

Appendix D: Public Comments post September 13, 2021 Public Meeting

September 14, 2021

Hello Mr. Knoll, "Jeff",

Thank you for your correspondence. I am reassured and heartened that as Ward 5's Town and Regional Councillor that you have such a strong sense of the character of Oak Park, by striving to maintain the area's family-friendly vision.

I sent the brief written position and opinion to you, Mr. Grant, Ms. Collingwood and the Town Clerk's office. Having spoken to a representative at the Town Clerk's office yesterday, I understand that making my position known before the meeting in writing was an important step in the process. I was able to view the meeting on the website in part last night around obligations respecting my two daughters.

I will do additional research and I am hoping to add to the discourse at the public meeting at a later date. However, having spoken to the Town Clerk's office I understood that my speaking as a delegate was premature and I needed to do additional research before I could meaningfully offer comment at the meeting.

Thank you for explaining the process to me. My neighbours have similar concerns about the proposed amendment to the by-laws requested by SmartREIT. I will continue to work towards a fair outcome for the Town of Oakville and Oak Park together with you, Mr. Grant, Ms. Collingwood and the Office of the Town Clerk.

Thank you for your reassuring and competent representation as Town and Regional Councillor, together with Mr. Grant.

Best regards, Janet Rowsell, B.A., LL.B., LL.M.

September 15, 2021

As for water:

am sending you a pic of Dalebrook Pond just behind us. After the storm last night(which did not even rank on anything...) you will see high water levels in Pond, very close to walkway.

Great doing its job, but never seen it this high in 19 plus years have lived here. How will we cope with more runoff from Trafalgar, & the known exceeding of existing sewer infrastructure from this proposal. The more you over-develop these open lands without any green space , the more run off, pollution & flooding we get.

Will leave this for your file, & review.

Look forward to report in 2022.

Wanda



March 13, 2022

Mayor Burton, Councillors and Ms Collingwood:

Councillors you received written concerns via email from residents about this development, and this submission filed with the Town Clerk, and a delegation regarding this proposed development in September . I am forwarding a copy of the submission I made Sept. 5th then. Planners did not advise that updated reports had been submitted about this development dated Feb 2022. I have come across these and reviewed these, and note the original issues raised remain unresolved.

It is my submission this updated information does not in any way address the concerns raised in September. Nothing in the Feb 2022 reports addresses any of the concerns we originally raised, and nothing has been changed in the proposal. Let us review these again:

1. Storm and Wastewater Management – Proposal should be denied on these grounds alone, and for many other reasons

Per my submission of Sept 5th the original April 2021 report acknowledged that current infrastructure can only support this if lands south are vacant. This is a false assumption. Parcel 7 is slated for development, and in fact for an even larger building than Town Council had asked for (more than 6 stories). This specific is absent from this report, but conclusion is the same.

The February 2022 more recent report again, tries to dismiss this in its conclusion by stating:

“The proposed sanitary design flow is 13.52 L/s as a result of the new development, which is 2.40 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.” •.

This is no basis on which to approve this development. These lands will not be vacant, and large development already approved at former ,PARCEL 7. More is also proposed for lands immediately west , as an active development proposal exists for 297 Oak Park, immediately west of here. YOU CANNOT APPROVE DEVELOPMENT THAT EXCEEDS EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE, ESPECIALLY WHERE OTHER DEVELOPMENTS ARE APPROVED, OR HAVE ACTIVE APPLICATIONS IN PROCESS. The Town is still intending to sell off lands south of this proposal.

1B. Use of Holding Tanks

The concerns raised in September have not been addressed. This is dangerous. These tanks lie immediately adjacent to Morrison Creek and also likely impact Nipigon Creek. Most importantly, no one has addressed the concerns raised about the impact on adjacent residential areas both east and west of Trafalgar. The Feb 2022 report does not address this, and it also confirms the pollution levels previously identified in the April reports. Our storm water management ponds connect to Morrison 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. **This increases pollution.**

These pollution levels are unacceptable.

This is an environmental disaster waiting to happen if allowed to proceed. This is particularly egregious when it is known, the proposal already exceeds existing infrastructure.

