

From: Anne Campbell

Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 11:25 AM

To: Mailbox, Clerks <Clerks@burlington.ca>

Cc: Meed Ward, Marianne <Marianne.MeedWard@burlington.ca>; kelnin.galbraith@burlington.ca; Kearns, Lisa <Lisa.Kearns@burlington.ca>; Nisan, Rory <Rory.Nisan@burlington.ca>; Stolte, Shawna <Shawna.Stolte@burlington.ca>; Sharman, Paul <Paul.Sharman@burlington.ca>; angelo.betivegna@burlington.ca; Mailbox, Office of the Mayor <mayor@burlington.ca>

Subject: Revised Development Proposal for 1085 Clearview Ave.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Members of Council,

I am writing with regards to the recent revised proposal for 1085 Clearview Ave., and while we appreciate that the developer is working with City Staff, and this proposal is somewhat an improvement from the original proposal, this is still an unacceptable development for the area. The entire area of Clearview, Queen Mary, St. Matthews and the subject lands are zoned 'low rise residential' and must remain as such, no exceptions.

A six storey, and if the drawing is any indication, would be 7 or 8 storey as they do not include penthouse mechanical, should not be permitted and be rejected. Six storey's need to include the penthouse levels, so the developer should be submitting for a 4 storey build on this site. I had noted in a previous submission for the original design, the subject lands should be restricted to a townhouse development. As an example, an area adjacent to the Clarkson Go and similar to this site, was developed with an absolutely fantastic 3 storey townhouse complex, called 'Southdown Towns', to compliment the surrounding area. Councilor Rory indicated to me in a return email he was going to look into this build as a preferred option. In fact, when Liv Communities bought the 2 homes at the end of St. Matthews, our Ward One councillor indicated to me that this site would be a townhouse complex, not a low rise building.

I, as all my neighbours, have concerns regarding a six storey development for this site. I will add my concerns to address the Summary of Revisions:

1) Building length reduced to include two 51 metre buildings. No indication or proposed density or number of suites.

2) Front setback from Masonry Court is unacceptable at 5 metres. One only needs to look at the 2 six storey complexes built by Adi, to see how ridiculously close they are to Masonry Court.

3) Rear yard setback landscape buffer of 5.25 metres is also a joke. One couldn't call a 15 foot strip of land landscaping and is unacceptable as it provides no real separation from the private homes.

4) Reduction in surface parking from 49 to 29 stalls. Once completed where would all the visitor parking be located. The developer must ensure there is adequate underground parking for visitors , as well on a tenant perspective, ensure the underground parking meets or exceeds City regulations.

6) Town facade is just that, a facade, and not actual townhomes with a yard, for an appropriate transition to the homes along St.Matthews.

A few other points:

1) There is also the massive noise and disruption to this extremely quiet neighborhood that would last well over 2 years, not to mention the last 5 or 6 years of chaos we have had to endure from the Adi development, which, is far from finished.

2) Where will all the contractor personnel park as there certainly will be no provision on this site. Parking on Clearview and St. Matthews is definately not an option, so the developer will have to provide alternative parking. We do not need any chaos on these family friendly streets.

3) For the tenants of this complex there is no greenspace nor any outdoor amenities.

It is the writers opinion that this build has no value add to the neighborhood, in fact would be a detriment to the community as a whole and should be rejected.

Regards,

Peter and Anne-Marie Campbell

From: Steve Favalaro
Sent: Saturday, August 08, 2020 8:48 AM
To: Mailbox, Clerks <Clerks@burlington.ca>
Subject: Proposed Development at 1085 Clearview Ave

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I wanted to write this email as we will be on vacation during the meeting but I would like to have our voice heard

We have been opposed to this project since the beginning for a number of reasons, and the proposed changes by Coletara Developments do not do much to address the situation

1. The proposed 6 storey structure does not fit with the current established neighbourhood and we will have a clear view of it from our front porch even with the proposed changes on St Matthews Side – I am not opposed to development if it is managed and in a way the respects established neighbourhoods in the City
2. 6 storey will have the new residence peering into the backyards of people on St Matthews and St Mary's with no privacy for those residence
3. I am concerned with the effect on sunlight late in the day from this building
4. Also concerned with the extensive noise and dust this project will produce during construction
5. I am also concerned about the impact on traffic these additional units will cause on Plains Rd. It is already busy enough especially at 5pm everyday (pre covid but it will return to this)

