

Appendix F - Public Written Submissions

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Kate Cockburn](#); [Janet Haslett-Theall](#)
Cc: [Town Clerks](#); [Leigh Musson](#); [Gabe Charles](#); [Neil Garbe](#); [Jane Clohecy](#)
Subject: Re: RE: Infrastructure Ontario - 2551 Sherwood Heights Drive (formerly 50 Sherwood Heights Drive) - OPA 1504.03
Date: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:18:34 AM

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.

Hello Kate,

Thank you very much for your quick response, for forwarding appropriately and for the additional information. Much appreciated.

Adrienne

----- Original Message -----

From: kate.cockburn@oakville.ca
To: [REDACTED]; janet.haslett-theall@oakville.ca
Cc: TownClerk@oakville.ca; leigh.musson@oakville.ca; gabe.charles@oakville.ca; neil.garbe@oakville.ca; jane.clohecy@oakville.ca
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 11:09 AM
Subject: RE: Infrastructure Ontario - 2551 Sherwood Heights Drive (formerly 50 Sherwood Heights Drive) - OPA 1504.03

Hello Adrienne,

Thank you for your email and interest in this application.

In order to officially reserve your right of appeal in accordance with the provincial Planning Act, you must submit your comments to Council c/o the Town Clerk in the Clerk's Department 1225 Trafalgar Road, Oakville, Ontario L6H 0H3 or townclerk@oakville.ca before a decision is made by Council. I have copied the Clerk on this email for your convenience.

The personal information accompanying your submission is being collected under the authority of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, and can form part of the public record which may be released to the public.

Please note that the application at the above noted property is for an Official Plan Amendment, and it is currently under review. There is no Zoning By-law Amendment associated with this proposal at this time. Should this proposed amendment to the Official Plan be approved, a Zoning By-law Amendment application would be submitted at a future date. The applicant is seeking to change the land use designation to permit a range of employment uses on the property.

I believe the meeting you are referring to is the Public Information Meeting that would have been held by the applicant before the application was submitted to the town. The town has not yet held a Public Meeting before Council. When this happens, a notice from the town will be mailed to property owners within 240m of the property, and the signage on the property will be updated with that information. As you have written in, you will also be notified. There will be instructions on how to participate in the meeting, if you wish to do so.

In the meantime, you can visit our [website](#) to review the application materials that have been submitted to-date.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Kate.

Kate Cockburn, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner
Planning Services

Town of Oakville | 905-845-6601, ext.3124 | 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: avanveggel avanveggel

Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2022 9:47 AM

To: Kate Cockburn Janet Haslett-Theall

Subject: Infrastructure Ontario - 2551 Sherwood Heights Drive (formerly 50 Sherwood Heights Drive) - OPA 1504.03

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.

Hello,

I'm a resident of the Clearview area. I would like to express my objection to amending the zoning of 2551 Sherwood Heights Drive. I have three main concerns:

As it is, the traffic on Ford makes it difficult to get in and out of our neighborhood, especially during rush hour. Increasingly, people are using Kingsway as a thorough-fare between Winston Churchill and Ford where we have 2 elementary schools.

It would be an eye-sore and would contribute to noise pollution directly across from Kingsway Gardens.

There are coyotes and foxes that would be driven out of that space and into the neighborhood where humans and pets are in danger.

I wasn't aware that a meeting was held to hear resident concerns. If there is another meeting in future, I would like to be notified at this email address or by phone at [REDACTED]

Thank you,

Adrienne

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Kate Cockburn](#)
Subject: re OPA 1504.03
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 5:25:49 PM

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 afternoon,

I am a resident of the Clearview neighborhood and just saw the signs regarding the property at 2551 Sherwood Heights Drive.

I looked at the documents on the website and just wanted to ensure I understand..

Am I correct in understanding that there is an application to change the zoning of the land so that it can be developed for light industry and business use?

If this is the case my question is -- what is the definition of light industry? I have no concerns with it being used by business but as the air quality in this neighbourhood is already poor, I would be concerned if light industry means manufacturing or some other industry that would further pollute the air.

I look forward to your response.

Denise McCourtie
[REDACTED]

28 August 2022

Planning Department
Town of Oakville
1225 Trafalgar Road, Oakville, ON L6H 0H3
kate.cockburn@oakville.ca

Attention: Kate Cockburn, Senior Planner

Re: 2551 Sherwood Heights Drive Development proposal (formerly 50 Sherwood Heights Drive)

Ms. Cockburn,

The Town of Oakville has posted an Official Plan Amendment to change the land use designation of 2551 Sherwood Heights Drive (formerly 50 Sherwood Heights Drive) from Parkway Belt to Business Employment. The following supporting documents have been filed to support the Official Plan Amendment and proposed change in land use:

