

APPENDIX F – PUBLIC COMMENTS

From: Stephen Chen [mailto:]
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2017 12:14 PM
To: Plas, Kyle
Cc: Meed Ward, Marianne
Subject: Carriage Gate proposal for 421 Brant St

Hi Kyle.....I am writing to provide some input on the above proposal.

The proposal is unacceptable to me because its height, at 27 stories, would set an unwelcome precedent for the downtown. I often take recreational walks through this area on my way to the waterfront. My greatest fear is a downtown dominated by high buildings, blocking out the sky and making my human scale seem insignificant in the scheme of things. We already have a few tall buildings of 12 to 14 stories in the area and these are bad enough although, fortunately, there are only 2 or 3 of them. A 27 story building would be that much more oppressive from an aesthetic point of view.

The way things seem to work is that approval of one 27 story building will quickly lead to proposals for more of the same height. And, sooner or later, some genius will propose a Toronto-style tower of 50 stories and, voila, a high-rise jungle.

What height should Carriage Gate be allowed? Well, if it matched City Hall in height it would fit in better with what is already there. The downtown is pleasant to walk through because there is a mix of building heights with no one type being dominant. I cannot believe that we need to go to 27 story buildings to meet the intensification goals for the downtown.

Steve Chen

From: Michael Prescott [mailto:]

Sent: Monday, April 17, 2017 7:16 PM

To: Plas, Kyle

Subject: Downtown Buildings

Hello Mr. Plas,

My wife has just handed me a flyer regarding a proposed 27 storey mixed use building in our downtown core. I also see that there was a meeting and comments due by the 7th of this month.

If the City has lost their minds and approved this project I would like to know who specifically is responsible for allowing this to go ahead. Hopefully the Burlington residents have been respected.

There is a building going up at Elizabeth and Caroline which we assume to be more 3 storey condos. Could you please confirm that.

The two cranes at the waterfront have been there for a while. Would you please let us know what is planned for those sites? I am sure once again nothing above 4 storeys would be allowed on our waterfront.

I also understand my grandfather's old gas station at Locust and Lakeshore is in line for development. Are there any final plans for that site?

Kyle I thank you in advance for your kind considerations.

Michael Prescott

Burlington Resident

From: Bill Cunningham [mailto:]
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2017 12:01 PM
To: Plas, Kyle
Subject: Planning Application 421-431 Brant Street

Kyle Plas

City of Burlington,

Planning and Building Department.

Hello Kyle,

My wife and I attended the meeting at the AGB on March 28th. I suspect our comments are similar to those of others who attended.

Generally, we were quite impressed by the proposed design and planned amenities of this building and feel that it would add to the overall attraction of the downtown core. Like others though, we are concerned at the lack of visitor parking proposed and feel this would exacerbate the parking problems already existing in the core.

However, 27 storeys is far too high. It would stick out like a sore thumb in the downtown core and if this development was approved as proposed, it would set a very dangerous precedent for the future. We understand the need for a tall buildings policy in the city, but do not feel that tall buildings belong in the core.

We also understand that the developer needs a reasonable return on investment (ROI) for any development to be worthwhile. So we are suggesting that the economist? (not sure of the proper job title), to be hired by the city, be tasked with working with the developer to figure out how many storeys would be justified to deliver an appropriate ROI.

Once a mutual decision is reached, the final design and the recommended number of storeys can be brought back to the various levels of approval for a final decision on whether, or not, this development should proceed.

I understand that our comments are being sent to you later than was requested at the March 28th meeting, but hope that they will still be given due consideration.

Thank You

Bill and Sue Cunningham

2016 Emerald Cres., Burlington, L7R 1M9.

From: Scott Johnson [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, May 01, 2017 2:58 PM
To: Plas, Kyle
Cc: Mailbox, Office of Mayor Rick Goldring
Subject: Apartment Building at 421-431 Brant St Burlington

Good Afternoon,

I have some concerns about the above structure:

My primary concern relates to its impact on parking in the downtown core.

As a recently retired Registered Condominium Manager who has managed both highrise and townhouse complexes throughout both Halton and Wentworth Regions including downtown Burlington, resident and guest parking is one of the prime concerns and cause of significant animosity between residents and neighbours. Although the parking garage on Locust St gives some relief to residential buildings located close to it, the rest must deal with illegal parking on private property or people parking in designated customer spaces for commercial units, such as the live/work complex at Pine and Martha. The existing downtown lots barely meet the current daily requirements let alone the early evening and special event needs.

