NEUF
ARCHITECT(E)S

MEETING REPORT

Project - address
Burlington Waterfront
2020 Lakeshore Road, Burlington, ON L7R 4G8

Issue date (yy.mm.dd)
2021.09.09

Meeting date (yy.mm.dd)
20.09.08

Project No. – Doc. type – Doc. no.
12576

Project Phase – Purpose of meeting
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION MEETING

Location of meeting
Virtual over Zoom

Report prepared by
Bronte Morris-Poolman

The following is a summary of discussions and decisions that took place at the meeting mentioned above. If this account does not seem to conform to what was said at the meeting, please notify the undersigned not later that the next meeting or within 5 business days, failing which it will be considered compliant.

P = Present, T = Attended via Telephone/teleconference, C = copied on meeting report

	Abbreviation / Company	Address	Telephone / Mobile	Collaborators	Abbrev	Pres.	Dist.
Client	**HDCi**	1827 Will Scarlett Drive Mississauga, ON L5K 1J6	T (647) 242-6956	**Peter Horn, Principal** tphorn75@gmail.com		C	
	Vrancor Group	366 King St. W. Hamilton, ON L8P 1B3	T (905) 540-4800	**Gunther Bluesz** GBluesz@bellacordesign.com		C	
				Darko Vranich darko@vrancor.com		C	
Architect	**NEUF architect(e)s**	8 Market Street, Suite 600 Toronto, ON M5E 1M6	T (416) 864-8550 x 326 M (514) 812-7407	**Lilia Koleva, Partner Architect** lkoleva@NEUFarchitectes.com		P	
				Anh Le Quang, Partner Architect alq@neufarchitectes.com		C	
			T (416) 864-8550	**Bronte Morris-Poolman , Architectural Graduate** bmpoolman@neufarchiectes.com		P	
			T (416) 864-8550	**Joana Abreu, Architectural Graduate** jabreu@neufarchitectes.com		C	
Planner	**Bousfields Inc.**	1 Main Street East, Suite 200 Hamilton, ON L8N 1E7	T (416) 947-9744x401	**David Falletta, Partner** dfalletta@bousfields.ca		P	
			T (905) 549-3005x259	**Evan Sugden** esugden@bousfields.ca		C	
Landscape	**Adesso**	218 Locke Street South, Second Floor Hamilton, ON L8P 4B4	T (905) 526-8876 x 201	**Mario Patitucci, Principal** mario@adessodesigninc.ca		P	
			T (905) 526-8876 x 205	**Graham Taylor, Landscape Architect** graham@adessodesigninc.ca		C	
Structure	**SLA**	3228 South Service Road, Suite 105 Burlington, ON	T (905) 631-6978 x 102 C 905-979-9600	**Steven Frankovich, Principal** SFrankovich@sla.on.ca		C	
Traffic	**Paradigm**	5A-150 Pinebush Road Cambridge, ON N1R 8J8	T (905) 381-2229 x 300	**Stew Elkins, VP and Chief Resources Officer** selkins@ptsl.com		P	
Wind	**RWDI**	625 Queen Street West Toronto, ON M5V 2B7	T (647) 475-1048	**Hanqing Wu, Principal** Hanqing.Wu@rwdi.com		P	
City of Burlington	**City of Burlington**	426 Brant Street Burlington, ON	T (905) 335-7600	**Thomas Douglas** Thomas.Douglas@burlington.ca		P	

		L7R 3Z6		**Mayor Marianne Meed Ward** mayor@burlington.ca		P	
				Councillor Lisa Kearns lisa.kearns@burlington.ca		P	
Facilitator	Monarch Park Group	Box 30086 RPO Woodbine Heights Toronto, ON M4C 5J2	T (647) 234-7726	**Karyn Dumble, President & Principal Consultant** karyn@themonarchparkgroup.ca		P	

Please ensure distribution to your colleague aforementioned work.