1. April 2022 - Aerial
2. April 2022 - Compatibility Study
3. April 2022 - Concept
4. April 2022 - Draft Official Plan Amendment
5. April 2022 - Environmental Impact Study
6. April 2022 - Environmental Site Assessment - Phase 1
7. April 2022 - Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire
8. April 2022 - Functional Servicing Report
9. April 2022 - Planning Justification Report
10. April 2022 - Survey

Upon initial review the application is a deviation from MECP guidelines for development and it is evident the applicant has not performed due diligence in evaluation of the significant risk this change in land use presents to local residents, the community, the public and the natural environment including native species. The significant risk to residents and users of the Kingsford Gardens Park which has a sport field, community garden, dog park and children's playground includes but is not limited to exposure to air borne contaminants including carcinogenic chemicals, dust, and noise.

The above conclusion is based on review of the above mentioned documents, and initial comments offered below:

1. The site is located in close proximity to the Kingsford Gardens Park which has a sport field, community garden, dog park and children's playground. This area is used extensively by the Clearview Community for sport and leisure activities.
2. The Compatibility Study completes an air quality, dust and odour assessment as well as an environmental noise assessment. This document is conflicting in its analysis and fails to address fundamental concerns to public health and safety from potential air, dust and noise impacts. As the proposed change in land use is in very close proximity to sensitive public sites including a kids playground, sports field and residents it is recommended a more comprehensive study is completed which includes a thorough analysis of air, dust

and odour impacts over the duration of the proposed land use from construction through operation. A few initial comments are offered below:

- The facility is planned within 70 metre of a sensitive land use, this conflicts with recommended minimum separation distances defined by the MECP. The minimum separation distance are provided to ensure adverse impacts due not occur to a persons health, enjoyment of property use and quality of the natural environment. Given the presence of the public sites within the minimum separation distance, it is unclear why a deviation to this policy would be considered.
 - The conclusions drawn for potential air, dust and odour impacts are formulated based on the assumption provided in Section 5.2 of the report which states “there are no large sources of air quality dust, odour or litter emissions associated with the proposed use of the lands.” This statement conflicts with the classification of the site as Class II Medium Scale Industry in Section 4 of the Report. Table 2 identified outputs from a Class II site as quoted “Dust: Frequent and Occasionally Intense” and “Odour: Frequent Occasionally Intense”. The basis of the reports conclusion related to air, dust and odour impacts is thus not substantiated and conflicts with classifications in the report.
 - The report identifies the potential to impact use of the community spaces and nearby residents with development of Class II industries. The Class II Industrial building are proposed on the site plan in close proximity to Kingsford Gardens and residents (refer to Concept Plan). The report concludes “it is likely that future industrial buildings associated with the Project site would require detailed noise assessments later in the planning process, such as for a zoning by-law amendment, or at the site plan application/building permit stages. Specific facility sources associated with the Project should be assessed at that time.” This fails to assess, minimize and mitigate any impact to residents and the community at this time and instead defers evaluation to the change in land use is in place.
 - The report fails to consider the significant risk to the community associated with construction air quality, odour and noise. As documented in the Environmental site assessment, the site includes fill material of a currently unknown environmental quality, potential hydrocarbon contamination and heavy metals. A more rigorous assessment of the potential air quality, odour and noise impacts from disturbance of these materials is required.
3. The Environmental Impact Study report provides the results of background review, field surveys and analysis of natural heritage features found on-site and adjacent to the subject property. The reports conclusions are based upon historical mapping and 6 site visits to map vegetation, 3 site visits to survey for birds, 3 aquatic surveys and 2 amphibian review site visits. In this discrete and short observation window a significant amount of native vegetation and birds species were identified, it is therefore recommended additional field monitoring and observation be completed. The report did not identify any significant natural features or species or their habitats which would pose a constraint to development, this conclusion was drawn despite the following;
- The documented need to remove 108 plant species including 40 native species to facilitate development of the land.

- The documented presence of 91 bird species in the area, 12 Species at Risk and Species of Conservation Concern in the development area.
 - The documented on site observation of 33 bird species including 4 breeding bird species and 2 bird species at risk (SAR)
 - Feedback from local residents that coyotes and foxes are known to frequent the area and with vegetation removal these species will be pushed into the local residential area.
4. The Phase One Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was completed to identify, through a non-intrusive investigation, the existence of any Potentially Contaminating Activities (PCAs) and Areas of Potential Environmental Concern (APECs) associated with the Site. Physical site investigations were not completed to obtain onsite information. It is known that the site was subject to the placement of fill material and likely contamination due to the presence of the highway in close proximity. The extent and nature of site contaminants, anthropogenic in origin, remains unclear as documented in the report. A more rigorous assessment of site contaminants including independent field investigations should be completed to assess the characteristics of the soil and groundwater and suitability for excavation and to permit the proposed change in land use. The contaminants identified as potentially present at the site including metals, Arsenic, Selenium, Antimony, Petroleum Hydrocarbons (PHCs), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCBs). These contaminants are known to be highly carcinogenic to humans and can lead to cancer.
5. The Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire filled out by GSP is misleading. In responding to Question 4.” Is there any reason to believe that the subject property is potentially contaminant based on historic use...”. GSP has responded as “uncertain.” This response is misleading and contradicts with statements in the Phase One ESA completed by GHD. The Phase 1 ESA identifies the area as subject to infilling with the potential for the contaminants identified in Item 4. above as being present.

