

#	Name, Address & Date Received	Comments
1.	<p>Greg Casson</p> <p>1081 St. Matthews Ave.</p> <p>Feb. 19, 2019</p>	<p>Lauren;</p> <p>I reside on St. Matthews Ave and would like some additional information regarding the application to develop 1085 Clearview Ave. and 1082, 1086 & 1090 St. Matthews Ave.</p> <p>I have attended a community meeting and reviewed the supporting documents available online through the City's website regarding the proposed development.</p> <p>I have been lead to understand that the "Landscape Strip" (Site Plan drawing, page A1.1) along the east, south and west sides of the development are to be just 3 ft / 36"s wide, with no fencing of any sort and the landscaping itself is to be determined at a later date. Is this correct?</p> <p>Regarding the east side driveway into the proposed development from Masonry Crt....it appears on the Site Plan drawing, page A1.1, that the driveway is only separated from the west edge of St. Matthews Ave., by the "Landscape Strip". How is this permissible? Is there not a set distance (dictated by the cities or the Region of Halton's bylaws) back from the roadways (St. Matthews Ave) edge that must be abided by? Is there no consideration given in the approval process regarding snow fall in the winter and where and how it will accumulate during the plowing process? I would suggest that if there is only 3 ft / 36" separating the driveway from St. Matthews Ave., that during snow plowing, of the driveway (presumably by private contractors on behalf of the building) and St. Matthews Ave by the City, that 3 ft / 36" is insufficient and will result in spillage of snow back and forth between the driveway and the street and vise versa.</p> <p>I have the same question and concern regarding the west side of the proposed development as it related to Clearview Ave. How is such a small space, "Landscape Strip", permissible?</p> <p>Regarding the shadow(s) that will be cast by the proposed building....are there no provincial rules or regulations that pertain to shadows and their effect on existing surrounding family dwellings?</p> <p>Lastly, how does the re-examination of the policies of the official plan impact this proposed development and the proposals time lines?</p>

		<p>Thank you in advance for responding to my inquires.</p> <p>I look forward to hear back from you.</p> <p>Greg Casson</p>
2.	<p>Jill and Greg Casson</p> <p>1081 St. Matthews Ave.</p> <p>Feb. 20, 2019</p>	<p>Lauren:</p> <p>Thank you for getting back to me and providing the answers to my questions / concerns.</p> <p>By way of follow up to the size of the landscape strip area and buffer, can you directed me to where in the development application supporting documents the developer provides the rationale or justification for such a drastic reduction in size, from the presently required 4.5m to less then 1m, of the buffer area.</p> <p>To add to the concerns I have previously stated in regards to the size of the buffer area being less then 1m in width. A 1m's width buffer area, essentially a sidewalks width, abutting St. Matthews Ave and Clearview Ave is unsafe and insufficient in size to grow anything but very minimal, low height vegetation. Trees, of any sort, to be used to landscape the property edge and provide some privacy, may survive in the short term but long term growth is not sustainable in such a small area. Snow clearing during the winter will further reduce the survivability of any vegetation planted in such a small area. A 1m width buffer is not in keeping with the present environmental design of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>After having attended community meeting(s) and reviewing the development application supporting documents, my wife, Jill and I are strongly opposed to the applicants proposal as it stands on the following grounds;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient buffer area along the east and west side of the development. We can see no rationale or justification for reducing the size of the buffer area from the presently required (Zoning By-Law) 4.5m to less then 1m other then it allows the developer to have a bigger footprint on the property therefore increasing the size of the development thus making it more profitable for the developer to develop the property. - The development size, six story building with drastically reduced buffer area to the east and west does not fit into the neighbourhood. - A drastically reduced buffer area raises safety and privacy concerns for the occupants living in homes on St. Matthews Ave and Clearview Ave and users (vehicles and pedestrians) of both

		<p>streets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A six storey building with no viable area to plant trees (that will survive and thrive in the long term) reduces the privacy presently afforded the homes located in close proximity to the development. - The shadow cast by a six storey building in the winter months will negatively affect the homes located in close proximity of the development, raising heating and hydro costs during the winter months for the home owners.
<p>3.</p>	<p>Peter and Anne-Marie Campbell</p> <p>1040 Clearview Ave.</p> <p>Feb. 25, 2019</p>	<p>Dear Lauren,</p> <p>This letter would be in response to the developers proposal for a 6 storey residential apartment building at the noted location. When the property was first purchased by Liv Communities, a new home builder and a division of Lanmark Homes, the area residents were originally led to believe this would be a Townhouse infill project, not this, now proposed, high density condo development. While not ideal, as all homes in this subdivision are zoned single family residences, it certainly was a better option to a condo tower. This is a relatively small piece of property for the area at .6 hectares (1 ½ acres) , as most of the properties in this original subdivision were all single family homes on 1/2 acre lots. This property has wide frontage along Masonry Crt. but is not very deep. While the prospect of a 6 storey condo is not totally unreasonable , given the properties location within a couple hundred meters of the Aldershot GO, the high density and all the proposed bylaw changes are, and for that reason this build should not be approved as it is submitted.</p> <p>In order for this build to happen, the entire property would need to be excavated, as the underground garage walls extend all the way to the property lines. This leads to a multitude of issues in logistics of how this build would be undertaken. I can only imagine that it will be a mess, much like the Affinity Condos on Plains Rd. that, required the entire property to be excavated. To that end, the city closed the sidewalks and boulevard on the South side of Plains Road in November of 2017 until completion. This was the quote from Ward 1 councilor at the time, for the City of Burlington’s actions and appeared in the Ward 1 newsletter when they had so many complaints : “An unfortunate but necessary closure of the sidewalk and boulevard to allow the Condo build to dig the parking because they do not have enough room on their property for materials “. Unfortunate yes, necessary no, if the City should not have allowed this type of build in the first place and the exact same problems will happen here. Just a few of the issues that come</p>

