

APPENDIX C – Public Comments

April 25, 2022

Please find below my comments on the proposal for two tower blocks at the corner of Cornwall and Trafalgar.

I challenge not only the amendment to increase permitted height of the buildings, I challenge the entire concept of the proposed construction.

This proposal looks like something that would have been approved in the 1960's, not the 2020's. The proposal is incompatible with the overall Livable Oakville plan. Specifically:

1. Increased density should not mean keeping all the single storey retail and offices around a huge car park and simply sticking a couple of massive tower blocks on the end. Meanwhile lining the pockets of Oakville treasury with cash payment in lieu of parkland. That is not imaginative planning - that is just doing what is easy and lazy.
2. It is not consistent with Livable Oakville principles: Where will the people who live in these 317 apartments go for recreation, fresh air and walks? Or does Oakville plan, as usual, to put the burden on surrounding neighbourhoods to cope with ever increasing traffic and population without any increase in parkland. We note that the Town is to be paid cash in lieu of parkland requirements - so where is the park going to be?
3. The Bronte abomination at the corner of Bronte Road and Lakeshore is a prime example of this kind of bungled planning. Sobey's keep their single storey retail and huge car park, and two huge tower blocks are simply stuck on the end. So we get ugly retail, ugly car park, and ugly towers. No park, no landscaping, nothing appealing at all. Definitely not livable.
4. No indication of any consideration of the challenges of climate change. The station area will become a concrete and tarmac no-go zone. These massive climate destroying concrete structures with no green landscaping of any significance will become unliveable heat traps in increasingly hot Summers. Increased density should not mean sacrificing livability.
5. Where is the requirement for self-sustaining power, power generating windows, solar shades, solar on roofs, etc.? Where is the requirement for sustainable building practices, using wood and other carbon reducing materials?

OK. Enough of the complaint; what is the alternative?

I ask you to imagine the entire area of Cornwall - Trafalgar, from Shoppers Drug Mart to Whole Foods and the proposed tower location. This currently is a huge area - all of it one storey retail, office and car park - and all concrete and tarmac.

Imagine instead a 4-5 storey building, built around the edges of this entire space. Retail is on the ground floor, floors above are apartments (and a lot more than 317 apartments). Inside this rectangle is an attractive area of grassed and treed courtyard. Cafes and shops open onto this open space, maybe with patios that can be covered in winter. All parking is underground, with 100% of spaces containing recharging stations for electric vehicles and bicycles; a separate parking area is reserved for residents.

This would give massive solar power capacity along the enormous roof space, be energy efficient, face in from the railway, be attractive from Cornwall and Trafalgar (if well designed), and be a gathering and meeting

point for those in the apartments above. The apartments would be highly desirable, being relatively low, connected to the ground floor, connected to cafes and shops underneath, and to nearby transport.

This is not a pipe dream - for several years we were fortunate enough to live in the suburbs of Amsterdam, the Netherlands, which is the most densely populated country in Europe. And we lived near a similar development. In that case a ten storey apartment block built over a supermarket and shops, with a central atrium, cafes and parkland behind. Almost always retail, supermarkets etc. had apartments above them and parking underground. Space was at a premium, yet they managed to create density of population with parks everywhere in an attractive environment.

I provide this vision as an example of what could be achieved and what could be mandated by the Council if they provide clear vision and direction to the planners of what is required from any plan as they move to increased density.

The planners are not to blame- they are working without any clear vision and direction for a truly livable Oakville and without clear requirements to address climate change, sustainable building practices and sustainable living environments. Please help them.

Regards,

Duncan Galloway

Michal Cegielski – email March 31, 2020

Thanks you for your notice for the Statutory Public Meeting with regards the Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments. I am just trying to understand the process. Is the meeting in order to facilitate people's views as to the development or are you looking for that before hand OR is it just to be notified of the outcome of the meeting. I am just trying to understand the process.

My personal view is that a building of that size will completely impact the already very challenging traffic pattern on that street. I live on Pine which runs parallel to Cornwall and would be very close to the proposed building site. A 19 story building would create a direct line of site into my property and my backyard infringing on my family's immediate privacy - if I wanted to be that close to a building of that size, I would not live in a Town, but rather a City (say Toronto).

Peter and Marie Bonfield – email March 14, 2020

In response to your invitation for the April 6 meeting about the variation for the Cornwall/Trafalgar property re-zoning, we would like to express our opposition to the proposed town action. As citizens living at the North end of Reynolds St., we foresee drastic changes to the neighbourhood. If you, as representatives are working in the interest of livability of Oakville, 2 massive high-rises of 14 and 19 storeys is not the direction to go. The purpose of keeping the original nature of Oakville is better served by sticking to the foresight of a maximum of 4-10

floors on that property. Otherwise, why have a plan? Or are financial pressures and power plays by developers winning out again? Are we dealing with another fait accompli of losing before we even speak out or fight back? Please register our resident opposition to this Zoning Amendment for WARD 3, as it saddles us with another monstrosity in our vanishing neighbourhood.

