

Planning and Development Council Meeting
September 13, 2021

Comments Received Regarding Item 6.3

Public Meeting Report

Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment,

SmartREIT (Oakville II) Inc./SmartREIT (Oakville) Inc.)

File No. OPA 1413.34 and Z.1413.34

From: Barbara MacDonald
Sent: September 10, 2021 3:14 PM
To: Town Clerk
Subject: Fwd: By-Law Amendments 256, 260 and 294

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Barbara MacDonald
Date: September 10, 2021 at 3:12:30 PM EDT
To: TownClerk@oakville.c
Subject: By-Law Amendments 256, 260 and 294

Good afternoon. My name is Barbara MacDonald and I reside at Rosegate Way, Oakville ON. L6H 6K3.

I have read the proposed amendments for this property and would like to express my opposition to this plan.

Two towers of 29 and 28 storeys will completely tower (no pun intended) over the neighbourhood. There are many concerns about this including, but not limited to:

Blockage of light/sun as well as overlooking the neighbouring two and three storey dwellings.

Increased traffic in an already congested and busy part of town. Yes, Trafalgar is being widened but adding that many people will negate any benefits felt from this improvement.

Increased danger to pedestrians. I do a lot of walking and crossing Trafalgar (safely, with a walk sign) is hazardous.

Increased noise and pollution from increased traffic. We moved here knowing that we are living in the "city" but this will increase both substantially.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Regards,

Barbara MacDonald

Sent from my iPad

Submission Smart Centres: September 7, 2021 by Lyndsey Thom

SUBMISSION : September 7, 2021

REGARDING: Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By Law Amendment 256,260 and 294 Hays Blvd, and 271 Oak Park Blvd.

CONCERNS:

1. The height and density of this development is not in keeping with a "LIVABLE OAKVILLE " for adjacent residents in our established neighborhoods.
2. STORM WATER: Management of storm water exceeds the capacity of the infrastructure. With the destruction of green lands, proper drainage of storm water is a major problem. The approval of this development would pose an immediate health and safety risk, with significant environmental impact to the adjacent homes in the area.
3. TRAFFIC: The volume, scope and number of cars exceeds standards and poses increased danger , pollution and noise. This will add hundreds of vehicles to already problematic intersections at both Oak Park /Taunton and Oak Park/Postridge/Trafalgar which already exceed town standards.
4. PEDESTRIANS: It is already dangerous crossing Trafalgar Road. This type of density will add to and compound the problem and inherent danger significantly.
5. PARKING: It is already difficult to find parking space on the streets in the neighborhood. Where are the overflow vehicles going to park ?
6. POLLUTION AIR and NOISE: Health is significantly at risk with the increasing volume of cars generating more pollution . Traffic noise will increase in an area that is already majorly problematic.
7. GREENSPACE: There is no green space for the many hundreds of people in this proposed development.

CONCLUSION: While this general area is a designated area of growth, this development threatens the health and safety of residents. Such over development will negatively impact vehicular traffic, pedestrian traffic, water, air quality and noise. It is incompatible with "LIVABLE OAKVILLE ". It is the responsibility of the Town of Oakville to protect the health and safety of its residents. This application should NOT be approved.

Lyndsey Thom, Taunton Rd , Oakville, L6H0N5

Submission Smart Centres: September 7, 2021 by Doug Thom

Regarding: Proposed Official Plan and Zoning by Law Amendments 256, 260 and 294 Hays Blvd. and 271 Oak Park Blvd.

This application should NOT be approved for the following reasons.

1. Population density.

The immediate area already has a huge development under construction. To add two more towers, 29 and 28 stories tall, 585 units, 493 parking spots. This does not allow for one car per unit. Where do the remaining cars go?

The proposal only compounds future local Storm Water traffic density issues, pedestrian safety issues and vehicular noise issues

The Oakville Police Department are currently addressing illegal modified vehicular exhaust noise issues that already exist.

2. Pedestrian Safety. Is the Town or developer prepared to construct at least one catwalk to ensure safe pedestrian crossing of Trafalgar Road?

3. Storm Water Management Holding Tanks

The proposal that holding tanks be used for storm water because there is no available land to construct storm water management ponds, speaks for itself. According to the report, "There is no guarantee a breach of tanks would not occur, nor overflow ensue."

