

David Barker

Millcroft Greens

Planning Justification Report – Page 3

*'In considering the approval, the City's Planning and Development Committee recognized the potential for conflicts between the two land uses, noting in its resolution "The City's approval should keep open the option of requiring adjustments to later phases in the event that problems related to the golf course occur in the early phases of development", and further requiring that a notification be placed on title for purchasers of lots adjacent to the golf course of the possibility of "nuisance" created by the golf course activity. The recognition of the potential for conflict was well-founded, as complaints by adjacent residents have been considerable and well documented.*

*Much has changed since 1987. Like many other golf courses, Millcroft GC has experienced a decline in membership over the years, reduced profit margins for pay as you play golfers, and increased operating costs. Taking into account the location of the subject lands within an urban serviced area, the changing market conditions for golf courses and the aforementioned design and safety issues, Millcroft Greens sees an opportunity to redevelop portions of the course and reconfigure the golf course to accommodate a more "executive style" of play. The proposed redesign would maintain an 18-hole golf course with generally shorter holes. Such redesign results in some lands becoming surplus to the golf course and available for redevelopment. These surplus lands provide the opportunity for the creation of additional residential lots, compatible with the layout and size of the existing adjacent lots.'*

The planning justification seems to be the applicant wishes to perform a service to the Millcroft community. It wishes to reconfigure the golf course so to reduce the potential for harm to adjacent residents and the property from stray golf balls. A byproduct of that community service will be surplus land that can be commercially developed by the applicant.

I have the following questions for the applicant to which I would appreciate direct answers.

1. Referencing the paragraph in the applicant's planning justification highlighting the City's concern back in the 80s as to the potential for conflicts arising between residents and golf club; did the applicant or any previous owner, at that time argue against the City's concerns? Maybe taking a counter position that the concerns were overstated?
2. Over the 30 or so years of the golf course's operations how many "well documented complaints" have been received by the golf club from adjacent property owners? Is the documentation to be provided to the City?
3. The planning justification report makes mention of "The City's approval should keep open the option of requiring adjustments to later phases in the event that problems related to the golf course occur in the early phases of development". Is the applicant seriously suggesting this application is driven by safety concerns now, years after the originally planned phases of development were completed and not by a desire to cash in on development of valuable real estate?
4. The applicant states the proposed changes will make the course a more "executive" style of course. Golf Span defines an executive course to be of approximately 5,400 yards in length. The present length of Millcroft from white tees is approximately 5,200 yards. So it would seem the proposed changes make Millcroft considerably shorter than the recognized length of an "executive" type course. The applicant states the golf course is financially challenged. I'm interested to understand how the applicant sees reducing the course to almost a pitch and put course will bring in more players and have a positive impact on the course's finances. Will not the change in course layout have an adverse affect and drive the golf club out of business?

"Executive Golf Course"

<https://www.golfspan.com/what-is-an-executive-golf-course>