From: MILLER

Sent: 2022/07/16 11:14 PM

To: City Clerks Office < City.clerksOffice@brampton.ca; Fay, Peter < Peter.Fay@brampton.ca > ; City Hall < City.Hall@brampton.ca >

Cc: Singh, Harkirat - Councillor < Harkirat.Singh@brampton.ca >; Dhillon, Gurpreet -

Councillor < Gurpreet. Dhillon@brampton.ca >; Vicente, Paul - Councillor

<<u>Paul.Vicente@brampton.ca</u>>; Whillans, Doug - Councillor <<u>Doug.Whillans@brampton.ca</u>>; Bowman, Jeff - Councillor <<u>Jeff.Bowman@brampton.ca</u>>; Medeiros, Martin - Councillor

<<u>Martin.Medeiros@brampton.ca</u>>; Fortini, Pat - Councillor <<u>Pat.Fortini@brampton.ca</u>>;

Palleschi, Michael - Councillor < Michael. Palleschi@brampton.ca >; Santos, Rowena - Councillor < Rowena. Santos@brampton.ca >; Bob Bergey < bobbergey6@gmail.com >; Kerry Byam < kbyam@icloud.com >; Kulu Hunjan < kuluhunjan@yahoo.com >; Bill Sterritt < billsterritt@yahoo.ca >; Melinda Cassar < mcassar@mrcm.ca >; Rick Wesselman < rwesselman@rbbn.com >

Subject: [EXTERNAL]Schlegel Application

Caution: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments that you do not trust or are not expecting.

To the Mayor and Members of Council

We have been in regular contact with your planning staff from the beginning of this application and they have indicated to us that there has been no substantial change to the Schlegel application since that application was ordinally filed. It appears that the original concerns listed by folks from from Rosedale and the surrounding neighbourhoods, have not been addressed. Instead objections from residents were dealt with through a normal reporting process which meant that each department used their metrics to judge the application addressing specific matters. Individual concerns were covered by institutional reporting. There is no overall discussion of the site or whether it is a benefit to the local neighbourhood except to refer to provincial, regional and city planning policy documents. We believe those policies have little to do with actual living and working conditions of neighbourhoods.

We followed the Schlegel application as it was processed through all departments (Regional + city and other agencies) and based on the reports which we read, the outcomes concentrated only on the application and not the concerns raised by the people of the Villages of Rosedale and PCC 564.

The attached letter to council represents an appeal to council to defer their decision on this project until September so that another public meeting might be held to address the issues raised by the public. We hope that city council will table this application on July 25 2022, so that the city and developer can address the concerns raised by the citizens of Brampton.

Tpm

Terry Miller
Cricket court
Vice Chair and Director PCC564

PEEL CONDOMINIUM 564

TO the Mayor and Members of Council

We (PCC-564) are writing this letter to express our concern about the application of Schlegel Villages Inc for a substantial change to the Official Plan and zoning bylaw for the lands known as 425 Great lakes Drive described as Block 3 Registered Plan No43M -134. These lands are subject to an OPA and zoning bylaw initially agreed to in 2003.

PCC 564, in Rosedale Village, is directly adjacent to the proposed application site, across Sandalwood Rd. at Great Lakes Dr. The Schlegel application, to amend the OPA and the zoning bylaw, changes the 2003 agreed density to an extreme by changing the density of the site from low rise to two multi-unit multi-floor towers. These changes, not only affect 564 directly but the other 21 condominium corporations as well.

The Planning and Development Services Report June 24 2020 pins the foundation of the Schlegel application on Provincial Policy Statements 2014 and 2020 and the Growth Plan of 2019. We are perplexed understanding how these policies and the Schlegel application fit the Sandalwood Great Lakes neighbourhood.

This neighbourhood already has a mix of recreational (soccer centre) institutional (three schools) residential (Rosedale community and two story residential neighbourhoods west and south of the site) and commercial (Trinity Common district shopping mall). All of these uses already drive traffic, noise, density, activity and environmental concerns.

The application proposes two 12 story apartments with a total of 512 units and 316 parking spaces. We believe two twelve story apartments will tower over residential backyards causing shadow blockage and loss of rear yard enjoyment. We also believe that, contrary to the proffered staff report and the applicants traffic opinion, traffic at the intersection of Sandalwood and Great Lakes will be untenable. As users of this intersection now, we know that it is a dangerous and

crowded intersection during rush hour and at other times of the day. We do not believe that enough study has been done regarding the treatment of this intersection and the Schlegel application will merely make this intersection unmaintainable and unsound. Speed and noise on Sandalwood will be exacerbated by the volume and velocity of all kinds of vehicles on the road, especially during a rush hour that now extends from 3pm to 8pm.

PCC 564 believes that greater consideration must be given to the items mentioned above. We believe that the OPA and zoning changes applied for will change the character of the Sandalwood/Great Lakes neighbourhood and the density and building height may have deleterious effect on folks living in the neighbourhood surrounding this complex.

We know that Provincial Policy Statements and Growth Plans come and go and always sound good but are objective in their nature. The reality of growth is a dynamic that changes the picture and shape of neighbourhoods and cities. The intensification applied for by Schlegel Villages Inc 425 Great Lakes is out of place.

Lastly we believe that the public notice policy of the city needs a shakeup. Fortunately for us several of our residents saw the advertisement in the Guardian. City planers could easily have informed PCC 564 or the Villages of Rosedale Inc. about the application.

We wonder why this application is now before city council in July the beginning of summer and holidays. We understand the paucity of opportunities people have to engage in the planning process brought about by changes in the planning process but the Schlegel application was presented to staff in April of 2020. The city needs to do a better job in informing folks about change. The 120 meters doesn't do that and only keen eyes spotted this application.