The report also states that "... not all waste is removed, only somewhere between 80 and 90% in a best case scenario per applicant's report."

In the 21st Century this is unacceptable. The fact that the tank solution was raised as a replacement for storm water management ponds is argument enough that the project should be built in another location with storm water ponds constructed.

Douglas Thom

Taunton Road, Oakville, L6H0N5

From: Mary McCarney
Sent: September 6, 2021 11:29 PM
To: Town Clerk
Subject: 256, 260 and 294 Hays Blvd, and 271 Oak Park Blvd

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Town Clerk
Town of Oakville

My name is Mary McCarney and I own a home in Oak Park at Littlewood Drive, Oakville, ON L6H 6T6.
I wish to express my strong opposition to the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendment for 256, 260 and 294 Hays Blvd, and 271 Oak Park Blvd, Oakville.

Two residential towers at 28 and 29 storeys are not at all in keeping with the walkable, livable neighbourhood in which I chose to become a first-time homeowner 22 years ago.

The ramifications for all area residents of allowing such a proposal would be profound and permanent. Traffic and parking, pedestrian safety, air and noise pollution, infrastructure and storm water management concerns are all very troubling. Intelligent and carefully planned growth that is compatible with a low-rise neighbourhood is reasonable. I believe this proposal is nothing more than ill-considered over-development and should be unanimously rejected by members of the Planning and Development Council.

Regards,
Mary McCarney

From: w crichton
Sent: September 5, 2021 3:49 PM
To: Town Clerk
Subject: Official Submission SMART PROPERTIES By Law Amendments 256,260,294 Hays Boulevard and 271 Oak Park boulevard Meeting Sept 13th, 6:30 p.m.
Attachments: W Crichton SMART Centres September 5th Submission.docx

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is Wanda Crichton. I reside at Rosegate Way in Oakville Ontario. L6H 6K3

This is my official submission objecting to the proposed By Law Change and Development for this site, as noted in your letter dated August 30, 2021. The document in Appendix B posted for this meeting is not my current submission, but preliminary questions and concerns I had raised previously.

I would like to speak at the meeting as a delegate, and have this document dated Sept. 5th entered into the official record, and circulated to Councillors well in time for the meeting. I also wish to confirm my appeal rights.

Thank you. Wanda Crichton

Submission: September 5 , 2021

Regarding:

Proposed Official Plan and Zoning by Law Amendment, 256,260 and 294 Hays Blvd, and 271 Oak Park Blvd. SMART Centres

Meeting Date: Sept 13th, 6:30 p.m.

The document in Appendix B posted is not my current submission. Those were questions raised earlier. This is my current submission.

The height and density of this development, is not in keeping with promoting a “Livable Oakville” for adjacent residents in **our established neighbourhoods of 20 to 25 years.**

I would like to note for the record, that although the documents posted now on the Town Development Application website are dated April 2021, they are not all the same as those originally posted in May 2021 that I initially reviewed. This is not noted, nor is a copy of the original version of documents available on the Town website for comparison. An example is the Functional Storm water Management Report and Traffic Studies.

This proposal should not be approved as follows:

1. Storm water Management - exceeds capacity of infrastructure

Greenlands have been completely destroyed in our area. This diminishes ability to properly drain what are no longer 100 year storms with climate change.

The applicant states:

Functional Storm Management Report Signing Page Page 10 on Applications website:

“The proposed sanitary design flow is 13.54 L/s as a result of the new development, which is **2.42 L/s higher than the sewers surrounding the site have been designed for** according to the Master Sanitary Drainage Plan prepared for the Uptown Core Lands. **Given the undeveloped lands remaining in the area, capacities are not a concern at this time and the proposed development can be accommodated within the existing sanitary sewer infrastructure.”**

The development (and amendment to By Law) should not proceed for this reason alone because it already exceeds the existing storm water and sewage limits . There is already approved development in the now vacant lands (former Parcel 7). There is no intent by the Town to keep the lands south vacant, as they are for sale.

Approval of this development poses an **immediate health and safety risk** to adjacent homes in the area with overflow storm water, sewage and resulting health and property damage.