		<p>to mind would be :</p> <p>Where would the site offices be located? No room on the property for large equipment. Where would the construction personnel park? The overflow from the Aldershot Go already extends to the entire length of Masonry Court. There is absolutely no additional parking. Excavation and shoring on the South side are immediately adjacent to private residence structures. How would materials be delivered to, and stored at, this site. This build is over intensification, no greenspace, only a very minimal amenity area, entire surface area of the property is a very long and skinny building and all asphalt. The drop off area is at the back of the building adjacent to two residential properties, 1077 Clearview Ave and 1078 St. Matthews Ave. , with a lot of above ground parking and only a sliver of landscape divide. Totally unacceptable.</p> <p>This application and all the requests for variances needs to be REJECTED in it's present form in order to maintain the integrity of the established R2-1 zoned single family neighbourhood. Front setback reduction from 7.5m to 2m . - NO Increase density from 75units /hectare to 257 units /hectare. - NO Reduction of amenity area, ie. green space, from 4660 m2 to 2458 m2. - NO Reduction in landscape width along Clearview, Masonry And ST. Matthews from 4.5 m to 1m, 0m & 1.5m respectively. - NO Reduction of landscape buffers abutting R2 zone from 6m to 1.5m. - NO Extension of below grade parking structure. - NO Reduction of 259 parking spaces to 202. – NO and actually ALL parking to be underground, ie., no surface parking allowed.</p> <p>Best Regards,</p> <p>Peter and Anne-Marie Campbell 1040 Clearview Ave.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Sharron Hughes 1084 Clearview Ave. February 26, 2019</p>	<p>Dear Ms Vraets,</p> <p>I would like to state that I'm against the rezoning of the above properties to allow a 6 storey residential apartment building to be developed.</p> <p>When my husband and I moved to 1084 Clearview Ave in 2011 it was because of the appeal of a quiet dead-end street across from a church and to-date the community has been just that. Family friend, quiet neighborhood.</p>

		<p>I understand that Aldershot is growing. I can see the extensive development happening all along Plains Road and Masonry Court but I question the value in adding even more development in an area of single-family homes. You don't even know what the effect will be on the neighborhood and traffic when the development at Masonry Court is complete. Right now, I often find it a challenge to enter and exit my street. I can't imagine what it would be like adding at least a 203 vehicles but I'm going to go with nightmare. My nightmare.</p> <p>This proposed development will be directly across from us. The literature provided states that "the proposal will enhance the public realm and streetscape along Masonry Court by creating ground level residential patios which serve to provide street-level activity and natural surveillance". It's ugly, huge and in NO way will enhance Clearview's public realm or streetscape. Our streetscape is lovely. I think the residences of St. Matthews Ave would agree. I don't know why improving Masonry Court – across from undeveloped land should be more of a concern than the existing residences.</p> <p>The proposal goes on to say "The proposal can be adequately serviced and does not create any impacts to the surrounding area. The proposal is keeping with the character of the neighbourhood". This will create an immense impact and is not at all in character with the neighbourhood. To say that it won't is ignorant and poorly researched. There are so many issues that have not been addressed. Developers will say anything to get their buildings up with no consideration for the consequences.</p> <p>Please do not destroy our neighbourhood. Please reject the proposed re-zoning change.</p> <p>If you need to contact me – I can be reached at ###-###-#### or 1084 Clearview Ave, Burlington ON L7T 2J1</p> <p>Yours truly,</p> <p>Sharron Hughes</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Dina Knight 1079 St. Matthews Ave. Feb. 26, 2019</p>	<p>Attention: Lauren Vraets</p> <p>I am writing to oppose the new development application in Ward 1 on St. Matthews Ave and Clearview. There are many concerns I have regarding this new proposal including its size, especially the height, density, location to existing single dwelling homes, noise, privacy, traffic, overall design and materials used, landscaping buffers and finally that this small piece of land</p>

		<p>needs to be removed from the mobility hub designation and stay low density.</p> <p>The Official Plan for this property should remain residential low density with single dwelling homes or as a alternative design stacked town homes. The transition from the existing homes to the new development proposal in the area on both streets needs to be considered. As a resident I would like to see a gradual transition and not a 6 storey tower. In review, areas on Plains Rd have had new development with town homes or even condos of 4 storeys at the new ADI development beside the GO Train and are in a busier traffic area, so why is this not being considered for these small single dwelling court locations. We specifically purchased a home in this area for the small, quiet court location without traffic or noise and enjoy our quiet single dwelling home with mature landscape in the area. The new development would take all of that away. A 6 storey building would mean greater noise from the 160 units with balconies and outdoor terraces, loading spaces which would mean garbage removal, moving trucks just outside our door as well as drop off and outdoor parking areas with 203 cars in and out daily. As well as mature landscape would be lost. The proposed building would take away existing privacy and create shadows on existing properties as well as roadways. The height of the building as well as the balconies and terraces proposed in the new development would allow for residents to lose their privacy because the residents would be able to see into windows of the existing homes as well as rear yards and pools. The height of the building needs to be reduced to a maximum of 4 stories or replaced altogether by designing town homes.</p> <p>The design and landscape of the building does not coincide with existing homes. It's modern facade and lack of design needs to drastically change so that it transitions with the area. The use materials like stone, brick and wood as well as having the building location setback further from the existing homes and courts would allow a better transition into the area. Currently the planning sketch only allows for a few meters of landscape buffers before the structure leaving very little transition, instead towers and greater shadowing.</p> <p>I accept that development needs to take place in our city yet Mayor Meed strongly agreed with residents that proposals into existing low density areas be given greater attention. Residents should not have to feel bullied by developers looking for greatest financial gains. City councillors and planning staff have a responsibility to hear existing residents views and to make sure all parties benefit from new developments that are proposed. At this time, the development proposed offers no</p>
--	--	---

		<p>benefits to the existing residents of this area. There are areas of the city that are blank slates, allowing for higher density and far from existing developments yet this area is not one of them and should be considered to remain low density for the future. I therefore recommend the planning department should not amend the existing zoning to allow the condominium to be built.</p>
6.	<p>James McKenna 1077 St. Matthews Ave. Feb. 27, 2019</p>	<p>Attention: Lauren Vraets</p> <p>Our beautiful neighbourhood should remain zoned as residential low density intended for single family homes. I moved to Burlington in 1968 and since that time I have lived in six different neighbourhoods encompassing most corners of our city. One thing each of these neighbourhoods had in common was that owners could rest assured nothing major would be done to change or destroy the unique features of the locale. Everything that contributed to making the area residential each resident knew was steadfast.</p> <p>When I purchased in Aldershot in 2003, I was excited about being part of the oldest most established part of Burlington. I knew from the beginning that just as each person on the street kept their property in pristine condition, that the City would not allow anything to violate or change the aesthetics of the area.</p> <p>And then the unthinkable happened!!!! Some of our local aldermen decided it may be a good idea to cluster people around Go train stations and maximize those that could live there by changing long standing zoning regulations and building upward. Apparently little consideration was given to the existing residents. If they eventually would look out onto someone staring back from their balcony or, worse yet, look out a window to see someone looking into their house or back yard from an upper level balcony, that now seemed OK. If there was noise from cars and trucks and daily activities of the proposed multi family development, that now seemed OK. If there was an erosion of privacy due to multi level buildings right across the street, that now seemed OK. This isn't the Aldershot I proudly moved into!!!! This isn't the Burlington I have proudly lived in for over 50 years!!!!</p> <p>I understand the land in question has been purchased by a private developer and he wants to maximize his profits. That doesn't necessarily have to be at odds with the neighbouring landscape. Why not consider upscale townhomes or a 2 storey condo building with balconies facing the street which houses the very Go train station the City wants the new residents to be near.</p>

