

Additional Comments Received		
Pamela Reed 5255 Lakeshore Rd, Burlington L7L 5X9	March 20, 2019	<p>I received the notice about a scheduled meeting about the reconstruction of the Lakeside Plaza.</p> <p>I will be unable to attend but would like to express my dismay about the number of high rise buildings proposed and the excessive height of these buildings.</p> <p>I do feel this plaza needs an update but this proposal seems extreme for a property this size.</p> <p>I hope the council will curtail both the number of buildings and the height, perhaps something more in line with the other condo buildings in the</p>
Giselle Whyte 5255 Lakeshore Rd. Burlington, ON L7L 5X6	March 29, 2019	<p>I am forwarding this email to you as suggested to me by Jeremy Skinner. Recently, he distributed a flyer / information sheet to residents in the neighbourhood of Lakeside Plaza. I responded to his ideas with the email that you see below. In your capacity as City Planner, I strongly hope that the comments I made and the concerns that I raised will be taken into serious consideration before the green light is given to the proposed redevelopment project of Lakeside Plaza.</p> <p>In advance, I thank you for your thorough attention to this serious matter.</p> <p>Jeremy-</p> <p>Thank you for the information sheet that you have prepared and distributed in my neighbourhood, specifically Newport Village (5255 Lakeshore Rd) recently.</p> <p>I have perused the websites that you included in your flyer and found the information both informative and, in many cases, concerning. You have addressed these concerns in the 13 conditions that you listed - conditions that will be addressed in your delegation's script and presentation at the Council Chambers at Burlington City Hall on April 9, 2019.</p> <p>Like all of the public comments summarized in Appendix D of the City Staff presentation, I am most concerned with the density of this project and the ensuing problems that this will create. When I drive to our city's core and see the monstrosity of</p>

		<p>sky high developments at the base of Brant, John and Elizabeth Streets with more coming at Martha, I am appalled that this has been allowed to occur. This concrete jungle of towers is the exact experience we should try to avoid with our Lakeside Plaza redevelopment project. Let's not replicate the "eyesore" that we have downtown for the sake of development and modernization of this part of our beautiful city.</p> <p>I concur that a redevelopment is much needed to give this area a long overdue make-over but not at the expense of what has / is occurring in downtown Burlington. I fully support your Condition #3 which is the swapping of the higher towers with the lower rise ones. First of all, we do not need 18 story buildings at all in ANY of the 5 phases. There is no reason why these high rise structures need to exceed 10 stories. The shading aspect is a serious fallout of towering structures. I see this with the darkness that has been created at the base of Brant Street. This will happen in Lakeside Plaza as well with the higher structures overshadowing the smaller buildings behind them. Swapping them as you have suggested would mitigate the shading concern to some extent all the while providing better street frontage for the commercial units which would otherwise be hidden from view along Lakeshore Road, the main artery.</p> <p>I would also suggest that through a simplification of the plans we could reduce the number of phases through which this redevelopment will be completed. I dread the noise, the traffic disruption, the dirt and dust that will be the norm in this area during the prolonged 5 phase construction. I do not know the proposed timelines for each phase but complex and involved construction such as this is never completed on time.</p> <p>With a great deal of public input all of which seem to raise the same concerns, I wonder how much consideration will be given to them. Or will the current plans continue as is, totally disregarding the valid concerns and excellent suggestions provided by so many area residents. I hope that the input and feedback requested and provided will not have been provided in vain.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Given that you only have 10 minutes allotted for your presentation, perhaps more emphasis could be placed on items 1, 2, 3, and 12 as these seem to be the issues and concerns that consistently were identified by local residents.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to provide input and also for your initiative in meeting with the Planning and Development Committee on April 9.</p>
Sandra Hughes	April 8, 2019	<p>I will not be able to come to the city hall on April 9 . It is late and I do not like to go out to different areas at night.</p> <p>I have a couple of concerns.</p> <p>It sounds like Food Basic grocery store is staying which is good.</p> <p>I just hope that shoppers drug store and Tim Horton's is also staying.</p> <p>There is a lot of seniors along the lakeshore.</p> <p>There is sun rise and Chartwell lakeshore.</p> <p>I know that the seniors walk over to the mall.</p> <p>Looking at the picture it looks like the seniors would have to walk further than they may be able to.</p> <p>It would take away their independence.</p> <p>There is also a lot of people that also uses these three stores.</p> <p>When the towers go up I hope they are making parking available underground for them.</p> <p>Maybe the towers should only be 5 floors high by the lakeshore and 11 floors in the back towers.</p> <p>The traffic is bad enough now.</p> <p>I hope you leave a lot of parking for the stores like they have now.</p>
Chris Kenaszchuk	April 9, 2019	<p>This is a comment about the proposed redevelopment of the property at 5353 Lakeshore Road. I reside at 5220 Lakeshore Road, which is very close to 5353 Lakeshore. I am opposed to the applicant's plan. I think it is too big. Also, I do not believe that the site currently functions so badly as a retail/commercial property that it must necessarily experience the kind of massive redevelopment the applicant has proposed. In fact</p>