It is also unclear whether this evaluation takes into consideration the 3 Towers already under construction immediately north of this property, at the southwest corner of Trafalgar and Dundas. I suspect it does not, which makes the proposal far worse and more dangerous for existing residents with respect to storm water and sewer management.

1A. Holding Tanks - creates Environmental Hazard for homes and East Morrison Creek

Report states:

“Runoff from these areas and the rooftop will be directed and temporarily stored within a proposed underground storage tank located below the access route, outside of the building footprint. All flows from the underground storage are conveyed towards the existing 750 mm diameter storm sewer on Oak Park Boulevard south of the site.”

Not being an engineer, this aspect seems even more dangerous. It appears there is some idea of using holding tanks. This is also a major health and environmental concern. ***These tanks would lie immediately adjacent to East Morrison Creek which runs under Trafalgar Road and immediately adjacent north of this property, and southwest of the property at Postridge.***

Breach or overflow would not only provide a complete Health and Safety hazard to existing residents in the area, but also an environmental disaster for the creek. It is unclear whether Nipigon Creek may also be impacted.

Our storm water management ponds connect to the creek directly. There is no guarantee a breach of tanks would not occur, nor overflow ensue. **Per the report itself, not all waste is removed**, only somewhere between 80 and 90% in a best case scenario per applicant's report. **This increases pollution.**

Approving this over- development of this scope without taking into account the environmental impacts to neighbourhood properties and East Morrison Creek is another reason to deny this over-development proposal.

No updated water study can be found by the Region since 2015, so any analysis did not include changes to building density and heights since granted by the Town in this area, and proposed here, which more than doubles heights and quantity of water to be considered for both storm and waste water.

Region of Halton Trafalgar Corridor Study 2015 APPENDIX F, completed by AECOM

The Region's Trafalgar Corridor study of 2015 raised these environmental concerns. Appendix F pages 5 and 6. Even that report is outdated, done in 2014 and did not include the scope of development already occurring. (E.G. bonussing of buildings) and proposals like this. A new study should be done before any more development is approved in the Trafalgar Corridor.

1B. Water Pressure for Existing Residents – not addressed or protected

As resident, am very concerned at the impact on water pressure to our existing homes. It seems no regard is in place for this.

I quote from the posted report on Storm water Management page 6:

“Water Balance The Town typically recommends that water balance be considered for every new development however, there is currently no requirements in this area.”

The Town should not be considering development of any sort, let alone this scope, without this matter being addressed.

1C. Lack of Mitigation

There is no other mitigation for run off on this proposal. They talk of a green roof. This won't solve the problem, by their own admission.

This over- development proposal is simply an entirely concrete structure, with entirely concrete surroundings , and no recreational green space to absorb any additional water. It is adjacent to an entirely paved parking lot plaza, and paved arterial road. There is no adequate and safe mitigation.

2. Traffic – exceeds standards, increased danger, pollution and noise

The volume, scope and number of cars generated by this proposed -development has to be considered in context of what is around it. Existing, stable residential neighbourhoods of 20 to 25 years are being disregarded.

It proposes 585 units, 493 parking spots.

There is no info provided on source of this data, or assumptions used. The traffic study cited, does not indicate whether it takes into account the additional hundreds of cars in the 3 towers already under construction at the southwest corner of Trafalgar and Dundas, immediately north of this intersection, or the numerous towers already approved north of Dundas, along Trafalgar. I suspect it may not.

The developer report notes:

Intersection of Oak Park/Postridge and Trafalgar – exceeding Town standards

“Under future total conditions, with the addition of site traffic, the intersection continues to operate at a busy LOS with overall v/c ratios of 0.79 and 0.99 during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hours. While this intersection is forecast to operate above the Town of Oakville’s threshold operability (v/c of 0.85), site related traffic will have a minimal impact on the operation of the intersection

This will add hundreds of cars to the intersection of Postridge and Trafalgar. This intersection per the developer study cited, already notes traffic at this intersection exceeds town standards. The

developer just dismisses this. **How adding hundreds of cars and frequent trips won't impact this intersection significantly is beyond logic. We can't ignore this as local residents.**

The same conclusion is drawn for intersection of Oak Park and Dundas.