A 183 unit building with a mixture of 1 to 3 bedroom suites will probably house well over 400 people. It is highly unlikely that there will only be 1 vehicle per unit and that only a handful of these units will have an occasional guest who could park in one of the few municipal lots.

Further, when large events such as Sound of Music or Ribfest take place, parking is now a nightmare situation. Loosing another 100 or more parking spaces to the proposed building will only make it worse.

Although Burlington is trying to encourage residents to use public transit and employment opportunities continue to grow, we are still a bedroom community. A very high percentage of the residents commute by car to the surrounding cities. Further, currently our transit system does not meet the needs of its residents for many reasons including frequency and availability but this is another conversation.

It is my understanding that Burlington has or had a bylaw that that for each residential unit in a complex the developer had to provide an additional 1/2 parking space. Therefore a 183 unit building must provide 275 parking spaces. Why is this not being enforced?

I also understand that the parking proposals for the condo buildings and the new hotel under construction on Lakeshore Rd at Elizabeth and at Pearl will have considerably less than 1 space per residential unit. It is highly unlikely that most of the purchasers will not have at least one vehicle and will rarely have guests. Although Burlington is trying to encourage cycling, I very much doubt that people paying upwards of \$2 million for a condo will ride a bike to pick up groceries.

Another concern is the congestion that the construction will cause with the closure of James St and Brant St and the loss of business to the downtown merchants and resaurants. A building of this size will take about 3 years to complete.

My other concerns relate to the shadow of the building and its impact on neighbouring properties as well as wind shear and downdrafts caused by such a tall building.

Hopefully my comments will be considered before the final decision.

Regards,

Scott Johnson

336 Blythewood Rd

Burlington ON L7L 2G8

From: Peter & Gail Gray [<mailto:>]

Sent: May 2, 2017 10:45 AM

To: 'kyle.plas@burlington.ca.' <kyle.plas@burlington.ca.>

Subject: Citizen Feedback re Proposed Development for 421-431 Brant St.

Dear Mr. Plas:

Re: Citizen Feedback re Proposed Development for 421-431 Brant St.

Wish to provide the following feedback after reading Mayor Goldring's Jan./Feb. 2017 Progress Report:

- ☐ Think 27 stories is excessive for the downtown core and over feel of this area
- ☐ Think the building is too close to the sidewalk – should be more set-back to allow for pedestrian sidewalk and not to be overshadowed by the building
- ☐ If 27 stories is allowed then more high rises of this nature will be allowed which will contribute to:
 - o Loss of sunshine on the streets
 - o Creating a wind tunnel that makes walking, and accessibility more difficult and hazardous
- ☐ Adversely affecting wind flow from the lake creating climate changing weather challenges
- ☐ 4 levels of underground parking means additional traffic in an already traffic congested area; plus, which seems to contradict the transit/walkability plan for this mobility hub
- ☐ Vehicles coming out of the underground park create hazards to walking/biking pedestrians
- ☐ No mention of additional transit being incorporated in this area, and before the building and residents are in place

Realize the high rises are coming in the mobility hubs however, think more positive planning needs to be incorporated for an improved community buy-in.

Thank you for being able to provide feedback from a citizen.

Regards, Gail Gray

Burlington

From: Tom Betty.muir [mailto:]

Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 2:22 PM

To: Goldring, Rick; Craven, Rick; Meed Ward, Marianne; Sharman, Paul; Lancaster, Blair; Taylor, John; Dennison, Jack

Cc: Morgan, Angela; Ridge, James; Plas, Kyle; Tanner, Mary Lou

Subject: Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment for 421-431 Brant St (PB-38-17) 12

Dear Councilors,

I have been unable to compose a close review of this project, and am unable to attend the meeting in person, but I would like to be on the record of the Statutory Meeting.

In short, I am opposed to the height and density, and all the relief measures to our Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws that approval of this proposal would require. It's just way too high and in the wrong place.

It is premature in terms of the new OP, and if approved as is, would certainly be a precedent and cause no end of problems. Think the ADI proposal.

I am not opposed to a redevelopment of this site, but certainly not 27 stories. I would support some intensification of this site, but no more than the public would support in the 8 to 12, maximum 15 story range, the higher end being conditional on the 2 stories of Office use proposed, or more.

I think it should be lower in height than Bridgewater, and the other building now being constructed by this same developer, just to the east of Brant.

I advocate this height restriction as a need to be respectful of the streetscape of Brant St. being recognizable and pedestrian friendly. We don't want to be totally overpowering in what would be numerous ways. I also suspect that the proposed Retail component will be too costly and evokes an image of posh that Burlington's retail market does not warrant. This image and cost factor could very well pressure the smaller, independent business owners out of that location.

