

APPENDIX E– DEVELOPER HOSTED PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING MINUTES



SHAPING GREAT COMMUNITIES

March 23, 2022

File No. 20297

50 Sherwood Heights Drive, Oakville

Public Information Meeting Minutes

Time: The Public Information Meeting (PIM) Presentation went live at 6:20 pm on Wednesday March 23, 2022. The presentation began at approximately 6:35 pm

Attendance: A peak of 22 attendees – please refer to list of attendees. This included members of Infrastructure Ontario, Town Councillors, and Town planning staff.

Part A – The Presentation

Eric Saulesleja, Planner with GSP Group, Planning Consultants to Infrastructure Ontario, provided the following presentation:

Slide 3: Agenda

- An agenda was shared that included the purpose of the Public Information Meeting (PIM), the purpose of the Proposed Official Plan Amendment (OPA), the Site and surrounding context, the applicable planning policy framework, the path to development, and the Q&A period.

Slide 4: Purpose of the PIM

- The purpose of the meeting is to provide an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed OPA.
- This meeting is the first opportunity for the public to comment on the proposed application. Further consultation, namely the statutory public meeting, will occur during the approval process. Similarly, to the notice given for this meeting, the Town of Oakville will provide notices of Future Statutory Public meetings which will be in front of Oakville Town Council.

Slide 5: Official Plan Amendment Application

- The Parkway Belt designation limits the development potential to transportation infrastructure in the Parkway Belt West Plan. The proposed Business Employment designation permits a range of employment uses, such as offices, light industrial use, hotels, public halls, indoor sports facilities, training facilities and commercial schools.

PLANNING | URBAN DESIGN | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

72 Victoria St. S., Suite 201, Kitchener, ON, N2G 4Y9

162 Locke St. S., Suite 200, Hamilton, ON, L8P 4A9

gspgroup.ca

- While this OPA will set the land use permissions on what can be built on the site, future applications will need to be undertaken.

Slide 6: Supporting Technical Studies

- As part of the application process, a Pre-Application consultation meeting was held with Town of Oakville, Halton and Review Agency staff, which established a list of supporting studies that have to be undertaken and submitted with the OPA application.
- The required studies included: an environmental impact assessment, stormwater management report, land use compatibility study, and planning justification report.

Slide 7: Site Location

- The Site is located between Sherwood Heights Drive and Ford Drive on the north side of Kingsway Drive. The site is approximately 7.4 hectares in area, which is currently vacant. The Kingsford Gardens Park is across the road from the site and is not part of this application.

Site 8: Surrounding Context

- The area is generally characterized by both employment and residential uses, while being adjacent to both the QEW and Highway 403. The Ford site is located nearby to the south, with additional employment uses being located along further up along Sherwood Heights Drive, across the QEW, as well as along Royal Windsor Drive to the east.

Slide 9: The Parkway Belt West Plan

- This plan was implemented to create a multi-purpose utility corridor, urban separator, and linked open space system. The Ministry of Transportation has confirmed that the site is surplus and there no further expansions to the 403 or QEW at this location. The application to remove the Site from the Parkway Belt has recently been approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Slide 10: Halton Region Official Plan

- The Regional Official Plan provides policy direction to develop lands in the Urban Area for an appropriate range and balance of employment uses to meet long terms needs.
- There is further policy direction to plan for jobs and housing across the region to reduce the need for long distance commuting and to increase modal share.

Slide 11: The Livable Oakville Plan

- The Official Plan provides direction that the Town will encourage the Province to continue to remove lands subject to the Parkway Belt West Plan from its jurisdiction. Any such lands will then be under the jurisdiction of the Town and this Plan, unless superseded by another Provincial plan.
- As such, a new land use designation will be required, which is proposed to be Business Employment.

Slide 12: Path to Development

- This OPA is an initial step to put the permissions in place to allow for future development.
- The OPA will prepare the lands to be sold, and the future owners will need to make further development applications in order for development to occur.
- These applications will require additional technical studies and reports, and the Zoning By-Law amendment application process will require additional public consultation. This path to development is generally a five step process and we are at the start of step 2.

Slide 13: Illustrative Concept

- This concept is not being submitted for approval. It is a demonstration on how a range of employment uses could be supported on the site.
- The number of buildings, floor plate design, amount of parking, building placement, and more will be further contemplated in the future zoning by-law amendment and site plan approval applications.

Part B – Question and Answer

Several questions were asked during the meeting, each of which was answered live. The following list provides the questions asked with a summary of the answer provided in blue.

List of Questions:

1. How can we see how many participants are attending?

Attendees do not have the capabilities to see the number of attendees – 20 attendees are noted.

