

Millcroft Greens

Statutory Public Meeting and Recommendation Report {Virtual}

Meeting Date: March 02-21

Report number: PL-12-21

February 27 2021.

Paul Petit

Burlington Ontario L7M3V5

“In regards to the Millcroft Greens Corp Application for zoning and other changes”.

I address this to those involved and affected by this application.

Frankly I'm not sure where to begin, the arrogance of this application is beyond my comprehension and here's why. To negate the massive effort, and very real cost to develop our City's Official Plan would be highly demeaning to all those involved. The very real cost to so many (all property owners in Millcroft) for the benefit of so few (the developers) would be very difficult to justify!

We moved to Burlington in 1979, in 1990 we chose to buy a house in Millcroft Community, very much attracted to the concept of a planned community. Thanks to the initial Monarch professional planners the Millcroft community was, and continues to be, a very enviable community in that it has been a pleasant and convenient place for its residents to live. The area has grown at a sustainable and controlled manner and Burlington North now has police, fire, EMS, schools, library, doctors, dentists, lawyers, insurance agents, grocery shops, large and small shops, restaurants, recreational opportunities such as a swimming pool, fitness centre's, parks, biking, tennis, and of course, golf, to name a few of its services and amenities. There are a diverse sized attractive homes, single family, townhouses, condos, retirement apartments where residents can enjoy living in close proximity to all these services. Further, transportation access has developed to enable easy accessibility. The master plan for this community has ensured that the residents of Millcroft have enjoyed an enviable lifestyle for more than thirty years. If the original planning of the subdivision and the subsequently developed approved plans for both the City of Burlington and the Halton Regional Plan are supported, Millcroft will continue to be a model community for many years to come. Burlington will continue to be deserving of being valued as one of the most live able cities in Canada!

Alternatively, if Millcroft Greens is successful in having the official plans to be altered, then this well loved and appreciated area will be very negatively impacted. I find it disgusting that there

is any chance that this [REDACTED] would be allowed to negatively affect the lifestyle, including their financial well being, to benefit the finances of a few [REDACTED] individuals while offering nothing positive of note.

I question both Millcroft Green's logic and their ethical practices. This corporate scavenger's modus operandi appears to be to tell the people about their non-existent or greatly exaggerated problems that they have but didn't know that they had and then supply a solution. I offer the following to substantiate this point in regard to Millcroft Greens Corporation development plan:

Millcroft Greens is going to solve our expanding wildlife by reducing our parkland.

Millcroft Greens is going to help our nicely maturing trees by cutting them down and replacing them with seedlings.

MillCroft Greens is going to solve our traffic issues by adding hundreds of new vehicles and various new road junctions.

Millcroft Greens is going to solve storm water issues by covering the land with the roofs of expensive homes.

Millcroft Greens doesn't care because Millcroft Greens won't be here to pick up the pieces, to solve the problems. For example of getting our parkland back, an impossible task, once gone; it's gone, never to return.

Millcroft Greens apparently has a problem with the Golf Course {I don't know what it is} anyway this problem is going to be solved by reducing the length of the course to about 4600 yards and naming it an "Executive" Golf course. Another brilliant idea by Millcroft Greens we all know that this plan is deliberately designed to fail. It stands as much chance of success as a 'field of hay in a 5 year drought'. Obviously Millcroft Greens at some point in the future intends to apply to develop the rest of the course into residential lots, so do not open this Pandora's Box.

Another item that I find very strange about this application is that Millcroft Greens has stated the plan for site E is a 6 story apartment building but what they haven't said is the new location for the maintenance building. Now you cannot operate a golf course without equipment, storage for items such as fuels, fertilizers, pesticides and what about winter Golf Cart storage. In his letter of January 12 addressed to Ms Rebecca Lau Mr Edward Moskal of Millcroft has detailed his concerns. If this doesn't tell you that they are going to walk away from operating the golf course I don't know what will.

In regards to the environment, it's always wise to respect the force of Mother Nature. I for many years lived on a sailboat and let me tell when Mother Nature decides it's time for a major storm it's time to get out of the way. A boat can move but our community is stationary. Major storms of all kinds are increasing, heavier rains will come and so again will the flooding.

The Tuck_Shoreacres_Appleby and Sheldon Creeks watershed Study of 1985 is more relevant today than when it was written. I am not an engineer and I struggled through this 170 page report until I reached the point that I needed a professional engineer who was currently working with environmental concerns, specifically storm water.