1. Introduction by Karyn Dumble

1-01 Overview and introduction by Karyn Dumble on meeting procedure and how to use zoom

Agenda:

1. Welcome and intro
2. Mayor Marianne Meed Ward and Councilor Lisa Kearns
3. City planning staff presentation on planning process
4. Development Proposal by owners
5. Questions and answer period

Review of members presenting and consultants

2. Mayor Marianne Meed Ward and Councillor Lisa Kearns

2-01 Mayor:

No application received and no decision made on proposal.

City requires any proposed development to speak to community first – tonight is said pre-application meeting.

Once application comes in, community gets another chance and meeting to review and give input. This process will take 6-9 months.

Application then council can approve, deny, or modify.

Councilor:

To find out more go to Burlington.ca/2020lakeshore and subscribe to updates.

Councilors do not take a stance until they review the proposal with planning staff. Will give opinion at statutory public hearing.

3. City Planning Staff Presentation on Planning Process

3-01 Video prepared by the City of Burlington on the planning process.

4. Planning Process Presentation by Thomas Douglas

4-01	Pre-application process not related to City's Waterfront Hotel Study. This is separate and will continue this year. Waterfront Hotel Study required by Official plan. Intended to guide redevelopment of the Waterfront Hotel site. Key criteria and design drivers within this study. More information available on the Burlington website www.burlington.ca/waterfronthotelstudy Development on same site as the Waterfront Hotel Study.

5. Planning Presentation by David Falletta

5-01	Overview of the site and the planning policy framework that applies to the site. Site within the Urban Growth Centre Boundary at key intersection. Surrounding context, development activity nearby. Overview of official plan policy framework that applies to site. Overview of Waterfront Hotel Planning Study, 2 emerging concepts, and preferred design principles.

6. Architectural Presentation by Lilia Koleva

6-01	Architectural overview of the project massing and key features. Relationship to the street and lake, connection between inside and outside. Overview of building's relationship to the site. Compliant with tall building guidelines in terms of setbacks and floor plate sizes. Landscaping and public realm overview. Programming overview in section. Supporting the local community through commercial opportunities, public art opportunities, and connection with Spencer Smith Park. Connection to active transportation including biking and public transport. Sustainability features: views and daylight, high SRI, bird friendly treatments, regional materials, vegetation, anti-glare glass, storm water management

7. Question and Answer Period

7-01	Q1: MMW: What is required to stop this proposal, to convert this property to a 100% publically available sight - say a park extension to the existing park structure. A1 – Mayor Meed Ward: 5% park dedication rule for all additional units to site compared to now. Land acquisition discussions happen after we process the application. 2 options: process application and land acquisition. Q2: Considering the current traffic on Lakeshore, are there any plans to expand or improve Lakeshore?

A2 – Stew Elkins: Traffic study to be done by proponent. Do not know impacts on Lakeshore Rd. yet. City is doing a downtown traffic review finished in October 2019, which did not identify widening of Lakeshore road. Currently not aware of widening capacity, but improvements can be made in terms of bike paths.

Q3: The 2017 City Emerging Plan & Citizen Plan B concepts were 2 tall buildings with clear views to the lake. Why is the Developer proposing 2 tall condos 33 & 35 storeys well in excess of the City's approved 22 to 25 storeys and proposing a connecting 4 Story Podium effectively building a 40 Foot WALL to the lake. Citizens have been very clear since 2017 they DO NOT SUPPORT A WALL of Buildings blocking views of the lake. Why is the Developer not listening to the citizens of Burlington?

A3 – Lilia Koleva: Clarify 30 and 35 storeys in not in addition to the podium. Believe that proposal is in line for the future of Burlington. Very open site and quality of built form respects that. Views to lake are provided through atrium. Atrium opens up completely to maximize vistas. Open to suggestions about atrium.

A3 – David Falletta: Recently approved New Official Plan and 22-storey height cap does not apply to site. It is a site specify policy that requires further development. NOP captures new proposals over 22 storeys. We believe the site can accommodate more height and density. Applied city tall building guidelines and urban design principles. Towers are pulled apart to allow for open space between, which greatly exceeds city's 25m guideline – currently is 40m. Understand that views and connectivity to lake is important and will look at John St. as an opportunity for physical connection to lake.