Please advise us of the Town's decision on the proposed building plan. We trust it is open to democratic expression.

Jack Neal (email) – February 15, 2020

I hope you're well. I am writing regarding the proposed OPA/ZBLA at 485 Trafalgar/271 Cornwall Road (File Z.1612.14) in the sense that I would like to receive any decisions/updates that are made with regard to this file.

Yurij Pelech (email) – November 28, 2019

Please be advised that for the past several years and against the backdrop of the ongoing Town of Oakville Official Plan Review (Livable Oakville) study initiative, we have represented the owner of the above-noted property and liaised with municipal staff relative to emerging policy matters and property redevelopment opportunities along the south-side of Cornwall Road.

That said, the attached 'notice of complete application' was forwarded to our attention by our client who in turn was circulated by the Town, and to ensure that we remain current and have the opportunity to engage ourselves in future public consultations associated with the Midtown Core and the immediate surrounding environs, we ask that you kindly please add our name to your circulation notification list with respect to pending development applications and scheduled statutory Public Meetings.

Michael Miller (email) – November 26, 2019

As an Oakville resident, I am writing to register my strong objection to the proposed development at Trafalgar & Cornwall roads. I, and many others I spoken with, believe that this is a very bad idea. The area is already quite congested, and the added population coming from this proposed development will greatly exacerbate the situation.

Furthermore, it is against the very character that is Oakville's strength, and the reason so many residents, like myself, have chosen to call it home.

I urged you to deny this, or any similar application.

Frank Veenema (email) – November 9, 2019

The construction of a 14 and 19 story mixed use building at this site is unreasonable. A building of that height will be the highest in the area, dwarfing even the GO Transit parking facility. The location of the building will cut off the late afternoon and evening sun for all of the residents in Ward 3. Has no one even considered the impact of a building this high?

The height of this building should not exceed that of the GO Transit facility.

Rob and Sue Thacker (email) – November 7, 2019

We are writing in response to the Notice of Complete Application - proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments for 271 Cornwall Road and 485 Trafalgar Rd.- FCTH Holdings (Ontario) Corporation Z.1612.14, Ward 3.

We are opposed to the above-said amendment primarily because it is simply not good planning practice to place such a proposed development in such close proximity to single-family dwellings (as found directly south of the development). One would expect a buffer of low rise buildings and then one of semi-attached units between such high rise development and single family units.

Yes, traffic at the Cornwall-Trafalgar intersection is also an issue with us i.e. would Trafalgar Rd need widening at the RR underpass? But the primary objection would be the planning concern.

Hank VanderSar (email) – November 5, 2019

Hello,

We received notice of 'complete application' for subject Application. The letter is confusing but my request is that when the application is at committee meeting/decision which I could attend, please let me know the date?

My note to Dave Gittings, Twon/Regional Councillor, when I received this notice was as follows:

Earlier this year, the 'developer' FCHT Holdings had a public info meeting whereby they proposed a 14 and a 19 storey building on the corner property. This is now the same proposal they seek amendments for!!! When I asked the traffic consultant what the plan was for traffic to/from the location, they had not completed a thorough study.

I suggested that egress north via a bridge or underpass over/under the railway lines seemed the only sensible solution. No comment was made!

Years ago council prevented Sunrise from developing the now Go Station parking lot location, supposedly due to inadequate parking and/or congestion at the Cornwall/Trafalgar intersection.

Then Metrolinx/Ontario Gov't (?) commandeered the same property for the existing parking garage.

They admitted somewhat later that indeed they did not foresee the congestion and recognized that perhaps the east location (former Chev dealership) north of the railway tracks would have been better.

Then they add an Operations Centre, saying this would not be an added congestion issue because the employees are coming by GO train; really?.

My question is, when is this 'lunacy' of further jamming the Cornwall/Trafalgar intersection going to stop and what can be done to stop this?

It seems I am powerless when I read this letter.

If you have advice for me and/or wish to see a copy of this letter, let me know. I can scan the letter and forward it.

I guess the info I sent would be my 'argument' to prevent this size of development.

Appreciate your response on this issue.

S. David Bazar (email) – November 4, 2019

Dear Town Clerk

It would be appreciated if you would please notify us in due course of the decision in the following matter.

Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments
271 Cornwall Road and 485 Trafalgar Road
FCHT Holdings (Ontario) Corporation

Please advise the Mayor and Council that we are in fully favour of the application