

From: Tom Betty.muir
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 12:15 PM
To: McInnes, Suzanne; Minaji, Rosalind
Subject: 484 Plains Rd Neighborhood meeting comments

To: Suzanne McInness, City of Burlington Planning

From: Tom Muir, Resident

Subject: 484 Plains Rd Neighborhood meeting comments

Dear Suzanne;

Please receive these comments, which are abbreviated, on the subject proposal application, for the public record of my interest in this proposal.

1. I accept that some redevelopment of this site can occur, and is permitted by the existing OP, and while not planning policy relevant to this proposal, the proposed revisions to the OP and By-laws also permit some development. My concern is that this proposal is asking for variances that go far beyond these stated permissions and represent an over-intensification and over-development of this site.

The existing permissions themselves would already represent intensification of this site, but no exploration of these possibilities are presented or discussed. The key question is, when is enough enough?

Unfortunately, there is so much scope of redundant, discretionary and arbitrary interpretation of the policy framework used to evaluate proposals, that almost anything can be supported and justified by assertions, based almost exclusively on intensification. This has become a plasticized idea – make it any shape you want.

It is difficult to argue against the assertions used to justify proposals, as that is all that is presented – just lengthy statements of rationalization supporting non-compliance with the OP and zoning bylaws. An argument of rebuttal cannot be made in this space.

In my 45 years of policy and issues analysis I learned to recognize the difference between evidence-based policy-making, and policy-based evidence making. This looks to be the latter – decide what you want first, and then pick the evidence.

Oftentimes, sections of the Policy Framework said to be used, are selectively chosen and focused to assertions that support the recommendation to approve. Other parts raising issues of approval are sometimes stated, but not followed up on.

As a result, the viability of existing business and commercial economic development is being sacrificed by planning justifications such as this one. What I continue to find disturbing is the continued de-commercialization of Aldershot. In this respect, the impacts of the loss of commercial at this site are completely ignored in the planning justification coverage of the Provincial Planning Statement as part of the policy framework.

"Section 1.3.1 of the PPS states that Planning authorities shall promote live/work, economic development and competitiveness by: a) providing for an appropriate mix and range of employment and institutional uses to meet long-term needs; b) providing opportunities for a diversified economic base, including maintaining a range and choice of suitable sites for employment uses which support a wide range of economic activities and ancillary uses, and take into account the needs of existing and future businesses.

In other words, the Strategic Plan and the PPS mandates the need for commercial uses to be planned for and increased not reduced, and the needs of existing business to be accounted for, not sacrificed. But the proposal contradicts what the policy calls for.

Notice the directions inherent in the words "shall" and "mandates". I do not see these directions being followed in the proposal by National Homes focused on population intensification.

In this regard, the proposal includes 10,748 square feet of commercial, whereas there is almost 50,000 square feet existing, and this commercial is fully serviced, providing maximum potential of uses, with commercial venting, full transport loading facilities and size, adjacent, or nearby, more than sufficient parking, and so on. There is no specifications as to what quality of commercial potential is proposed.

Moreover, this seems to be inadequate replacement commercial space, and appears to resemble what the development business calls "throwaway commercial", provided to get the real goal of intensified residential. The city needs to require more adequate space and to ensure that it is the maximum commercial quality and potential.

At the meeting, it was stated by a resident, and answered as follows:

"Concerned about retail space. I have lived here for 30 years. Concern over loss of Dollar Store and Home Hardware. Also concern that costs will be too expensive for new tenants"

"Managing partner of NH: There is an option for existing tenants to move into new space. Market will dictate size of units. New development will be set at market prices. Existing prices are well below market rates."

I have talked to existing business and they say that the rents will double and become unaffordable. There are issues of timing for exercise of the option after closure of existing business viability. And there are access and parking issues that are not addressed.

The proposal asks for reduced parking, and the parking configuration suggests that both visitors and residents can and will use these parking spaces, and will interfere with commercial customer access and business loading and pickup. This is not explained or accounted for.

2. Overall, I conclude that the proposal for 484 Pains Rd East by National Homes does not conform to the existing Official Plan of Burlington (OP), does not achieve compatible intensification, represents over-development of the site, and does not demonstrate good planning.

3. The non-compliance with the Official Plan and Zoning Bylaw results in over-development that is not compatible with the existing stable residential neighbourhood. Over-development results in negative impacts on existing businesses and commercial potential due to the redevelopment and residential over-intensification of what is now a completely commercial land use.

Also negatively impacted are neighbourhood character, quality of life, traffic, safety, parking, scale, massing, setbacks, space for amenities, landscaping and buffering, noise and health.