Q4: Lakeshore has become a 'parking lot" during prime times. This project will only make it worse. Is there any way of widening Lakeshore road? Getting to the hospital in an emergency may take up to 20 minutes for just a few blocks.

A4 – Stew Elkins: Proposing all access from Elizabeth street to eliminate the access at the end of Brant and eliminate the smaller access near John street. By doing so, it will reduce the amount of conflict on Lakeshore rd. and make minor operational improvements on Brant street. Traffic study still needs to be done. Time trails usually are not done, but can discuss with proponent for hospital timelines during peak hours. Need to understand there will be congestion in this area since it is downtown in peak hours. Trying to promote pedestrian friendly environment, so people can easily cross lakeshore. Encourage trips via transit, walking, and cycling.

C1: This looks amazing.

Q5: I live on the 4th floor #404 at the Bridgewater. I am very worried that my view will be compromised as well as the sun, which comes in at noon to sunset. In addition, the traffic on Elizabeth is a zoo now. How will over 500 vehicles be able to access the proposed building and The Bridgewater residents?

A5 – Lilia Koleva: We have done a sun study as part of the submission; We can look at the impacts specifically. East tower is the lower tower.

A5 – David Falletta: City has a comprehensive term of reference for shadow studies with appropriate impacts. We used these guidelines on this site for this design. As part of Waterfront Hotel Planning Study people wanted to get rid of access on Lakeshore Road. We agree with this and this proposal does that. Makes Lakeshore Rd. more animated, pedestrian friendly, and safer.

A5 – Stew Elkins: No widening of Elizabeth, still will be two lanes. Utilize the traffic signal there vs. on Brant for ease of movement.

Q6: What is the commitment to affordable housing?

A6 – David Falletta: Very early in process, owner will be considering all of these elements. Currently do not know what the mean development price will be and do not know how many/if any will be affordable housing.

Q7: Is there not a concern of traffic gridlock created causing hospital and accessible emergency access causing safety issues?

A7 – Stew Elkins: Have yet to complete traffic study. Cannot confirm or deny the traffic gridlock. City's previous 2019 study showed that there were reasonable levels of service at intersections.

Q8: How long will the construction disruption be?

A8 – David Falletta: City's construction management plan will include this as well as other elements. Not there yet. City has created guidelines including not closing sidewalks or roads. More info once application filed.

Q9: Does the fire department have capacity to service buildings this high?

A9– David Falletta: Fire department will provide comment on application.

Q10: Has the developer performed shadow projections to show how the height of these buildings affect sunlight on the park and surrounding buildings at various times of the day? Wind tunnel?

A10 – David Falletta: City's guidelines were referenced. Important because proximity to Spencer Smith. No shadow impacts on park.

A10 – Lilia Koleva: Wind study showed quite positive effects.

A10 – Hanqing Wu: Wind tunnel between towers is not a concern. Predominant winds from SW and NE, which is perpendicular to the site. Podium also helps resolve the issue. Yet to do detailed study.

Q11: Mr. Falletta, I believe you said the property sits within the Urban Growth Centre. Am I right in thinking you and the proponent are ignoring both the recently approved boundary changes to the UGC and the zoning and other aspects of the new Official Plan Passed by this Council and the Region, which we understand to be compliant with Provincial policies?

A11 – David Falletta: Relocating urban growth center yet to be approved. If it does move, it will trigger updates to COP to provide framework around the new urban growth center from current one. We are not ignoring this; we understand the policy framework is evolving.

Q12: May I remind you the new OP reflects the wishes of Burlington Residents. So, in ignoring the new OP and UGC, you and the proponent are ignoring the clear desire of the residents of Burlington to not have ultra-high tower blocks as expressed in the 2018 municipal election. If we, Burlington residents, the OP, and the UGC are being ignored how do you and the proponent justify that?

A12 – David Falletta: We do not think anything is being ignored. Everyone is talking about a vision established in the NOP that is under appeal. Does establish strategy urban growth and a downtown. All stems back to 2006 growth plan and before that the city's official plan. Always been an indication that there is no more greenfield land and strong emphasis on intensification in

strategic growth area. The downtown has always been intended to growth and support transit. NOP supports this. No height or density requirements in NOP. Number of criteria that have been approved by council that align with good planning policy and those have been applied.