		<p>My recommendation and preference is that the zoning remain exactly as it is and that City council pay more attention to the desires of existing residents than to maximizing profits for developers or maximizing population density at the expense of everything “Burlington “.</p> <p>I hope that our new mayor, who campaigned on minimizing change to existing residential neighbourhoods, and our newly elected council, whom I trust has the best interests of existing residents in mind, puts a stop to the proposed changes and allows us to continue to enjoy and be proud of our corner of Aldershot.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion and I assure you I speak for most in the area</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Ruth, Diane & Deborah Roberts</p> <p>1019 Clearview Ave.</p> <p>Feb. 27, 2019</p>	<p>Hello Lauren,</p> <p>Please find the attachment regarding our concerns re the application to change the Official Plan in our neighbourhood of Clearview Avenue. I have also copied our concerns to our Councillor Kelvin Galbraith</p> <p>Ruth Roberts</p> <p><<LETTER>></p> <p>NEW DEVELOPMENT ON CLEARVIEW</p> <p>As longtime residents of Clearview Avenue we have seen a few changes take place in our neighbourhood. Most of these new developments have added to the character of this area. However.....</p> <p>The new proposal for the property located at 1085 Clearview and 1082, 1086 and 1090 St. Matthews will certainly be a negative impact on this single family residential area.</p> <p>The proposed change from the Official Plan designation to Residential – High Density and to change the zoning to High Density Residential RH1 is not in keeping with our ideas of what this original Official Plan indicated.</p> <p>We do understand that new development is coming but the density (with a high-rise 6 storey building is certainly not compatible with the surrounding single family homes. The site specific zoning requests re setbacks, landscaping and buffers, amenity area, and required parking, as well as increased site density, and permission for placement of patios in the front yard and a second driveway are certainly areas of our concern.</p> <p>Although it is assumed that most of the occupants will use the Go Station for their main means of transportation mostly to and from Toronto, it is obvious to all that the major mode of movement in Aldershot is the automobile. Bus transportation to</p>

		<p>shopping areas, theatres, and the downtown – even City Hall is neither convenient nor timely. Having 160 units in the building will certainly generate more traffic and increase not only pollution but also traffic congestion on Plains Road.</p> <p>We heartily oppose the construction of a 6 storey highrise development in this area. Perhaps a small community of townhouses should be considered. This would enable the property in question to be developed with a somewhat increased residential component but have a less damaging impact on our neighbourhood and traffic.</p>
8.	<p>Garry Dalley</p> <p>1043 Clearview Ave.</p> <p>Feb. 27, 2019</p>	<p>Lauren,</p> <p>This is building is clearly excessive for this area for which my family and many others reside. There is no reasonable way to deal with the overflow of traffic that will result from this build.</p> <p>It will turn Clearview Ave. into an extension of the problems we already face with Plains Rd. during busy times.</p> <p>I am 100% against this size of build, and will be looking forward to the first meeting.</p>
9.	<p>Nancy McKenna</p> <p>1077 St. Matthews Ave.</p> <p>Feb. 27, 2019</p>	<p>Attention: Lauren Vraets</p> <p>I am a long-term resident of St Matthews Ave who is very opposed to the new plan proposed for my neighbourhood. St. Matthews Ave. is a quiet dead end street. The landscape is mature. Huge trees line the street, making a beautiful canopy enveloping the homes and street. The houses are immaculate single dwellings. There are no sidewalks, children play safely on the street... and hydro lines are still prevalent. This is true old Aldershot.</p> <p>Recently a developer has decided to upheave our pleasant neighbourhood with a proposed multi-storey building. This is an invasion of the privacy I purchased when I moved here!</p> <p>Do I want high rise residents peering down into my home and backyard? NO!</p> <p>Do I want the noise from an additional 160 units' occupants and vehicles in this small space? NO!</p> <p>Do I want increased traffic and delivery trucks en route to a high rise? NO!</p> <p>Do I consider a parking lot an acceptable trade for mature trees and blooming landscape? NO!</p> <p>Does the modern fascade in the proposed drawings reflect the character of this neighbourhood? NO!</p>

		<p>Do I feel bullied by this impending high-rise developer? YES!</p> <p>Are there other areas of Burlington available for development? YES!</p> <p>Did Mayor Meed promise to protect existing low-density residential housing? YES!</p> <p>Do I expect our Town Council to protect its existing low-density residential housing constituents? YES!</p> <p>I am respectfully requesting rejection of this proposal and continued maintenance of St. Matthews Ave classification as low-density residential.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Nadine Martin</p> <p>1050 Clearview Ave.</p> <p>Feb. 27, 2019</p>	<p>Dear Ms. Vraets:</p> <p>With respect to the Planning Application submitted by MHBC Planning Ltd. which we received via mail from the City of Burlington, I wish to make the following comments. I am greatly disappointed with the City of Burlington Planners that they would even entertain such an application for this dramatic zoning change.</p> <p>We are a cloister of homes on three streets that form a community not unlike the White Oaks Community that the city deemed would be omitted from hub development. It goes beyond reason why one street over would not be granted the same courtesy. We are not any different than White Oaks. You are asking to change our zoning from Low density to High density. Not only would this result in a shockingly drastic change to our neighbourhood, it shows all the signs of you having made a promise to a developer in advance.</p> <p>My house has been on this street since 1942. It is part of a community. We are happy being part of this community but you somehow think it is acceptable to go into this community and try to dictate a new way of life for us. A zoning change to high density would bring commotion, noise pollution and of people to an area that has historically been tranquil and reality free from a lot of traffic. This would be just the beginning of you stealing from us the peace and green space that we all chose when we moved to this area. You do not have the right to do this to us. I vehemently oppose this application.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Nadine Martin 1050 Clearview Avenue, Burlington</p>

