

**Appendix “F”:  
Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



**Subject Property:** 2370 Lakeshore Road West, Brampton, ON

**Type of Application:** Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment

**Meeting:** Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting Afternoon Session

**Meeting Location:** Sir John Colborne Recreation Centre for Seniors  
1565 Old Lakeshore Road, Oakville, ON L6L 6N1

**Meeting Attendees:** Derek Coss, Amica Senior Lifestyles  
Alison Keller, Amica Senior Lifestyles  
Steven Cohen, Succession Development Corporation  
Stephen Closs, Associate Planner, GSAI  
Jason DeBrum, Managing Partner, SRM Architects  
Town Councillor Jonathan McNeice  
Residents of the Town of Oakville

---

**Agenda:** 1.0 Call to Order  
2.0 AMICA Team Presentation  
3.0 Q&A Period  
4.0 Closing Remarks

---

**SUMMARY OF MEETING:**

**AMICA Team Presentation:** The PIC meeting began with a presentation made by the Amica team, in which the team discussed who Amica is, the services it provides, the urgent need for seniors housing, the continuum of care model in a local context for Bronte Village, the planning process, application timeline, and the architectural details of the proposed building.

**Q&A Period:**

**Discussion 1:** Resident 1 asked that the Amica team reiterate the specific uses of the additional two storeys that are requested as part of this

## **Appendix “F”: Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



application, the programming and amenities for Floor 1 to 4, and whether this proposal is only to add volume (of residents) to the building.

Mr. De Brum clarified the changes between the four storey and six storey building, and Ms Keller further elaborated on the programming for the building, the considerations behind Amica’s decision to add the two storeys, the waitlist at Amica Bronte Harbour, and how the building contributes to the neighbourhood’s vibrancy.

Resident 1 followed up and inquired if the operation is meant to be “two tier up and down”, in response to which Ms Keller explained the concept of the spectrum of care and how it is not necessarily a tiered system.

### **Discussion 2:**

Resident 2 asked about the number of units that are being proposed, and the effect of this particular development on the immediate surrounding community. Concerned about the scale of the development, and the “Canyonization” of Lakeshore Road.

It was questioned if any shadow studies were conducted to understand the proposed development’s impact on sunlight reaching the residential properties to the east and south. Resident 2 also expressed the opinion that the additional two storeys would not be in keeping with the nature and character of the surrounding area.

Mr. DeBrum responded that the location of the building is in keeping with the setback requirements prescribed for this site, and reiterated that a 6 storey building is contemplated by the Official Plan through policies pertaining to bonusing, which he acknowledged are no longer in effect following the amendments to the Planning Act.

Responding to the concern about shadow and reduction of sunlight, it was discussed that the differences in impacts between four storeys and six storeys are minimal; and that some level of shadow impacts from mid-rise buildings are inevitable. The Amica team expressed that they would continue to work with Town staff to ensure the development is in compliance with Town’s requirements and terms of reference.

**Appendix “F”:  
Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



- Discussion 3:
- Resident 3 raised concern over the loss of sunlight again and Mr. DeBrum reiterated that the team acknowledges that the building will create shadows but anticipates the additional floors to meet the terms of reference established by the municipality.
- Resident followed up and asked if the intent is that this application to go before the OLT, and drew comparison with a nearby application that is/was in front of the OLT. Resident 3 also questioned the policy and regulatory basis of the 6 storey proposal and asked that the approved building permit be circulated with the participants of this meeting.
- The team responded that there is no fixed direction on next steps, and that it is the team’s intention to have the Town’s approval for the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments. The team also reiterated that the bonusing overlay in the Official Plan contemplates these two storeys, and indicated that they would follow-up with the resident to discuss the proposal further should the resident desire.
- Discussion 4:
- Resident 4 asked what businesses would be in the ground floor retail units, and what else will be on the ground floor.
- Mr. DeBrum responded that floor space east of the vehicular access arch is dedicated for community-based retail. Ms Keller further explained that Amica is consulting with Bronte BIA and is interested in supporting its vision of a “15 minute community” through this mixed-use application.
- Discussion 5:
- Resident 5 asked about the site access and parking arrangements, and more particularly raised concerns over whether there are enough parking spaces provided for the staff, visitors, and residents who live in the independent living units. The second question related to how the elevated traffic volume could impact the nearby area.
- Ms Keller responded that approximately 60% of the building is dedicated for assisted living and memory care – and that none of these residents would be driving. She further pointed out that the

**Appendix “F”:  
Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



average age of residents for this building, as per the average age of Amica residents, is anticipated to be in the late eighties. It is therefore anticipated that there will be fewer parking demands from residents. In addition, the daily routines and travelling patterns of elderly residents, as experienced by Amica, will not contribute to peak-traffic volumes.

Resident 5 followed up and asked if there were any additional parking spaces added to the building in comparison to the previously approved 4-storey building and if the addition of parking space is proportionate to the increase in floor area.

Mr. DeBrum responded that additional parking spaces are provided, and that only two floors of residents can drive. He further noted that the majority of Amica staff take public transit, hence freeing up the remaining spaces for visitors.