2. How does this format, where we are not permitted to speak, meet the requirement for public consultation? It seems like we should be able to speak. Typing may not be accessible for all attendees.

Attendees were notified if they wish to speak, they will have their microphone unmuted.

3. Who prepared the reports?

Reports were prepared by the consulting team: GSP Group, Natural Resource Solutions Incorporated, SLR Consulting, and WalterFedy.

4. Where can we access those reports?

The reports will be publicly accessible once the OPA application is submitted and deemed complete by the Town. They will be on the Town website.

5. Why was the local community association not contacted directly prior to this session?

Based on the protocols of the Town, GSP was provided a mailing list by the Town and invitations were sent according to this list.

6. Has an environmental site assessment been completed to support the land use with specific field investigations completed?

Yes – NRSI went to the site with Conservation Halton to assess features.

7. On what basis was the site removed from the PBWP?

The MTO declared the lands surplus to their needs – they did not require it for their infrastructure. The declaration of surplus was circulated to other agencies, and non expressed an interest in acquiring the lands.

8. Why was our community not notified of the request to remove the park belt from the PBWP?

A notice was provided to the public in the local newspaper in line with the application process.

9. Why were the reports referenced in this presentation not provided in advance?

The reports are not yet publicly available – they will be once the application is submitted and deemed complete. A public engagement meeting was asked to be held before the application was submitted.

10. Is it safe to assume that GSP funded the reports in support of their proposal?

GSP Group did not fund these reports – we were hired by IO to provide a planning opinion as to how the application meets planning policies. As planners, we act in the best interest of the public.

11. Why not make it residential homes?

An examination of the area demonstrates the land is a location well suited for non-residential use. This will help transition from the nearby Ford plant as well as bring a non-sensitive use in proximity to the Highway. There would be noise and land use compatibility concerns if residential uses were located on the Site.

12. We cannot lose soccer fields and growth for our kids as it is a growing community - can you ensure leaving space for that.

The adjacent park space will not be developed as part of this application.

13. We should leave greens on Kingsway at least instead of a business building. It will destroy the look of the area"

The adjacent park space will not be developed as part of this application.

14. Where/how will we receive further notification of any developments on the future of this site?

A notice sign will be posted on the property which will provide details and a file number. Nearby residents will be notified of the statutory public meeting. Notice will come from the Town, following their procedures for notice.

15. What kind of building will be there?

This will ultimately be up to the future purchaser of the property. The Business Employment designation permits a wide range of non-residential uses, the specific uses that will be proposed for the site are not known at this time.

16. On what basis does your report say that further business development space is justified?

The Site has been removed from the PBWP. The Region and Local OP provide policies for employment lands, which is met by the application. There is an opportunity for modal share of transit and is an appropriate site for employment.

17. How can this community provide meaningful feedback during this presentation without those reports?

This is an initial opportunity to receive information and give early feedback as the project begins the OPA process. Once the application is submitted and the reports are posted online, there will be further opportunities to provide comments to Town staff.

18. Can we get the contact info for Infrastructure Ontario in regards to this project?

We will discuss with IO on who the appropriate contact will be.

19. Why is leaving the green space as green space not in the public's best interest? We already have significant underutilized "business/employment" spaces including just on Bristol Circle.

The Town OP provides a long-term vision for the growing needs for the community, and in our opinion the application helps meet these needs.

20. how many participants are on this session?

There have been around 20 attendees for the most part of the presentation.

21. Is it Infrastructure Ontario's policy to classify natural green space as 'vacant'?

The Town OP designates the site as Parkway Belt, and now that the Site has been removed from the PBWP the Site must be given a new designation.

22. Unfortunately, I have to leave to attend another meeting. I know I speak on behalf of many of my neighbours when I say we are VERY opposed to this amendment. We do NOT want to see this land become business/employment. Oakville also has a commitment to green space and the tree canopy. Was that considered? How can you possibly decide the best use of this land without having consulted the people who live 106 meters away from the proposed site?

Concerns noted.

23. Can it be reduced to ensure a greenery on Kingsway? This way we do not see office buildings as we drive into residential area?

The specifics of building location and setbacks will be determined through future planning applications and will be subject to further review by the Town and agencies.

24. Does the Business employment designation include height restrictions? With the close proximity of homes in the neighbourhood, privacy could be a concern.

The implementing zoning by-law puts in place the regulation on building height, setbacks, and parking (etc) and will be determined through the future planning applications. This will be subject to further public meetings and review by the Town. The Kingsford Gardens Park and Sherwood Heights right-of-way provides over 100 metres separation distance which will be taken into account for the design of the Site.

