

Good Evening ladies and gentleman

Thank you for your time this evening.

My name is Colleen Hutter. I have lived in Millcroft with my family for the past 17 years.

I am speaking this evening to ask for the City's Councillor's and the Mayor to vote against any proposal pertaining to development of Millcroft Community's Open space otherwise known as the lands of the Millcroft Golf Course.

The existing zoning for the Millcroft Golf course is zone O1, Open space and it is my understanding as per the Official Plan that rezoning Open Space would not be allowable. Burlington's Strategic Plan 2015-2040 lays out a strategy for a Healthier and Greener City, Ontario's Provincial Policy Statement, 2019 Greater Golden Horseshoe Statement addresses protection of Natural heritage, wetlands and Open space. Burlington's Official Plan Section 8.4.2.2(d) "A proposal to re designate lands within the Major Parks and Open Space designation to another land use designation shall only be considered by the City in conjunction with a statutory Official Plan Review." Demonstrating that the intent is not to be rezoning Open space.

That being said why are we even here responding to a proposal to rezone Open Space when we can name Municipal and Provincial Official Plans that state that doing so would be against the directions our Cities, Region and Province is taking. Yet we are here today fighting to maintain our Open space, the natural habitat's and the wildlife that lives within it.

Rezoning the Open Space to Residential would be a very dangerous precedent for future development applications that puts all Open Space and parkland and even Conservation lands at risk. Should this get approval it will very likely expand beyond into the rest of the Millcroft Golf course, no matter what their marketing materials states. This is just a first attempt at getting development approved so that there can be subsequent phases. fighting to maintain our Open space, the natural habitat's and the wildlife that lives within it.

In reading the Planning Justification Report there was reference being made to the Millcroft Golf Club as having reduced profit margins. I would have to argue that with proper management and marketing there is absolutely no reason why this needs to be the case. Last year in particular likely turned out to be an excellent year for golf courses with golf being about the only allowable sport, while soccer, baseball and football fields remained completely vacant. Further reducing the size of the course will likely not attract people but just the opposite and further reduce its viability. We have lived in the Community for 17 years and I can advise that we have never received any Marketing materials, or advertising from the Golf club. No programs were advertised for kids , camps or lessons, nor any neighbourhood programs that would send me running over to sign up. Does this sound like a business that wants to improve or wants to use their plight as a business case to sell off the lands for profit?

There have been many arguments brought forward as to why this should not proceed but no argument should be as powerful as the one that protects the nature and Green space around us. This is very much a topic that is at the forefront of Environmental talks these days and there is no turning back once you take that first step to destroying the Green space and wetlands around us.

Further, In reviewing the proposed site plans for development I would feel negligent if I didn't point out some very glaring deficiencies in what is being proposed .

First off:

As per Alan Ramsay's report I have taken the opportunity to show the percentage in deficiency that is being proposed by Argo. This illustrates that there is not any compatibility or integration with the existing fabric on the neighbourhood, from all aspects of what is being proposed.

i) Development Standards – As illustrated below Millcroft Greens is proposing significant reductions to the zoning regulations in comparison with the R2-3 zone found on most of the abutting and adjacent properties.

Zoning Regulation	R2-3 Standard on Adjacent lands	Proposed R3-2 Exception Zoning	Percentage Deficient
Min. Lot Frontage	18m	15m	16.67% reduction

Zoning Regulation	R2-3 Standard on Adjacent lands	Proposed R3-2 Exception Zoning	Percentage Deficient
Min. Lot area	680m ²	425m ²	37.5% reduction
Min. Front yard (dwelling)	7.5m	4.5m	40% reduction
Min. Side Yard (1.)	1.8m or 10% of lot frontage	1.2m	33% reduction
Min. Rear Yard (2.)	9.0 m	7.5m	16.66% reduction
Min. Building Height (2.)	10m	12m	20% increase
Min. Lot coverage (2.)	25%	n/a	n/a asking for no restriction

Is it even possible for a developer to be proposing no restriction on Lot coverage? In my experience there is always a restriction on this when builders plans are put fourth to the City for approval.