4. The proposal asks for very significant amendments to the Official Plan and By-Laws asking for increased height, increased density and increased floor area ratio, reduced minimum setbacks, reduced amenity area, and reduced parking standards. The Planning Justification for the proposal only mentions the floor area ratio (from 1.5 to 2.14); net residential density (from 51 to 185 units/ha, to 216); and height (from 2 to 6 stories, to 8) but claims that except for these variances the proposal conforms. There is no quantitative evidence to prove this assertion, and many specifications are left out (See comment 5).

I point out that the draft proposed OP and bylaws states that increases in height above the maximum 6 stories permitted are to be "discouraged". The planning justification refers to the draft OP/zoning bylaw proposed permissions, and states that the variances for FAR and density asked for are "small", but for the 6 story height draft permission the justification ignores this, and the direction to "discourage" such heights, states instead that the 8 stories is "compatible" without evidence.

I would also add that the heights stated in the planning justification appear to be 1 story less than the by-law would indicate, given the amenity areas proposed for a top floor on all the buildings, including the townhouses. That is, the apartments are actually 9 stories, not 8, and the townhouses are 4 not 3. This is not what the planning justification states.

5. There is no table showing the detailed proposal zoning bylaw permissions of the MXG zoning versus the proposed MXG-site specific variance requests, with the compliance comparisons. I will not detail these at this time, but I am sure you know what I mean. Such a detailed table was provided for the planning justification studies and site plan descriptions, for the 92 Plains Rd E proposal.

6. Instead, in the planning justifications and the applicant presentation for this meeting, is a misleading set of tables showing changes to such site specifications from July 2017 proposal versions to revisions of November 2017, and are misleadingly labeled as "improvements". In

these tables, there is no reference at all to what is permitted in the MXG zoning bylaws compared to what is being asked for and how these comply.

7. On traffic, the report provided does not allow for the traffic diversion involving the existing traffic in and out of the plaza - these business trips are more than likely to be forced to drive to another source for the needs they visit the present site uses for. The traffic report appears to net all of these existing visits out of the estimates made for the redevelopment traffic generation. This is an error, and underestimates the impacts of this proposed redevelopment on traffic, congestion and safety.

8. Going further on the traffic issue, no account appears to be made for the cumulative effects of proposed developments on the Plains Rd corridor. These developments include the present one, 35 Plains Rd E, 92 Plains Rd. E, and application for 53 Plains Rd. E (the Solid Gold site), and others that are likely in the future. This has clear implications for the reliability of the traffic, congestion, and safety estimates, and given that a school is right across the street, this is important for safety.

More generally, this proposal, as well as the others mentioned, (and staff are generally guilty of this too) is assuming car ownership rates to fit the proposal design. But traffic will get worse, even 15 minute service buses get caught in it too, despite small tweaks like traffic signal control to green on buses, and so on and so on, in a sort of feed-forward amplification loop. Buses do not take people everywhere they need or want to go in practical reality times they have available, and the purposes.

At the meeting it was stated - *"7 mins by car to GO or 37 mins to walk or 10 mins by bike. Discouraging car usage."*

The Aldershot Mobility Hub is not within walking distance. It seems to be ignored in this assertion that just getting there is not enough in terms of time needed to be on time to catch the train.

Even for biking, few people do, and in the winter even less, so such rosy assumptions mentioned at the meeting are just not realistic, are not substantiated by an evidence-based research design that can predict the future, and are professionally frowned on statements that overreach the research design.

This proposal is not discouraging car usage, as stated, but is clearly increasing the cars and their usage. Further, the loss of commercial walking targets, frequently used like Home Hardware, The Dollar Store, the Chinese restaurant, and other business, will increase the need to drive elsewhere, as alternatives are mostly driving distances away.

Despite this, with the help of car ownership and modal split assumptions, we have never seen a traffic study for an application ever fail the test – there is never a traffic impact, and the roads can handle whatever.

For just one thing, that always stands out in the proposal reports, is the traffic and parking assertions. These are completely at odds with public comment and concern. I suggest that they do this in part to enable the heights and densities that are wanted, and cannot be physically accommodated in the build.

Further enabling are assertions that traffic is never above the road capacity, no matter how much is added, and the cumulative load is never considered. It doesn't matter what the real road congestion situation is.

The parking requirements are similarly nonsensical to me. There is increasingly a departure from the reality of multiple car ownership per unit.

I agree that not every unit will have 2 or more cars, but it's just fantasy to say and assume that all units will have mostly 1 car, and thus dismiss the parking issue that is a reality.

At the present time, residents in the Jazz building across the street are reported by residents and business nearby to be parking in the proposal site at all times of days and overnight. As well, parents of children at the school across the street also use the site to park as they pick up and drop off their kids.

All those thousands of unaccounted for vehicles are not going to disappear because the planners refuse to recognize they exist.