11.	<p>Dawn Kurmey</p> <p>1060 Clearview Ave.</p> <p>Feb. 28, 2019</p>	<p>Ms. Vraets,</p> <p>I'm writing to highlight my concerns for the proposed development of 1085 Clearview avenue and surrounding lots.</p> <p>The Clearview/St. Matthews neighbourhood has been under a lot of scrutiny over the last few years as we were targeted as a location for the Mobility Hub, for the same reasons our community banded together to protect our neighbourhood from Mobility Hub developments, amending the zoning to accommodate a high rise development would be tragic.</p> <p>Looking at the letter distributed two weeks ago asking for comment/feedback I have numerous concerns;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Opening up roadways at Clearview and St. Matthews avenue onto Masonry court would destroy our community which is comprised of young families (our children play in the roads) and senior citizens who regularly walk the streets (that don't have sidewalks) each night after supper. Into a freeway of cars rushing to & from the Aldershot go station. It is crucial to the essence of our neighbourhood that these roadways are not opened up for vehicle traffic. Opening up these roads would be a danger to the existing residents within the community 2) The proposal submitted does not appear to have adequate parking for the number of units that the developers current plan on constructing. Masonry court and the Aldershot Go Station already has a shortage of parking and often vehicles line the streets during the week to accommodate commuter traffic. 3) The lack of park space proposed in this development is also concerning considering the number of residents within the building and the fact the Station West development across the road was allowed to consider a storm water collection basin as park space in their development approval – there is not adequate park space in the area for the number of families. <p>When you factor in the already congested roadways, the number of new units in this proposal and the continued intensification of developments proposed within this community and surrounding around area there is not enough infrastructure to support these developments. Our community is also in conflict as our Ward counsellor Calvin Galbraith is unable to represent us as there is a conflict of interest as his home backs onto the proposed development.</p> <p>Marianne Mead kicked off her campaign at the top of Clearview Avenue gaining the trust of the community that she would support us in preventing over-development and</p>
-----	--	--

		<p>intensification. I hope that our newly elected counsellors continue on this mission to protect existing established neighbourhoods and work with the community and developers for reasonable projects that enhance existing neighbourhoods inside of exploit them for profit.</p> <p>Thank you for hearing and listening to my concerns.</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p>Gaetano Fanelli 1060 Clearview Ave. Feb. 28, 2019</p>	<p>Lauren,</p> <p>I live at 1060 Clearview Ave with my wife and a newborn baby. I not only speak for us but for the neighborhood as a whole when we say have a huge issue with this proposed re-zoning.</p> <p>There is absolutely no benefit to our community if a 6 storey apartment is built there, I will outline the main issues that will adversely affect of daily lives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Putting a 6 storey building into a residential only area will cast major shadows over the existing homes 2. It will have an increased traffic and congestion issue that already exists on masonry that already has the go station and has not even closed a single unit in the large development currently being built 3. It's not safe to open up the dead end streets of Clearview and St Matthews as we do not have sidewalks or curbs. How are our roads supposed to safely take on the increased traffic for this proposed development, the one currently being built on masonry, the vast amount of GO train traffic and don't forget the proposed (2) 11 storey buildings at Clearview and plains on the solid gold site. Plains road is one of the most congested roads in the entire city during rush hour, we need to wait for a break in traffic just to turn down Clearview as it is today. <p>The developers were also bold enough to tell us residents not to worry about both the dead end roads being opened up at the town hall discussion that was held at aldershot arena a few months ago which was obviously a lie.</p> <p>We are not opposed to change and development in our area or in our city but this proposal can not be looked at in a vacuum, it will have adverse effects on the functionality and safety of our neighborhood in conjunction with all the development happening in this small area at once.</p> <p>We hope the city of Burlington agrees with the residents of this neighborhood and sticks with the zoning laid out in the city's OP epically since our new mayor campaigned and won on the promise to end over development in the city of burlington.</p>

		<p>We hope the city will do the right thing and not approve a zoning change and preserve our neighborhood.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Gaetano Fanelli</p>
13.	<p>Steve and Marina Favalaro</p> <p>1073 St. Matthews Ave.</p> <p>Feb. 28, 2019</p>	<p>Hi Lauren, I am writing to voice our objections to the proposed development on Clearview and St. Matthews Ave. I had originally intended on attending the open house, but when I went to the original one, it had been cancelled and I did not receive notice of the new date. I have reviewed all the documentation on the City's website regarding this proposal and while I am all for development, in this case I need to voice our objection.</p> <p>In my view, the proposed development is completely out of character with the surrounding neighborhood, and unless the City is going to rezone all of St Matthews and Clearview to allow for this type of development, the proposed building will stick out like a sore thumb for years to come. All the buildings around it are low density. In addition I also note that from the shadowing plan, after about 5:30 pm our property will be completely shadowed by the new building. This does not comply with the Mobility Hub area plans and in my opinion the properties in question should not be removed from this study area.</p> <p>It is my opinion that allowing this development to proceed with greatly impact the character of St. Matthews Ave, not only from the height aspect but also the overall design (modern which does not match the character), reduce our property values and set a precedence for more development like this in Aldershot that negatively impacts the low density residential aspects of our neighborhoods. If there is going to be more development in our area I would more than support town homes than 3-6 storey condos. With all due respect I think the City needs to stop bending to developers and listen to the people that live in the impacted areas. Aldershot is being over run with condo's, traffic with limited to no major commercial development – we do not need anymore nail salons lining the streets of Aldershot</p> <p>Thanks Steve and Marina Favalaro 1073 St. Matthews Ave</p>
14.	<p>D. Seeley</p> <p>1032 Clearview Ave.</p>	<p>Being a homeowner on Clearview my concerns are how drastic the changes to setbacks buffers etc. Going from low density to high density is a major impact on the neighborhood. Traffic is a</p>

