

Andrew Raymond,  
[REDACTED] Georgina Court,  
Burlington, Ontario, Canada, [REDACTED]

---

December 11, 2017

Suzanne McInnes  
426 Brant St.  
Burlington, On  
L7R 3Z6

**Email:** [suzanne.mcinnnes@burlington.ca](mailto:suzanne.mcinnnes@burlington.ca)  
**Phone:** 905-335-7600, ext. 7555

Ms. McInnes,

Further to our community meeting held on May 23, 2017, and our upcoming Open House discussion December 12, 2017, I would like to formally voice my strong objection to the proposed development and the revised proposal. This proposal fails to address our concerns, especially the access from Georgina Court rather than Upper Middle Road.

I live at [REDACTED] Georgina Court and the neighborhood children all play on the street and often in the Georgina Court area as it is not a thoroughfare for traffic. There are no park playgrounds within a reasonable walking distance of our home so the street is where everyone is out playing. The proposal of accessing the development from Georgina Court is not acceptable as this will significantly increase the traffic and there already is not enough street parking for homeowners guests.

I believe that the traffic impact study was incorrectly performed as it fails to consider the already over-congested traffic flow on the traffic circle of Quinte St. and Rome Cres. This is already a dangerous circle but with the proposed traffic from this development this will be unsustainable and dangerous for the children in the neighborhood. As such a simple alternative access for this development from Upper Middle would solve this issue and be consistent with townhouse development approximately 100 meters west of this proposed development which is accessed directly off Upper Middle.

The planned parking of 4 visitor spots for the 22 homes is completely insufficient and there is no room in the plan for parking on any of the roads. Georgina Court cannot be parking as there is no room and the west side of Georgina Court has a fire hydrant and cars are appropriately prohibited from parking there for safety reasons (which I fully support to protect my family and my neighbors family).

---

In addition the development proposes to shorten the minimum side-yard setbacks, back-yard setbacks and minimum rear yards. This is not in character with the rest of the neighborhood and I object to this amendment to reasonable in-place current setback standards.

The noise impact from traffic is so unacceptable that the developer must advise their "Purchasers/tenants are advised that despite the inclusion of noise control features in the development and within the building units, sound levels due to increasing road traffic may occasionally interfere with some activities of the dwelling occupants as the sound levels exceed the Municipality's and the Ministry of the Environment's noise criteria." So given they require this special notice the immediately surrounding homes will also be negatively impacted by this higher noise level and this is unacceptable.

From a safety perspective I also wish to object to the proposal with the private lane to the townhouses which is very dangerous as it would only take one errant visitor temporarily parking in front of the lane to delay Emergency Vehicles from accessing the homes. That could lead to additional time in the event of a fire and increase the risk of human loss of life. We cannot accept this risk and this "laneway" should be expanded in size to a full width road, accessed from Upper Middle.

The proposed densification is also inconsistent with the immediate homes on Georgina Court and Rome Cres and hence we object to this change to the fit of the neighborhood.

There is also a lack of parks for children of our neighborhood to play. I recommend the city expropriate this land at 5219 Upper Middle from the current owner and develop a neighborhood park, or provide additional park land across the street at or beside Corpus Christie High School.

I also am particularly surprised and disappointed that the developer revised their proposal to include a new sidewalk in front of our house. There is no need for that as there is an existing sidewalk on the other side of Georgina Court. I feel this was added to the revised plan to retaliate for our community objecting to the proposed development plan.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Andrew Raymond, Homeowner at [REDACTED] Georgina Court Burlington Ontario**



The information in this e-mail is intended solely for the addressee(s) named, and is confidential. Any other distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited.

♻️ Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Andrew Raymond,  
[REDACTED] Georgina Court,  
Burlington, Ontario, Canada, [REDACTED]

---

May 31, 2017

Kyle Plas  
426 Brant St.  
Burlington, On  
L7R 3Z6

Email: [kyle.plas@burlington.ca](mailto:kyle.plas@burlington.ca)  
Phone: 905-335-7600, ext. 7555

Mr. Plas,

Further to our community meeting held on May 23, 2017, I would like to formally voice my strong objection to the proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment: 520-05/17 for the proposed development at 5219 Upper Middle Road.

I live at [REDACTED] Georgina Court and the neighborhood children all play on the street and often in the Georgina Court area as it is not a thoroughfare for traffic. There are no park playgrounds within a reasonable walking distance of our home so the street is where everyone is out playing. The proposal of accessing the development from Georgina Court is not acceptable as this will significantly increase the traffic and there already is not enough street parking for homeowners guests.

I believe that the traffic impact study was incorrectly performed as it fails to consider the already over-congested traffic flow on the traffic circle of Quinte St. and Rome Cres. This is already a dangerous circle but with the proposed traffic from this development this will be unsustainable and dangerous for the children in the neighborhood. As such a simple alternative access for this development from Upper Middle would solve this issue and be consistent with townhouse development approximately 100 meters west of this proposed development which is accessed directly off Upper Middle.

The planned parking of 4 visitor spots for the 22 homes is completely insufficient and there is no room in the plan for parking on any of the roads. Georgina Court cannot be parking as there is no room and the west side of Georgina Court has a fire hydrant and cars are appropriately prohibited from parking there for safety reasons (which I fully support to protect my family and my neighbors family).

In addition the development proposes to shorten the minimum side-year setbacks, back-yard setbacks and minimum rear years. This is not in character with the rest of the neighborhood and I object to this amendment to reasonable in-place current setback standards.

---

The noise impact from traffic is so unacceptable that the developer must advise their "Purchasers/tenants are advised that despite the inclusion of noise control features in the development and within the building units, sound levels due to increasing road traffic may occasionally interfere with some activities of the dwelling occupants as the sound levels exceed the Municipality's and the Ministry of the Environment's noise criteria." So given they require this special notice the immediately surrounding homes will also be negatively impacted by this higher noise level and this is unacceptable.

From a safety perspective I also wish to object to the proposal with the private lane to the townhouses which is very dangerous as it would only take one errant visitor temporarily parking in front of the lane to delay Emergency Vehicles from accessing the homes. That could lead to additional time in the event of a fire and increase the risk of human loss of life. We cannot accept this risk and this "laneway" should be expanded in size to a full width road, accessed from Upper Middle.

The proposed densification is also inconsistent with the immediate homes on Georgina Court and Rome Cres and hence we object to this change to the fit of the neighborhood.

There is also a lack of parks for children of our neighborhood to play. I recommend the city expropriate this land at 5219 Upper Middle from the current owner and develop a neighborhood park, or provide additional park land across the street at or beside Corpus Christie High School.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Andrew Raymond, Homeowner at [REDACTED] Georgina Court Burlington Ontario**



The information in this e-mail is intended solely for the addressee(s) named, and is confidential. Any other distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited.

♻️ Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Ghazawan and Baidaa Alchi

████ Rome Crescent

Burlington, Ontario

████

To: Kyle Plas, MCIP, RPP - Senior Planner, Development Review

Burlington Planning and Building Department

PO Box 5013, 426 Brant St.,

Burlington, Ontario L7R 3Z6

May 31, 2017

**Re: Planning Applications for: 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004 – 2005 Georgina Court**

**File: 520-05/17**

Dear Mr. Plas:

We are writing with respect to the above noted planning application. We attended the public meeting held on May 23, 2017 and appreciate the information that was provided. We have further reviewed the plans and wish to object to the proposed development. We have attached a document outlining our concerns and questions as it pertains to the development, of which, we would like to highlight the following three issues listed below as our primary concerns:

1. Entrance of the planned Townhouse/Condo units on to Georgina court. The the road design as proposed parking and road infrastructure cannot support the additional vehicles. Additionally, the increased traffic is a safety concern for our kids playing outside and walking to school. The entrance of the townhouse complex should be on Upper Middle Road using existing driveway and turning lane for 5219 Upper Middle Road, reducing the traffic infiltration on local streets.
2. Proposed reductions in setbacks, lot coverage and height do not meet the zoning requirements of the Orchard community. The 3-storey townhouses with 3 metre setback will provide inadequate privacy and block out light for existing homes surrounding the proposed development. In addition, the proposed lot area of 200m<sup>2</sup> is nearly half the current allowable lot area in the Orchard. This lot size is not in keeping with the character of the existing planning Orchard community. We request setbacks align to the other developments in the community and meet the current requirements the RM3-138 zone.