My biggest concern is the precedence this is setting for this kind of development in an existing established neighbourhood. I would support the development of 2 storey townhomes on this site as that would fit with the neighbourhood and transition nicely to the development on Masonry court. But of course developers want to make as much money as they can so want as many units as they can. The City needs to stop bowing to developers and manage growth better which the current Council appears to be doing so I congratulate them on that – lets keep it up and make sure the City maintains its character for future generations

Thanks
Steve and Marina Favalaro

From: Dawn Fanelli
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 6:40 AM
To: Mailbox, Clerks <Clerks@burlington.ca>
Subject: 1085 Clearview Avenue Development

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Morning,

While the revised proposal is an improvement from the original proposal – this site is zoned for low-rise residential. To say that this is a compromise from the developers is a joke. This "revision" maintains the same number of units and profitability for the developer while making insignificant concessions. The proposal does not offer any value to the existing community.

Our family has the following concerns regarding a six-storey development on this site;

1. There is not enough park space for the number of units, and it blocks our unobstructed view of the escarpment
2. Noise and disruption - This is a 2+ year major construction build, which requires tower crane(s), excavation, large volumes of trucking and concrete trucking to complete. This all-day construction noise/traffic 6 days a week for 2+ years. After construction, the noise will continue - the proximity to existing housing with large commercial HVAC units, commercial Garage door opening/closing to under-ground parking, increased density of people in our quiet area.
3. Increased traffic/parking on our quiet family friendly streets – We are concerned that contractors (during construction phase) will use Clearview & St. Matthews to access the site. Lining our residential streets with commercial trucks & high volumes of traffic, jeopardizing the safety of our children. The new proposal limits above ground parking and we are worried that condo residents/visitors will use Clearview for over-flow parking and walk across the landscape barrier. Our neighbourhood does not have sidewalks and our children use these quiet streets to play (ride bikes, wagon rides etc.) I would like to remind the City of Burlington that this community suffered the death of a 6 year old child on St. Matthews avenue who was

struck by a commercial truck. This terrible incident prompted the closure of access to Masonry Crt. from both Clearview and St. Matthews. I hope that the city learns from this tragic incident and continues to promote safe communities for their residents.

4. Carbon-dioxide vents from underground parking structure to increase pollution in our area
5. Concerned for Watershed management and flooding to our community

Yours truly,

Dawn Fanelli

Re: Revised Development Proposal 1085 Clearview Ave.

Although we did not received any official notice of the meeting to be held on August 11th with respect to this revised proposal we have some continuing concerns about this development particularly as it potentially impacts our own property. Due to the timing of this meeting we are likely not able to attend and therefore are submitting these concerns in writing

Unfortunately the developer did not really listen to the fundamental issue related to this project. People in the Clearview-Queen Mary-St. Matthews neighbourhood do not want a six-storey apartment building in this existing community.

Historically this property was part of the neighbourhood of single family dwellings: a community of mixed demographic s of seniors, and young families, singles and empty nesters. Coletara does not have to create a “fully integrated planned community” --- it already exists here with the amenities of trees and grass, flowers and vegetables, birds and wildlife, outdoor air and sunshine to enjoy. We continue to support a fitting development, such as luxury townhomes, that would truly integrate into this unique neighbourhood. Many of the issues noted below would be eliminated if such an appropriate proposal were presented.

1. How many trees are planned to be removed for this development? Each tree absorbs significant amounts of water. Given the high water table in this area these trees are necessary to reduce the impact of flooding. Any tree removal is contrary to the preservation of the environment and quality of living in this area.
2. Storm water flow: As our property is already regularly flooded following storms as a result of the inadequate storm water drainage on St. Matthews, any additional storm water flow onto either Clearview Ave. or St. Matthews Ave. is to be prevented.
3. Building length reduced: The original proposal was for one building of 113 meters in length. The revision is now two 51-metre length buildings (total 102 metres) **plus** a connecting element. The length of that connecting element is not given. What is that length? The total footprint of this proposal does not appear to be any less than the original.
4.
 - a. Elimination of one driveway entrance/exit: Which exit is being eliminated? Any driveway or pedestrian entrance/exit on either Clearview Ave. or St. Matthews Ave. is undesirable.
 - b. Entrance and exit to a 6-storey building must be only to Masonry Court.
 - c. Access to the site during construction must be via Masonry Crt. not Clearview Ave or St. Matthews Ave.
 - d. Where will those involved in construction park their vehicles? Again no parking on either Clearview Ave. or St. Matthews during the construction is to be maintained.
5. Reduction of surface parking from 49 to 29 parking stalls: What visitor parking is being provided for this development? No visitor parking is to be permitted on either Clearview Ave. or St. Matthews Avenue.
6. The address for this site should be changed from Clearview Ave. to a Masonry Crt address.