	<p>Feb. 28, 2019</p>	<p>big concern and I don't know how this will be handled. Construction causes traffic hassles and with the Go commuters it is amplified. The whole picture has to be taken into consideration. Each application with extra changes to zoning is going to cause more and more concerns regarding traffic and parking.</p> <p>I am glad the access for the proposal is on Masonry Crt. The developer has shown consideration .I know this is a prime area for development but our roadways cannot handle traffic at the best of time.</p>
<p>15.</p>	<p>John Knight 1079 St. Matthews Ave. Feb. 28, 2019</p>	<p>I have been a Burlington resident for 47 years, I have lived in all ends of Burlington in the east,north ,south and now the west end of Burlington for the last 8 years. After looking at many homes with my wife and 2 young children we stumbled across this beautiful home on St.Matthews Ave with mature landscape, huge trees, and a quiet street that ends in a court. My children enjoy playing in the court, riding their bikes and setting up nets for hockey games and basketball. But now a developer wants to change that not just for the residents of St Matthews, but also Queen Mary and Clearview. If this multi-storey condominium was originally there in the first place I wouldn't be writing this letter because there is no way we would of chosen a house directly across the street from it. I oppose this proposal to amend the zoning in this area. It needs to remain low density residential.Why you ask? The proposal of a condominium development on this property would mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Absolutely no privacy, we would have to keep our blinds closed at all times,someone watching you sitting out front,cutting the grass,playing with your kids etc. When you have eyes watching you from the many units and balconies right across the street 2-We receive the afternoon sun which is needed for my garden and to heat our house in the cooler months, that condominium at 6 storeys high will cast a shadow causing our heating bills to go up in the winter 3-The area has been zoned for low density and needs to be kept as low density residential with single dwelling homes or town homes. The height of the building proposed is too high. 4- NOISE,NOISE,NOISE, cars coming and going from the drop off turn around, 49 cars starting/parking at all hours of the day and night ,noise of residents on balconies surrounding the building, terraces and patios and most concerning is the loading docks for moving trucks and garbage disposal located right outside my front door. 5- No green space what so ever between St Matthews and the

		<p>structure of the condo unit. The plans do not allow for vegetation/trees on the land left in this small strip of grass barely a few meters wide</p> <p>Overall there's been a lot of new condos going up in Aldershot in the last few years, they all seem to be right on Plains road which is great but why come into our lovely neighborhood and build this large building a stones throw away from my doorstep and other single homes. It doesn't make sense, would you Lauren or the Developer like this situation if it was across from your homes? The location of this condo would be better suited along Waterdown rd or Plains rd. Personally why not get rid of all these run down buildings eye sores on Plains like the run down motels and build your condo structures there. That would make Aldershot a more updated area of Burlington. The condominium being proposed for the area does not transition into the existing neighborhood.</p> <p>Mayor Meed Ward assured the residents of this area during her campaign that she would help maintain this area as low density residential. She stood outside our home as we discussed what was happening and she agreed that this area was to remain a quiet court location with single homes. She agreed with residents that a proposal like this should never be allowed to change this existing mature area.</p>
16.	<p>Beth and Aaron Boag</p> <p>1045 Clearview Ave.</p> <p>Feb. 28, 2019</p>	<p>Hi Lauren,</p> <p>As residents of Clearview Ave we are writing to provide feedback on the proposed planning application. We voted for Marianne on the understanding that our neighbourhood would be unchanged, after being so supportive and petitioning for this neighbourhood to remain dedicated to two-story buildings. After everything with the mobility hub, we were led to believe it was decided that this site address would support residential townhouses on the site. We were quite surprised to see that a proposal for a 6 storey building has come through.</p> <p>Although we see that access will not be available through Clearview Avenue (which we are thankful for), the idea of a moderately high rise building so close to our quiet cul-de-sac is disheartening. It impedes on our sightlines, and eliminates the quiet charm of this Aldershot community.</p> <p>We have only lived in this neighbourhood for four short years. Many of our neighbours have been here for decades. This is an area where families live with their children, everyone who lives here chose this area for being stable, friendly, lovely, and a caring community. The addition of a 6 story high rise would be a</p>

		<p>severe detriment to this community.</p> <p>I should also mention there are not enough amenities in this area to appease the drastic population increase Burlington is planning for. Keep with the charm of the area and make smart development decisions by keeping a limit on the height of the building and number of units... and please start planning for more groceries, restaurants, gas stations and retail to keep up with this growing area!</p>
<p>17.</p>	<p>Lowell Crane 111 Queen Mary Ave. Feb. 28, 2019</p>	<p>Good Evening, please accept this email as my comments on the proposed change to the Official Plan and Zoning for the properties located at 1085 Clearview Ave, and 1082-1086 1090 St Mathews Ave.</p> <p>Just as an introduction, I have lived in Burlington since 1985. I purchased my home on Queen Mary Avenue in 1996 fresh out of university. My home is located within the Clearview/St Mathew Ave subdivision. Like everyone in Aldershot, a conscious decision was made to live in a lesser/older home in order to have the more spacious atmosphere Aldershot provided. Larger lots, less housing density, the village feel as opposed to a larger new home in North Burlington with more population and house density.</p> <p>The proposed development threatens exactly that. The essence of Aldershot.</p> <p>Here are my concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This developer, like any good developer purchased a piece of property on pure speculation based on trends to intensify areas around Go Train Stations. Mobility Hubs. He originally proposed a 11 storey building. When success of that variance seemed unlikely, he reduced the size of the building and added window dressing to support his proposal. Driveways off Masonry court, Terraced Upper Floors, and Greenspace are just developer smoke screens to achieve to check the boxes on the Planning Departments checklist for development. Let's be clear. This is about building height. This developer gambled on an investment and lost and is now pulling out all the tricks to get his new down sized proposal pushed through. <p>Is the idea of the planning process to allow developers to keep submitting proposals until one sticks? Along with the primary land he purchased, this developer has purchased residential properties in the neighborhood which has already lead to the disintegration of the neighborhoods character. Always dark, non-maintained properties for the surrounding neighbors to look</p>