This is not "good planning", but is making convenient but false assumptions to facilitate what the planners want to do. It's the residents that are being subjected to the consequences, and the planners have no conscience about this manipulation of their lives.

9. The proposal does not consider a variety of community stakeholders, or any future residents, but particularly for families with children. Where will the children play and interact as community? There is no provision of green space. The proposal asks for reduced amenity area.

10. In summary, as I do not want to, or have the time to, right now, provide more details of the concerns and objections to this proposal, I will say that it represents over-development and unbalanced over-intensification of the site, without adequate setbacks and buffering, landscape areas, green-space, resident, visitor, or commercial parking, adequate commercial use and quality, or space for amenities, among the other things I have identified.

The significant reduction of standards in the Zoning Bylaw required to facilitate this level of intensification, and the failure to satisfy Official Plan policies, and the PPS mandated directions concerning the "shall", or "mandated", directions for the provision of commercial, and needs of business, results in an application that is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, or the existing in force OP and zoning, or even the not in force proposed OP.

I cannot find any reasoned basis to support this proposal without substantial revisions to comply and conform to the existing OP and bylaws.

I look forward to a responsive reply from you to my comments here showing how you will correct the deficiencies I have identified in this proposal.

Thank you,

Tom Muir

Townsend Ave.

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

From: Greg Woodruff

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 1:14 PM

To: McInnes, Suzanne; Minaji, Rosalind

Cc: Tom Betty.muir

Subject: Re: 484 Plains Rd Neighborhood meeting comments

Please include my additional comments on this file.

I agree with everything My Muir has submitted and will add some additional points.

1) I have recommended that previous developments be required to have upgraded fire code rating, transport truck access reasonable levels of commercial parking and maintain or expand the commercial space on site. Because this was not done, existing vendors have no place to transition too. The small offices in previous developments are not compatible with the existing usages of hardware store, general store or bingo hall. This could have been done on may sites, e.g. Affinity in particular - if it had been - then these business might have a place to transition too. The same problem repeats with this site, removing of the commercial space will not only remove these business from our community, but future businesses will have no valuable space to more too. The knock on effect of bad developments is leading to more.

2) The problem of increased rents on new developments is mitigated by having new developments increase the amount commercial space. If the rents are high then increasing the commercial space in the area is the answer. Removing it is obviously not.

3) There is no planning justification for reduced or removed tenant or commercial parking at this site. It is not in a mobility hub or growth center. No reasonable expectation exists that people on this site will require vehicles at a reduced rate. Many of the planning justifications used for different configurations "in and around Mobility Hubs" do not apply here, yet are just re-used anyway. Is there any location in Burlington where staff would maintain existing parking ratio or expect increased car usage?

4) Staff profess to be generating a more walkable community with more walking and less driving. However every development creates more driving and less walking. This will apparently "invert" at an unexplained time via an unexplained mechanism. Even if you imagine Rapid Bus Transit or the like, buy the time this development direction is complete - the bus will go to nothing significant, but condos and 3 GO train stations.

5) What is primarily de-commercializing Aldershot are staff recommendations. Simple things like sane lot coverages, 100% commercial main floor, etc ... could render these spaces intensified and still of use to the community.

If staff are building a urban area, they are at present building one of the worst urban areas ever created, extracting the congestion and pollution of the city, but running off the access to local businesses we previously enjoyed.

Hoping that they "rise from the dead" is not planning, let alone good planning.

Thanks,
Greg Woodruff

From: Alex Lait

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 11:32 PM

To: McInnes, Suzanne

Cc: Sherry K Bowman

Subject: Comments on planning application for 484-490 Plains Road East, File 505-06/17 and 520-14/17

Dear Suzanne McInnes

We attended the info night on Jan 17th about the development application for 484-490 Plains Road East. We own and live at 495 Atkins Place. Our property directly abuts the development with a proposed 8 story building on one side and a 4 story building directly behind us.

Our concerns:

1. Building height and setbacks from property line. The proposed development is requesting a significant variance to the planning rules. The proposed setback 7m, with the planning rule being at least 18m for a 6 story building and 15m for the 4 story building. The proposal puts the new construction far too close to the property line for the height of the buildings. The other factor is that if a 18m setback is required for a 6 story building, it would be expected that an 8 story building would require additional setback.
2. Privacy. The proposed buildings would loom over our house and there would be no privacy in our yard. This is due to the height and setback proposed in the plan. If the setback and height met the planning rules, there would be less concern as the buildings would not be directly over our yard.
3. Noise. In the current plan, there is an exhaust fan for the underground parking directly next to our property line. This would create a significant amount of noise and would ruin our use of our yard. This should be re-located to the center of the development or away from the residential property lines. We have concerns with the the building HVAC and mechanical noise generated by the proposed development. There is also concern with an increased amount of noise with several multifamily dwelling that has such a small setback from our property.
4. Fencing. The density of the proposed development is significantly above the current use and that of the surrounding area. We feel minimum 8' privacy fence is needed to minimize the impact to our use of our property. The fence is also needed to help mitigate the noise and privacy concerns.
5. Lighting. While there are no specifications now, night lighting of the development is a concern if there are to be light standards for walkways or driveways. These would need to be designed to minimize the light leakage onto the adjacent properties.

