

**From:** Knight, Dina  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 08, 2020 11:23 PM  
**To:** Mailbox, Clerks <Clerks@burlington.ca>  
**Subject:** Proposed Development Hearing Submission St.Matthews

August 8,  
2020.

To Whom it may Concern;

Mayor Meed Ward, Councillor Galbraith, Melissa Morgan and City Staff,

I am writing to share my concerns and to get some clarification for questions I have regarding the new development proposal by Coletara at 1085 Clearview/St.Matthews Ave. Over the past several months I have inquired about this development file and have received some feedback from city staff although updates have been less than transparent for residents of the area.

As a concerned resident and home owner I have participated in this planning proposal through emails, council meetings and as a delegate and have been clear in stating that I oppose this development.

Almost 10 years ago, we purchased our home on St.Matthews Ave because it was on a quiet residential court location. The court location was a selling feature to raise our family because there was little traffic, my children could play outside safely and it was a quiet established neighbourhood with mature trees for privacy and a variety of new and older homes. We were confident about our purchase in the area because it was surrounded by established homes and never thought we would be faced with developers looking to completely overtake and change this residential location into rental apartment units. The new revised proposal of two apartment buildings in my opinion does not belong in a single dwelling residential established neighbourhood. There are many areas in Burlington and Aldershot where large six storey apartment buildings would be appropriate for example on Plains rd, Waterdown rd or near commercial properties but not in an established residential area. I am completely shocked that the planning department, city councillors and our Mayor would even give this proposal any consideration. I know from direct experience that the Mayor opposes over development especially when it is at the price of changing existing neighbourhoods as she stated to us when visiting the area and speaking to our residents during election time.

To my understanding to date city council has opposed the proposal at last year's council meeting, and now the LPAT hearing is to be rescheduled due to COVID 19 and until that date is set, the city legal team and planning department along with the Mayor have been in closed door negotiations with the Developers. In an email on July 9<sup>th</sup> Councillor Galbraith explained " In the previous staff report and refusal of the development application, staff did support the height and density of this development but refused it based on set backs, size and massing of the building to name a few. This unfortunately does not set up well at LPAT for a low density

option if it makes it that far and I am certain that the developer knows this." So with that being said, what exactly does this mean for the residents of St. Matthew's Ave now.

Firstly, the residents have repeatedly stated that they oppose the height of this building at six storeys as it does not transition to the single homes in this area but instead towers over them. Instead of two buildings at six storeys the residents would support townhomes, semi or detached dwellings which fits into the existing established neighbourhood. When I look around Burlington and Aldershot it is hard to understand how the planning department has approved condos that have been built on main city streets such as Plains rd, Masonry rd, Guelphline, Applebyline at a maximum height of six storeys yet now is supporting the same height proposal of six storeys in our quiet residential area.

On the other hand, there are also examples in the city where condos of only four storeys have been built on main streets for example Modr'n Condos on Gulephline, Branthaven Homes Condos on Plains rd. and these smaller condos were approved by the planning staff so I ask why is a six storey condo still being considered and supported by city planning staff in our quiet residential court.

Secondly, the Developers have proposed a density of the two buildings that far exceeds the design of this single dwelling residential neighbourhood. In the new proposal there are a greater number of units for the rental apartment building at (162) than in the original proposal of (160 units) condo units. There is an increase in 2 bedroom suites which also intensifies the population of the building from the original proposal of 22% to 35%. The new proposal includes rental apartment units instead condo units for purchase. Residents have asked that the Clearview and St. Matthews Ave development area be taken out of any considerations for the Mobility Hub which called on the intensification near GO train locations. The Clearview and St. Matthews Ave is located in an established neighbourhood and is not to be included or compared to the new ADI Development across the street at Station West which was created as its own GO Train community. Residents are asking the city to reconsider accepting a proposal with this type of intensification for our quiet neighbourhood.

Finally, I have carefully read over the new proposal presented by Coletara Developers and there is still some clarification needed. I was disappointed and still concerned to still see the size and mass of the building to be the same, the original proposal was 113 m and now there are two buildings with the total of 102m, adding a walkway in between and a landscape buffer. After adding all the measurements there is not a significant difference to benefit area residents. The height of the building remains at six storeys in the new proposal with additional height given for the venting/heating/ cooling systems on top of the building which will raise the height again by at least another storey. Although residents oppose the building proposal overall I am asking that the Developers as well as City staff give greater attention to lowering the height and size of the building overall which would greatly help the transition into the neighbourhood if the proposal had to be settled. I am concerned about the location of garbage units as well as noise from services trucks for the building. On the original plan they were located on the south east

side by St. Matthews and not sure if this has changed in the new proposal. I agreed with the one entrance driveway off Masonry rd on the west side of the building and less at grade parking on the north side of the building. I agree with the decision to change the design on the St. Matthews side of the building to include townhouse facades to help transition into the neighbourhood and improve the streetscape although no dimensions were given so we could actually see how this might help. I also agree with the set back of the building on the St. Matthews side requested by city staff but would like to see it improved further by doubling it in size to 9m instead of the current 4.5m. I feel that the extended setback along with substantial townhouse facades would improve the design.

Residents would like to feel their voices are being heard and that participating actively in the process will make a difference. Residents have been clear in stating that we oppose this development proposal. We understand development will be taking place in the area but we feel this needs to include a better design proposal with less mass, height and density to transition to the existing established neighbourhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Dina Knight