3. The number of homes proposed exceeding the maximum units per hectare currently permitted. We understand the adding mid-density homes in a transportation zone is important for growth and prosperity of Burlington; however, the proposed plans appear to be pushing the number of units without taking into consideration the built form character of the adjacent community. In addition, the extent to which changes to the existing zoning by-law are being requested (parking, setbacks, heights, lot area etc) are illustrative of the inappropriate intensity of this proposed development in this local context.

When we purchased our home 5 years ago and requested information regarding Georgina Court, the City provided us details on what was anticipated (8 single family homes). This proposal is nearly three times that amount and does not remotely reflect the intent of the original plans. We understand that owners have the right to submit an application and develop the way that they see fit. We just ask that the City and the Planning department considers the original plan and support the community by approving a development that better reflects the character of the Orchard than the proposal in front of us now. We trust that you will review the proposal keeping in mind the public interest and consider the overall impact of the proposed development will have on the existing families living within the surrounding homes.

Sincerely,

**From:** Afi Aroujalian [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 02, 2017 9:20 PM  
**To:** Minaji, Rosalind  
**Cc:** Sharman, Paul  
**Subject:** Rome and Georgina Court / 5219 Upper Middle - Letter to Participate in the planning process

From: Afi Aroujalian & Babak Seyedan  
[REDACTED] Rome crescent, Burlington,  
[REDACTED]

To: Kyle Plas, MCIP, RPP - Senior Planner, Development Review  
Burlington Planning and Building Department  
PO Box 5013, 426 Brant St.,  
Burlington, Ontario L7R 3Z6

May 31, 2017

**Re: Planning Applications for: 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004 – 2005 Georgina Court**  
**File: 520-05/17**

Dear Mr. Plas:

We are writing with respect to the above noted planning application. We attended the public meeting held on May 23, 2017 and appreciate the information that was provided. We have further reviewed the plans and wish to object to the proposed development. We have attached a document outlining our concerns and questions as it pertains to the development, of which, we would like to highlight the following three issues listed below as our primary concerns:

1. Entrance of the planned Townhouse/Condo units on to Georgina court. The the road design as proposed parking and road infrastructure cannot support the additional vehicles. Additionally, the increased traffic is a safety concern for our kids playing outside and walking to school. The entrance of the townhouse complex should be on Upper Middle Road using existing driveway and turning lane for 5219 Upper Middle Road, reducing the traffic infiltration on local streets.
2. Proposed reductions in setbacks, lot coverage and height do not meet the zoning requirements of the Orchard community. The 3-storey townhouses with 3 metre setback will provide inadequate privacy and block out light for existing homes surrounding the proposed development. In addition, the proposed lot area of 200m<sup>2</sup> is nearly half the current allowable lot area in the Orchard. This lot size is not in keeping with the character of the existing planning Orchard community. We request setbacks align to the other developments in the community and meet the current requirements the RM3-138 zone.
3. The number of homes proposed exceeding the maximum units per hectare currently permitted. We understand the adding mid-density homes in a transportation zone is important for growth and prosperity of Burlington; however, the proposed plans appear to be pushing the number of units without taking into consideration the built form character of the adjacent community. In addition, the extent to which changes to the existing zoning by-law are being requested (parking, setbacks, heights, lot area etc) are illustrative of the inappropriate intensity of this proposed development in this local context.

When we purchased our home 5 years ago and requested information regarding Georgina Court, the City provided us details on what was anticipated (8 single family homes). This proposal is nearly three times that amount and does not remotely reflect the intent of the original plans. We understand that owners have the right to submit an application and develop the way that they see fit. We just ask that the City and the Planning department considers the original plan and support the community by approving a development that better reflects the character of the Orchard than the proposal in front of us now. We trust that you will review the proposal keeping in mind the public interest and consider the overall impact of the proposed development will have on the existing families living within the surrounding homes.

Sincerely,  
Afi Aroujalian

**From:** Basu, Shibaji [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 11, 2017 11:25 PM  
**To:** Emberson, Lola  
**Subject:** Planning Applications for: 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004 - 2005 Georgina Court - File: 520-05/17  
**Importance:** High

Hello Lola

This is further to my earlier communications (attached) on the above to Senior Planner Kyle Plas and Councilor Paul Sharman.

I am again saying "No" to this proposal in no unclear terms as the neighborhood, being provisioned for single detached units only, does not have the capacity to support even the revised application.

So once again request you to consider the overall impact this proposed development will have on surrounding neighborhood and the cumulative impact of such developments on the city and its future before arriving at a decision.

Thanks & Regards,  
Shibaji Basu  
[REDACTED] Quinte St.

**From:** Basu, Shibaji [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 08, 2017 9:25 PM  
**To:** Plas, Kyle  
**Cc:** Minaji, Rosalind; Sharman, Paul; 'Giovanni Stea (gstea)'  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Applications for: 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004 - 2005 Georgina Court - File: 520-05/17  
**Importance:** High

Hi Kyle

This is further to my communication below and the public meeting we had on May 23, 2017 at Corpus Christie school.

In the meeting and also in other correspondences, the proposal has been scrutinized and specific concerns around proposed design has been brought up which are all very valid points.

However, the real issue is bigger. We as a community would certainly not like that many units to come up in an area currently provisioned for single detached units only (I know I am speaking on behalf of the community but I am sure everyone's thinking the same way).

Question is, what is the city thinking? It is not just doing things as per rules and standards (I have full faith in the system that rules will be followed whether in approving the proposal or otherwise). It is going beyond and thinking about the future of the city and decide whether a construction plan is to be approved.

If this zoning by-law amendment is approved, what's next? Approving construction in green belt areas?

Once again, request you to consider the overall impact this proposed development will have on surrounding neighborhood and the cumulative impact of such developments on the city and its future.

Thanks & Regards,  
Shibaji Basu  
[REDACTED] Quinte St.

**From:** Brez, Ryan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 05, 2017 9:58 PM  
**To:** Plas, Kyle  
**Cc:** Minaji, Rosalind; Sharman, Paul; Brian.Hudson@halton.ca; 'Eunice Brez [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 5219 Upper Middle Road 2004-2005 Georgina Court Letter of Concern

Dear Mr. Plas,

I am filing this formal notice of concerns with respect to the above planning application on behalf of myself and my wife Eunice Brez and daughters Aria (4) and Evelyn (2).

I attended the public meeting held on May 23, 2017 and a community meeting held by residences of Georgina Court and Rome Crescent and we have come away with some substantial concerns to the proposed plans/application in the area of Safety & Fit. I have included in copy Paul Sharman (Councilor City Burlington) and Brian Hudson (Senior Planner Halton Region) because as an Ontario, Halton & Burlington resident and taxpayer I ask that all key stakeholders from all levels of government work collaboratively together to assess this application and make the appropriate amendments to reflect the voice and needs of their constituents.