		<p>at. Very nice.</p> <p>If this area is re-zoned it only a matter of time before developers follow the lead and purchase up homes as they become available, primarily from long term residents who have passed on and slowly lower property values of current residents. The City needs to protect current residents from that approach from outside developers. It's happened in this case. It will continue until residents are basically forced out.</p> <p>I don't believe the City, or the residents have any obligation to meet this developer half way, no obligation to help get him out of a speculation that went wrong. They knew what the zoning and designation was before purchasing. Buyer beware.</p> <p>With that said, I think residents see the need for intensification, see the logic in the plans for creating mobility hubs. No one is saying these properties do not need to be developed. Where is the proposal that shows what can be achieved by maximizing the current zoning which designates this precinct as low density, and allows only single-family homes, semi-detached and street townhouses. I see 3 storey townhouse developments on Plains Road, that would fit nicely on this property. Achieving the intensification requirement but not drastically changing the character of the neighborhood. It seems to me that the ask of the developer is to far removed from the current designation. Let him come back with something that maximizes the current zoning or stretches it to a reasonable level. No need to blow the current zoning out of the water.</p> <p>2. Before any proposal is agreed to, the intensification targets for Aldershot should be reviewed and confirmed to determine what is needed to reach targets. It's too late once all the buildings are constructed to backtrack and find out that you have far exceeded the targets. If you're a resident of Aldershot, you have seen building after building go up without confidence there is anything guiding the process other than the deep pockets of developers and a property tax hungry city. I don't want to read in 5 years that Aldershot is in fact over intensified and that traffic, parking are chronic problems. The character once so craved, gone forever just to meet the needs of developers with no concern other than their bottom line. There are 3-4 buildings currently slated for Plains Road currently within a 2-minute walk of the proposed property. There is a large development currently under construction next to the Go Station, within view of this property. The long-term plan is to have 20 plus story buildings off Waterdown Road and other areas surrounding the GoStation. Is this 6 storey building in</p>
--	--	---

		<p>fact needed to meet the Aldershot Target? Should intensification even be a criterion for consideration in this proposal?</p> <p>3. Aldershot is facing a traffic and parking nightmare when all these building are built. Is there a plan in place to deal with that? Parking from the Go Train is already spilling over and doesn't even account for the new populations coming to Aldershot, Waterdown and Hamilton which will continue to grow and grow. How does this proposed building help that situation?</p> <p>4. One of the greatest features of Aldershot is the mature tree canopy which are the homes to a diverse ecosystem of birds and various other wildlife. Having been here for the 20 plus years, it's a pleasure to see the uptick in the hawk population in recent years where once they were few and far between not to mention the robins, blue jays, cardinals etc. Has any consideration been given to how all these proposed buildings will impact this ecos system?</p> <p>To Summarize, I think Aldershot residents have had no choice but to accept the ongoing intensification of the Plains Road Corridor. As much as we like to see things stay the way they were, progress is inevitable. However, let common sense prevail. Let's listen to the residents. Before existing neighborhoods are impacted Let's see the plan for the Plains Road Corridor play out. Intensify existing neighborhoods by infilling with townhouses or building on double or triple lot to preserve the character of the neighborhoods. This proposed 6 storey building will a square peg in a round hole in this neighborhood. Let's not be fooled by token gestures of site features that are just smoke screen to real issue.</p> <p>It pains me to figure out why the current development under construction next to the go station which does not impact any neighborhoods is not being constructed to this building height. Where was foresight to see this requirement for intensification was coming.</p> <p>Appreciate the forum to submit a long-term residents concerns.</p> <p>Lowell Crane</p>
18.	<p>Lianne Dalley</p> <p>1043 Clearview Ave.</p> <p>March 1, 2019</p>	<p>Lauren</p> <p>I am writing to you to express my concerns regarding the re-zoning of 1085/1082/1086 Clearview and 1090 St. Matthews Avenue.</p>

		<p>I have sat in on a few different town hall meetings with regards to re-zoning plans in Aldershot, with particular interest in the development plans for the Solid Gold property. I was a little taken back to see further re-zoning and development of 1085 Clearview Ave. My biggest concern with all of these developments is that there is not a proper infrastructure in place to support these plans. With the Solid Gold property development, it is my understanding that the traffic assessment results were not favourable. Has this been a consideration for this new development? Do we have the infrastructure in place on Plains Road and subsequent side streets to accommodate these developments? On a good day, the traffic is so backed up on Plains Road. I anticipate that this is going to get even worse with this property development. Our neighborhood is a quiet area where I feel safe for my kids to play outside. This new development will substantially increase the flow of traffic which is concerning for my kids. And my last concern is the development of a block apartment building right in the middle of a single home neighbourhood? I can't see this as been a positive addition to our neighbourhood. The only one benefiting is the owner of the new building.</p> <p>I hope these comments are taking in to consideration for the approval of the re-zoning.</p>
19.	<p>Michael Moore 1065 St. Matthews Ave. March 2, 2019</p>	<p>I live on St. Matthews Avenue. I am 100% against this change to the official plan and zoning change for 1085 Clearview Ave, 1082, 1086 and 1090 St. Matthews Avenue.</p> <p>Putting a building this large and high in an established neighbourhood of single family homes is a colossal mistake and asinine. It is truly ponderous as to why the City came up with this official plan...nevermind asking for comments on our feelings on how you want to destroy a neighbourhood.</p>
20.	<p>Lisa and Ryan Browne 1074 St. Matthews Ave. March 5, 2019</p>	<p>Hi Lauren, We are writing to you to oppose the new development application in Ward 1 on Saint Matthew's Ave. We live at 1074 Saint Matthew's Ave we have a few concerns.</p> <p>First of all the height I feel it should remain low density residential if feel like 6 stories is not a reasonable transition from our home which is two stories. When we purchased our home a year and a half ago the real selling feature was the quiet court without traffic and noise. It would take away the privacy we enjoy. The hight needs to be reduced to at the most 4 stories to make for a reasonable transition. Second concern we have is the added traffic to our beautiful quiet neighbourhood.</p>

		<p>We hope you take our concerns into consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lisa and Ryan Browne</p>
21.	<p>Tom Muir</p> <p>70 Townsend Ave.</p> <p>March 3, 2019 with additional emails documentation provided on March 4, 2019, April 6, 2019,</p>	<p>Hi,</p> <p>It is my intention to submit some written comments on this application, however, I have been on an extended absence from home and will not be able to submit these by the March 1 suggested date.</p> <p>I would appreciate an extension to this date, and intend to submit my comments by March 12 2019. I hope that this meets with your approval.</p> <p>Further to this application, I did have several correspondences on this file at the time of the neighborhood meeting on this project, so there should be a file on this with Roz Minaji who I copied all correspondence. This file I wish to be part of the record of my interest in this application and gives a sense of my concerns and criticism.</p> <p>Thank you, Tom Muir 70 Townsend Ave., Burlington. L7T 1Y7</p> <p><<<Correspondence>>></p> <p>To: gtchisler <gtchisler@mhbcplan.com> From: "Tom Betty.muir" Date: October 29, 2018 at 7:08 PM</p> <p>Hi,</p> <p>I met you at the open house tonight, early, we spoke a bit about my concerns and advice, and I asked you for a copy of all the boards that were on display. You told me to email you to give you my address, so here it is. I also ask for a copy of the OP and zoning compliance comparisons - existing OP versus your requested amendments. I need these boards and information in order to comment intelligently on your proposal.</p> <p>Thanks, Tom Muir _____</p>

From: "Tom Betty.muir"
 To: gtchisler <gtchisler@mhbcplan.com>
 Cc: Minaji Rosalind <rosalind.minaji@burlington.ca>
 Date: November 4, 2018 at 9:15 PM
 Subject: Re: Clearview proposal open house.