Our residential neighbourhoods are already over-run with traffic. Speeding through, disregarding stop signs and pedestrians and looking for shortcuts. Adding more cars to these intersections, knowingly bringing them over capacity should not be authorized.

Pedestrians – more danger

It is already completely dangerous to cross Trafalgar Road as a pedestrian in this area. This type of density will only compound the problem. It is also becoming increasingly hazardous on our residential streets with all the extra traffic.

Mistaken and Out-dated Assumptions on Public Transit

Use of public transit in Oakville has diminished, was poor prior to the pandemic, and as a former commuter will not fill the gap. It does not serve where many people work. Not everyone takes the Go train to work in downtown Toronto. The BRT's referenced here are decades away.

Post-pandemic, use of transit is over-estimated. This proposed over-development will bring even more traffic into the area I submit, with increased use of Ride Services like Uber.

With the impact of Covid pandemic, assumptions regarding use of transit and traffic are out of date. I submit an updated traffic study traffic study, that includes the existing and proposed developments , use of Ride Services, and post-pandemic use of Public Transit is needed.

Developments of this type only encourage more commuters, creating more traffic. I believe the Town's focus should be on local high quality employment development now, not the minimum wage retail proposed in this development.

3. Parking – overflow to residential streets

Where are these cars going to go? Overflow to neighbouring streets.

The developer report notes that at least 75% of people in the area own 1 car, and over 50% own 2. Why would you think future residents would be any different? Sales of cars are up, not down since pandemic, even with supply shortages.

4. Air and Noise Pollution – adverse impact to citizens

It is unclear why there would be 4 stories of above ground parking. Not only is this hazardous, but increases noise and air pollution for existing residents. **Idling of cars outdoors, particularly in winter will increase air pollution and noise.**

Our health is at risk with the increasing volume of cars and traffic generating more air pollution and added noise.

The scope of this proposal will push traffic at intersection of Trafalgar and Oak Park/Postridge even higher than recommended; this is increasing the air pollution, and endangering the health of area residents. It should be denied also for this reason also.

Where is an updated environmental study assessing the impacts on health of local citizens of the massive development, including this proposal?

5. Skyline and Related adverse Environmental Impacts of Light and Shadow Pollution.

5A. Shadow Impact

The shadow study included clearly shows that existing properties, particularly on Penrose and parts of Rosegate Way will be in complete shadow for their backyard living areas, particularly during the times of year when most needed e.g. summer. **Citizens in neighbourhoods that have existed for decades should not lose the enjoyment of their outdoor space with excessive shadowing due to this over-development. They will also in some circumstances, now have only a view of these towers from their outdoor living space (Penrose). This impact needs to be addressed.**

5B. Incompatibility with Existing Neighbourhoods

Approval of this proposal will fill the sky with towers, & is 2.5 times higher than the Taunton. It is also a health issue, as natural sun light is needed at all times of year.

28 and 29 story buildings are in no way compatible with 2 story town home neighbourhoods adjacent in Wards 5 and 6.

5C. Skyline and Light Pollution /Impact on Birds and Bird Migration

This will create total light pollution at night for our streets. How will night lights from this tower impact adjacent residential area who face them, along with their bedroom windows?

There is no information available on how these proposed towers (along with those adjacent) will impact existing bird populations (endangered owls at night) as well as bird migration

This tower should not proceed for these reasons and at minimum until these environmental issues are addressed

6. Green Space and Community Supports and Services - lacking

There is no Green Space included for the thousands in this proposed By Law Amendment and development (which has to be considered in context with the 3 huge towers already under construction directly north of this site), and those proposed adjacent to Memorial Park. This brings

thousands of people into this area without any more green space. Memorial Park is already operating at capacity at peak times; trails at Morrison Creek, 14 and 16 Mile Creek already show damage of over-use and experience over-crowding already during peak times.

This is not a family-friendly development, nor would children have immediate access to any outdoor play area on site. **This is simply creation of a concrete jungle.**

Schools in the area already operate with many portables and new ones are years away from being operational.