We were drawn to "Bronte Woods in the Orchard" and Rome Crescent in 2008 as a place where we could safely & happily start a family due to its layout and infrastructure. The Orchard is a bustling family community that was built with pockets of small courts that enabled neighbor relationships to be forged & a safe environment for our kids to play and socialize on the street. The proposed plan under file: 520-05/17 we believe undermines this small court and low density community that we all bought into. Instead the current proposal is to maximize densification & developer profits through variance requests to most building size guidelines under the current zoning. As many of my fellow neighbors have pointed out the original plan was that 5 single detached homes were to complete the Rome Cres court extension known as Georgina Court.

In addition to the above 2 major areas of concern for my family are Safety & Fit.

**Safety:** We live on a child rich and friendly street in which we as a Rome Cres/Georgina Crt community pride ourselves on enabling our children to play as collective in a safe environment. I have concerns as current traffic and street parking has greatly increased in the community and our street. Changes in street parking bi-laws and increased vehicles in the community have led to safety concerns. The current court layout causes blind corners and frequent close calls with our children on our street. The current entrance to Rome Cres is a blind right onto our street and with limited street parking due to small home frontages. Cars currently line the side of the street creating increased visual blind spots and risk for all. The Planning application is proposing to increase this incoming traffic on Rome Cres by at minimum +53%, as +22 households is being proposed (currently 41 households Rome/Georgina, vs proposed 63). The developer's position (based on the public meeting) is that with just 4 able bodied visitors' parking spots, single car garages & single car driveways that this will be sufficient to accommodate the increased

traffic/vehicles. Based on common sense and first-hand knowledge of current traffic/parking habits on our street this is not viable solution. Additionally, at the public meeting it became clear that the condo road would be built so narrow that no parking in the street would be allowed for fire/safety reasons thus pushing the vehicles back onto Rome Cres. & intensifying our current safety concerns. This is a dramatic increase in traffic flow onto our "quiet" court that is simply unacceptable! Public works/EMS services to keep the street safe are also a concern. The proposal as presented at the public meeting had no solution for snow removal/disposal and the limitations of EMS vehicles entry and exit (must back out) creates an undesirable and ideal situation.

**Fit:** As I mentioned in my opening statement the "Bronte Woods in the Orchard" community was a built as pockets of courts with "like fit" homes being grouped together. Our section is entirely built with Single Detached family homes. This was a significant feature that enticed us to move to Rome Cres. vs moving to another region or city in the GTA. I believe Semi-Detached & Townhouse medium density zoning does not "Fit" with the "Low Density" street/community we bought into.

**Recommendation:** We ask that the Condo Townhouses and road entry point be reoriented off of Upper Middle Rd using existing driveway and turning lane for 5219 Upper Middle Road. This access point would ensure consistency with all other Condo Townhouse communities along Upper Middle Rd (from Burloak Drive to Guelph Line) and reduce the proposed Rome Cres traffic/densification by 34%. Additionally, we recommend that remaining land on Georgina Court be used as originally intended as 5 Single Detached homes (5 households) vs the 8 households being requested.

We trust that you will review the proposal keeping in mind the public interest and consider the overall impact of the proposed development will have on the existing families living within the surrounding homes.

Regards,

Ryan Brez

**Ryan Brez** [REDACTED]

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

From: gary-and-tracy gary-and-tracy [REDACTED]  
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2017 11:17 AM  
To: Plas, Kyle  
Subject: Rome Cres. / Georgina Court development

Good morning Mr. Plas,

My wife and I are original owners on Rome Cres. We have been fortunate to have lived here since the summer of 2003 and it has been a great street to raise our family. We have some concerns in regards to the proposed plans to develop the land adjacent to Georgina Court, which runs off of Rome Crescent. I will outline our concerns below.

When we purchased on this street over 14 years ago, we were informed that the future development of the land in question would be made up of detached homes. This new proposal is for 4 semi-detached homes and 18 town homes. We are concerned that the amount and type of dwellings being proposed will negatively affect our property value.

Also of great concern is the additional traffic that will be accessing our quiet street. The proposal as it is could increase the amount of traffic entering our street by 50% (taking into account the current number of homes on the street, averaging 2 cars/ house, plus the 22 new homes). Rome Crescent has been a wonderful, quiet street on which our kids frequently play. The closest park is a kilometre away and our small yards do not allow our kids much room to run around. Our children's safety on our street will be greatly reduced if all this traffic ends up accessing this new development from our street, not to mention the additional cars that will be parked on the street due to limited parking spaces that will be available to the new homes.

How will the city deal with snow and garbage removal for the new development? A city garbage truck will not be able to get down Georgina and be able to turn around. Where will they pile the excess snow in winter time? It was suggested at the community meeting that private garbage removal would be utilized for the townhomes. Will they pile up the garbage on Georgina until a city truck picks it up? Not only would this "solution" be unsightly, but also unsanitary. What will happen in the winter, when snow banks are high? How will garbage be dealt with then? How will an emergency vehicle access those homes if necessary?

We strongly urge you to consider routing the traffic to the new development off of Upper Middle Road. This is the best option to keep our street as safe as possible for our kids, to avoid extra traffic and parking on our street, and to (as best as possible) allow the residents of Rome Crescent to be unaffected by this new development.

We have attached a photo taken last week of our kids at play. This is an almost daily occurrence on Rome Cres, on all parts of the street. We'd like it to continue.

We appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Gary, Tracy, Quinn and Reese Creamer  
[REDACTED] Rome Cres.

June 8, 2017

Kyle Plas  
Senior Planner – Development Review  
City of Burlington

Re: Proposed Development for 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004-2005 Georgina Court

Dear Kyle,

Thank you for allowing concerned residents to participate in the process regarding the future development in our neighbourhood. Many of the concerns raised at the meeting are shared by many of us – the two main issues I have heard consistently are with respect to the road access /entry point for the condominiums (traffic concerns) and the number of buildings and as a result, the increased height of the condos. This impacts me personally as I back onto Upper Middle and am impacted by the potential of three-storey town houses behind our house.

My specific concerns are articulated below:

- **Road access / entry point for condominiums** – with 22 additional houses, that will mean up to an addition 40 cars coming and going out of our street and along Quinte. I have reviewed the traffic reports and I don't think they're realistic. At certain times of the day it is very challenging to turn left onto Upper Middle from Quinte. It can also be challenging to get onto Quinte from Rome – many cars going along Quinte believe they have the right of way and speed through the round-about. **My suggestion would be to have the entry off of Upper Middle.** This would be consistent with other townhouse developments in the area. **Has the city considered adding in a stop sign at Quinte and Rome? Has the city considered adding a traffic light at Quinte and Upper Middle?** These are the steps needed to ensure safety.
- **Height of town houses** – While the builders said that they had not decided on the design of the condos, the fact that they are asking for maximum height of 3 storeys indicates to me that there is a good chance that they will utilize that allowance. Looking at the specs of the condos, they are asking for many exceptions to the by-law and creating narrow houses – the only way to add square footage is to build up. This will directly impact our sun exposure and privacy.
- **Parking** – there is already very little parking on Rome Crescent and Quinte. Although the builders indicated that the condos have 2 parking spots each (driveway and garage), we all know that very few people actually park in their garage. Especially if they have less area in the house or yard; many

use the garage for storage. That means these cars will be parked on Rome Crescent and Quinte. My biggest concern with this is safety – a lot of children live on Rome Crescent and we can't have cars whipping around the crescent looking for a spot. Same goes on Quinte – there is no room. You would need the same structure as Sutton – with a wider street with parking along the side.

In addition – the visitor parking is not enough for 14 condos – there are really only four usable spots as one is a handicap spot. Visitors will also be looking to park on Rome Crescent – and the safety concern is greater as they won't know or respect the neighbourhood and may drive too quickly around Rome Crescent looking for a spot. There will be a lot of frustration on the part of residents and visitors. Not a good experience for anyone.