Remember, to longtime residents of Burlington, Brant St. is Burlington's downtown Main St., right down to the waterfront. I want this street, and therefore, Burlington, to be recognizable to me and these others. It has a quaint and old world visage that I want retained.

High buildings do not belong here, in the designated Downtown, so put them somewhere else.

Some of you likely know that Oakville has a 4-story limit fronting their Main St – Lakeshore Rd. There is no height limit elsewhere in that downtown area.

I suggest that since the City has rumors of need for new space, and I would never support building a new City Hall for \$50 million or more, somewhere else, that further discussion and negotiation on this proposal include the possibility of a developer-city agreement on the office space proposal.

Comments have been made that Mixed Use doesn't work very well downtown, however, collaborative partnerships, such as this suggestion, can be a way to get something built, for development that we can discuss if we can live with, and for the City that needs additional office space.

If we want to Grow, and support live-work-walk forms of mixed-use, not just residential and condos, then a reasonable proposal on the height and density, and possible private-public partnership, or even a private-private deal on the Office component, seems a way forward for discussion.

I have looked at the Information Report that staff prepared for this meeting. I would agree with pretty much all of the issues raised, and they reflect my own thinking, and what details I picked up in my limited review. My agreement also includes some support for a more limited and publicly supported development, as I describe above.

This list is from the staff report - From the 100 people at the neighborhood meeting:

Traffic & safety;

o Increase in traffic volumes;

o Concerns about turning movements, especially onto James Street and Caroline Street;

o Inadequate provision of drop-off, delivery, service vehicle space;

o Downtown congestion during highway closures;

• Inadequate parking spaces to accommodate residents and visitors;

o Car share and transportation demand management should be incorporated;

• Concern with building height;

o Building height is not compatible with adjacent buildings and land uses;

o Building height should conform to City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law;

o Building height would dwarf City Hall and Civic Square;

o Represents significant deviation from City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law;

• Concern with number of units / density;

o Poor location for additional density;

o Proposed development constitutes over-intensification;

• Support for proposed development;

o Opportunity to improve Brant Street, James Street and John Street;

Questions / comments about unit prices and sales period;

o Adds excitement to the downtown and could attract a younger demographic;

• Concern about length of construction period and noise implications;

• Built Form & Urban Design;

o Mid-rise building would be more appropriate than high-rise building;

o Mixed use developments don't work downtown (i.e. Upper Canada Place and Burlington Square Plaza);

o Development potential of properties at north end of block bound by Brant Street, James Street, John Street and Pine Street;

• Concern that this application will be precedent setting;

- *Sustainability should be integral part of development;*
- *Negative impact to downtown charm and aesthetics.*

From the 15 to 20 written Public Comments;

- *General opposition to the proposed development;*
- *Support for the development;*
- *Concern about the significant increase in density from the permissions set out in the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law;*
- *Concern with proposed building height;*
 - o *Poor location for proposed height;*
 - o *Proposed development could dwarf City Hall;*
- *Impacts from building height;*
 - o *Height would create wind impacts;*
 - o *Height would create shadow impacts;*
- *Traffic & Safety;*
 - o *Increased traffic volumes;*
- *Insufficient parking;*
- *Concern that this application would be precedent setting;*
- *Architectural / Urban Design / Streetscape concerns;*
- *Concern the building could impact the existing character of the downtown.*

I think that you can easily see that this proposal does not achieve any real public acceptance in its proposed form, except for a general, but abstract support for some kind of development of more modest dimensions, which I could also support in keeping with broader public discussion and support.

Thank you,

Tom

From: Phyllis Mair [mailto:phyllismair@cogeco.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2017 2:34 PM
To: Plas, Kyle
Cc: 'mayor@burlington.ca.'
Subject: Feedback on Proposed downtown development.

I was not at the May 2nd meeting regarding the proposed downtown development, however I do wish to present some concerns.

Parking: the underground parking appears to accommodate exactly the number of residential units proposed. In today's society with 2 income family and teenage children with part time jobs, public transportation just doesn't cut it. In order to draw tourists and locals to visit and use the services downtown, it appears there would be insufficient parking in the area. e.g. the business/retail employees as well as shoppers will require parking. Reliability on public transit in Aldershot/Burlington is a far cry from what you are dreaming of in 20 years. We will rely on cars for many years yet - how will people get from their homes to go stations without a car and no public transportation on their street or even nearby. When one arrives home from go station, they still need a car to run errands (picking up children/groceries/banking/dry-cleaning and so on, making it to important public/school meetings on time) your dreams are a long way off.