6. Shadows. The proposed height and setback would create significant shade in the evening.

7. Drainage and landscaping. Water flow is always a concern and we would like to make sure there are sufficient drainage paths so that water flowing onto our land is not increased.

8. Vibration during construction. There are also concerns with vibration damage to our house during construction. We would expect that there would be pre-construction inspection and ongoing monitoring for vibration levels during the construction phase.

9. Valuation of our property. It is expected that if 8 story building is looming over our house, a significant reduction in the value of our house could be expected.

Sincerely,

Alex Lait

Sherry Bowman

█ Eagle Drive
Burlington
█

City of Burlington
426 Brant Street
Burlington
L7R 3Z6

30th January 2018

Dear Ms. McInnes,

Re: 484 - 490 Plains Rd East

Following the recent Neighbourhood Meeting that occurred on 17th January for the above development, I am writing to you to express my objections.

As you are aware, the site in question currently supports over 50,000 square feet of diverse retail across a multitude of buildings. The proposal, as it currently stands, is offering a mere 10,748 square feet apportioned almost equally between the two 8 storey buildings. Whilst this has been increased from the initial meager offering of 6,900 square feet, I do not feel this is adequate given the size of the subject lands and the ratio to residential units.

To lose over 80% of retail is simply too significant to be brushed aside and will certainly diminish the type of stores that could be attracted to the building and is exacerbating the general decline of commercial properties along the Plains Rd corridor. It was mentioned at the meeting that existing tenants would be offered first refusal of space in the new building – albeit at new market rents – but I fail to see how an existing food business could even be accommodated given the apparent lack of commercial venting.

We are seeing an ever increasing use of mixed use buildings appearing on Plains Rd and, as per conversations I have had with the Planning Department, there is no minimum criteria in the Official Plan that dictates what that minimum should be. This only encourages over intensification of residential under the guise of mixed use but the retail component is always sadly lacking. It is evident in this proposal and it was also notable in the development that is occurring at 35 Plains Rd East (I believe the same architects were engaged on both projects).

There are a number of ways this could easily be rectified:

1. In exchange for the significant loss of retail, have the two 8 storeys redesigned such that commercial venting is factored into the building plans. This would allow for different types of retail to use the space more effectively. For example, small food outlets such as restaurants, bakeries, or cafes (a picture of a café is shown on page 21 of the applicant's Urban Design Brief so they must have already considered this).
2. Enlarge the retail area by having the residential amenity area onto the second floor. Doing so would allow retail units to have greater depth and a larger floor space area therefore increasing

variety – and possibly the number of units depending on how they are subdivided. More retail space would equate to more employment which is something the applicant has already mooted in their Planning Justification Report:

"The proposed development provides both a range of housing choices that are available to the residents and commercial uses that provide employment opportunities"¹

Furthermore, the Transportation Impact Study² that is part of the supporting materials found on the City's web site, is rather vague on some points and inconsistent in others. For example, the study states:

"Within the site environs, these improvements will result in 15-minute or better train service operating in both directions, all-day every day between Aldershot GO Station and Union Station. This service interval will be a dramatic improvement to the Line during the mid-day, evening, and weekends: current off-peak services along Lakeshore West operate at 30-minute service intervals. Changes to the Lakeshore West service are expected to be realized by the end of Metrolinx's 10-year RER Project, around 2026."

The promise of 15 minute GO service to Aldershot is not necessarily true as Metrolinx does not own the tracks west of Burlington and *may* not be able to deliver on such a frequency³.

The report also includes a section on other background developments and correctly includes Georgian Court Estates as a potential traffic factor but does not mention the current developments at Filmendale and 35 Plains. Is this an oversight? Surely all projected traffic flow needs to be incorporated into these numbers? Furthermore, the "Total Site Traffic Volumes" goes on to state:

"The site currently contains several retail stores and a Bingo building, which will be removed in the future for the proposed development plan of 393 residential units and 10,748 ft² of retail. As such, the existing site traffic activity will be removed and when added to the new site traffic, the site would generate in the order of 130 and 60 net-new two-way vehicle trips during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hour periods, respectively."

