repairs, repair of vandalized property etcetera. In other words, this property manager has a poor record with existing buildings/tenants and should not be provided with an opportunity to displace current tenants so that they can poorly manage MORE tenants.

The amount of new tenants that this proposal will accommodate does not sufficiently satisfy the City's Official Plan, without extending the high-density residential designation to the rear of the property - currently designated as medium density.

It appears that Welwyn Interests Ltd. and/or their associates think that they know what is better for the City of Burlington than our fine, intelligent planners. I am offended by their arrogance.

SCHOOLING

Tom Thompson public school is already at max capacity. If these 50 units are approved there will be a large impact on neighboring schools as they will be denied enrollment to Tom Thompson. This will start to diminish the education of our future. Who wants to live in a city where their elementary children have to be bused across town to attend school.

MISCELLANEOUS

It is my position that City hires experienced individuals to deal with issues of zoning and by-laws and it is inappropriate for a business to think that they know better, by asking the City to change all of its planning, zoning and by-laws to accommodate their need to cram more people into an existing space -- not to the benefit of residents, but for financial greediness. This proposal will displace 8 families, disturb hundreds of families during construction, change existing zoning laws and by-laws and planning laws all for the sake of adding 42 new units to the City. This does little, if anything to improve anything in the City with respect to population and availability of rental units. They have not taken into consideration the effect this could have on families in the area, the schools or, most importantly of all, a City that is proud of its beauty and has been able to expand in many, many un-developed properties in the surrounding area with much more

accommodation than simply having an addition 42 units on property that is already sufficient zoned and already developed.

Respectfully,
Burlington, ON

[REDACTED]

From: Lindsey Bruce [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 10, 2018 11:08 PM
To: McInnes, Suzanne; Gulak, Carol
Cc: Meed Ward, Marianne; Ryan Bruce
Subject: Re: Prospect Street Development.

Thank you Suzanne.

Can you then please explain the process of approvals or public input after the statutory public meeting? Ultimately, we'd like to see any revised plans and comments from the city to the proponent. I understand that we may not be invited to meetings between city staff and the proponent, however we've been told that we will be included in this process and I'd hate to miss information or decisions being made in these internal meetings. I've worked for a government agency (Conservation Authority) in the past, and been privy to meetings where decisions are made, and comments/input from the public is not considered.

Again, we are very concerned about this development and would like EVERY opportunity to be involved and informed as the application process unfolds.

Our contact information
Lindsey and Ryan Bruce
[REDACTED]

Here are our concerns in writing to be considered for the staff report and public meeting.

1) Grading: The proponent is proposing an average grade change of approximately 1m over the rear lot lines of 3 single family dwellings on Maplewood Drive. This includes modifying the grade and installing a 0.85m tall retaining wall along these three lots. We have significant concerns with this as it will affect our drainage and the aesthetic appeal of our backyard. This area is subject to very high groundwater and we have had water problems in our house for the past 5 years. We have spent a lot of money waterproofing our foundation, installing a sump pump with backup systems and dealing with water problems in our backyard and basement. We are concerned that this significant change in grading will have detrimental negative impacts to us. Also, we do not want to have a retaining wall in our backyard. Period.

In our opinion, the modifications in the grades are too significant to be ignored by the City's engineering department, even in this early stage of the re-zoning application. If they need to re-grade the entire development site in order to facilitate an increase in density, then the application to re-zone and intensify should be denied. We shouldn't be allowing developers to grade this much, affect neighbourhoods and sensitive groundwater tables to over-intensify. This is not minor and nature and does not meet the intent of Burlington's Official Plan or zoning by-laws.

The increase in grade on the site also brings about other concerns related to a) tree protection and the b) height of the proposed buildings.

a) Tree protection - The proposed landscape plans were completed without any consideration to the proposed grading plans. The landscape plans and tree retention on site are basically negligible and include very little vegetation to be saved. The 2 trees and 1 tree "unit" that are being saved are located in an area that according to the grading plan, will be subject to over 1.2m of fill and in the exact location of the proposed 0.85m retaining wall. Anyone reviewing these two plans in conjunction will see that preserving these trees is impossible. Landscaping plans should be revised to include proposed grading on the site.

We are very concerned again with the retaining wall in our backyard - and also the impact it will have on our beautiful 30ft tall cedar trees that line our entire rear yard lot line. The landscape plans say that this tree "unit" is "private" (owned by the proponent) however we have been told by city staff that they are considered boundary trees and that they cannot be removed without written consent of the co-boundary owner. We will not be providing this written consent and would like the proponent to re-consider any changes to the grade that will negatively impact these trees.