Can these tanks as proposed withstand a seismic event, even small, which do occur in Oakville?

How would these be constructed? Digging up Trafalgar Rd that was just refinished up to Hays Blvd?
Another burden for residents.

Considering the use of holding tanks, adjacent to existing residential areas and 2 creeks, and pollution levels noted are unacceptable, and development application should be denied on these grounds also. Nothing has changed.

1C. Building Population Estimates Under-represented in Feb 2022 Report – create even more pressure for waste and storm water management

Page 1 of the Stormwater Management Report provides for **1216** residents. **This is again in excess of what allegedly the site can absorb which is 1071 (see point above).** This does not take into account approved developments on Parcel 7 south and proposed on Oak Park.

I submit there is a **severe underestimation of population per unit, especially the larger ones, and further impact on water and sewage infrastructure.**

The Feb 2022 Table 1 assumes the following:

Commercial – 5 average. No rationale for this. If the commercial involves coffee, or food places, the impact on water and waste will be much higher than an equivalent of 5 individuals.

Townhouses: 8 townhouses at 2.6 people per unit. I submit is highly unlikely that there would only be 2.6 people in these units, based on the realities of today's real estate market.

I submit the average would more likely be 4. It is presumed this would represent sharing by adults and/or families. I submit, that would make it closer to **32. (not the 21 estimated)**

Combined 1 BR and 1BR plus Den , average of 1.68 for 337 Units for 559 people. Another underrepresentation:

Broken out:

I submit that it is more likely most of the 1BR plus den would have 2 occupants , and since there are: 52 of these units: that would then increase the proposed population by another approximately 50 people.

The developer I contend has seriously underestimated the population of the larger units:

The 2 bedroom and 2 bedroom plus den are given to average 2.6. I submit that this is an underrepresentation. These units are likely to be shared by many, or families and would submit the actual average would be more likely 3 to 4 per unit for at least half or more of these units. This would increase from the projected population of 624 to I submit closer to: 700 and potentially as high as 900

I would also submit that my estimates are just as accurate as those proffered by the developer. I submit actual occupancy would be much higher than 1216.

This also exceeds the infrastructure. There is no rationale as to who their target purchasers will be. If some will likely be purchased as investment properties for rental, you can guarantee that the estimates provided are low. 20% or more of purchases fall into this category per recent real estate information. Oakville has the highest rents in all Canada, so more people will share any units.

This will create even more excess pressure on the water and sewage infrastructure.

Green Roof remains insufficient mitigation. The architectural plans provide for no meaningful green space or ways of providing any more mitigation.

NO ONE HAS ADDRESSED OUR CONCERNS RAISED IN SEPTEMBER ABOUT POTENTIAL IMPACT ON WATER PRESSURE IN THE HOMES OF EXISTING RESIDENTS, AND WHY WATER BALANCING IS NOT A REQUIREMENT FOR THIS AND OTHER NEW PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS IN OUR AREA.

The Feb 2022 reports do not change any of these facts, or address concerns raised then.

2. TRAFFIC REPORT

The February report confirms what existed in April. **The volumes exceed what is approved by the Town for the intersection of Postridge and Trafalgar.** Since these lead directly into our residential neighbourhoods, our traffic will further increase. **No one has addressed the impact on the residential streets immediately east of Trafalgar, like Dalebridge, Postridge, Rosegate Way, as we had requested. A development that exceeds existing Town traffic standards should not be approved.**

Allowing traffic in excess of standards an intersection that leads directly to residential areas to the east, and underrepresenting future volumes by not considering the developments approved south at Parcel 7, and west proposed on Oak Park north of Memorial Park should not be accepted.

The February report changes nothing from the April report to address residents Concerns. Traffic will exceed Town standards. The developer thinks this isn't a problem. I do. I live here.

2B. Parking

As requested in Sept 2021, no one has considered the traffic impact of Ride Services, like Uber, bringing additional traffic into these buildings and area. The use will only increase. The report in Feb 2022 changes nothing from what existed in 2021. Overflow will be directed to residential streets.

The reliance on public transit in this submission is not supported by any objective evidence of levels of use in Oakville currently, or historically.