This assertion needs verifying. As was called out at the Neighbourhood meeting, the surface parking lot at the existing Bingo Hall is being actively used by parents for school drop off and pick up purposes. The report only mentions afternoon peak hours and does not mention what specific time of day the study was actually conducted. I suspect the vehicular traffic for the existing site traffic volumes may not be including the school traffic.

Given that there will only be 10 laybys on Plains Rd (which are supposed to be reserved for retail users only) and there is no official school parking, how will this development proposal accommodate safe

¹ Page 21, Section 6: The Economy - Region of Halton Healthy Communities Guidelines

https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/resources/Planning_and_Development/Current_Development_Projects/Ward_1/484-490-Plains-Rd-East/1.-Planning-Justification-Report.pdf

² https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/resources/Planning_and_Development/Current_Development_Projects/Ward_1/484-490-Plains-Rd-East/11.-815-005-Transportation-Impact-Study.pdf

³ http://www.metrolinx.com/en/regionalplanning/rer/rer_lsw.aspx

pedestrian and vehicular movement in the area? The applicant's Planning Justification Report alludes to this but does not give specific details:

*"In order to balance pedestrian and vehicular movements in a safe and efficient manner, various approaches may be considered, including shared parking facilities in central locations, and/or on-street parking where deemed appropriate by detailed studies"*⁴

*"The site plan promotes public safety"*⁵

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge safe receipt of this letter. I look forward to your comments in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Mr S J Miller

⁴ Page 25, 5.2.2 (j) Policies [https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/resources/Planning and Development/Current Development Projects/Ward 1/484-490-Plains-Rd-East/1.-Planning-Justification-Report.pdf](https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/resources/Planning_and_Development/Current_Development_Projects/Ward_1/484-490-Plains-Rd-East/1.-Planning-Justification-Report.pdf)

⁵ Page 28, 5.3.2 (g) (vi) General Policies [https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/resources/Planning and Development/Current Development Projects/Ward 1/484-490-Plains-Rd-East/1.-Planning-Justification-Report.pdf](https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/resources/Planning_and_Development/Current_Development_Projects/Ward_1/484-490-Plains-Rd-East/1.-Planning-Justification-Report.pdf)

From: Loreto Mancini
Sent: Saturday, February 03, 2018 3:32 PM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Subject: 484-490 Plains Road East File:505-06/17 & 520-14/17

Dear Suzanne,

As an Aldershot resident for 49 years, I am not in favour of the builder's application.

The step down limit of 8 and 4 stories should not to be used to ignore zoning. I would be reluctant to approve 6 stories so close to the property line. Aside from the shadow effect, which is only shown as a sun dial in their report, an increase of density to this location will not serve Aldershot in any way positive. Keep it all at 4 as to reduce density.

Rick's professional opinion is "Aldershot can handle the footprint" and "No adverse effect". Asking for density and going against zoning by-laws does not justify the end, it is irresponsible. Have you taken into consideration future developments? More condos are soon to be built in the direct vicinity.

Reducing parking requirements because by 2030 the bedroom town of Aldershot will have zero carbon foot print is laughable. Telling people to walk and bike will not change the issues. Aldershot residents will always need a car. Reducing parking will create a nightmare for the neighborhood. Clifford said across Southern Ontario it is now accepted to anticipate zero drivers, I disagree. This developer should adhere to zoning by-laws. He later said that the goal of zero foot print "might not happen".

The traffic analysis done on Wednesday June 7th does not represent true overall traffic flow and congestion. The long term goals that Burlington planners are trying to achieve in transportation do not mitigate impacts, not creating the obvious problem does.

Please have transportation planners look into designated right hand turn lanes at (North) Waterdown/ Plains, (North) King Road/ Plains, (East) Service Road/ King. A right turn lane to occupy a minimum of 3-4 cars. The density of future developments directly relates to the developing issues with transportation. Please reduce the number of units at this location and adhere to zoning parking requirements.

Thank you,

Loreto Mancini

From: Phyllis Mair

Sent: Monday, January 22, 2018 11:35 AM

To: McInnes, Suzanne

Cc: Craven, Rick; Mailbox, Office of Mayor Rick Goldring; Meed Ward, Marianne

Subject: Comments regarding Aldershot neighbourhood meeting re Bingo Hall & high-rise proposal for downtown Brant Street

Importance: High

Good Day,

My husband and I attended the meeting regarding National Homes development proposal for the Bingo Hall property. I do understand the need for high density due to shortage of available lands in the area, however, I do have many concerns that some policies and bylaws are in need of updating. I still strongly oppose that you are limiting parking because of the so called changes in public transportation 30 years from now. In the meantime public transportation is a joke. Visitor parking is far too little for the number of residents especially on special occasions. We have no municipal parking lots in Aldershot that could ease the problem somewhat if in walking distance of these units. We are becoming so isolated as a community. I also strongly support that consideration be given to a community hall for meetings and activities to bring the residents of Aldershot together. Time for some major changes to bylaws and city planning.