In addition to these being the only owner retained trees on the entire site with the rest being removed - and most noted in good condition. With the increase in number of trees being removed in our downtown core, we as a community should be fighting for this greenspace and these trees to be preserved. We have an abundance of wildlife including many varieties of birds, squirrels, chipmunks, rabbits etc that will be impacted with this proposal.

b) The height of the proposed building is also of concern for us. With the changes to the grading plan, again this seems to complicate the calculation of the building height. They are calling the stacked townhomes - 3 storeys, however with the basement level being "created" with the 1.8m increase in height - we see this as a 4 storey or at worst 3.5 storey building. At the town meeting - City staff said this would be treated as a 3.5 storey building. However, nowhere in the by-laws does it say that a stacked townhome can be more than 3 storeys.

In addition to the number of storeys, the height of the building is questionable. On the elevation plans submitted, the height is noted as 14m from fixed grade to top of roof peak. However, if you look at the actual grades provided (109.92m at roof peak and 94.92m at fixed grade) the height equals 15m. Also, the calculation of fixed grade is not explained or noted on the grading plan. The definition of fixed grade for multi-unit dwellings is "the elevation of the ground at the street or common driveway line measured at the mid-point of the dwelling unit." It appears that they have used the PROPOSED grade located at the catch basin (or low point) of the parking area... this seems arbitrary and should be clarified on the application. In our opinion the "common driveway" should be taken closer to prospect street and using the EXISTING grades. I would like further clarification from city staff as to how the height is determined.

2) We have concerns with the proposed setback to the rear lot line, abutting the single family residences on Maplewood. The required rear yard setback in the bylaw is 15m plus 1m for every

5m over a building 30m in length. They are proposing 14m which on paper seems like a minor reduction in the setback. However, when you look at the site as a whole - they are proposing two 32m long buildings only separated by a 4m gap. In our opinion, this 4m gap hardly provides any relief from the overall 68m length of the entire development. From our backyard, we will see the 4m break, but our neighbours to the east and west - will look out and see no break in the wall. Therefore, we feel that the setback should be considered from a 68m length and should be calculated as $((68-30)/5*1)+15=22\text{m}$. In our opinion, the proposed 14m setback is not sufficient given the nature of the proposed development.

3) Since the proposed application is to change zoning and increase the density on site, we believe that the proposed development should be able to meet the majority of the zoning requirements outlined in that new zone. They are proposing to go from RM2 to RH4 and therefore increase from medium to high density. However, even with the new zoning, they are going over the maximum density allowed by 18 units per hectare.

4) There is a significant gap in the geotechnical information - the locations where groundwater wells were installed were not in the location of the proposed development and therefore cannot determine the relevant groundwater table. South Burlington is known to have high groundwater table and our area is no exception. As mentioned above, we've had issues with water on our property and would encourage the City to ask the proponent to provide groundwater research in the appropriate location. In addition, as for any residential construction in the City of Burlington, the footings for the proposed development should not be supported within the seasonally high groundwater table.

4) This development is providing zero accessible units. We see this as a huge downfall of this proposal. The approved development to the west of this on Prospect was already approved with 96 units - also zero accessible units. These rental units will be owned by the property management company, with profits being made as a corporation. The AODA requires that an organization that offers accommodation be subject to the standards set forth in this Act. We believe this should be considered and every opportunity be taken to provide accessible units in this development.

5) The development is proposing inadequate parking for such a large number of units. Again, considering that they are proposing to re-zone to higher density, we feel that they should be able to provide the required number of parking spaces by reducing the number of proposed units.

6) Lastly, we have just invested in solar panels on our south and west facing roofs, and it is unclear by the sun shadow study if this development will impact the amount of energy we can harvest with this system. We would like further information and clarification with respect to the height of the building and the shadowing of our roof.

In closing, we hope that city staff and council consider these negative impacts as they review this development. As neighbours and property owners in the city of Burlington, we recognize that re-development of the site is important to the proponent, however this re-development should be done with careful consideration for the long-term impacts on

the surrounding homes and done properly to minimize impacts and designed within the limitations of the site. This includes but is not limited too, density, parking, greenspace and water issues.

Regards,
Lindsey and Ryan Bruce

From: Mark Clennett [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 1:02 PM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Subject: 2087 Prospect Street Proposal (I support it)

Ms. McInnes.

I believe that this change should be approved.

While I do not plan to attend the meeting, I believe that my support should be noted.

My overall opinion is:

While this one project will not “change the world”, it is a step in the right direction by:

- **Providing more rental accommodation**
- **Increased density**
- **Contribute in improved economic opportunity's in our neighbourhood**
- **Maintains the character of our neighbourhood**

My more specific comments are below

I live in an apartment very nearby (2067 Prospect), where similar units are being constructed

I acknowledge some noise and dust during this ongoing construction period.

I also do not see these units as significantly changing the nature of our neighbourhood.

I also believe that the increase in density can have some benefits.

- Is likely to increase the number of people **(customers) using local services in our area.**
 - It has clearly been a challenge to find small business people willing to open businesses in the mall at Brant & Fairview.
 - I would also note that the Sears store at Maple-view mall seems empty (not sure of prospects)

Is likely to increase the number of students going to local schools **(Prevent school closures)**

Please consider & I am open to clarification/comments via e-mail.

Mark Clennett