- Number of houses – the applicant is requesting relief from many specifications in the zoning by-law: min lot area, min lot width, min front yard setback, min side yard setback, min rear yard, max building height, min visitor parking. I can only assume that the reason for all of the exceptions is to fit as many houses in the area as possible. My question is what would the development look like if they had to stay within the specifications? There would still be many houses and a lot of money made for the developer – but in a more respectful way of the current and future residents. I don't see why they would be allowed to have so many concessions – I believe the rules were made for a reason and to allow so much relief would be a bad precedent and would be a slap in the face of current residents. There needs to be a balanced approach here that all parties can live with.

There are several residents already looking to move from Rome Crescent because of the potential for 22 new houses and a roadway through our street. This is very disappointing and sad to think about the families who thought they had their 'forever' home, now looking to move to another neighbourhood, school, etc. because of this development. Again, I think people would feel very different if the builder lived within the zoning specifications and had a more respectful plan.

Thank you.

Heather & Alex Finnerty

█ Rome Crescent

**From:** Frattina, Rosemary [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 25, 2017 10:27 AM  
**To:** Plas, Kyle  
**Cc:** 'Rosemary and Kris Szkodzinski'  
**Subject:** Planning Applications for: 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004 – 2005 Georgina Court

Dear Mr. Plas:

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and attended the neighborhood meeting and wish to present my concerns as identified in the attached presentation. I would appreciate them being considered when making the final decision.

My key concern is the safety of my kids, and that of other kids in the neighborhood. I strongly feel that their safety will be comprised by the increased traffic flow and parking challenges that will accompany the addition of so many more houses onto an already small street. I understand, and was aware at time of purchase, that Georgina Court would one day have additional single-family homes built to complete the design, however, access to a private condo road with an additional 14 units off of Georgina was never part of the plan and it is that aspect that presents major concern. Once built, no-one will be able to control the overspill of cars from those residents and/or their visitors onto Georgina and Rome Crescent both from a drive-by and a parking perspective. It will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the existing residents, particularly the many, many children that currently play outside on our beautiful, quaint and safe street. I really hope and would appreciate if the quality of life and safety of our children are factors you will consider when making the final decision. I think there are better ways for the builder to accomplish their build without having such a negative impact on the existing residents.

Thank you so much.  
Rosemary Frattina

[REDACTED] Rome Crescent  
[REDACTED]

**From:** Moira Leslie [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 16, 2017 10:49 AM  
**To:** Plas, Kyle  
**Subject:** RE: 5219 Upper Middle Road

In light of the future development being planned for Rome Crescent/Georgina Court/Upper Middle Road we as homeowners on Rome Crescent would like our objections on record.

Our home is on a "Crescent" which in turn has a "Court" within it, when buying into the Crescent/Court we assured ourselves of a safe environment for our children to grow and play, the crossroad of the Court and Crescent is a baseball diamond most of the year, the court is a basketball playing court, the slight hill of the Court allows for sledding in the winter, so how will any of the children on Rome or Georgina ever be able to play outdoors again if the proposed development goes through? By todays standards 22 homes will probably have 2 cars each putting a constant stream of over 40 vehicles each and every day coming and going not to mention weekend visitors, parties, Christmas etc: The access to the townhomes should and must be from Upper Middle Road.

Secondly the proposed condominium lane is so small it will also contribute to safety concerns, surely emergency vehicles will have a terrible time accessing this laneway? what of garbage collection? if there is to be a common area for the condominium residents to pool their garbage/recycle where is it to be located?

The third point we wish to address is the 3 metre set back, looking at the proposed plans the townhomes will be built within 10' of the existing homes and tower above them being 3 stories high, surely this is never acceptable to anyone, the density of this proposed development will destroy a whole community and create traffic nightmares not seen before.

Please have my points placed on record for the planning committee to address.

Kind regards  
Moira and Mitchell Leslie  
[REDACTED] Rome Crescent  
Burlington [REDACTED]

Hi Kyle,

Francesco Lo Greco  
[REDACTED] Rome Cres  
Burlington, On  
[REDACTED]

Also I would like to add there are many (about 40-50) children under the age of 10 on this Crescent and it would pose a greater danger to these children with an increased traffic flow into this crescent. Not to mention that it will diminish the value to many of our homes on our street. As no other crescent off of Quinte that have low density housing have high density homes their backyard or on the same street. As well, the plan for this three story townhouses will block 3-4 house of sun in there backyards thus the enjoyment of the home owners property. The fact is that this area was zoned for low density single detached homes and it was original done to keep the flow of housing and low traffic. I want to repeat we do not OBJECT to new single detach family homes being built here. And with the demand of single detach homes in the area they would fetch a extremely high price. New custom built homes on this court could go for 2million plus each. Rather then 14 townhouses and 8 semi detach. The original plan called for 9 single detach homes and that is what should be built.

Sent from my iPhone  
Frank Lo Greco

> On May 10, 2017, at 2:17 PM, Plas, Kyle <[Kyle.Plas@burlington.ca](mailto:Kyle.Plas@burlington.ca)> wrote:  
>  
> Good afternoon,  
>  
> Thank you for your below comments dated May 10, 2017. In order to stay notified of the file's status and to preserve your appeal rights, please submit your full mailing address.  
>  
> Your comments will be considered in the preparation of our report to the Planning & Development Committee of Council. A copy of your comments will be included in the report. Please note that the report will be posted on the City's web site.  
>  
> The City has set up the following webpage ([www.burlington.ca/5219UpperMiddle](http://www.burlington.ca/5219UpperMiddle)) which you can visit for updates on this file. Also, please note that there is a public neighbourhood meeting being held on May 23, 2017 at 7pm at Corpus Christi Secondary (Auditorium / Theatre) to provide details on this application.  
>  
> The Planning & Development Committee will hold a Public Meeting in accordance with Sections 17, 22 & 34 of the Planning Act to consider this application and you will be notified of the date and time of the Public Meeting, once details are available.  
>  
> If you have any further questions with respect to these applications, please contact me.  
>  
> Regards,

>  
> Kyle Plas MCIP, RPP  
> Senior Planner - Development  
> Planning and Building Department  
> City of Burlington  
> 426 Brant Street, PO Box 5013  
> Burlington, ON L7R 3Z6  
> t (905) 335-7600 ext. 7555  
> e [kyle.plas@burlington.ca](mailto:kyle.plas@burlington.ca)

>  
>  
> Please consider the environment before printing this email.

>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----

> From: [REDACTED]  
> Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 11:31 AM  
> To: Plas, Kyle  
> Subject: File 520-05/17 5219 UpperMiddle Rd and 2004-2005 Georgina Court

>  
> Hi Kyle,

>  
> I am writing to you as a resident of Rome Cres which backs on to your new proposal.

> I am total outraged that the city of Burlington is entertaining this proposal. I object to this on a few grounds. One our street is a quiet crescent with limited parking and with this new development you will create a mess with parking and unbelievably more traffic. The proposal of 4 parking spots and 1 disability parking spot will not be enough for all these homes, that you will allow this developer to build. Thus this will place a stress on parking on a street that already has limited street parking. Plus the fact is 22 extra homes on the court will amass to 44 more cars on a daily basis entering Rome Cres. This will create more traffic on Quinte which only has a stop sign to exit onto UpperMiddle and make Rome a through way. The original proposal back in the early 2000s suggested 9 detached homes and that is what should be built here.

> All the neighbours of Rome and Georgina will fight this proposal every step of the way and we will not allow our street to become a traffic through way. I am voicing my option and I object to this development. I hope you have a change of heart and build what should have gone there when the subdivision was proposed.

>  
> Sent from my iPhone  
> Frank Lo Greco



I have copied from the Planning Justification Report from Weston Consulting, these extracts are in italics where they are the regulatory requirements and in bold italics where they are by Weston Consulting.

My comments on the Weston Report are shown in normal font.