Existing recreational centres are small and dated, decades old, & not designed for this type of population increase. While a new one is planned north of Dundas, there is no timeline. That will only increase pressure on existing over-used facilities.

7. Accountability to Local Residents – Council's obligation

For the reasons outlined, this proposed By Law change and development does not meet Town standards in key areas, and presents a clear and present danger to the health and safety and viability of adjacent neighbourhoods for reasons outlined. It is the responsibility of Town council to ensure bylaws, zoning protect the health and safety of citizens. Developments cannot endanger health and safety of citizens.

Conclusion:

While this is called a designated growth area, this proposal is not growth. This is over-development at a scale that threatens the health and safety of nearby residents in terms of traffic, water, sewage, air light and noise pollution. It is not in any way compatible with "A Livable Oakville" for residents here. This application should not be approved.

Wanda Crichton

Rosegate Way Oakville ON L6H 6K3

From: LJ
Sent: September 2, 2021 3:53 PM
To: Town Clerk
Subject: Re

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Re: 256, 260 & 294 Hays Blvd & 271 Oak Park Blvd., Ward 5

A 28 or 29 storey building at the above mentioned site is not a good idea since it will block the skyview for many. Also, I've heard people complain (often seniors) about having had to use elevators at those towering heights. Statistics show that seniors who live on or above the 17th floor, die 2-3 years sooner than other people. For this reason, I believe a 28 or 29 storey building at the above mentioned site is counterproductive to humanity. Affordable, sustainable accommodation would better suit our lifestyles today.

Loretta Jackson
Central Park Dr.,
Oakville, ON, L6H 0E2

From: Pouneh Majidpour

Sent: August 20, 2021 1:29 PM

To: Franca Piazza ; Mayor Rob Burton ; Jeff Knoll ; Marc Grant ; Tricia Collingwood ;

Subject: Re: Statutory Public Meeting Notice - SmartCentres (on behalf of SmartREIT (Oakville II) Inc/SmartREIT (Oakville) Inc), File No. OPA 1413.31 and Z.1413.31, Ward 5

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayer Mr. Rob Burton,

Dear Members of Council in Ward 5 Mr. Jeff Knoll and Mark Grant,

I have received this email and the attachment today. I read the attachment and there are couple of questions regarding this attachment.

- 1) As I understand the email came from the City however the information on the attachment's letter is on behalf of the builder, Am I right?
- 2) Does participation in this meeting mean approving the builder's request?
- 3) What was the town's decision on this matter that the builder wants to amend it? I think nobody knows about it.
- 4) Does any member of council which has been chosen in our ward (ward 5), participate in this meeting? Are they going to represent their view and plans in this meeting as well?

As an almost 12 year resident of Oakville, this is my first time to participate in such events. Building high rising apartments is a big concern for our community. I am definitely sure the city and the council members of ward 5 defend the rights of our residents in the meeting. However, I

will appreciate it if you could give my neighbours and I clear information regarding the City plan for development.

Thank you and your team, for working hard on behalf of Oakville residents to create a safe and friendly environment for everyone.

With regards,
Pouneh

On Fri, Aug 20, 2021 at 9:27 AM Franca Piazza <franca.piazza@oakville.ca> wrote:

Attached is the Statutory Public Meeting Notice served in accordance with the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended.

If you prefer that we use an alternative email address for service, please contact Franca Piazza, Legislative Coordinator at 905-845-6601 ext. 5986 or at franca.piazza@oakville.ca

Franca Piazza
Legislative Coordinator
Planning Services

Town of Oakville | 905-845-6601, ext.5986 | f: 905-338-4230 | www.oakville.ca

[Complete our Community Development customer service survey](#)

Canada's Best Place to Live (MoneySense 2018)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

<http://www.oakville.ca/privacy.html>

From: Denise Phillips
Sent: May 20, 2021 4:16 PM
To: Tricia Collingwood
Subject: Re: Concern

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you. All the Taunton suites are rentals, so I would be interested in more information. For me, it is simply a question whether the additional traffic will negatively impact the community environment. My address is Taunton Road suite 327, L6H 0N5. It is my intention to live here for the rest of my life (following my husband's death), hence my concern. Thank you, Denise Phillips

On Thu., May 20, 2021, 3:10 p.m. Tricia Collingwood, <tricia.collingwood@oakville.ca> wrote:

Hi Denise – I am the planner on the file and I was the planner on The Taunton as well. If you have any questions please let me know. If you don't mind me asking do you own or rent your unit? If you rent then I would advice you giving me your address and I can ensure that you are included in the mailing list for the future Council meetings.