Based upon initial review of the documents filed to support the proposed change in land use, the proposal presents significant risk to residents and users of the Kingsford Gardens Park which has a sport field, community garden, dog park and children’s playground. These risk include but are not limited to exposure to air borne contaminants including carcinogenic chemicals, dust, and noise.

Very truly yours,



Daniel Cressman, P.Eng

August 23, 2022

Planning Department
Town of Oakville
1225 Trafalgar Road, Oakville, ON L6H 0H3
kate.cockburn@oakville.ca

Attention: Kate Cockburn, Senior Planner

Re: 2551 Sherwood Heights Drive (formerly 50 Sherwood Heights Drive), File: OPA 1504.03

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Official Plan amendment of the above-noted site. I am a resident of [REDACTED] Oakville.

My understanding from the meeting held by councillor Haslett-Theall is that this is an application for E2 zoning. However, I understand you have advised some residents that this is only an application to remove the site from the Official Plan. Can you confirm that even if this application is granted the zoning will remain Utility until a further application is made?

In any event, in my view, the current application is flawed in several ways.

First, there was no meaningful public consultation. The Public Consultation Plan described in section 6 of the Planning Justification Report is grossly misleading. There was one meeting which consisted of GSP presenting its plan with no opportunity for residents to provide their thoughts or opinions. Notice of the meeting was only provided to a very small number of residents. Despite concerns being raised by several residents, the application was submitted exactly as it was presented at the March 23, 2022 meeting. Neither Infrastructure Ontario, nor the Town of Oakville, have provided an opportunity for meaningful public engagement.

Second, the Planning Justification Report states at para. 1.1 that the surplus lands were circulated to other entities for potential use as parkland or open space protection and there was no expression of interest. Can you provide what was allegedly circulated to these stakeholders? The Town of Oakville has invested heavily in this area with community gardens, parks, soccer fields and even a new pollinator zone. The Town itself has an interest in preserving this area and, at the very least, should insist on a study considering the potential impact on these specific community features.

Third, can you request an independent assessment/critique of the Environmental Impact Study (para. 5.1 of Planning Justification Report)? NESI concludes, in error, that there are no significant natural features or species or their habitats. All Clearview residents will tell you there are birds of prey and coyotes (and likely many other animals) that live in this area. It is also at

odds with their own field observations and their conclusion that mitigation efforts would be necessary.

Fourth, can you request an independent assessment/critique of the land use compatibility (para.5.3 of the Planning Justification Report)? There is no specific consideration of the air quality, dust, odour, noise and vibration on the community gardens, dog park and children's play area which are within a few meters of the proposed E2 building site.

Fifth, can you request an independent assessment/critique of the Environmental Site Assessment? Physical site investigations were not conducted to obtain onsite information. A change in land use should not be permitted without a more rigorous assessment of potential site contaminants.

My neighbours and I are deeply distressed with the proposed change in land use. Oakville has invested so much in that immediate area to make it liveable. This proposal would significantly reduce the ability of Oakville residents to enjoy the recreational space immediately adjacent to the site.

Sincerely,



Iris Kingston



And to:

Council c/o the Town Clerk
Town of Oakville, Clerk's Department
1225 Trafalgar Road, Oakville, ON L6H 0H3
TownClerk@oakville.ca

Janet Haslett-Theall
Councillor, Ward 3
Town of Oakville
1225 Trafalgar Road, Oakville, ON L6H 0H3
janet.haslett-theall@oakville.ca

Stephen Crawford, MPP
Constituency Office

Unit 1 – 74 Rebecca St.
Oakville, ON L6K 1J2
stephen.crawfordco@pc.ola.org

Clearview Oakville Community Alliance
President Bob Brabers
rbrabers@sympatico.ca
clearviewcoca@gmail.com

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Town Clerks](#)
Subject: 2551 Sherwood Heights Drive
Date: Monday, June 20, 2022 12:41:11 PM

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.

Hello:

I just read the sign posted "new development is being proposed in your neighbourhood" north of Ford Drive on Sherwood Heights Drive.

My main question of concern is "traffic along Sherwood Heights/Ford Drive and over to Winston Churchill Blvd."

This is a residential neighbourhood and having a huge amount of traffic going back/forth could become a major concern.