Ruth, Diane and Deborah Roberts

Good Morning, I am writing to you this morning in response to the Revised redevelopment proposal put forth by the developer for 1085 Clearview Ave in Aldershot.

I would like to first commend the developer and the city for the ongoing process that has taken place here. At this point everyone, including residents in the area understand the need for this property to be developed and there has been progress in working towards a solution that works for all parties involved and meet the directives sent down from the Provincial level. Its certainly a step in the right direction have more open consultation.

One correction, the communication noted that this was the 2nd submission for this development, it may be the 2nd official submission when in fact it is the 3rd submission the first being a much taller structure (I believe double the size) then is currently proposed that met unfavorably in early consultations. Unfortunately for those citizen that live around these developing areas, the process is really just a dartboard that the developer keeps throwing submissions at until the proposal finally gets passed by the City and or LPAT. If there was no opposition to the first proposal we would have a double digit structure being built in this same parcel of land. There should be more to the system then this to protect both the long standing residents and those that are moving into a community that will be impacted by this building.

My ongoing concerns are as follows:

1. Height of the building: Despite all the window dressing being submitted in the revised proposal, the issue of building height is of primary concern. I propose 4 story buildings that limits the impact on all the surrounding residents. Not only those that have lived in this community for 70 plus year but all the new residents that will become citizens of Aldershot in the near future. I am curious how many of those buyers were given the heads up that a 6 story buying was being erected across the street and if they provided any avenue for input in this process. The 4 story building will have little impact on privacy, site lines etc for the existing and newer neighborhoods where a 6 story building will have a dramatic impact. The 4 story also meets the requirement of the Provincial government of intensification of existing neighborhoods. The developer also gets his needs met as when he purchased this property he was aware of the current zoning as low density residential so being granted a 4 story site is really a victory.
2. Over intensification: You don't have to be a city planner to see what is happening in this area of Aldershot. I think I'm being cautious when I say there 5-7 buildings currently approved or the writing is on the wall for this immediate area. They will all be 6 story's or higher. Does another 6 story site need to be approved? Wouldn't a smaller building or better yet townhouse development not meet the need of the stakeholders and yet still maintain some character to the area.
3. Maintaining of the tree canopy: There are very mature trees that are on the border of this property and the Clearview/StMathew Neighborhood. These trees will be crucial in maintaining at least of the privacy that most have grown accustom to over 70 years of living there. I would sincerely hope that not only will these trees being maintained and protected throughout the construction process with very stiff penalties if damaged.

Appreciate the forum to express my concerns.
Lowell Crane

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Moore

Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 8:29 AM

To: Mailbox, Clerks <Clerks@burlington.ca>

Subject: Revised Development Proposal - 1085 Clearview

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am disappointed that I had to hear about this proposal from a neighbour instead of being notified by the City.

The Liv Community building that was proposed was too large, too wide, too high and completely incompatible with the existing neighbourhood. This revised proposal is in no way an improvement to the previous plan. It is still too wide, still too high and still completely incompatible with the existing neighbourhood.

Please do not permit this project to be approved and destroy a neighbourhood.

Michael Moore

From: Pereira, Mike
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 2:43 PM
To: Mailbox, Clerks <Clerks@burlington.ca>
Subject: Development at 1085 Clearview Ave

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I am writing in regard to the proposed development from Coletara at 1085 Clearview Ave.

I am a resident and co-owner of St Matthews Ave and the proposed condo would be 3 doors down from our house at 1090 St Matthews Ave.