Thank you

Tricia

Tricia Collingwood, MURP, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner- Current Planning - East District
Planning Services

Town of Oakville | 905-845-6601, ext.3833 | f: 905-338-4414 | www.oakville.ca

[Complete our Community Development customer service survey](#)

[Canada's Best Place to Live \(MoneySense 2018\)](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

<http://www.oakville.ca/privacy.html>

From: Denise Phillips
Sent: May 19, 2021 6:25 PM
To: Marc Grant <marc.grant@oakville.ca>
Cc: Town Clerk <TownClerk@oakville.ca>; Tricia Collingwood <tricia.collingwood@oakville.ca>
Subject: Re: Concern

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you for your response. Sometimes I fear that progress leads us in the wrong direction. I will continue to follow the situation.

On Wed., May 19, 2021, 2:53 p.m. Marc Grant, <marc.grant@oakville.ca> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

Thank you for reaching out with your concerns. This matter is still pending discussion before Council, and therefore I am forwarding your email to the Town Clerks.

In doing so, your comments will also be seen by the entirety of Council, and considered by the Town Planners working on this file.

This development is going by the mouthful of a name "SmartCentres - 256, 260 and 294 Hays Boulevard and 271 Oak Park Boulevard - Z.1413.34 and OPA 1413.34" and all the documents about it can be found here: <https://www.oakville.ca/business/da-37956.html>

I hope you and yours are keeping safe,

Best Regards,

Marc

Sent from my iPhone

On May 19, 2021, at 2:32 PM, Denise Phillips

wrote:

I have never contracted a Councillor before, but I wish to state my concern regarding the application for two 26 and 27 story buildings for the property at the corner of Trafalgar and Oak Park. I live in The Taunton. I am NOT complaining about the view, but rather the significant increase in traffic. I have already noticed that the Oak Park/Trafalgar intersection has frequent collisions.

I trust you will consider the potentially negative effect of such an addition to the community. Thank you for your continued work for Ward 5.

Sincerely,

Denise Phillips

Taunton Road,

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Marc Grant
Ward 5 Town Councillor
Office of the Mayor & Council
Town of Oakville | 905-815-6001 | f: | www.oakville.ca

Vision: To be the most livable town in Canada
Please consider the environment before printing this email.
<http://www.oakville.ca/privacy.html>

From: Catherine N
Sent: May 27, 2021 6:55 PM
To: Chris Ahearn
Cc: Jeff Knoll; Marc Grant; Town Clerk
Subject: Re: Proposed official plan and zoning by law 256,260 and 294 hay's boulevard and 271 oak park blvd

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I wholeheartedly agree with you Chris.

Catherine
Sent from my iPhone

On May 27, 2021, at 6:17 PM, Chris Ahearn wrote:

High density in the north oakville core is already getting out of control

The fact another two towers just under 30 stories are being considered across the dodge dealership is crazy.

We must have proper planning, infrastructure etc otherwise it will turn into Sq1 part 2 with high density and high crime rates.

Let's keep it reasonable 55/65 Speers was milestone at 19 stories... we now have oak and co at 25 why continue to push the envelope?

We should be focused on creating a community not a high rise neighbourhood where no one knows anyone and drugs and crime are profitable and self sustaining

Chris Ahearn

--

Chris Ahearn
Hon. B.A. Psychology, A.S.A
Royal Lepage Real Estate Services LTD

Office phone #905 257 3633
Chrisahearn@royallepage.ca

From: Sonja DIDYK
Sent: May 27, 2021 6:24 PM
To: Chris Ahearn; Jeff Knoll; Marc Grant; Town Clerk
Subject: RE: Proposed official plan and zoning by law 256,260 and 294 hay's boulevard and 271 oak park blvd

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I agree with everything Chris Ahearn has pointed out. Please do not repeat the mistakes of Square 1. Sonja Didyk,
Central Park Drive

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Chris Ahearn](#)
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:17 PM
To: [Jeff Knoll](#); [Marc Grant](#); townclerk@oakville.ca
Subject: Proposed official plan and zoning by law 256,260 and 294 hay's boulevard and 271 oak park blvd

High density in the north oakville core is already getting out of control

The fact another two towers just under 30 stories are being considered across the dodge dealership is crazy.