Here is a synopsis of the response {FYI Millcroft previously was the Rose Community}:

“In regards to the Tuck_Shoreacres_Appleby and Sheldon Creeks watershed Study.

Upon review of the Rose community Appendix. As you are aware it states that the golf course is a required part of the stormwater servicing particularly to:

1. reduce the existing shallow flooding and overspill and
2. to provide adequate depth for outlets for the storm sewers

The golf course is described as a preservation strategy for "branches of Appleby creek". This is described in the Konx Martin Kretch Limited report dated 3rd of February 1984. I recommend discussing this with Conservation Halton staff to understand their definition of their regulated area (and how their regulated area has changed over time).

The golf course is designed so that the lowest connected foundation drain will not be inundated during the Regional Storm flow (in the major flow channels creek and golf course). The criteria for the design of the golf course is to maintain the rear lot line elevations a minimum of 2.5m above the bottom of the golf course.

The golf course open space is wide and deep and offers significant storage for stormwater. This storage will obviously be lost should the area develop and the question remains as to how the developer intends to replace that lost storage. Underground storage tanks of this size would be prohibitively expensive (this was evaluated in the subwatershed study - not feasible).

But the golf course was not only required to protect private property from local flooding issues it was also a requirement because it helps to contain the regional flood line along the east branch of Appleby Creek.

The golf course was considered an essential part of the flood control strategy in the Appleby Creek Subwatershed Study (1985). It was demonstrated through modeling to be essential in order to contain the regional flood along the East branch or Appleby Creek.

I request that the following questions be answered.

1. What strategies have been put in place to compensate for the loss of the golf course on river flooding?
2. Have the proponents conducted an assessment of potential basement flooding within the areas where foundation drains are connected to storm sewers?

3. What is the volume (cubic meters) of storage currently available for stormwater in the golf course and what is the volume of storage proposed through the developer's functional servicing report? (And later why aren't they the same?)
4. Will residents and the City be compensated in the case that basement flooding and other damages occur?"

Yesterday February 28 I received the following and again I confirm that the author is an Engineer and currently employed in storm water management.

"Paul, I've provided you some fairly technical information below. But at a high level here are some of the concepts you may be interested in:

1. The golf course is really built over remnant parts of Appleby Creek. If you looked back far enough prior to a lot of storm sewers and roads being built you would likely find that these low lying areas were intermittent parts of the creek, forks if you will, that flowed at time (spring) and were soggy areas at other times. Conservation Halton has given up on these reaches of the creek in that they are no longer considered a part of their regulated area around the watercourse but that doesn't mean these areas don't provide valuable and sorely needed ecological services.

2. One of the main ecological services provided by the golf course is flood relief. These services were identified as critical to protect life and property in the Subwatershed study completed in 1985. Somehow over time numerous flood studies have been completed that have rationalized urban intensification suggesting that the flood relief provided by the golf course is no longer required. With climate change intensifying rainfall patterns, and urban infill eroding storage on the landscape doesn't seem ironic (if not impossible) that the golf course is no longer required for flood relief?

3. Stormwater management requirements have evolved and compounded over the decades making it more and more difficult for developers to urbanize, infill etc without doing their due diligence to protect the environment. Given the golf course is part of the region's natural heritage system and a valuable ecological resource, doesn't it seem out of line for the proponents to state that the stormwater management criteria developed in a subwatershed study completed in 1985 trumps our current best practices?

4. Of all the proposed stormwater management strategies that I've reviewed over the years I have rarely seen a system proposed that does so little to mitigate the proposed development. Given the sensitivity and value of these rare remaining natural areas within the urban fabric doesn't the proposed mitigation strategy deserve to be the best it can be?

That's my high level two cents. If you prefer more technical advice I can do that too but I can't guarantee you would understand it.

He further wrote: The first thing to note is that the functional servicing report states:

"Tuck, Shoreacres, Appleby and Sheldon Creeks Watershed Study (SWS) prepared by the City of Burlington in June 1985 takes precedence over the City of Burlington's and MECP's design guidelines and standard practices."