Not looking to sound "woe is me", however, I feel I need to be an advocate for people with disabilities whether children or adults. I feel there need to be some changes in building requirements in some of the new developments.

Townhouses these days are so narrow and up to 3 storeys with no basements, no driveway/garage, yard/balcony. House prices are out of control, so how do young families with disabled children find appropriate accommodation anymore? No basements means no extra living space for children to play, no balconies is a concern in event of fire/explosion/disaster. You can't go from underground parking with a handicapped child, take them inside and then leave them to go back and unload parcels from their car. stairs are useless for handicapped persons. We need more one floor townhouses with basements (definitely need the storage area)and driveways. getting ridiculous how crammed these so called living quarters are becoming. going back to my grandson, impossible for them to move to a one floor condo or apartment because of dangers in common entrance areas and elevators. we must wait til no one on elevator and even them germs are everywhere.

My sister lives in the Jazz building and her windows are fixed to open only a very small amount. in these 20 plus storey high-rises, how do tenants get out when trapped inside their units. Don't think fire truck ladders even reach that high. Are there special exterior fire escapes on the floors when seniors cannot manage that many stairs and the elevators cannot be used in event of fire/disasters. think of the proposed high-rises close to the Aldershot go station. there must be precautions put in place in event of disasters. currently, I don't feel they are good enough. Another huge concern is the shortage of

elevators in future multi storey high-rises. Two is not enough. Recently there was concern with ambulance staff having to wait to use elevator due to some work being done and only one elevator available - a delay like this can make the difference between life and death. Also can you imagine the time delays with all the people using the elevators in high-rises on their way to work each morning, especially if one is out of use. I propose that high-rises over a certain height require more elevators. Even the current ones in Aldershot with only 2 should have as well a service/freight elevator for emergency use by ambulance attendants. the two main elevators for residents should not be used for moving in. This again causes problems when only 1 available. I recall our first apartment when we were married 45 years ago. it was a new building and the elevator employees were on strike. Climbing to the 8th floor was an ordeal especially having to make several trips from underground parking with groceries or carrying small items of furniture. My mother was unable to climb that many stairs so she couldn't visit us during the strike. time to really think about peoples' needs in these multiple high-rises. Can't always be just about money for the developers.

City Hall Planners must consider needs of all the people, when making plans for future development. If we can't have anymore single houses for families and single homes are totally out of reach, we still must allow some proper accommodations for handicapped persons. In Aldershot, homes are approaching \$1 million and even more - don't know who can earn that kind of money . We need townhouses with more space and basements and driveways and garages to raise our children. sure we need density but we also need to think of young families. Otherwise those living in these high-rises are merely transients with no respect for the buildings and continually moving out of Aldershot . No support for the businesses in our community because by the time they get off the go train, they head home and shops are closed. Public transit is a joke. You can't use public transit after work to drop your kids off to activities, pick up groceries, drop off dry-cleaning or whatever in a time sensitive manner. Parents cannot even get home in enough time to attend their children's school plays, or meet the teachers nights. sorry for rambling but just because we need intensification, we can't lose our family values and needs.

I'll likely think of some more comments or concerns at a later time, but I would appreciate your consideration of what I have outlined above.

Thank you for taking the time to listen.

Phyllis Mair

Bedford Ave

Burlington ON

P.S. I totally agree with Marianne's proposal to delay the Official Plan. More serious brainstorming and consideration is certainly required before proceeding.

From: Kelly Green

Sent: Wednesday, January 17, 2018 6:51 PM

To: McInnes, Suzanne

Subject: Planning application for : 484-490 Plains Rd East / File # 505-06/17 and 520-14/17

To: Suzanne McInnes , MCIP,RPP, Senior Planner

Re: Above site building

Dear Ms. McInnes,

As per our conversation earlier today here are a few of my concerns we discussed. First off let me start by saying that I am not opposed to the building being proposed. I am fine with the new development as I feel it will help to build up the Aldershot area and increase property values including my own. However I do have some concerns that I would like to see addressed first.

My main concern is the actually drilling of the proposed site. When the JAZZ condos were being built the drilling etc. that occurred disrupted my business immensely. I had one employee actually have to take a medical leave of absence for two months as the vibration and shaking of my building was deemed to be

Unbearable working conditions for her. She provided a medical note and as an employer I had no choice but to grant her the time off. This significantly impacted my business . As an Insurance company I am not in a position to hire and train someone in 2 months, this job requires the individuals to be fully provincially licensed and then trained , this normally takes at least 6-9 months. I simply cannot afford for my business to be impacted in such a way. Losing a staff member is not an option for me. On top of that the drilling and noise was so loud sometimes that we could not even service clients properly as it was impossible to hear anyone over the phone. More often than not we had to hang up or sometimes not even answer our phones as it was impossible to service my clients properly.