Q13: Lilia, you believe it is in line with Burlington vision for the lake and I do not agree. Seem to be ignoring waterfront study. Understand you work for developer and their desires. 40-foot high podium is not open and transparent. Animated experience seems to be building to sidewalk, which is not pedestrian friendly. If I was standing across the road on Lakeshore looking through atrium, will I see concrete, steps, sky, and none of the lake? Slides suggest this. Far from our vision. Looks like Harbourfront, which would be sad.

A13 – Lilia Koleva: Views will be included in official application looking down John, Brant, and Elizabeth to see impact. Took 2 views from both sides of the sidewalk to see impact of podium to the lake. Most instances the tower is not blocking, it is podium. We have adjusted that on Brant. On John, we approached the 4-storey atrium with no programming on levels 1-4. Only sky bridge on level 5. Looked into spider glass to try to be transparent. Owner wanted to ensure we keep views to the lake. Not going to see a concrete wall. Looking at other options of opening atrium for maximum transparency. In terms of view, strong topography change. Slope to our benefit, so you will not see the steps. From Elizabeth, setback is less compared to on John and Brant.

Q14: Please address the issue of public parking displaced by these buildings.

A14 – Stew Elkins: Parking study to be done, no answer at this time. We do have formalized on street parking proposed on Lakeshore and proposal that will add to the public parking element.

Q15: How do you apply for the application to stop this development? Burlington is becoming a hodge-podge of high rises. This will block lake views, which is the main attraction of the city of Burlington. I am tired of hearing this was done by previous councils. I would rather we buy the property and remove all impediments of our lake view. If this application is put in how much chance has it of being seriously considered. I doubt very much.

A15: None.

Q16: You have not eased our concerns about the traffic issues. Elizabeth will have possibly 500 plus cars exiting on little Elizabeth along with 300-ish cars from Bridgewater. Not to mention the cars from the retail, hotel etc. this sounds like a nightmare in the making.

A16- Stew Elkins: Based on proposal, we prepared estimate of trip generation. 300 new trips in am peak hours and 350 in pm peak hour. Do not know numbers for Bridgewater, but will include it in our study. Signal at Lakeshore and Elizabeth has a cycle of 90 seconds. 40 cycles at peak hours. Average arrival rate for our site and Bridgewater – 15 vehicles on south side every cycle. Not a nightmare, manageable.

Q17: The signalized intersection at Brant Street is heavily used by pedestrians to enter the Park going southbound and ensures the free flow of pedestrian traffic northbound from the park into the downtown commercial district. The developer has indicated that the Brant/Lakeshore access to the property will be eliminated and vehicular traffic in/out moved to the Elizabeth Street side of the property. What specific "enhanced pedestrian features and animation" are planned by the developer to ensure the safe flow of patrons to the park?

A17 – Lilia Koleva: Discussed with Paradigm how to create a safe connection at Brant and Lakeshore. One consideration is to propose a sidewalk enlargement. For safety and more public realm.

A17 – Mario Patitucci: On frontage, we worked hard to implement the streetscape guidelines from Burlington and usually exceed requirements for clear path of travel and others. We enhanced public realm and connection. Working on connection to park and have succeeded in other areas.

A17 – David Falletta: Currently clear boundary between public and private. Design blurs the two lines, more integration, more public elements along sites edges. Allow public realm to enter into the site.

Q18: From midway on the West - East crosswalk at the foot of Brant, what portion of the vista to Lake Ontario will remain? Half. Where would PLAN B's thin red line bifurcate the west most tower?

A18 – David Falletta: (Site plan on screen) As part of WHS, plan B group asked for a view corridor along Brant be provided. NEUF has made a plan that considers view corridors. Corridor that plan B established. In formal application, will show views down the 3 streets to the lake. BUD recognized our perceptions since we showed them these views. They were supportive of the podiums relationship to context.

A18 – Lilia Koleva: (showing views Brant from BUD submission) Do not see podium down Brant from East, but yes on West. Studies on East and West side. Same studies from John through atrium and down Elizabeth.