I along with my partner Stephanie Stevens are against this development and have the following concerns:

- We just bought and moved into our house on June 1st and we bought it because it is a mature, quiet neighborhood
- Noise on our street during construction: we work from home and it will be very difficult to work with all of this noise happening.
- Concerned that there may be some overflow parking of cars who cannot find parking at the condo.
- There are no sidewalks on our street, so children play on the street. With increased traffic, it may no longer be a safe place to play.

We are a young couple and are looking to grow our family in the coming years, and we would love to see this property better used to build a public park for our children to play in.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mike Pereira

August 10, 2020

RE: REVISED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL FOR 1085 CLEARVIEW AVENUE

TO: The City of Burlington

Firstly, the new development proposal for 1085 Clearview Avenue does not address the fact that this site is zoned low-rise residential. This proposal would alter the demographics to high density housing.

Secondly, it was made clear by the Province in their recommendations to the City of Burlington with respect to Hub development that no established communities would be included. Our community consists of White Oaks development and the Clearview/St. Mary/St. Matthew street development. White Oaks was excluded for reasons that are not clear to us while our area was not.

Thirdly, our community consists of approximately 50 plus single family detached dwelling homes, many built in the 1940s with 9 homes that have been built within the last 10 years. Young families have begun to move back into the neighbourhood because it is a neighbourhood without sidewalks where children can play on the streets and families can gather to chat. Neither Clearview or St. Matthews are through streets meaning the reduction of traffic flow is precisely what draws couples with children. Many of the homes are still house original families who are now seniors. We are a private and close community. WE ARE EXACTLY THE TYPE OF COMMUNITY THAT THE PROVINCE INTENDED TO EXCLUDE FROM HIGH DENSITY DEVELOPMENT.

Fourthly, it is morally wrong to walk into our small enclave of homes and disrupt how we live as a community. We take offense at the detachment city planners have exhibited in throwing our community under the bus. These are our homes and we pay our taxes to live in them.

Fifth, there is more land that can be developed in the surrounding area that would not encroach on a well established area. It is not a very comfortable feeling to have to defend our position on an ongoing basis and it is a particularly hard pill to swallow when many of the homeowners continue to invest heavily in the beautification of their properties.

Regards,
Nadine and Robert Martin
Clearview Avenue

From: Ryan Browne
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 11:38 PM
To: Mailbox, Clerks <Clerks@burlington.ca>
Subject: Concerns for revised proposal development at 1085 Clearview Ave

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Ryan and Lisa Browne

To whom it may concern,

Hello, I'm writing in regard to the revised development proposal at 1085 Clearview Ave. Our family has lived at this address for 3 years and really like the neighbourhood and the people who live here. We moved here for the reason of a good place for our two children to grow up and go to school and to live on a cul-de-sac, where we knew our children would be safe and no worries of busy traffic like where we used to live. I would like to stress a couple points of concern with this new development and the effects it will cause for us.

- we oppose the height of this new six-storey development, which is too close to our residential neighbourhood. it will block our view, sun and privacy in a significant way. Existing condos are located on the main streets like Plains Rd and Brant where access to the building is not invasive and will not cause a rise in traffic like it would where single dwelling homes with kids and families are walking, running, playing etc...

- I'm a parent who works nights and needs to sleep till noon. over the course of the last two years I have been awoken by heavy machinery sounds every morning, which have affected my sleep a lot. I have learned to accept it knowing that it will be done soon, but now knowing that it will be three times as close to my house and for the same length of time, kind of upsets me.

- increased parking on surrounding streets will increase more. our streets do not have curbs or sidewalks which causes people to park and unload on our lawns, which many people in our neighbourhood take pride in maintaining.

- air pollution from machinery, trucks and dust constantly being stirred up over such a long period of time is not normal in a low-rise residential area

- I feel trucks and heavy machinery can affect the integrity of some homes in the area. with the rumbling and consistent moving of land.

These are just a few quick points I could think of before the meeting that I would like to mention. I know there are many more points that I also agree with from surrounding neighbours including green space and parking garage emissions. I feel that I have to say something about this manner in respect for my family and neighbours to make sure our voices are heard.

Thank You
Ryan and Lisa Browne

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Mailbox Clerks](#)
Subject: Coletara Application
Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 7:56:06 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I support Burlington City Council's decision to refuse Coletara's revised application.

Susan