I strongly urge the community and the City to look at what exists today as far as lot size and coverage, along with setbacks so they can understand that what is being proposed here will not be seamless or complimentary in any way to what exists today once completed.

Further:

Millcroft Green’s has proposed a 20 foot landscape buffer behind the existing homes to give separation from the new homes being built. What I find quite interesting is that the new homes being proposed has lot depth deficiencies of between 10 and 30 feet from what the average sized lot depth is in the existing neighbourhood.

Therefore if you are an existing Millcroft Resident you will have no more privacy from the new home behind than what exists today for houses that back onto other homes. As a matter of fact you may have even less. The developer has actually taken away from the new subdivision customers properties and made that the landscape buffer, only showing that there wasn’t enough room for the new street with homes on either side and their “landscape buffer” in the first place.

An example of this would be some of the lots being proposed show between 90 and 113 foot depths, whereas many of the existing depths for non golf course lots in Millcroft are 123ft. Those backing onto the course run 70 feet wide by depths of over 125ft up to 160ft. So you can see that

there is already a deficiency in what is being proposed and even adding a 20ft buffer those golf course lots will have even less separation from their abutting properties than those streets where they have always backed onto other homes. Let us not forget that Argo is proposing that there will be walking paths run along those landscape buffers. How can this be representative of privacy for those being affected as per the proposed subdivisions?

After reviewing the proposed site plans, what I see as a weak attempt at trying to fit a street full of homes in a space that cannot accommodate them. The entire design seeks to steal from Peter to give to Paul to try desperately to make it work .

While much focus is being shed onto the Millcroft Green's housing proposal , the re-zoning of the lands along Dundas from Medium density to high density for the purpose of building a 6 storey 130 unit apartment building clearly demonstrates another proposal that does not compliment nor is compatible with the existing community.

There are no apartment buildings inside the major intersections that surround Millcroft. The existing zoning would allow for a townhome complex to be built and accommodate a sufficient number of units for housing. In keeping with the fabric of the community why would it not be the best case scenario to have a community of townhomes built there much like what is further along Dundas across from the Hayden community centre. To change the zoning, increasing the density to add a 6 story building with no specific height being presented adding over 130 extra cars into the mix will absolutely affect surrounding homes and the site line for this building will travel well across the northern streets within Millcroft including those streets that back onto the hydro corridor towards the equipment shed. Not to mention there will be an increased safety risk to the student pedestrians who are walking to and from Hayden Secondary school and to the park land across the street on a regular basis.

The City of Burlington has committed time and effort and the expertise of many Subject matter experts to build a sustainable Official plan only to see developers appeal the plan for their own greed. This land has been zoned Open space since 1984 and continues to be zoned Open space. Why aren't these developers purchasing lands that are conducive to their development goals? Why is the cart in front of the horse ? It is time to

maintain the parameters that we have set, as a community , as a City and as a Region.

The future of this City and the liveability of this City very much depends on a balance between Green-space, Conservation, Parks and golf courses, sporting fields, and liveable Communities. A Community cannot be considered liveable when the snow needs to be trucked to other neighbourhoods parking lots, the basements and lands around our homes are flooding, and the streets are cracking and sinking from ongoing water management issues.

History shows us that we must learn from our mistakes, here is our chance to do just that. There are communities all around the world, that balance all of this. There is a reason why Burlington rates as one of the best City's in Canada to live. We must keep to the standards that we have been operating on and continue to strive to maintain those standards. Its time to say No to development of the Open space that makes our City what it is today!

As a resident of Burlington, I am committed to maintaining and nurturing Open Space, Green Space, parkland and the Conservation Lands that surround us. We are uniquely situated below escarpment lands. It is our duty as a City and as the people that reside here to protect our Environment and that is why I am asking that Council and Mayor Marianne Meed Ward reject the proposal before you today to rezone the Open Space lands of Millcroft and the land under Zone E keeping it at Medium density.

Thank you for your time