Q19: This project looks like a done deal. Please address the statement: "The transition to a Toronto-West city is now complete."

A19: None.

Q20: How many people are watching?

A20 – Karyn Dumble: 90 peak

Q21: How did you arrive at 35 storeys? Is that the max you think you'll be approved for? Is it based on surrounding buildings or by-laws?

A21 – David Falletta: Looked at context, emerging development pattern. Saw buildings up to 26 approved and 29 proposed. Thought site could accommodate more based on surrounding uses and built form impacts. Applied built form impact criteria: shadow, wind. Looked at form and fit, views, and other good urban design principles. Arrived at 35 and 30 that will fit and provide acceptable impact.

Q22: Are there any plans for any type of green roof infrastructure on the towers and podium? I really like the shape of the buildings and the podium structures to support.

A22 – Mario Patitucci: Working on podium roof amenity spaces that are anticipated to have green roof component.

A22 – Lilia Koleva: Podium level is stepping many times on lake side. Multiple amenity spaces included a green roof. Looking at storm water management solutions and green roofs are helpful to mitigate that.

C2: The quaint village-like culture of Burlington can't be maintained with 22+ story buildings going up on every corner.

Q23: Can we see the shadow projections? Notably these were not outlined this evening.

A23 – David Falletta: Email David or Evan to get them. We have done them for BUD submission. Required for the formal development application. Access city's project website with Evan's contact information.

Q24: David, with respect to your answer on additional height & site specific authorization I agree we could support additional height of 35 storeys and Landmark building(s) on this site IF the Developer were to give consideration to a development along the lines of the Plan B concept where the buildings were grouped on the east side of the site. Right now, there is a LARGE impasse between the Citizens & the City's Visions and what the Developer is proposing. A LOT of compromise will be required for approval.

A24 – David Falletta: Understand concern and here to work with you. We will share views with you for build form beyond red line vs. at it.

Q25: Downtown does not have enough public parking now. Are there any plans for public parking?

A25 – Stew Elkins: We will provide parking for commercial and residential uses. Not aware of public parking.

A25 – David Falletta: Paradigm will look into how the site currently uses public parking and how it will with development.

Q26: Are there specific plans to provide on-site surface parking to accommodate the patrons of the proposed commercial units or is it the expectation that patrons will use the pooled public parking throughout the downtown core?

A26 – Lilia Koleva: Lay-by area along Lakeshore road is provided. We have separated commercial and hotel parking from residential. Numbers will be confirmed by Stew. Commercial patrons will be able to use parking within building.

Q27: Can we see a wider view of the proposed development from above so that we can see how this will affect our views of the lake?

A27 – David Falletta: Reach out to us to provide whatever views we have. Assuming this question is from people in other tall buildings nearby. Policy requirements relate to views around public realm, not for a private balcony scenario.

Q28: When will the recording be available - and where would one go to look at it- the Gazette wants to tell its readers.

A28 – Thomas Douglas: No application yet. Materials will be posted on city's website once we get proposal. Meeting is being recorded. We will be looking at where it can be shared with public.

Q29: This development as proposed should not be approved - over builds - does little nothing to add to the livability in the city actually takes away from making a better city - the developer is already "in his opinion" making an early case for the appeal / amendment to the city plan

A29: none.

Q30: Considering that this project will include a large portion of commercial space on the lower floors of these towers, has the traffic study included the expected additional flow of delivery vehicles and municipal garbage vehicles, service vehicles etc.?

A30 – Stew Elkins: Will be doing an auto exercise and circulation review to make sure loading space will accommodate the necessary services like loading and delivery.

Q31: When will incomplete studies be completed?

A31 – David Falletta: Once proposal is finalized, it will then be studied and those will influence the ultimate design including parking, setbacks, etc. Will be available once application filed.

8.Closing Remarks

8-01 David and Lilia want to hear feedback and thank you for time.

Councilor Lisa Kearns thanks everyone for question and comments. We cannot provide our opinion this time, but want to continue to speak with community. Thanks to applicant and moderator.

Mayor Meed Ward thanks residents and organizers. If questions were not answered completely, please contact applicant and city.