We must have proper planning, infrastructure etc otherwise it will turn into Sq1 part 2 with high density and high crime rates.

Let's keep it reasonable 55/65 Speers was milestone at 19 stories... we now have oak and co at 25 why continue to push the envelope?

We should be focused on creating a community not a high rise neighbourhood where no one knows anyone and drugs and crime are profitable and self sustaining

Chris Ahearn

--

Chris Ahearn
Hon. B.A. Psychology, A.S.A
Royal LePage Real Estate Services LTD

Office phone #905 257 3633

Chrisahearn@royallepage.ca

From: Hareesh Krishnan
Sent: May 23, 2021 12:41 PM
To: Town Clerk
Subject: Submission for Appeal of Zoning By-Law Amendment

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a resident of Oakville (Uptown Core) and recently received the Notice of Complete Application for Zoning By-Law Amendments at 256, 260 and 294 Hays Boulevard, and 271 OakPark Boulevard by SmartREIT (Oakville) Inc.

I would like to have the ability to appeal this decision due to multiple reasons including:

- 1) All residences in the area have height restrictions and that should be maintained for uniformity and peace of existing residents.
- 2) This area already has a lot of residential complexes in construction which can impact the resources along Dundas and Trafalgar
- 3) The area doesn't have sufficient parks, day-care and pet boarding, and no community center to support additional 500 residences. This should be made available for existing residents, even before a residential tower is permitted
- 4) Concerns over quality of learning at schools and dust pollution, due to excessive construction happening in this area
- 5) There isn't sufficient street side parking in this area and adding additional residential towers will weaken the existing infrastructure.
- 6) Several roads in this area are "Unassumed" and adding more residential towers in this area, will impact maintenance of the road

I am also concerned such mass commercial constructions will not support Oakville being the most livable town in Canada. I am ok for a limited height residential building which doesn't impact the resources of the area. Please let me know how I can further partner and appeal this bylaw amendment. It will also be helpful if you can connect me with other public bodies (who are appealing this) so we can make a combined appeal.

Best

Hareesh Krishnan

Taunton Road
Oakville L6H 0L3

From: L H
Sent: May 24, 2021 4:00 PM
To: Town Clerk
Subject: OPPOSE THE PROPOSED OFFICIAL PLAN ZONING ---256, 260 AND 294 HAYS BOULEVARD AND 271 OAK PARK BOULEVARD

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sirs and Madams:

I strongly oppose to the two residential towers at 28 and 29 storeys buildings at the subject area.

I have lived in Oakville since 2005 and have seen the development especially in recent years. Seeing the town prospering with rapid housing development is good; however, we need to take into consideration the aesthetic effect of these high buildings, like these two buildings "standing on Trafalgar from no where". The north side of Dundas has already given us a feeling of "pressure" when passing the Trafalgar and Dundas area. It will further make the traffic worse along Trafalgar Rd. Look at Mississauga, with high condos looking over townhouses and houses. A lot of us cannot afford to live at Lakeshore, south side of Oakville, but at least don't make Oakville residents like me to feel too pressured living in dense neighborhoods.

Hope the Council will take into consideration the aesthetic factor.

Best regards,

L Huen

Taunton Road, Oakville, ON

From: Kim Prezio
Sent: March 1, 2020 5:40 PM
To: Town Clerk
Subject: Vacant property

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good evening

I'm a resident that lives at the Taunton. There a piece of property across were I live im just wondering what is the future planning? I see that alot of buildings are possibility going to be built there.

In my opinion it would be nice to build a park there or leave it for nature, there's way to many home s, building s, being built. There's not enough green space any more.

I see all the farm land as been used up it's over kill! unsightly in my opinion it's GREED for money sad!

