

When many of us in Alton village bought into the community, the planned density significantly smaller. The RAL4-331 Zone regulation is 100 to 185 units per hectare. The height restriction was for 4 stories, but then later increased to 10 at this site. The property was then sold to ADI, and they had to be well aware of the city regulations and what the existing zoning was.

Still, they want to change our regulations in almost every way. This is not the first time ADI has done this. The city is well aware of their effort to overdevelop at 374 Martha Street. If 26 stories were considered overdeveloped for downtown Burlington, two 19 story buildings are even more overdeveloped in north Burlington.

This overdevelopment is not good for the community that previously bought into an existing planned area with city regulations. Now, to propose a new development with almost 2x the density, less than adequate parking, reduced green space over city regulation. No general positives for the community. The designed area will negatively affect the existing community in almost every way.

While the city report suggests that this proposal will put the traffic at near peak capacity, but is adequate I feel this is simply wrong. Traffic already gets backed up, especially in mornings with school drop off, and crossing guards.

The justification that Doug Wright Park being 0.8km away is sufficient is also flawed. There are two problems with this conclusion. First, you're asking small children to walk along palladium which is a disaster waiting to happen. An example of an accident that we, the residents expect, to occur happened last on Feb 26<sup>th</sup> at 4:45pm, which during the summer is a prime time to visit the park. On Feb 26<sup>th</sup> a Volkswagen Jetta veered off the road, rolled over, and smashed a tree and concrete light standard. This type of accident is not unexpected given how fast people drive down this road. The second problem with this assertion is that the park during peak times is always packed. Baseball games being played at the diamond, families using the basketball court, and dozens of kids all over the climber/slides. This area cannot support a significant increase in usage without discouraging people from using the facilities.

Finally, my main concern about this development is the quality of education this would lead to. I drove past both schools and counted 9 portables at AVPS and 3 at St. Annes'. I understand from previous meetings that the city believes that as the neighbourhood ages, the needs for schools change. However, doing research I found that many school districts in Ontario, and around Canada, have portables for much longer than they should be. There was a report released by the BC Teacher's Federation that shows 53% of teachers teach in portables for more than 3 years, and 21% teaching in portables for more than 5 years. With portables being undesirable work locations I can only imagine the average life span of a portable if almost 1/4 of teachers who work in portables are still in them after 5 years.

This report also discusses the sub par education students receive in these buildings. It discusses how children are limited in their arts/crafts activities in them, they have less

access to some educational tools such as TV and video. They specifically say "it is clear that facilities in the portables directly influences what is possible in terms of teaching strategies. If optimal teaching strategies are limited, then students learning is likely to be reduced"

If you're thinking well this is BC, not Ontario. I would think this is a lot more applicable to our situation than a study on millennials' driving habits from Washington DC that was talked about during the last community meeting on this development. If you look closer to home, in Ontario, I found it harder to find real publications on the topic of portables relating to children's education. However, there are many news articles.

An article from May 2002 written by Jessica Leeder at the National Post says that Janice Keil a teacher and health and safety officer at Bishop Allen Academy Secondary School in Etobicoke, found

"...90% of the 770 students she surveyed reported regular headaches, bronchial infections, asthma, allergies, congestion, throat irritation, dizziness and other respiratory problems."

This same article says alleges

"portables are responsible for a growing number of health problems among students and teachers at the school"

and continues that

"[they have] received reports from a high percentage of staff members who are experiencing fertility problems, miscarriages and problems conceiving, which they believe to be a result of teaching in run-down portable classrooms."

A Global News article from Oct 2014 shows that portables being used were not well maintained, were old and risking the health of our children with toxic mold. The article states that:

"The province will not give us more money, she said. "To repair the present building will be a couple hundred thousand (dollars) which isn't chump change."

If you look up Secord Elementary School in Toronto, children had to walk out of school and picket to get attention needed to fix their educational conditions. In Oakville in Jan 2015 parents are challenging the school board over the temperature in portables.

These structures, while cheap compared to a proper structure, are a poor place for an education! There are problems after problems being reported. We should not be encouraging higher density when our schools already overcrowded.

While I have no first hand experience with the portables at AVPS and St. Anne's, however

if its possible for these schools in Ontario to risk our children's health, its possible in Halton.

With all this in mind, I cannot understand how the school boards had no objections servicing the children's education when we already know portables are bad, and we already have 12 portables in a neighbourhood that you're asking to significantly increase the density of with an additional 494 units.