*Planning Justification Report*

*Report by Weston Consulting*

*7.1 Provincial Policy Statement, 2014*

***Summary: The proposed development is consistent with the PPS in relation to development efficiency, housing provisions and intensification. The subject lands are located within the urban and built-up area and the PPS supports development in such locations that have consideration for compatibility with surrounding land uses, support the efficient use of land, optimize municipal and transit infrastructure, and provide additional housing options within the community.***

***The development proposal contemplates semi-detached and townhouse type dwellings, a compatible medium-density housing form within the Orchard Community and will contribute to the provision of an increased range and mix of housing to meet future demand, as required in Section 1.4 of the PPS. Additionally, the proposal introduces moderately intensified residential uses to a site that can be better utilized through infill development within the City of Burlington urban area. The development also respects and is appropriately set back from existing residential uses. Based on the foregoing, it is our opinion, that the proposed development and applications are consistent with the PPS.***

The report does not show how the development “respects” the existing residential uses. The report indicates “appropriate” set backs from the existing residential community, however these are not as required by the Orchard Residential 2.

***The proposed development introduces an appropriate housing forms to the area at an increased density. As such, the proposed development increases the mix of housing type and density while providing housing at a more affordable market price than what currently exists.***

*Growth and Intensification Section 2.2.2 of the Growth Plan addresses managing growth and states:*

***The proposed development is located within the built-up area in the City of Burlington and is of a medium density residential form compatible with the context and character of the surrounding area.***

This obviously depends on what you define as the surrounding area. I would define the surrounding area to be that between Upper Middle Road to Blue Spruce Avenue and west of Quinte Street. That area comprises exclusively single family detached homes. High density townhouses are not compatible with the context and character of the surrounding area.

#### *7.4 Region of Halton Official Plan, 2010 (January 2016)*

*31(2) where residents take part in, and have a sense of control over, decisions that affect them*

Based on the meeting of December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2017 I do not consider that the residents feel that they have a sense of control over any decisions regarding this development.

#### *Halton's Regional Structure*

***The proposed development introduces an appropriate housing forms to the area at an increased density. As such, the proposed development increases the mix of housing type and density while providing housing at a more affordable market price than what currently exists.***

I take this to mean that the housing in the new development will be cheaper (more affordable) than the surrounding area. How is this compatible with the requirements of *Growth and Intensification Section 2.2.2 Growth and Intensification Section 2.2.2* commented on above? I.e. how is this *compatible with the context and character of the surrounding area?*

#### *7.5 City of Burlington Official Plan (Office Consolidation 2015)*

##### *7.5.2 Transportation*

***A total of 5 visitor parking spaces will be provided for the 14 townhouse block at an approximate visitor parking rate of 0.35 spaces per unit. A Traffic Brief and Parking Study has prepared by NexTrans Consulting supports this rate where the average parking rate from other municipalities is 0.29 spaces per unit.***

A resident made the interesting comment in the meeting that the townhouses have no basement, and are of a compact size. Many families accumulate large items that require storage (e.g. bikes, coolers, camping supplies). With no basement it seems reasonable to presume that these may be stored in the garage, reducing the parking available at some units to one and putting increased pressure on all parking in the area.

*The proposed development is facilitated by the extension of Georgina Court into a cul-de-sac and a private laneway for local and emergency vehicles to access the townhouse units. The cul-de-sac is proposed to be a public roadway extension of the current dead end of Georgina court and will complete the planned network for the Orchard community. In addition, a common element condominium road intended for access emergency services. The proposed laneway is appropriate as it only intends to service the townhouse units and cannot be extended as it bounded by a stormwater management pond directly to the west and is terminated by a hammerhead. The private laneway will appropriately extend the cul-de-sac to facilitate the completion of Orchard community.*

I do not know how the extension of Georgina Court into a cul-de-sac facilitates the completion of the Orchard community. If Georgina Court was developed as envisaged on the original sketch (appendix B, Georgina Court configuration), i.e. with detached single family homes, would that not also facilitate the completion of the Orchard community?

*7.5.3 Design Section 6 of the City of Burlington Official Plan provides policies on development design. It is the objective of the City of Burlington to ensure that 'the design of the built environment preserves, enhances and connects natural features and landscapes'. It is also the objective of the Plan to 'ensure the design of the built environment strengthens and enhances the character of existing distinctive locations and neighbourhoods, and that proposals for intensification and infill within the existing neighbourhoods are designed to be compatible and sympathetic to existing neighbourhood character and; to ensure consistency, compatibility and quality in the built environment while allowing for a diverse design expression'.*

*A concept plan has been submitted which takes into consideration the existing character and context of the surrounding residential area.*

I have difficulty understanding how the proposed development complies with the regulatory requirements. Interestingly this is one section where the consultant's report does not say that the proposed development complies with the relevant regulatory requirements only that it "takes into consideration" as noted above. Perhaps because the addition of compact townhouses does not **"take into consideration the existing character and context of the surrounding residential area"**.

*Design Guidelines Policies Design Guidelines policies are discussed below:*

*a) The density, form, bulk, height, setbacks, spacing and materials of development are to be compatible with its surrounding area.*

*b) The compatibility of adjacent residential and non-residential development shall be encouraged through site design and buffering measures, including landscape screening and fencing.*

***It is our opinion that the proposed development is compatible with the surrounding area in terms of density, form, bulk, height and setbacks. The proposed development at 50.3 units per net hectare is generally within the density threshold of its Medium Density Residential land use designation of 50 units per net hectare. Further, the surrounding neighbourhood is generally indicative of new single detached dwellings with a traditional architectural style and treatments of two to three storeys. Appropriate setbacks will be provided to maintain privacy, daylight penetration, and landscaping opportunities with adjacent properties.***

The proposed development requests setbacks less than the Orchard requirements. They consider the setbacks to be "appropriate" but not complying with the regulatory requirements.

The townhouses have very small rear gardens, so the land available for landscaping opportunities is very limited.

### 7.5.5 Housing Intensification

*(v) compatibility is achieved with the existing neighbourhood character in terms of scale, massing, height, siting, setbacks, coverage, parking and amenity area so that a transition between existing and proposed buildings is provided;*

*v) Compatibility is achieved as the proposed development is consistent with the existing neighbourhood character and context;*

*ix) Appropriate buffering and setbacks have been indicated on the proposed development concept in consultation with engineering consultants; x) The proposed development does not inhibit the future development of adjacent properties and provides access to the proposed Georgian Court and Rome Crescent. A Tertiary Plan has not been noted by staff as a requirement.*

Again the use of the term “appropriate” rather than complying with the regulatory requirements.

### 7.6 City of Burlington Official Plan Review

*Established Neighbourhood Areas will be intended to accommodate existing development, redevelopment and intensification opportunities which are already currently permitted through a site's Official Plan land use designation. As such, Established Neighbourhood Areas will not be considered essential towards achieving population/employment growth to 2031 and beyond.*

Is the proposed use of the area of the proposed development designated as such in the Official Plan? If it is not it would appear that it would not be considered essential and so the many references in the report to “*The proposed development will add 22 residential units which will contribute to the minimum 8,300 of new housing units to be added to the built-up area between 2015 and 2031*” would not be relevant.

### 12. Conclusion

*These lands, one of the largest remaining infill development blocks in the Orchard Community, offer the opportunity to build-out the boundaries of the residential subdivision and construct the unfinished and approved cul-de-sac at Georgina Court.*

Interestingly the US edition of the Oxford dictionaries defines a cul-de-sac as “a street or passage closed at one end”. This has been one of the major arguments by the current residents that Georgina Court is a cul-de-sac and as such it is not appropriate for the townhouses to be accessed through Georgina Court which would then not be closed at one end.