Must keep the small town feeling: I like the quaintness of the downtown areas - see no place for a 27 storey building to take away from this.

Hours of business and services: As I see already in Aldershot area, services and shops are only open during daytime hours. People arriving home from go station cannot stop and shop at these locations because they are closed. so who in their right mind wants to fill all the vacant commercial spaces if they are not customers. Also, if you hop a bus from the go station to get home, there is no way you will be able to shop. so merchants suffer. we are forced to shop elsewhere out of the city and support other communities rather than our own.

City Hall: City Hall should be the prominent focal point in our downtown, not a 27 storey building. Maybe consideration should be made to enhancing our city hall to stand out above the rest of the street first and foremost.

These are just a few of my thoughts and concerns about your planning. I appreciate your forward thinking 20 years down the road, however, we are living here now and must be considered now.

Phyllis Mair

1047 Bedford Ave

Burlington ON L7T 2K4

From: Tahira Badre [mailto:]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 4:48 PM
To: Plas, Kyle; Meed Ward, Marianne; Mailbox, Office of Mayor Rick Goldring
Subject: 421-431 Brant St. Application

After attending the Council Chamber meeting on May 2 , it was clear that the developer has very little regard for the negative impact this proposal would have on the inhabitants of the building or the surrounding neighbourhood. The design itself is not compatible with the area. I invite all counselors to sit on the bench by Gerry Weber, look across the street, up and down, and 'see' the reality of how this building would forever change the downtown atmosphere. This is a tipping-point and crucial decision for the future of Brant St. If an ultra-modern high-rise is allowed to be built on this piece of land, it will open the door to others to follow, and Burlington will lose it's current atmosphere of welcoming cultural, historical heritage that we are so proud of.

The proposal would remove current commercial parking spaces that face James St., provide insufficient parking for residents, only 2 elevators (!), no parking for visitors (!), no parking for commercial tenants, change the continuity of individual shops along Brant St., with a design that is completely out of context visually with the neighbourhood. The proposed height of the building would also cast a shadow on the recreational swimming pool area of the Elizabeth St. apartment building, which also serves the residents of the Pearl St. apartment. Traffic concerns are obvious.

This proposal does not belong in this location. Welcome a building with character, that people will be happy to live in and invite friends and family to visit.....a building pleasing to look at that fits with the surroundings. It is possible, with the right conscientious developer.

Karen Campbell

477 Elizabeth St. Apt. 1409

From: [mailto:]
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 3:54 PM
To: Plas, Kyle
Subject: 421/31 Brantstreet

Good Afternoon

As a resident of downtown Burlington I am very much opposed to the 27 storey monstrosity that is being proposed across from city hall. There are numerous negatives and no positives come to mind.

How anyone could come up with this proposal is beyond my imagination. Of course monetary reasons for the developer certainly would have a bearing. Surely the City can stop this project before it's too late.

We have an official plan but it doesn't seem we ever stick to it – developers somehow manage to get changes approved one way or another (OMB??). Why do we bother with a plan when it isn't being followed?

Will this project be discussed at the July 21st meeting at the Art Centre?

Thank You

R Kryzanowski

From: Serge Jodoin [mailto:t]

Sent: Sunday, August 20, 2017 5:42 PM

To: Plas, Kyle

Cc: Dennison, Jack; Grimshire, Francine; jenny.sutterfield@burlington.ca

Subject: Official Plan Amendment: 505-01/17, Zoning Bylaw Amendment: 520-02/17 |Objection to the Plan and Amendment for 421-431 Brant||

Sir,

I fail to understand how the CoB could consider approving the construction of such an eyesore in front of City Hall located at the intersection of the main East-West access to the downtown core, Spencer Smith Park, the Burlington Performing Arts Center and the Art Gallery of Burlington not to mention City Hall itself. This project would cause massive traffic disruptions for many years during construction, destroy the viability of many small businesses in a wide area of the core and open the rest to other insanities. No developer sponsored study can justify a derogation to common sense.

I always understood this area is zoned for low level buildings in order to preserve the charm of the older part of this city which is already compromised by 10 story plus buildings on the West side of Brant and the condo tower follies along the Lakeshore.

The CoB peddles Burlington as a livable pedestrian friendly community in many of its PR exercises and displays at the Central Library and elsewhere. So what gives? Scrap it.

Stop the insanity and build up somewhere else. Not the core! I asked the opinion of several long term residents about this and the recurring question is Do you know? Everybody knows!!!

Cheers,

Serge Jodoin

604-3050 Glencrest Road,

Burlington, ON L7N 2H3