I'm sure my opinion dose not matter but the city of OAKVILLE likes to cut down tree's to build housing, and low rises, or mid rise. We just don't see enough trees in Oakville the new construction.

The City of Oakville should plant more trees I would help! to make more appealing instead ripping nature down to put more houseing up, there so many ways when building you can keep the trees instead of cutting them down.

I'm sure you probably don't care what I say, but where dose it stop!!!☹

KimP

Regards

Planning and Development Council Meeting
September 13, 2021

Additional Comments Received Regarding 6.3

Public Meeting Report, SmartCentres (on behalf of SmartREIT (Oakville II) Inc./SmartREIT (Oakville) Inc.), Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment, Z.1413.31,256, 260 and 294 Hays Boulevard, 271 Oak Park Boulevard

From: Hani Barghouth

Sent: September 12, 2021 10:25 PM

To: Town Clerk <TownClerk@oakville.ca>

Subject: Submission regarding Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment 256, 260 and 294 Hays Boulevard and 271 Oak Park Boulevard, SmartCentres - OPA 1413.34 and Z.1413.34, Ward 5

Hello,

My name is Hani Barghouth and I reside at [REDACTED] Rosegate Way in Oakville, Ontario L6H 6K3

This is my official submission objecting to the proposed plan and zoning by-law amendment to permit an increase in the height permissions allowing the two proposed residential towers on the subject land.

My main concerns include:

- Increased Traffic , noise and air pollution in an area that is already busy and expected to be even busier with the new towers already coming up to the north along Dundas !
- This also poses increased danger on pedestrians crossing the streets in the area
- Shadow impact on our street especially during summer times
- Most schools in our area are already at capacity with multiple portables, such new development is expected to increase demand on schools which could negatively impact the quality of learning.

In conclusion, the proposed amendment seems to allow over development in our area which will negatively impact the health and safety as well as the quality of life for residents which is incompatible with our "LIVABLE OAKVILLE ". This application should not be approved.

Thank you,

Hani Barghouth

[REDACTED] Rosegate Way, Oakville, ON L6H 6K3

From: Janet Rowsell janetsrowsell@gm

Sent: September 12, 2021 11:27 PM

To: Town Clerk <TownClerk@oakville.ca>

Subject: Proposed Amendment - 256, 260 and 294 Hays Boulevard & 271 Oak Park Boulevard

Hello Town Clerk,

I am a resident and home owner at [REDACTED] Littlewood Drive, in Oakville, Ontario.

Please note as a resident and homeowner that I am strongly opposed to the proposed amendment to the zoning by-law.

There is already building taking place which will over-stress and significantly change the urban core. Residential buildings of a height of 29 and 28 storeys will damage the character and significantly impact the community resources of the area that I live in with my children.

I will attend the town meeting on Monday, September 13, 2021. However, I am very concerned about the development and I want the amendment and application to be dismissed and refused. A building which is four to six storeys is acceptable but not a building of this height. I and other residents will strongly oppose this development.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours truly, Janet Rowsell, B.A., LL.B., LL.M.

From: Gayle Dykeman

Sent: September 13, 2021 6:52 AM

To: Town Clerk <TownClerk@oakville.ca>

Subject: Increase in Height Restrictions (Oak Park) Sept.13 Meeting

As residents at [REDACTED] Central Park Dr. we vehemently oppose the change.

If we wanted to live in high density we would have moved to Square One. Is this the look and living conditions Oakville aspires to? We chose Oakville five years ago, and left our house where we lived in Mississauga for 37 years. Several factors made the decision an easy one -
- traffic (resulting in higher insurance rates) noise, social issues (increased crime, lack of physicians, crowded parking lots for shopping etc.), higher taxes to support infrastructure, etc. etc.

Saving Glen Abbey further supported our belief that we made a wise decision. Now it appears that corporate greed? desire to raise taxes? and income for the Town of Oakville? have won out and Oakville desires to copy the rest and not remain distinct.

Why was the new highrise eyesore at Trafalgar & Dundas exempt from this restriction ??? Casting long shadows deters gardeners and poses too many issues to list. The signage at the location sounds like a 'done deal'? If the Town Council does indeed listen to the concerns of residents kudos.

L. & G. Dykeman (taxpayers)