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

From: gary-and-tracy gary-and-tracy [REDACTED]  
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2017 11:26 AM  
To: Plas, Kyle  
Subject: Rome Cres. / Georgina Court development

Dear Mr. Plas,

My name is Quinn Creamer and I am 11 years old. I live at [REDACTED] Rome Cres. It's a great street to live on and play on. I have a little sister Reese, who is 3 years old. She loves to play outside with all of the little kids on our street.

Sometimes cars drive too fast on the street and don't watch out for kids playing. I'm worried that once all the new houses are built there will be even more cars on our street and my sister or her friends could get hurt. I like to play basketball and hockey in the street with all of our neighbours. I get upset when a car parks in front of my house because then I can't put my hockey net there. The park is too far away from our house and my parents can't always take us there to play. Please don't let any more cars use our street. The new houses should have their own driveway from Upper Middle Road. Us kids need a safe place to play.

From  
Quinn Creamer

**From:** E LS [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 24, 2017 12:40 AM  
**To:** Plas, Kyle  
**Subject:** Concerns RE: Georgina / Rome / proposed new development

Mr. Plas

I hope all is well with you.

I was unable to attend the meeting on Wednesday night. Both my wife and I volunteer with BOMBA -- serving as coaches for our son's Little League team.

Thus, I wanted to reach out with an email.

I was born and raised in Burlington (Centennial Drive)...moved to Toronto for 20+ yrs...and came back to Burlington just under 5 yrs ago.

Part of what brought me back to my roots was the sense of community and safety -- not just in the city overall but in the street/neighbourhood we were lucky enough to find and successfully buy a home on: Rome Cres.

I feel that the new proposed development at the base of Georgina -- just off Rome -- could have a major (negative) impact on the very foundation that motivated me to return to Burlington and to this street/area specifically.

Many neighbours who have lived here from the beginning -- some original home owners from 12+ yrs ago -- have mentioned that there has always been chatter about Georgina eventually being extended into a cul-de-sac of sorts.....with perhaps 4-5 more homes. That has always been in the back of many folks' minds.

But nobody ever fathomed having EIGHT semi-detached homes and a whopping FOURTEEN townhomes as well (plus the additional parking spaces). Furthermore, the fact that all of these homes will enter, solely, through Rome and Georgina -- with no entrance/exit off Upper Middle - - seems quite excessive and, for lack of a better term, it would seem like "false advertising" to the many families that have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in their homes to only find out that the largest investment of their lives could be hindered by a major (unexpected) development in their backyard. Literally.

However, the potential impact to our land value is only the beginning. The increased traffic will almost certainly create an increased danger to our children that play outside on our currently-quiet Crescent, and our streets/boulevards could become overrun with more parked cars (from residents and/or visitors) in this new development.

I have opted to contact you directly -- rather than 'talking' through social media or the newspapers, etc -- simply because I really don't want the public knowing exactly where I live.

I'm sure you can respect and appreciate that.

But I definitely take this matter seriously and I hope a resolution -- or at least a compromise -- can be met. I respect that the business world doesn't always work this way but I often live my life -- personally and professionally -- by my gut. Or perhaps a better analogy would be: By my nose. If something stinks...you'll know it. And this proposal doesn't smell right. It's not something anyone on Rome ever imagined when planting their roots. Myself included.

Please feel free to contact me any time. And I am going to forward a similar note to Mayor Goldring as well.

All the best.

Eric Smith

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**From:** Lori Sousa [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 08, 2017 10:19 PM  
**To:** Plas, Kyle  
**Cc:** Sharman, Paul  
**Subject:** 5219 Uppermiddle Road

To: Kyle Plas, MCIP, RPP - Senior Planner, Development Review  
Burlington Planning and Building Department  
PO Box 5013, 426 Brant St.,  
Burlington, Ontario L7R 3Z6

From resident at [REDACTED] Rome Crescent

**Re: Planning Applications for: 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004 – 2005 Georgina Court**  
**File: 520-05/17**

Dear Mr. Plas:

We are writing with respect to the above noted planning application. We attended the public meeting held on May 23, 2017 and appreciate the information that was provided. We have further reviewed the plans and wish to object to the proposed development. My primary concerns are as follows:

1. Entrance of the planned Townhouse/Condo units on to Georgina court. The the road design as proposed parking and road infrastructure cannot support the additional vehicles. Additionally, the increased traffic is a safety concern for our kids playing outside and walking to school. The entrance of the townhouse complex should be on Upper Middle Road using existing driveway and turning lane for 5219 Upper Middle Road, reducing the traffic infiltration on local streets.

2. Proposed reductions in setbacks, lot coverage and height do not meet the zoning requirements of the Orchardcommunity. The 3-storey townhouses with 3 metre setback will provide inadequate privacy and block out light for existing homes surrounding the proposed development. In addition, the proposed lot area of 200m<sup>2</sup> is nearly half the current allowable lot area in the Orchard. This lot size is not in keeping with the character of the existing planning Orchard community. We request setbacks align to the other developments in the community and meet the current requirements the RM3-138 zone.

3. The number of homes proposed exceeding the maximumunits per hectare currently permitted. We understand the adding mid-density homes in a transportation zone is important for growth and prosperity of Burlington; however, the proposed plans appear to be pushing the number of units without taking into consideration the built form character of the adjacent community. In addition, the extent to which changes to the existing zoning by-law are being requested (parking, setbacks, heights, lot area etc) are illustrative of the inappropriate intensity of this proposed development in this local context.

We just ask that the City and the Planning department considers the original plan and support the community by approving a development that better reflects the character of the Orchard than the

proposal in front of us now. We trust that you will review the proposal keeping in mind the public interest and consider the overall impact of the proposed development will have on the existing families living within the surrounding homes.

Much appreciated,

Lori and Denny Sousa [REDACTED] Rome crescent

From: Giovanni Stea and Angela Stea

█ Georgina Court

Burlington, Ontario

█

To: Kyle Plas, MCIP, RPP - Senior Planner, Development Review

Burlington Planning and Building Department

PO Box 5013, 426 Brant St.,

Burlington, Ontario L7R 3Z6

May 31, 2017

**Re: Planning Applications for: 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004 – 2005 Georgina Court**  
**File: 520-05/17**

Dear Mr. Plas:

We are writing with respect to the above noted planning application. We attended the public meeting held on May 23, 2017 and appreciate the information that was provided. We have further reviewed the plans and wish to object to the proposed development. We have attached a document outlining our concerns and questions as it pertains to the development, of which, we would like to highlight the following three issues listed below as our primary concerns:

1. Entrance of the planned Townhouse/Condo units on to Georgina court. The the road design as proposed parking and road infrastructure cannot support the additional vehicles. Additionally, the increased traffic is a safety concern for our kids playing outside and walking to school. The entrance of the townhouse complex should be on Upper Middle Road using existing driveway and turning lane for 5219 Upper Middle Road, reducing the traffic infiltration on local streets.
2. Proposed reductions in setbacks, lot coverage and height do not meet the zoning requirements of the Orchard community. The 3-storey townhouses with 3 metre setback will provide inadequate privacy and block out light for existing homes surrounding the proposed development. In addition, the proposed lot area of 200m<sup>2</sup> is nearly half the current allowable lot area in the Orchard. This lot size is not in keeping with the character of the existing planning Orchard community. We request setbacks align to the other developments in the community and meet the current requirements the RM3-138 zone.

3. The number of homes proposed exceeding the maximum units per hectare currently permitted. We understand the adding mid-density homes in a transportation zone is important for growth and prosperity of Burlington; however, the proposed plans appear to be pushing the number of units without taking into consideration the built form character of the adjacent community. In addition, the extent to which changes to the existing zoning by-law are being requested (parking, setbacks, heights, lot area etc) are illustrative of the inappropriate intensity of this proposed development in this local context.