There are three schools (James W Hill, St Lukes and John Knox) within walking distance of this area.

The environmental issues this could create might be something to take in concentration as well.

Each time I travel Sherwood Heights makes a feeling of country living whereby we have a lovely community gardens, dog park, soccer field park is on the east side.

Taking the west side of Sherwood Heights away to Business Employment is questionable.

Thank You

Louise Hynds

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Kate Cockburn](#)
Cc: [Town Clerks](#)
Subject: Appeal against proposed development at 2551 , Sherwood Heights, Oakville
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2022 6:53:36 PM

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 Kate

Hope you are doing great.

I am a resident of Clearview area within Oakville and wanted to write to you with respect to the proposed development at the captioned address.

As a resident, i am deeply concerned upon the impact of a warehouse / industrial development on the community. The said development is being proposed in close proximity of multiple residential dwellings and I hereby put forward my concerns on the potential impact on the overall community.

A community development, a commercial space or a community hall may be a good idea for the society to come together but an industrial area would destroy the children parks around the area and pose risk to the society's peace as well.

I assume there are more concerned members who may have written to you and happy to discuss this further as per convenience.

Regards
Rahul

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Town Clerks](#)
Cc: [Tricia Collingwood](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: Appeal Application to develop at 2551 sherwood heights drive, oakville (formally 50 sherwood heights drive)
Date: Sunday, June 5, 2022 9:35:12 AM

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.

Hi,

We would like to appeal the decision to develop at 2551 sherwood heights drive, oakville (formally 50 sherwood heights drive) and to remove the land from the Parkway Belt.

Some things to consider;

- it is a natural ecosystem for many animals which will be displaced.
- are there not billions being spent to expand the qew near hurontario-dixie which includes buying property back from private owners? Why build so close to the highway and bottleneck future expansion?
- traffic on the one way road is already dangerous for many people that are walking on it as it does not have sidewalks on either side

We would suggest surveying alternate locations to complete the buildings you are seeking to put up.

Highest regards
Roman, Sara

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Janet Haslett-Theall](mailto:Janet.Haslett-Theall@oakville.ca)
Cc: [Planning](#); [Stephen Crawfordco](#); [Kate Cockburn](#); [David Gittings](#)
Subject: Re: 2551 Sherwood Heights Drive (formerly 50 Sherwood Heights Drive) - OPA 1504.03
Date: Sunday, June 26, 2022 10:39:44 PM

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.

Actually, could we put a long term care home there? It is sorely needed. My mom waited for over 7 years to get into one. There is an intense shortage. And with the parks across the street it would be perfect.

Thank you

> On Jun 26, 2022, at 9:30 PM, Janet Haslett-Theall <janet.haslett-theall@oakville.ca> wrote:

>

> Good evening Sasha,

> Thank you for copying me on your concerns. Councillor Gittings's and I shared resident and our serious concerns regarding E2 upon receipt of the application. Other parts of Sherwood Heights are E1. A retail request is a new suggestion to consider. You have copied planning who will respond to you and Councillor Gittings and I will also follow up. The planner assigned to this file has changed to Kate Cockburn who I have copied. It is our understanding this zoning application will be heard in Dec or Jan 2023.

> Take care

> Janet

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On Jun 26, 2022, at 8:34 PM, Sasha Nekipelli <anekipelli@gmail.com> wrote:

>> Good day,

>>

>> I am reaching out about the proposed zoning amendment on Sherwood heights drive.

>>

>> While I understand that due to limited land, that piece cannot be left undeveloped, I, along with many residents of Clearview, disagree with the E2 proposed zoning:

>>

>> - the report did not consider the community gardens and dog park directly to the east and children playground directly to the south

>> - there is already significant noise from the highway crossing and the E2 would increase the total noise which is already unbearable for the North clearview residents.

>> - the E2 would lower property values in the area

>> - we need more retail. The report did not consider other zoning possibilities at all. We request that retail zoning be added instead of industrial.

>> - if it's impossible to avoid industrial, we disagree with the E2 zoning and propose that an E1 maximum be allowed.

>> - we would agree to all office buildings instead of warehouses/industrial.

>>

>> Basically, we disagree with E2 zoning specifically as the community feels it would be terrible for the area. If we can reduce to allow an E1 maximum or consider other zoning options such as retail or office buildings the community would be happier.

>>

>> PS we request that a sound wall be put up directly north of clearview to shield us from the QEW but that's a separate issue.

>>

>> Thank you,

>>

>> Alexandra Nikipelli

>> [REDACTED]

>> Oakville ON [REDACTED]

>> 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.

>

> Janet Haslett-Theall

> Councillor

> Office of the Mayor & Council

> Town of Oakville | 289-837-3923 ext.6005 | | www.oakville.ca

>

> Please consider the environment before printing this email.

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

>

>