2c. CHOV Lanes and rapid Transit – inaccurate

The Feb 2022 report is inaccurate in relying on these to address the immediate impact of the proposed development. It relies on the use of HOV Lanes and Rapid Transit. There is no indication HOV Lanes will be put in use soon, and that will only create more overflow onto adjacent streets. Even more, the report references Rapid Transit on Trafalgar and Dundas Corridor. By Town and Region's own admission in other venues, these are not imminent, and likely at minimum a decade minimum or more in the future. **To use that as a rationale to support increasing density to the level proposed is frankly misleading, as it does not address the adverse unsafe impact on existing residents and situation that will result for the foreseeable future and years.**

This report also ignores the impact on our residential streets east of Trafalgar. We had requested this be addressed, and it has not.

- 3. AIR AND NOISE POLLUTION – Concerns raised Sept 2021 remain unanswered. See submission. The February 2022 report needs to be questioned in terms of its accuracy. For instance: page one of the Noise Impact Study reads:**

"The subject site is not significantly affected by noise from...or air traffic, or ...". Really? The reference to air traffic is factually incorrect. Mr. Knoll, you are well aware of the many concerns about air traffic noise here in Wards 5 and 6, which you have acknowledged publicly. This has not changed. **I would question the entire accuracy of any report written by a company on noise, that would make such a statement.** I live immediately adjacent, and have made many complaints to the GTAA about flight noise and height. A reprieve during the pandemic, but this is now about to change back to what we had endured previously. **The report does nothing to address the concerns we previously raised about Noise and pollution levels for adjacent neighbourhoods.**

This particularly pertains to the above ground parking which adds 5 stories to this proposed behemoth of development, that is totally inconsistent with anything in the area, and will only add to noise and air pollution. No answer to that.

Why above ground parking? This question remains unanswered from months ago. Completely inconsistent with any other buildings in area.

4. SHADOW IMPACTS

The concerns raised about the impact of severe shadow on residential properties east of Trafalgar, and the tree canopy have not been addressed.

NONE OF THE CONCERNS RAISED BY CITIZENS MONTHS AGO HAVE BEEN ANSWERED OR ADDRESSED IN THESE FEB 2022 REPORTS. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. THE APPLICATION SHOULD BE DENIED FOR THESE REASONS.

All areas should be equally treated. We should have same concerns about the quality of our existing neighbourhoods being protected by Council, as do others in other Wards. We are dealing with overly massive requests here that have no place in a “Livable Oakville” .

Planners: where are the answers to the questions we raised?

Wanda Crichton

REFERENCED SEPTEMBER 5th, 2021 CORRESPONDANCE from 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 █

March 27, 2022

Please note that my husband Douglas Thom and I share the concerns of many regarding this proposed development which threatens the neighbourhoods on both sides of Trafalgar Road.

We wish to participate in the planned virtual discussion of significant concerns.

Thank you,

Lyndsey Thom

Douglas Thom

April 19, 2022 – follow up conversation to document comments from Lyndsey and Douglas Thom

Hello Lyndsey and Douglas – thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today about the Smart Centres proposal and future development in Uptown. I have captured your comments below for the Councillors information.

- Residents for 25 years
- Recently moved from west Oakville – living at The Taunton
- Appreciative of what has taken place in Oakville – living in the area by choice – and for all of the good things about Oakville – the services are superior – trails/recreation, etc. however the vision for the future seems to be falling short of what makes Oakville a great place to live
- Noticing what is happening in Uptown

- Concerns with:

Water

- o Infrastructure is under stress
- o Where is the stormwater going to go
- o Is there enough capacity for future developments

Traffic

- o Parking – where will everyone park, including visitors
- o All the new residents/potential families – chances are that many will have 2 cars

Parks and Open space

- Where will the children play – what type of park space is planned
- Where will people take their dogs

Sun/shadow impacts

- Impacts to existing residents

Heights/densities

- Why is there height proposed at this location
- Is there a reason for it to go here
- It is too high – too dense
- Doesn't seem to be enough of a middle ground

If I missed anything please feel free to add that in.

Thank you

Tricia