When we purchased our home 5 years ago and requested information regarding Georgina Court, the City provided us details on what was anticipated (8 single family homes). This proposal is nearly three times that amount and does not remotely reflect the intent of the original plans. We understand that owners have the right to submit an application and develop the way that they see fit. We just ask that the City and the Planning department considers the original plan and support the community by approving a development that better reflects the character of the Orchard than the proposal in front of us now. We trust that you will review the proposal keeping in mind the public interest and consider the overall impact of the proposed development will have on the existing families living within the surrounding homes.

Sincerely,  
Giovanni and Angela Stea

# Questions to Address

- What is the definition of compatible built form?
- How does a cul-de-sac turn into a condo road consists of compatible form?
- How do semi-detached set backs fit into detach dwellings?
- How will emergency services access/turning radius survey?
- How does the parking spaces protect the visual integrity of the existing trail system?
- How do you determine 5 (incl. 1 handicap parking) visitor spots is sufficient for 14 townhomes? (city plan suggest 7 based on # of units)
- Where will visitors from Georgina court park?
- Have fire/emergency services reviewed and commented on the proposal

# Questions to address

Are you plan to have garbage disposal and what will be used (i.e. garbage bins)?

Is it the street scape appearance backyard to upper middle?

What is the definition of appropriate transition? (elaborate on example given in neighborhood “gradual transition” and “neighboring single residence”)

Does OSCP indicate you must have higher density homes along a transportation corridor?

Are proposed homes entry on Georgina cul-de sac a “dead end street”?

Are there a cross-section that shows the heights of the proposed TH and the heights of the existing single family homes on Rome and Georgina?

# Questions to address

How is a private laneway acceptable within a cul-de-sac?

Explain what is being done for “adequate privacy”?

How is the proposed residential development “constant with the established character of the immediate area” ?

What are the set backs required between a low and high density?

What is the density of proposed development when the road-widening, cul-de-sac and other road is removed from the calculation (What is the net density?)

What is the cross-section between existing homes and proposed development? Heights of 3 storey towns may be perceived as taller because of changes in grade.

# Concerns

is a secondary Plan, prior to purchase of real-estate, the city advised a single dwelling unit development was in place on Georgina Court.

Termination of cul-de-sac is unacceptable. Homes were purchased under a pretense.

Construction of 22 unit build

Construction? – request construction mitigation plan)

Cul-de-sac does not provide appropriate termination with entrance (private road) to.

Visitor parking spots for 14 added town houses. Increase of cars parked on streets (Rome, Quinte, Georgina) if private road built.

Private road used as short cut from Upper Middle onto Georgina and surrounding streets

Loss of continuity and appeal with 3 types of building forms

Urban design of townhouse – towns to front onto rears of other towns – poor quality design

# Concerns

Upper Middle - out of character, poor urban design and poor CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) very unsafe for residents and students walking to school - there will be no 'eyes' on the street for that section of Upper Middle

Witnessed close calls with traffic circles those entering circle with both Rome and Scotia (private road access to Georgina will increase traffic)

Traffic in the morning is already excessive (Quinte to Upper Middle) adding a potential 22 house holds (i.e. 44 cars)

With having so many homes in such a confined area increases volume of cars, adding to frustration in the driving conditions, in turn compromising the safety of pedestrians (young children in neighborhood and students walking to the high school)

# Concerns

Towering town homes invade privacy of those backing onto homes (backyards) on Rome Cres & Quinte.

Natural lighting impact on homes backing onto potential 3 story townhomes development

3 meter set back invading privacy and inconsistent with neighborhood

Traffic Analysis done on February 23rd a record breaking weather day of 15 degrees on the tail end of family day weekend (Feb 20th) - no traffic analysis looked at the intersection of Upper Middle and Quinte and the directional traffic along upper middle the analysis of traffic patterns was purely Rome Cr and Georgina Cr, as well as Quinte and Rome

Traffic and children safety. Currently no stop sign at Rome and and Georgina court. Adding additional congestion to a blind corner.

Environmental concerns – drainage, flooding, increase impact to the retention pond. Large 70 year old tree providing landscape view.

Snow removal – where would the snow pile up, how can they get around?

Remove private road entrance of Townhouse to Georgina court and have all access points from Upper Middle. Replace Semi Detached Dwellings with Single Detached. Similar to the townhouse development west of the site

2 story townhomes - This is a two-storey community with mixed use at major intersections, this 3 storey development cannot be considered compatible with surround developments

Keep setback, lot sizes and other development criteria in keeping with RO2 development standards – this will likely reduce the amount of units that can be crammed into the site, and the reduction in units will reduce the visitors parking requirements and traffic impacts on our local roads and community services

We would like our councilor to request the planning division put together a working group to improve this proposal so that it is more in keeping with the intent of the Orchard Secondary Plan and supportable by the community

# Discussion

Richard Rumas and Heather Swietek

[REDACTED]  
Burlington, Ontario  
L7L 7B7

June 7, 2017

Kyle Plas, MCIP, RPP - Senior Planner, Development Review  
Burlington Planning and Building Department  
PO Box 5013, 426 Brant St.,  
Burlington, Ontario L7R 3Z6

**Re: Planning Applications for: 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004 – 2005 Georgina Court**  
**File: 520-05/17**

Dear Mr. Plas:

We are writing with respect to the above noted planning application. We attended the public meeting held on May 23, 2017 and appreciate the information that was provided. We have further reviewed the plans and wish to raise objections to the proposed development. Our main concerns are as follows:

1. **Entrance of the subdivision via Rome Crescent and Georgina Court.** Our crescent is home to several young families with small children. The increased traffic of approximately 44 more cars will put these children at risk while playing and walking to school. We believe the entrance to the new development should be accessed via the existing driveway and turning lane for 5219 Upper Middle Road.
2. **Insufficient visitors parking in the Condominium Corporation.** Due to the insufficient number of visitor parking spaces allotted in the proposed condominium corporation our already clogged streets (Rome Crescent and Georgina Court) will become severely clogged. We have lived on Rome Crescent for 6 years and not one day has gone by where the parking spot in front of our house is not occupied. Visitors to our home already have to park several home away and sometimes around the corner as residents and guests of Rome Crescent and Georgina Court are already parking in the available street parking.
3. **Proposed reductions in setbacks, lot coverage and height do not meet the zoning requirements of the Orchard community.** The 3-storey townhouses with 3 metre

setback will provide inadequate privacy and block out light for existing homes surrounding the proposed development. In addition, the proposed lot area of 200m<sup>2</sup> is nearly half the current allowable lot area in the Orchard. This lot size is not in keeping with the character of the existing planning Orchard community. We request setbacks align to the other developments in the community and meet the current requirements the RM3-138 zone.

4. **The number of homes proposed exceeding the maximum units per hectare currently permitted.** We understand the adding mid-density homes in a transportation zone is important for growth and prosperity of Burlington; however, the proposed plans appear to be pushing the number of units without taking into consideration the built form character of the adjacent community. In addition, the extent to which changes to the existing zoning by-law are being requested (parking, setbacks, heights, lot area etc) are illustrative of the inappropriate intensity of this proposed development in this local context.

We are not opposed to the development in its entirety and we welcome the changes happening in our subdivision and City. We would just like to ensure the safety of the children and residents of Rome Crescent and Georgina Court. We request that you take our concerns into consideration for modification to the above noted planning application.

Yours truly,  
Richard Rumas and Heather Swietek

From: Janusz and Agnieszka Szczepaniak

████ Rome Crescent

Burlington, Ontario

████

To: Kyle Plas, MCIP, RPP - Senior Planner, Development Review

Burlington Planning and Building Department

PO Box 5013, 426 Brant St.,

Burlington, Ontario L7R 3Z6

June 5, 2017

**Re: Planning Applications for: 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004 – 2005 Georgina Court**  
**File: 520-05/17**

Dear Mr. Plas:

We this letter we are providing you with the list of concerns and questions as they pertain to the proposed above development.