My next major concern is , the possible damage to my building. My building is an older build and all the shaking and vibrations of both the foundation and windows etc. was MAJOR with the build across the street. With this new proposed building so close, within feet of my office it will no doubt be even worse ! it was terrible previously and that was across the road. I am concerned with the integrity of my building and what future impact that will have on my property. What if anything are the builders prepared to do ??

I also have two apartments in my building which have tenants, I rely heavily on these units being rented out to cover my monthly expenses. With the building shaking and noise I also run the risk of them deciding to pack up and move . if that happens it will be next to impossible to re-rent those units out with all the construction happening next door as no one wants to live through that ! Especially on such a large scale.

So I guess my question to the builder is what are they planning on doing to make this situation bearable for the surrounding businesses and residences ? will there be remuneration of some sort ? what about future damages to my building as a result ? what about financial impact on my business , both on my insurance company and my rental units ?

I look forward to working with the builder and the City to make sure all my concerns are handled in advance of the build beginning. As I originally stated I am not opposed to the build but rather the construction impact on the points mentioned above.

Sincerely,

Kelly Green - Pilon

Plains Rd. East

Burlington, Ont

From: Craven, Rick
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 9:21 AM
To: 'Murray Charlton'
Cc: Emberson, Lola
Subject: RE: Invitation To Neighbourhood Meeting Re: 484-490 Plains Road East

From: Murray Charlton
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 6:57 PM
To: Craven, Rick
Subject: RE: Invitation To Neighbourhood Meeting Re: 484-490 Plains Road East

Hello Rick,

Thanks for your efforts to inform on this file.

Unfortunately, we are on vacation out of town till the end of March so cannot attend the meeting.

We feel one of the primary considerations should be how to minimize the impacts of the development on the single family homes around the periphery or within visual contact such as our place. Keeping the trees is a good aspiration. Recently, the trees near the property line of houses on Glen Acres Crt were more than decimated by cutting for hydro. Those trees are badly needed to mitigate the visual impact of the development – the trees should be replaced by the time the project is finished so the coverage is as complete as possible – this also gives a more pleasurable view for the new occupants. The problem with Hydro ruining the trees should be addressed by changes in Hydro routing.

In general, we do not support changes to the zoning plan in order to accommodate the builders.

All the best,

Murray and Christel Charlton

From: Edward Venema
Sent: Monday, January 15, 2018 10:16 AM
To: McInnes, Suzanne
Subject: Proposal at 484 Plains Rd.

Hi Susan my name is Ed Venema I am my mother's POA at Atkins Place Burlington.

The concerns I have are as follows

- The shadows that an 8 storey building will cast through the summer months is not acceptable! In June, July , and September by 3-330 pm the sun will be gone and even earlier in April and may! We have sun light until 8:30,9 o'clock that's 5 full hours of lost sun light. My parents of been there since 1965 and they have beautiful flowers and they have a great looking property in the summer that we enjoy! An 8 storey building will damage all of that!

- My other concern is privacy, balconies eight stories high looking down into my mother's backyard again I believe this is not acceptable. We had all the privacy in the world since 1965.

- Noise from the exhaust fans create in the summer! Plus the exhaust.

People enjoy there back yards and live in them in the summer! They don't need to hear noise, Smell orders, have people looking down on them and not to have sunlight to enjoy!

- I believe that an eight story building well devalue my mother's property!

- How will this impact plains rd?

Plains rd is very busy now, what will plains rd be like after these buildings are built?

- My last concern is the construction, the noise, garbage and if there's any damages to surrounding properties! What measures have been taken to try not to have any of these issues?

Thank you Ed Venema

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

From: James Rae

Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 3:50 PM

To: McInnes, Suzanne

Subject: Re: Planning Application for: 484-490 Plains Road East File: 505-06/17 and 520-14/17

Thank you Suzanne for your reply.

I would like to add that the homeowners who purchased in this neighbourhood did so with the attractiveness and particular location of Aldershot as a major deciding factor. After years of being good citizens and maintaining an image that makes this in the best top three areas to live in and after finally paying off a mortgage and raising a family, their reward should definitely not be medium rise condo developments with a ratio of person to square footage rivalling a bee hive.

The planning department has set standards and rules for new development and any deviation from those standards only serves to line the pockets of those who would never reside here or care about the aftermath! It should be worth noting that Plains road is the only east/west thoroughfare and giving what is planned for the area from Ikea to Waterdown road, it would only be a matter of months before there are stop lights at every intersection, congestion beyond imagination and injury.

