Appendix:

CPRM-07-20
CPRM August 11, 2020

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 [redacted]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 9th 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

From: Steve Favalaro [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, August 8, 2020 8:44:18 AM
To [redacted]
Subject: Public meeting

Hi Roger, I received your note in the mail about the development on Clearview. Thanks for doing this. We will be on vacation during the meeting but I would like to participate in the group submission.

We have been opposed to this project since the beginning for a number of reasons

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

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

Thanks again for doing this and good luck at the meeting
Steve Favalaro

[redacted]

3

Hi Roger. It's Jim and Nancy McKenna across the street at [redacted] St Matthews. Unfortunately I have a medical appointment in Toronto Tuesday morning and am unable to attend this public meeting. Feel free to use our names in the group submission

I like some of the proposed changes the developer is making but wish the facade was less modern looking and more in keeping with the appearance of our neighbourhood perhaps with a brick exterior

Please let us know how the meeting went and what the opinion of the mayor and council seems to be

Thank you for your involvement and concerns

Jim and Nancy

[redacted]

4

Hi Roger. My name is Robyn De Souza. I live at [redacted] Clearview avenue. Our household received your notice today and we'd really love to participate in the group submission. There's 5 of us living in this house. It's separated into 3 homes. What information do you need from us in order to give you as much support as possible?

I do believe our entire family agrees with every single one of those points

---

5

Hi Roger, I'm Sharron Hughes from [redacted] Clearview. I'd like to included in the group submission

It's still the same building. A high rise built on its side. The compromises they have come up with are a joke. There are no compromises

Thanks- further thoughts that it would be disruptive to the neighborhood. Especially those that will share a backyard. We don't know what the traffic impact will be from the condos that are being built on masonry court.

From: Lorilee Churman [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 9:45:39 AM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Development

ONe meeting the city planner was not sure if we are mobility hub .STated the mobility hub went to Brant street only, not further west.

Would only want to consider single town houses . No high rises, as with the architecture of this area. Have high rises if needed be on plains road.

Where is the meeting on the 11th.

Thanks lorilee churman

[redacted]

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

[redacted]

MEMO TO BRUCE:

RE: Liv Community Appeal of Burlington City Council's decision to refuse Liv Communities' Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments (Appeal Tribunal Case No PL190378)

We became aware of the original Application at a community meeting apparently done some 1 ½ years after Liv Communities had commenced discussions with the City Planning Department.

At a hearing before council, the legal representative for Liv arguing for Counsel Appeal stated that they had been "negotiating" with the Planning Staff and had received "suggestions" from staff to "assist" in their Application, including the purchase of the single family residences at the top of St. Matthews Avenue, and that it was expected that with satisfaction of these "suggestions", this would not be a problem with their application.

I got the distinct impression that Council was unaware of these dealings between Liv Communities and the Planning Department.

Of course, no one in the community knew of any of this.

The problem is, that historically, developers have used these "negotiations" with the Planning staff to argue an Appeal if Council does not approve the Application.

We base the opposition to this Application as follows:

1. Originally, the Province proposed 3 mobility hubs in Burlington – Burlington GO; Appleby Go and Downtown. Burlington Planning staff in their wisdom added the Aldershot hub. Thinking behind these hubs, was to accommodate and populate interim facilities in the foreseeable future.
2. What was crystal clear in the Province's recommendations was that no established residential communities would be included. In the Aldershot "mobility hubs", there are two residential communities:
   (1) White Oaks residential community; and
   (2) Clearview avenue / Queen Mary / St. Matthews residential community (referred to also by Planning as the Gove Park / St. Matthews neighborhood Precinct (see attached in yellow)

   For reasons know only to Planning Staff, the Clearview etc. residential community was not excluded, contrary to the Provincial Government guidelines (White Oaks residential community was- speckled grey on attachment)

   The Clearview / Queen Mary / St. Matthews community consists of approximately 51 single residential detached homes dating back to the early 1940s, along with +/- 9+ new homes (10 years or less) with a broad range of age demographics – young families with children, to seniors, and everything in between. There are no sidewalks, and families walk, talk and gather frequently on the street, including children. It is a close community. It is EXACTLY what the Province intended to exclude.

3. The Province also provided that there be a buffer between development and the residential communities.

   When Adi Developments had the development approved (the north side of Masonry Court adjacent to the railway tracks, it met both criteria – did not impose on the residential community and the buffer – Masonry Court – met that test – the subject applications meets neither of them.

4. The Clearview residential community does not need to be included (by a long shot) to achieve the population increase demands as anticipated by both the Provincial and Municipal Governments.

   There are a ton of property included in the Hub (s) which could be developed and not disrupt a residential community.

5. A petition was circulated prior to the Council having this application worded as follows:
   "ALDERSHOT MOBILITY PETITION
   We, the undersigned of the Clearview, Queen Mary, St. Mathew's residential community request the City of Burlington staff and council to recognize the Clearview, Queen Mary St. Matthew community as an exclusion from the City of Burlington created Aldershot Mobility Hub proposed area with the same exclusion as the White Oaks community".

   There were 48 supporters (a couple from the White Oaks community). Five residences, the owners were away, and 2 properties had been sold to Liv Communities (1082 – 1086 St. Matthews) – Petition attached.

   Liv Communities knew all the criteria from the beginning, but simply expected to be successful. I hope they are proven wrong.

From: Robert Martin
[redacted] Clearview Ave