

Shoreacres Community Meeting Minutes

July 29, 2014 | 6:30 – 8:45 | Burlington Seniors' Centre

6:30 – 7:15 Introductions and Staff Presentation

- Planning Policy Framework
- Minor Variance and Land Severance Process
 - o Discussion regarding appeal period for the C of A and the OMB
- Site Plan Process
- Public Notice Requirements
- Recent Planning Applications in the area
- Next Steps

7:15 – 8:45 Discussion

- Participant asked about the kinds of concerns that sparked the Indian Point and Roseland Character Studies
 - o Staff advised the concerns were similar to the ones raised for Shoreacres and specifically included concerns over development applications, including a few applications that were appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB)
 - o Staff advised that the Study generated a wide variety of opinions and issues
- Conversation between participants and staff about how neighbourhoods go through change
 - o Staff advised that our city is going through change because we are no longer expanding the urban boundary and that means new homes will be built in established residential neighbourhoods
 - o Staff advised that Planning does not regulate taste; the public can express values and taste through their homes
- Participant commented that they had an impression when they bought their house that the neighbourhood would stay the same. They believe builders should be respectful and have courtesy
- Participant expressed disagreement with the term “Arbour Neighbourhood” used by some of the participants
 - o Staff advised that the City does not name neighbourhoods and the name of this area is not set in stone
- Participants commented that 10m maximum building height is too high
- Participant expressed concern that the size of the preliminary boundary is too small and should be reassessed
- Participant expressed concerns about impacts on property values
- Participants commented that the neighbourhood has a unique, harmonious appearance
 - o This area is a community of bungalows and mature trees
 - o Concerns regarding privacy; especially with corner lots and windows
 - o The demolition of houses has a damaging effect on the community

- Participant commented that the neighbourhood is not a multi-generation, multi-family neighbourhood and that a recent build in the area is a travesty
- Participant commented that the 60m radius for Committee of Adjustment applications should be extended for mailings to notify residents
 - Staff advised that the notification requirements are set out in the Planning Act of Ontario
 - Participant encouraged neighbours to share Committee of Adjustment notices with neighbours
- Participant asked at what point the arborist gets involved during rebuilds
 - Staff advised that there is no private tree protection by-law in Burlington
 - City staff have 2 ways to protect trees:
 - Through the site planning process, staff can give suggestions to residents regarding their private trees
 - Under the Ontario Forestry Act, there are protections for shared boundary trees – this is Provincial law, but reviewed and managed during site plan applications
- Participant asked who to talk with to have notifications sent out for site plan applications
 - Staff advised that, as long as the development complies with zoning, the site plan process is not a public process and does not require public notice. The Building Department is concerned that development is safe (in accordance with the Building Code) → City staff do not govern taste
 - Staff explained that, in rare circumstances, undelegated site plan approvals can go to Council for approval
- Participant advised that they are concerned over general Zoning By-laws
 - Comment that they don't understand how a house can be torn down and a new one 3 times the size can be built
 - Planning needs tools to protect neighbourhoods and stop the building of monster homes
 - Developers are “building for profit, not conscience”
 - Monster homes are destroying the harmonious streetscape
- Participant advised that there is a problem with the side street setback requirement and have concerns with privacy
- Participant doesn't like surprises and questioned why there is no notice of demolition
 - Staff advised that notice requirements are regulated by the Planning Act and the Ontario Building Code
 - The Building Code does not require notice of demolition. If the demolition will be done safely, a demolition permit is issued and it is a private matter between the property owner and the City
- Participant advised that they are not against minor change, but the term “minor variance” can be misleading because people may not grasp the impact of the variance through the public notice
- Participant advised that there are specific examples how the neighbourhood is under siege
 - A recent development on Goodram “fell out of Alton” – the participant does not want the compact development in North Burlington to occur in their area

- The participant expressed dislike for a recent “flat roof home” that was recently built in the area
- Participant made reference to this area deserving the nickname “Treeland” for its trees similar to “Birdland” which has many birds
- Participant referred to MPAC assessing areas that are homogenous and similar and felt that this neighbourhood should remain homogenous and similar
- Participant asked for clarification that Indian Point and Roseland were pilot projects
 - Staff advised that the Character Area Study was initiated through the Official Plan Review and aligns with the objective of creating vibrant neighbourhoods in the City’s Strategic Plan
 - Staff confirmed that the Character Area Study for Roseland and Indian Point was intended as a pilot program
- Participant referred to a shift of standards and asked about the reference point for neighbourhoods across Burlington (e.g. Alton vs. South Burlington)
 - Staff advised that the purpose of a character study is to define characteristics unique to that area and consider implementing policies or regulations that reflect the area
- Participant made reference to Reset TO (placemaking, streetscape etc.)
- Participant commented that a neighbourhood with bungalows lends itself to greater privacy which is often a key consideration when property owners purchase new homes
 - Staff advised that our job is to find a balance between what can be done in the interest of the neighbourhood and what is desired by a property owner
- Participant had concerns with a Study which may be a long, drawn-out process and the participant indicated that people who live in the area already know what their neighbourhood is
 - Participant asked what can be done to fast track the study; also concerned about development in the interim; R2.1 zoning needs to change and 2-storey homes should be prevented
 - Staff advised that the By-law can be changed in approximately 6 months
 - It is possible to alter corner lot regulations, change lot coverage and height limits
- Participant commented that houses along Lakeshore are investment properties, not homes
- Participant asked how the community can enable change
 - Comments about a Character Study that can provide a holistic view of the community
 - Staff advised that public engagement takes time and encouraged people to follow the process and be engaged from the beginning until the end
- Participant would like interim by-laws to be considered, specifically for side street setbacks on corner lots
- Participant commented that 2-storey dwellings and bungalows exist harmoniously on Shoreacres and they can be compatible
 - A ban against 2 storey development is too extreme
- Participant identified himself as the owner of 246 Oak Cres and advised that he turned the main face of his dwelling because it was mandated by the City

- Participant commented that we still live in a democracy and encouraged people to look to and put pressure on their local Council and not to forget the role of local government
- Participant asked about choosing a Character Study over an Interim By-law
 - o Staff advised that the Character Study and Interim By-laws are mutually exclusive processes and one does not prevent the other
- Participants requested to have information sent out regarding Roseland's request for an Interim Control By-law and information on corner lot requirements

8:45 Wrap-up

- Staff thanked the participants for attending the meeting and encouraged people to leave their contact information and email addresses on the sign-in sheets in order to receive further information about the study
- Staff noted that a staff report on the feedback received at the meeting and from the surveys will be going to City Council in the fall and that those who have provided contact information will be contacted once the staff report is available and the Council meeting date that will consider the staff report has been confirmed