This is an obvious play since stormwater management criteria have changed and progressed significantly since 1985. Also, I reviewed that subwatershed recently and one of my main conclusions after reading that study is that the golf course provides a lot of storage for stormwater that is essential to reduce flooding around Appleby Creek. The subwatershed study evaluated strategies like storage tanks and increasing the culver size under upper middle road and determined that preservation of the golf course was the only approach that could prevent flooding of the homes around Appleby creek. I notice that super pipe storage has been included as a strategy in the functional servicing report even though the subwatershed study evaluated and surmised that this strategy will not work.

It's not appropriate that this functional servicing study on the one hand used the watershed study to reduce their stormwater management criteria requirements and on the other had proposed servicing strategies that this same watershed study already concluded would not work to reduce flooding.

For example, the subwatershed study states that:

"... no runoff quantity controls, erosion controls or quality controls are required for the watercourses adjacent to or downstream of the proposed development Areas."

This is not compatible with current provincial requirements.

The functional servicing study states:

"With respect to discharge of post-development flows into existing sewer systems, adequate storage / flow control will be provided where necessary to ensure that the existing flows in the storm sewer system are not exceeded."

This second point is not in line with the requirements/criteria developed in the subwatershed study. The subwatershed study deems the golf course an essential part of the flood control strategy for the Creek. By building on the golf course and only providing enough storage to ensure that the existing flood in the storm sewer system is not exceeded does not address the issue of the lost storage on the landscape that is required to prevent riverine flooding.

On August 4th, 2014 a narrow and severe band of thunderstorms struck the City of Burlington, causing widespread flooding. The event produced average subwatershed rainfall depths up to 150 mm over 6-7 hours and maximum localized rainfall depths to nearly 200 mm. The event was centred primarily over the middle-eastern part of the City with the greatest flood impacts observed in Roseland, Tuck, Shoreacres and Appleby Creek

watersheds. Thousands of flooding reports from residents and businesses were received by the City of Burlington and Region of Halton. The impacts cited by area residents and businesses were related to several flood mechanisms including riverine flooding, inadequate major overland system drainage... Insured damages associated with the storm were estimated to be in excess of \$90 million with many homeowners uninsured or under-insured

The concept of major overland system drainage was raised in the "Tuck, Shoreacres, Appleby and Sheldon Creeks Watershed Study (SWS). It identified the golf course as an essential element of the flood control strategy to prevent flooding along appleby creek.

Also, the functional servicing study presents strategies to mitigate changes to the water balance that were identified in the companion hydrogeoglocal report.

A water balance was prepared by RJB in conjunction with their hydrogeology report. A copy of the report is provided in Appendix B. Development of the Subject Property will reduce infiltration to the shallow groundwater flow system. The groundwater balance calculations suggest that, without mitigation, a potential reduction of 37% of the average annual groundwater infiltration could occur (refer to RJB Report Table G-3, Appendix G in Appendix B).

To mitigate these issues the functional servicing report recommends disconnection of the downspouts and the addition of 300mm or topsoil to the new lawn area. This approach to mitigating the water balance is just not appropriate. It could be scientifically challenged. In all likelihood the compaction and grading that will occur with development will reduce infiltration potential more than the proposed mitigation measures.

Overall, the level of mitigation proposed is not appropriate and the way in which the SWM criteria have been scoped for these studies is not in line with current practice.

I will review further as time permits. Let me know if this is helpful or not (so pressed for time these days)"

I learned a long time ago that to be respected and successful one had to work to mutually beneficial outcomes, a win-win for all concerned. Where is "the win" for the residents of Millcroft? Where is the "Win" for all those who developed past and present Official Plans? Not one part of this application is respectful to the achieved great success of our Millcroft community. It is not even respectful to past Official Plans and the current one recently unanimously passed by Burlington City Council and endorsed by Halton Region. Whilst on the subject of the Official Plan' I understand that the new plan was over two years in the making. I've no idea how many man hours were involved or the financial cost to us all, but I am confident that it was substantial. What I do know is that to negate all the effort to negotiate these official plans is dismissive and disrespectful to all those involved in their development. This includes the professional planners, Burlington's councillors, Mayor and the Halton Regional officials/employees.

I cannot find a win- win in any part of this application. To request that presently zoned park land be deemed to become residential is totally beyond reasonable! To dismiss the objections of the great majority of stakeholders who will be negatively impacted should this application be approved is unjustifiable!

If this proposal is in any way approved, then those that approve it are not being respectful to the residents of Millcroft, the environment or those who developed the above noted plans, but also, frankly, of Burlington as a whole. I believe that such approval would be indefensible!

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Petit