Hi,
 This is my second request, and I phone called you and left a message last Friday.
 I have not had any reply or acknowledgement.
 Do you have a problem?

Tom Muir

From: Gerry Tchisler <gtchisler@mhbcplan.com>
 Date: November 5, 2018 at 3:36 PM

Hi Tom,

Thanks for your patience. I was waiting for a response from the owner regarding the display boards since we do not normally distribute draft materials to the public prior to finalizing a design and formally submitting an application to the City. The owner does not wish to distribute the concept plans at this time (see email below). If you would like, I can still send the other display boards. Let me know.

Regards,
 Gerry

*From: Katherine Rauscher
 [mailto:KRauscher@livhere.ca]
 Sent: November-05-18 3:27 PM
 To: Gerry Tchisler <gtchisler@mhbcplan.com>
 Subject: Clearview Materials*

Hi Gerry,

At this time we would like to hold back on sharing our elevations and floorplates, as they are not yet finalized. We are currently reviewing the comments received from the comment cards and are making revisions to the proposal. We would be happy to share materials related to surrounding developments/amenities and the current Official Plan and Mobility Hub designations. Once our official application is made all our materials will become public documents and available for review. I believe the

City of Burlington will also post the materials on their website at that time.

Regards,

Katherine Rauscher | Project Manager

*L!V Communities | Loyalty. Integrity. Vision.
1005 Skyview Road Suite 301, Burlington, Ontario L7P
5B1
T. 289.245.1300 x 520 | C. 289.208.4391 | F.
289.245.1301*

From: Tom Betty.muir

Sent: November-05-18 3:50 PM
To: Gerry Tchisler <gtchisler@mhbcplan.com>
Subject: Re: FW: Clearview Materials

Hi,
Please send me whatever boards you can. Concepts, designs, and floorplates were not my main interest. I wanted the written planning related information boards, including the shadow study, the data on the unit numbers and configurations, the amendments needed, and such.

Thanks,
Tom Muir

From: Gerry Tchisler <gtchisler@mhbcplan.com>
Date: November 6, 2018 at 12:05 PM

Hi Tom,

Attached are the open house boards that were displayed last week. Not included in this set are the boards that show the concept plans and related information, as per the emails below.

Regards,
Gerry

From: Tom Betty.muir
Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2018 6:14 PM

To: Gerry Tchisler
Cc: Minaji, Rosalind
Subject: RE: FW: Clearview Materials

Hi,

Thank you for this, but it is much less than was shown to residents at the open house.

In this information here you say nothing about what is being proposed - no height, no unit numbers, no parking, no amenity and so on, in terms of the OP amendment and particularly the zoning bylaw standards existing now, and what the proposal is requesting in the way of amendments.

The time available at the open house was far from what is needed to provide intelligent comment. This is not satisfactory or acceptable to refuse the provision of all the information presented there so residents can have a basis on which to know what you have in mind.

Ask your client to reconsider providing what they proposed at the Open House. They asked for comments and it's only fair that they provide the information they are asking for comments on.

Do you really expect people to remember everything you had there? You gave until Nov.12, so how does that work when you won't provide the information needed? I had no problem with the timeline at first, but I don't have enough to comment on fully.

For Roz, if this is what the new developer neighborhood meeting process is all about in terms of information provided to enable intelligent comment over a reasonable period, then it needs an overhaul. This developer looks to be providing a quicky peep show.

Better bring a camera is good advice for the future.
Tom Muir

From: Gerry Tchisler <gtchisler@mhbcplan.com>
Date: November 8, 2019 at 8:15 AM
RE: FW: Clearview Materials

Tom,

The boards that I have sent were the same set of boards there were shown at the open house minus the boards which are related to the design, as we had discussed. The board showing the official plan and zoning information if the same board that

was shown at the open house.

Please note that, unlike some other consultations, this one is occurring PRIOR TO a formal application submission. This is why there is limited information available, much of which is still in draft form. Once the design has been refined and an application is made to the City, you will get further opportunities to review all the material in detail and comment on the proposal. At that point, all of our drawings, reports and studies will be publicly available through the City for everyone to review.

The intent of the open house is to provide people with preliminary information and gather feedback at the meeting. We provide a period of time for people to submit comments after the meeting as a courtesy in case they don't have enough time to write something at the meeting.

Regards,
Gerry

From: "Tom Betty.muir"
To: Gerry Tchisler <gtchisler@mhbcplan.com>
Cc: Minaji Rosalind <rosalind.minaji@burlington.ca>
Date: November 8, 2018 at 11:06 AM
Subject: RE: FW: Clearview Materials

Hi,
I know the boards you sent were among those shown at the Open House.

The problem is that there is basically no information on which to judge the actual build that is being proposed, or the actual amendments that are needed to permit it.

There is nothing that enables an observer to judge the siting, scale, density, massing, shadowing, height, setbacks, gross evidence of compatibility, zoning compliance, parking, and so on. I'm not a competitor looking for design tips.

For all I care, you can just put up a cube with the right shape, and provide the numerical details and zoning standards compliance, and that would give me a sense. Put a car or a person in front of it so I can see the scale. There are simple things that can provide a perspective and sense of variances from permissions.