In the end one must accept that when an area is built out it is completed, not tear down small buildings and erect monstrosities! Putting brick on warehouse style condos does not make them houses, just bigger blocks of ugly construction material and trust me if it were better for a family of 4 to live in 600 sq ft. we would all be living in India, China trying to get out.

Thanks again.

James Rae

> On Jan 9, 2018, at 7:52 AM, McInnes, Suzanne <Suzanne.McInnes@burlington.ca> wrote:

>

> Mr. Rae, Thank you for your email dated January 8, 2018.

>

> Your comments will be considered in the preparation of our report to the Planning & Development Committee of Council. A copy of your email will be included in the report. Please note that the report will be posted on the City's web site.

>

> The Planning & Development Committee will hold a Public Meeting in accordance with Section 34 of the Planning Act to consider this application and you will be notified of the date and time of the Public Meeting.

>

> If you have any further questions with respect to this application, please contact me.

>

>

> Best Regards,
>
> Suzanne McInnes MCIP, RPP
> Senior Planner, Development Review
> Department of City Building | Planning Section

>> -----Original Message-----

> From: James Rae
> Sent: Monday, January 08, 2018 12:22 PM
> To: McInnes, Suzanne
> Subject: Planning Application for: 484-490 Plains Road East File: 505-06/17 and 520-14/17

>
> While intensification strongly favours the increase in revenue for the coffers of the City of Burlington, the City should not hand out amendments to zoning by-laws to builders like candy.

>
> 1. Is it proven that Emergency Vehicles (fire pumpers/ladder trucks) can access with ease/safety all internal areas within the proposed development?
> 2. Why is it that City planners always resort to allowing the "minimum" standard when internal acoustic sound levels are involved. ie; minimum wall thickness/acoustic material for ie; Plains Road East road noise and mandatory air conditioning (read...keep windows closed at all times)in abutting buildings to reach these minimum acceptable noise standards?
> 3. Why would there not be a by-law specifically addressing high traffic/noise areas with a higher standard of noise suppression materials?
> 4. What specific right does the City have to rewrite the rules in favour of a developer when local local residents have their privacy, sunlight and peace taken away by just adding 7.5 meters of setback horizontally but forget about the vertical component and it's effect on the area homeowners. 8 floors instead of the allowed 6! Make a rule then stick to it!
> 5. Commercial space that is useless for any business other than single employee and we have enough, nail salons, dry cleaners, massage parlours, vaping bars, etc.

>
> Burlington is going to have to set minimum square footage for one, two and three bedroom living because if you let the developers have their way, we will be living in a matchbox society and that is the first step towards ghetto like crime and general unrest. We should not destroy our good name and quality of living for a quantity of poorly spec'd, stupidly small living spaces.

>
> If affordable living is being discussed, we have apartment buildings in areas that support that. You wouldn't find this kind of development in Tyandaga or the Bridal Path in Toronto why would you think it would be ok here? Walking and bicycling are great for exercise but not for shopping!

>
> James Rae
> Plains Road East
> Burlington
>
> name not to be used without consent.
>

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

From: John McCullough

Sent: Monday, January 08, 2018 10:49 AM

To: McInnes, Suzanne

Cc: Nicole McCullough;

Subject: Planning Application for: 484-490 Plains Road East File: 505-06/17 and 520-14/17

Hi,

As a resident and tax payer of this area, I have the following comments regarding this and future applications to change the zoning to put up more condos.

The people of aldershot have no local amenities. The Canadian tire, beer store and department store was converted to condos. Now you are forcing home hardware, our only local hardware store out of business. They can not get reasonable rent anywhere else in Burlington, let alone aldershot.

What is to be gained other than greed and taxes by allowing this zoning change? Nail salons, message parlors and hair salons. We do not need any more of those and the current infrastructure can t sustain 400 more families in that area plus all the other condos being put up in the area.

The congestion due to all the new condos on plains rd is making it very difficult to get around. I chose this area because it was fairly quiet compared to the orchard where we previously lived. Driving north on appleby line is going to be the same as plains rd east if condos continue to be approved. It is painful. Condos are slowly destroying Burlington one by one. As a life long resident, if I wanted to live surrounded by condos, I'd move to Toronto. Please stop the madness and look for development to support the existing area and people.

John McCullough

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

From: Lori Thomson

Sent: Saturday, December 23, 2017 7:21 AM

To: McInnes, Suzanne

Subject: 484-490 plains road east

Good morning Suzanne

I am a fairly new resident in Aldershot .. and would agree to the development at this location. I approve of new residential .. commercial and service-related designations.

It will enhance this part of town as there are other new mid rise condos such as mine being constructed. It improves the appearance of this area of Burlington .. and more importantly .. seems to enhance and add to the economy of our beautiful City.

.. count me in !!

Lori Thomson

Plains Rd E