	<p>I think the property could be enhanced simply by asking the owner to replace the parking lot asphalt, repaint the parking space lines, and install some vegetation islands on the parking surface. That's all; nothing more.</p> <p>These are my objections.</p> <p>[1] I am concerned about the project's density and scale. In the applicant's Planning Justification Report for the property, in the Executive Summary, the project's overall density is given as 235 residential units per site hectare.</p> <p>The City of Hamilton has published a document titled, "Residential Intensification Guide." The guide describes Hamilton's residential areas based on the density of residential units in an area. I was unable to find a similar document published about Burlington. Consequently I think Hamilton's guide can be used for my objective of providing context for the applicant's plan.</p> <p>On page 12 in the Hamilton guide, Downtown Density is described as having 300–335 residential units per hectare. The applicant for 5353 Lakeshore Road proposed a density of 235 units per hectare. The proposed 235 units per hectare is 78% of the lower figure of 300 units per hectare that Hamilton discussed for its downtown density in the guide. And the proposed density of 235 units is 70% of the upper figure of 335 units used in Hamilton's guide.</p> <p>The residential density proposed for 5353 Lakeshore is very close to Hamilton's target for downtown residential density; it is between 70% and 78% of the downtown density target established in Hamilton. However the property at 5353 Lakeshore Road is a long way away from downtown anywhere, whether it be Hamilton or Burlington. It is certainly not downtown Burlington.</p> <p>I do not understand why the applicant proposed a density that is more appropriate for a city's downtown region than for one of its established residential neighbourhoods like the one around 5353 Lakeshore that is substantially – if not entirely – already built out.</p>
--	---

		<p>For your interest I have reproduced the residential density targets provided for other kinds of developments in Hamilton's guide:</p> <p>Street corridors "are the principal, higher order streets (i.e. arterial roads) within Hamilton that are intended to move larger volumes of traffic throughout the City." Density target: 95–110 units per gross hectare.</p> <p>Community nodes "are higher density concentrations of land uses, either existing or planned, that are located outside of the Downtown." Density target: 50–65 units per gross hectare.</p> <p>Established residential neighbourhoods "in Hamilton are generally the areas bounded by primary streets in the City, which are predominately built out." Density: 70 units per gross hectare.</p> <p>Former non-residential sites "such as commercial plazas, industrial sites, or vacant school sites can sometimes be converted to or redeveloped for residential use." Density target: 135–165 units per gross hectare.</p> <p>The property at 5353 Lakeshore would be a former non-residential site if the applicant carries out its plan. In Hamilton the residential density target for a former non-residential site is 135–165 units per gross hectare. The density proposed for 5353 Lakeshore is 235 units per hectare. This is between 42% and 74% greater than the density target for former non-residential sites discussed in Hamilton's guide. I think the proposed density for 5353 Lakeshore is enormously greater than one that any person should reasonably contemplate for the property and surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>[2] I am concerned about lack of affordable housing in Burlington. Halton Region estimates the approximate purchase price for townhouse and condominium dwellings that would meet its definition of "affordable." In 2017 Halton's estimated affordable sale price was \$362,950. In 2019 dollars this price would be about \$376,000.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>On April 8, 2019, there were six condominium units listed for sale on the web site www.realtor.ca, that were very close to 5353 Lakeshore Road, and located in the City of Burlington. The units were at 5340 Lakeshore Road, 5280 Lakeshore Road, and 5250 Lakeshore Road. They were all 2-bedroom units.</p> <p>5340 Lakeshore is directly across the street from 5353 Lakeshore Road. The unit for sale was offered at \$1,649,000.</p> <p>5280 Lakeshore is 200 meters west of 5353 Lakeshore Road. It had two units offered for sale at \$569,000, and \$579,900.</p> <p>5250 Lakeshore is 250 meters west of 5353 Lakeshore Road. It had three units offered for sale at \$499,900, \$539,900, and \$649,900.</p> <p>All of these units were offered at prices considerably greater than Halton's affordable price target of \$376,000. The listed prices were between \$123,000 and \$1.27 million greater than Halton's affordable sale price target. In percentage terms the prices were between 33% and 438% greater than Halton's affordable price target.</p> <p>If a new residential condominium unit was constructed and offered for sale today at 5353 Lakeshore Road, in order to be affordable in accordance with Halton's target, the new unit's list price would have to be 33% below the lowest listed price of nearby condominium units being offered for sale today, i.e., the unit at 5250 Lakeshore Road listed for \$499,900. I find it difficult to believe that even one single, newly-constructed residential unit at 5353 Lakeshore Road would voluntarily be offered for sale at Halton's affordable price target.</p> <p>To the best of my knowledge the applicant did not propose to provide any affordable housing units on the property. Is the applicant willing to provide a significant number of affordable residential dwellings? I hope so. And if so then I would like the City of Burlington to require the applicant to provide detailed and legally enforceable plans to provide affordable housing in an amended proposal.</p>
--	--

Irene Mellon	April 9, 2019	<p>I regret not being able to attend the council meeting on April 9 re Lakeside Plaza but would like to express my concerns.</p> <p>I live and work by the plaza and have spoken with many neighbours and customers. Everyone is excited about a rejuvenation of this tired, neglected plaza but without exception everyone agrees that the height limit should be restricted to mid-rise buildings.</p>