		<p>I don't need to see multiple pictures of the location and the conceptual draft mobility hub. I want to comment on the build and there is nothing much here to enable me to do that.</p> <p>The OP and zoning information provided I recall from the Open House, but it doesn't tell me what amendments are needed, from which I can get some little impressions and basis to comment.</p> <p>And including the adopted but not approved and so not legally existing OP and non-existent Mobility Hub, as part of what can be seen as a justification for the proposal, that is not presently permitted, is not something that you are allowed to do under the rules.</p> <p>I told you at the meeting that 6 floors and all that massing and needed amendments are not permitted under any OP, or under the Mobility Hub draft designation for Clearview, and yet here we have just such a proposal, but you leave out the only significant details to judge and comment on.</p> <p>As well, the information on existing activity is not accurate. 92 Plains is for 6 floors not 4, and has been appealed to the OMB since last April or so. Since you guys - MHBC Planning and planner David McKay - are representing this developer I would expect that you would be accurate.</p> <p>Overall, you are still not providing needed and sufficient information to enable anything much in the way of comment because there is little about the actual build proposal to comment about.</p> <p>You can and should do better.</p> <p>Tom Muir</p>
<p>22.</p>	<p>Tom Muir 70 Townsend Ave. March 13, 2019</p>	<p>Hi,</p> <p>As I wrote previously on March 3, I am on an extended leave from home and unable to submit anything but an abbreviated set of comments and concerns. Please accept this correspondence in short form, as a record of my interest in this application, and for inclusion in the record of the proceedings.</p> <p>1. As an initial reaction I found that the Planning Justification did not include a written record of my comments on the inadequacy of the information provided at the neighborhood meeting, that I sent to you earlier this month. There was no mention of this</p>

concern I expressed. The consultant actually stated that any added time to comment after the meeting was a matter of courtesy, and additional information was not provided. Comments were restricted to sticky tabs at the meeting. In the zoning compliance tables and discussion there were numerous apparently inaccurate or incorrect statements of permissions, or in force existing OP and ZBL permissions, such that it seemed to be deliberately misleading and false. What is being compared to what would need for me to check every instance and/or statement of comparison.

It seems to me that the consultant is using a mix of existing OP, adopted OP, and draft only studies with no force, and such things and I wound up not being able to believe any of it. It appears that the planning justification was written with the draft and then adopted OP that is not approved, and the consultant failed to rewrite it to take account of the factual non-compliance and refusal with a revision to get the report to the factual state of accuracy.

This willingness to be inaccurate and misleading, using false information, is similar to what I found in the reports of the same consultant for 92 Plains Rd E, and I noted this in my comments submitted on the public review process for that application. I think this is lacking in professional ethics and shows a willingness to cheat.

Public comments actually printed were biased and incomplete, and did not reflect what I saw and heard. Public concerns including what I expressed about the application being overdevelopment and not in compliance with the in force OP and ZBL, and not compatible with the zoned low rise residential neighborhood it is proposed to be located in, was omitted. This zoning is in the existing OP, and was in fact retained in the adopted OP now under revision. This zoning allowed 25 units per hectare, but the application asks for 250 upha, a 10 times increase in density. Permitted is 1 1/2 story limit, asked is 6 story; permitted is low density residential, but asked is high density. The permitted height is stated as 6 stories but this is incorrect, but stated as in compliance.

The expressed intention of Council and the mayor and direction to staff, is that the entire Clearview neighborhood be excluded from the Mobility Hub and to retain the low density zoning. The developer was informed of this, however, at the neighborhood meeting this was concealed from the residents in attendance. Instead residents were told the application was based on a non-existent Mobility Hub.

The developer and consultant was informed of this situation but

		<p>chose to ignore this and to submit their application anyways. I suggested that other built forms including towns and semis were permitted and could provide a project with some increased density by right. This was not included in the public comments.</p> <p>2. There are a large number of other amendments to zoning that are wanted to enable the over-development application to proceed, and these too are not permitted in the OP, and are added dimensions of the incompatible built form. These include amenity area, landscape aear, landscape buffer, front yard, driveway widths, parking, and others. I do not support any of these.</p> <p>The apparent intent of the exceptions asked for in this application is to fit the land parcel configuration and zoning standards to the design of the building proposed, and not the design and fit the building to the land parcel and zoning standards.</p> <p>3. At this stage of the application process I am really telling you things you already know about the application. I am basically telling you that I am opposed to this project for the few major non-compliant and incompatibility reasons stated.</p> <p>I can provide a more thorough submission when the city has a Statutory public Meeting inviting more comments, and then further at the time of the staff recommendation report.</p> <p>I object to the project and its misleading and inaccurate presentation in the planning justification, and I recommend that staff refuse the application at the first opportunity.</p> <p>I apologize that I have been unable to provide a more substantive set of comments at this time. The purpose is to get my key concerns on the record at a very preliminary time in the process.</p> <p>Thank you, Tom Muir</p>
<p>23.</p>	<p>Peter and Anne Marie Campbell</p> <p>1040 Clearview Ave.</p> <p>April 3, 2019</p>	<p>Good Morning All,</p> <p>I listened with intent at last evening's meeting regarding the Liv Communities site proposal and inclusive of the comments that were received by Lauren, the speakers made it obvious one thing is clear, this is definitely not the right build for this site. This must NOT be approved in any way shape or form and that town homes would be the right fit, actually the 'only' fit for this site.</p> <p>The developers smoke and mirrors propaganda about the build and the proximity to GO Station aside, the representative indicated they never considered town homes, even though this</p>

is contrary to what we were told was going to happen at the site. There is a build you may want to check out in progress at the Clarkson Go by Haven Developments. This build is obviously the result of an excellent collaboration between the neighbourhood, Mississauga Council and the Developer, to build units that acceptable and appropriate and not throw up just another condo tower because it is close to the GO. This is something Burlington must strive for to succeed and yet protect our established neighbourhoods. Please have a look at Haven Development's website.

This a new stacked townhouse complex under construction at the Clarkson Go, aptly named the 'Clarkson Urban Towns' by Haven Developments and is the perfect and only solution for the Liv Communities site that would be acceptable. This Clarkson site is an enclave of approximately 60, back to back s and 2 and 4storey towns, with the 4th storey being an individual rooftop amenity. It is composed of 5 separated builds and each complex has it's own specific underground parking for both the condo units and visitors below the units. There is absolutely no above ground parking.

My daughter moved out of her condo tower and purchased a brand new townhouse in a development in Scarborough, Toronto, that sold out in days from pre construction plans only. Their complex is almost identical in nature to the above and was the perfect solution for that area it is located within. This is what millennials want if that is the developers target market as indicated.

This proposal obviously has a long way to go as it is totally unacceptable as it stands, so let's take the time and get it right.

Best Regards,

Peter and Anne Marie Campbell