1. Entrance of the planned Townhouse/Condo units on to Georgina court. The the road design as proposed parking and road infrastructure cannot support the additional vehicles. Additionally, the increased traffic is a safety concern for our kids playing outside and walking to school. The entrance of the townhouse complex should be on Upper Middle Road using existing driveway and turning lane for 5219 Upper Middle Road, reducing the traffic infiltration on local streets.
2. Proposed reductions in setbacks, lot coverage and height do not meet the zoning requirements of the Orchard community. The 3-storey townhouses with 3 metre setback will provide inadequate privacy and block out light for existing homes surrounding the proposed development. In addition, the proposed lot area of 200m<sup>2</sup> is nearly half the current allowable lot area in the Orchard. This lot size is not in keeping with the character of the existing planning Orchard community. We request setbacks align to the other developments in the community and meet the current requirements the RM3-138 zone.
3. The number of homes proposed exceeding the maximum units per hectare currently permitted. We understand the adding mid-density homes in a transportation zone is important for growth and prosperity of Burlington; however, the proposed plans appear to be pushing the number of units without taking into consideration the built form character of the adjacent community. In addition, the extent to which changes to the existing zoning by-law are being

requested (parking, setbacks, heights, lot area etc) are illustrative of the inappropriate intensity of this proposed development in this local context.

4. Our greatest concern is the increased traffic in already busy neighborhood creating unsafe environment for the walking and playing children and increased pollution. As noted above the number of available parking places is inadequate for a number of units in the proposed new development. This will force the new occupants and their guests to use existing parking places on Georgina Court and Rome Crescent. One solution to this problem would be the return of 3 hour parking limit on both roads and no overnight parking.

Regards,

Janusz and Agnieszka Szczepaniak

**From:** Allen Teska [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 10, 2017 11:29 PM  
**To:** Plas, Kyle  
**Cc:** allen.teska  
**Subject:** [REDACTED] Rome Crescent Concerns on Proposed Development and Ask

Hello Kyle:

Thank you for taking the time to reach out to our community about the new development.

Since we moved in it has always been clear to me and many of the community that the land currently under proposal was eventually going to be developed into homes and potentially town homes. I understand the developers requests and their analysis and i want to share my thoughts and concerns. I would ask as follows in terms of consideration.

Reorientation of Townhouse development - i would love the developers to consider running the private road from the already created access point off Upper middle and not off Georgina Court to support traffic density.

If the townhouse is not re-oriented - further traffic analysis on traffic patterns at Quinte and Upper Middle should be made as the lack of a traffic light or traffic support south off quinte can cause some challenges for those looking to turn onto upper middle or quinte as this is one of 2 main arteries into the neighbourhood (Quinte being the other)

Construction Traffic: i would hope that consideration for construction traffic is made from Upper middle directly into the development through the already created access point that currently resides on the single dwelling property and not up Quinte.

Further Parking Consideration - the inability for visitor parking on Quinte causes additional visitor parking concerns regularly on Rome Crescent and the current support for visitors i

believe is under estimated in the current analysis plus it is reduced from 7 to 5 spots with the new townhouse structure

Further analysis into the impact on the local schools and the anticipated number of children these new dwelling will add to the current Orchard park and St Elizabeth Seton school, as our neighbourhood was already re-zoned for density purposes 5 years ago and I believe with this development I would hope there is no impact on the school zones currently in place.

Overall i am very sure that more research will be done by the city to insure traffic pattern and parking analysis and school zoning is revisited but i had the following concerns about the current reports.

The traffic analysis submitted was done the week of family day (feb 23rd Thursday - Feb 20th the monday was family day) and on a day that was unseasonably warm and pleasant temperatures (record breaking 16degrees in February according to the web). Traditionally these short weeks are lighter as more holiday are used in to tie in the extra day for families who look to take a week off and extend a vacation especially with the local high school Corpus Christi starting their second semester at that time . I would love to see further traffic analysis used to assess traffic flow in a busier traffic time, as well as look into traffic flow at the south end of Quinte at Upper middle where congestion is usually a factor due to the amount of traffic off upper middle.

I do have concerns for parking on the street as the street of Rome without additional parking on the end of

Rome which is often full will push parking up the street where it is already tight, and as a result there will definitely be future parking constraints.

I am concerned about the construction traffic on the street and how it will impact the young families currently on the street that have a current preference to play in the street vs the back yard, this is a very nice social construct associated with our neighbourhood that will be lost with any construction traffic and vehicle associated with construction idling on Rome and Georgina.

I am filing this formal notice on behalf of myself and my wife Lara Hinton and sons Charlie (3) and Gabriel (3 weeks) who would like to be on public record stating that more research on the above mentioned concerned should be done before a final decision on the orientation and access points of the new townhouse property is made. Please take this email as our formal opposition to the plans.

Thank you for your time, consideration and openness to dialogue

Allen

**From:** Rutherford, Kevin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 15, 2018 3:17 PM  
**To:** McInnes, Suzanne  
**Subject:** Question about Proposed Development on Georgina Court

Good afternoon Suzanne,

My wife and I moved into [REDACTED] Georgina Court last week and I wanted to see if there was any approvals or final designs for the new homes beside our house?

We are new to Burlington and being new in our home we didn't attend any of the neighborhood meetings but I was reviewing the information over lunch today and noticed in the revised conceptual site plan that the sidewalk for the street was being moved from where it currently sits on the west side of the street to our side on the east. I was hoping you could confirm if this is the final layout or if there and option to leave the sidewalk in its current location?

Kevin Rutherford

# NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING COMMENT SHEET

Subject: Zoning By-law Amendment Application  
Address: 5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004-2005 Georgina Court  
Files: 520-05/17

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

① access from upper middle only  
not Georgina Court

② condominium lane is too narrow so  
dangerous for fire access + snow removal  
if one visitor parks illegally on  
the lane then fire risk

③ Need a park for children's play as  
we now have to play on the street

④ new traffic study for quiet + round  
circle (report)



YOUNG PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
4255 Kane Crescent  
Burlington, Ontario L7M 5C2  
Tel: 905-319-1232 Fax: 905-319-1560  
E-mail: ron@rmy.ca

---

May 24, 2017

City Of Burlington  
426 Brant Street  
Burlington, ON L7R 3Z6

Attention: Mr. Kyle Plas. MCIP, RPP  
Senior Planner  
Development Review  
Planning & Building Department

Dear Kyle:

Re: **Proposed Rezoning & Site Plan Applications For Upper Middle Road Enclave Inc.  
5219 Upper Middle Road & 2004-2005 Georgina Court  
City File: 520-05/17**

---

Further to the May 23, 2017 Neighbourhood Meeting, this letter has been submitted on behalf of the Orchard Community East Master Servicing Cost Sharing Agreement ( OCEMSCSA ) Group regarding their concerns regarding the above noted development application. As a result, please be advised that the OCEMSCSA Group has no objections to the development application subject to the following development condition being incorporated into the conditions of rezoning approval;

**“Prior to the approval of any engineering drawings, enter into a Master Servicing Agreement with other landowners in the Orchard Community which would include, among other things, an agreement to construct roads, infrastructure and stormwater management facilities and external servicing as well as provision for cost sharing and construction.”**

Should you have any questions regarding the comments outlined herein, give me a call. In addition, it would be greatly appreciated if you could keep me advised of the on-going status of the subject development application.

Yours truly,

R.M. Young, P. Eng.

Cc: All OCEMSCSA Group Members  
B. Lipson, Torkin Manes  
N. Zamperin, Torkin Manes