25. Are there any utilities located within this site already?

Service report will be consulted – it is not believed there is servicing.

26. Has there been an assessment of the pollinator plants and wildlife living in that area. Biodiversity is necessary on our planet, including pollination of the community gardens across the street from the site.

The Site has been altered and subject to fill as noted in the Phase 1 ESA. The Site is not identified as having natural heritage features. Future landscaping could be a method to implement the noted concerns.

27. With Ford at the footstep of this community, doesn't that warrant a greater green space buffer?

The non-residential use will act as a transition to the residential use from the Ford facility, there is a large buffer in place with the Kingsford Gardens.

28. What is the process for putting the site back into the PBWP?

We are not aware of a process to put it back in the PBWP. MTO has noted they do not need the lands.

29. When do you expect to make the submission to the Town?

In the coming days.

30. If we are talking about "longterm vision" why are we undergoing this process now?

With the province owning the land and no longer requiring them, this process is used to “prep” the site for sale. It is easier to sell with a new land use designation in place. The removal of PBWP lands is supported by the Town OP.

31. Would MPP Crawford (area MPP) be an appropriate contact for residents in addition to the IO folks?

We are unsure if they are an appropriate contact.

32. On what basis it is removed from the pbwp?

The MTO declared the lands surplus to their needs and an application was submitted by IO to the MMAH for removal.

33. Can the local community association be provided with material and updates via email, rather than relying on Canada Post? COCA can get updates to our members via email, Canada Post is low - just received the meeting notice letter today via the mail

We will work with the Town on how to best notify residents.

34. How much does IO anticipate to sell this land for?

Unknown at this time.

35. Can we access the recording of this meeting?

We will consult with the Town as how to best provide the recording of the presentation. It will likely come from the Councillors.

36. the growing needs of our community include averting a climate crisis already unfolding. What are Infrastructure Ontario's plans for retaining natural green space? (noting that I object to calling the site 'vacant' when it is teeming with life)

Conservation Halton mapping does not identify environmental features on the site, and based on site visits with NRSI, no issues were raised. Further work will be subject to further review.

37. What procedure was used to remove this lot from the Park way belt.

The MTO declared the lands surplus to their needs and an application was submitted by IO to the MMAH for removal.

38. Is there already a potential purchaser that Infrastructure Ontario or GSP is aware of?

The site is not yet listed for sale. There is no potential purchaser identified at this moment. A decision on the OPA will occur before the site is listed.

39. So will the Town have to pay for water lines, sewage lines?

Typically, detailed servicing plans are provided through future planning applications, and if future connections are required, they will be at the expense of the developer.

40. the email list that is gathered from this meeting will help staff sending out future notices

(This is a note from Town planner Tricia Collingwood)

41. Can we do a petition from residence of the area to oppose this change.

Written comments can be submitted to the Town. If they are submitted for the statutory public meeting, they maintain the right to appeal.

42. What is Infrastructure Ontario's climate plan?

We do not know the details of IO's climate plan.

43. Can you let us know what councillors attended today?

Councillor Haslett-Theall and Councillor Gittings.

44. We have nothing more to add to this meeting. It seems evident that many stakeholders did not receive notice of this meeting (including us). I advise you use additional means to improve stakeholder involvement for upcoming meetings.

The mailing list was provided by the Town – we will defer to the Town and Councillors if alternative methods are desired for notification. A notice sign will be posted and the application will be available online.

45. will you also be involved in the area at the NW corner of Upper middle Rd and Ford Dr. that has been declared surplus also?

We are unsure of the status of the applications for that site.

46. Can the local community association be emailed on all updates on this matter?

We will work with the Town on how to best notify residents of updates.

47. What is the project #?

No file number has been created yet as the application is yet to be made.

48. There's a file number on the meeting notice letter.

This is the GSP Group internal project number.

49. Concerned with the site being contaminated - has an RSC been completed or subsurface investigations? Is an RSC required?

A Phase 1 Site Assessment was complete. Future studies may be required at the ZBA or SPA stage. An RSC is generally not required when a non-sensitive land use is proposed.

50. Concerned with increased traffic and distance to traffic. A children's park is nearby, and development poses an increased risk to children safety. Concerned with loss of greenspace and wildlife implications.

Kingsford Gardens Park provides a separator to the residential use as well as the realigned drainage channel along the front of the Site – this separation distance is over 100 metres. Future uses will be subject to land use compatibility studies.

Councillor Haslett-Theall briefly spoke about the methods of communication used to raise awareness of the application and neighbourhood meeting, including Facebook and newsletters.