**Discussion 6:**

Resident 6 asked about how many staff will be working in the development once it is in operation. Mr. Coss responded that there will be approximately 167 team members, but at any given time there will only be approximately 30 to 35 on site, and half of those would be full time employees delivering care. It will take approximately three years to develop this building, and it is expected that 70% of the staff will come from existing Amica residences to support the new positions at 2370 Lakeshore.

**Discussion 7:**

Resident 7 asked that if there is a preference for Bronte residents to apply for beds available at this location. Ms Keller responded that, based on numbers from Amica Bronte Harbour, 90% of the residents will come from the local community. She further explained that, while Amica accepts application from across the country, seniors choose to live in certain locations because they either come from the local community themselves or they move in to be close to their families living within the neighbourhood.

**Discussion 8:**

Resident 8 asked about considerations and provisions for Lakeshore Boulevard during the three years of construction, and raised concerns over traffic issues during that time. Mr. Cohen responded that, as part of the building permit approval (for the 4

**Appendix “F”:  
Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



storey proposal), a construction management plan was requested by the Town, which will detail how construction, traffic flow, and pedestrian flow is to be managed. During the construction, there will be wood boarding that separates the site from public roads, and provisions will be put in place to allow for easy pedestrian circulation during construction.

**Discussion 9:**

Resident 9 asked for clarification on what exactly the application must demonstrate in order to get the approval for the additional two storeys. Mr. Closs responded that the Official Plan speaks to compatibility, and the application will demonstrate the same in terms of shadowing, step-backs, and architectural design, and that the applicant is working with the Town’s Urban Design Staff to achieve this.

Resident 9 followed up to inquire if the Town will be contributing to the process with the reports and studies that are being completed. Mr. Closs confirmed that the Town will contribute their input by reviewing and commenting on the various technical reports that will be submitted as part of the application. It was further explained that it will be an ongoing process until there is a version of the proposal that Town Staff find satisfactory.

Resident 9 further followed up by asking what Amica’s next step will be, should the Town refuse the proposal for the additional two storeys. Mr. Closs explained that Amica can either go ahead with the approved 4-storey proposal, or decide to appeal the refusal to the OLT, but that it is not Amica’s intention to get to that stage – that Amica intends to work in collaboration with the Town through the entire process.

**Discussion 10:**

Resident 10 drew comparisons between this proposal and a nearby building. Mr. DeBrum responded that this proposal is only asking for what’s already contemplated in the Official Plan.

**Appendix “F”:  
Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



**Subject Property:** 2370 Lakeshore Road West, Bronte, ON

**Type of Application:** Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment

**Meeting:** Public Information Center (PIC) Meeting Evening Session

**Meeting Location:** Walton Memorial United Church  
2489 Lakeshore Road West, Oakville, ON L6L 1H9

**Meeting Attendees:** Derek Coss, Amica Senior Lifestyles  
Alison Keller, Amica Senior Lifestyles  
Steven Cohen, Succession Development Corporation  
Stephen Closs, Associate Planner, GSAI  
Jason DeBrum, Managing Partner, SRM Architects  
Town Councillor Jonathan McNeice  
Regional Councillor Sean O’Meara  
Residents of the Town of Oakville

---

**Agenda:** 1.0 Call to Order  
2.0 AMICA Team Presentation  
3.0 Q&A Period  
4.0 Closing Remarks

---

**SUMMARY OF MEETING:**

**AMICA Team Presentation:** The PIC meeting began with a presentation made by the Amica team, in which the team discussed who Amica is, the services it provides, the urgent need for seniors housing, the continuum of care model in a local context for Bronte Village, the planning process, application timeline, and the architectural details of the proposed building.

**Appendix “F”:  
Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



Q&A Period:

Discussion 1:

Resident 1, who lives at 2170 Marine Drive, asked how many more people the extra 2 storeys proposed by Amica would accommodate. Ms Keller responded that the extra two storeys would provide 57 more units and that there would be 65 total parking spots proposed at the site. Resident 1 followed up with a question regarding whether the 65 parking spots would be restricted to use for Amica staff only. Ms Keller responded that very few senior residents will have the capability to drive, that the development will be a “walkable site” with independent living residents living on the additional proposed 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> floors, and that 80% of facility staff will be taking transit to work. Ms. Keller further emphasized that the proposed parking provision complies with local by-laws, that visitors to the facility will typically come during off-peak hours, and that there is sufficient parking to accommodate everyone coming to the facility. Resident 1 lastly expressed concern that 65 parking spaces would be insufficient and that more consideration should be made to adding more parking spaces.

Discussion 2:

Resident 2 expressed the opinion that the proposed two additional storeys would only accommodate 57 more residents, which would not be sufficient to resolve the overall housing shortage issue for seniors requiring assisted living and care. Ms Keller responded that the seniors’ care and living crisis is a long-standing issue and implied that, whilst two floors may not solve the overall issue, it would help mitigate the growing seniors’ care and living crisis in Oakville. Ms Keller further stated that 90% of residents at the existing Amica Bronte Harbour site are local Bronte residents and that there is a waitlist of 152 more seniors looking to move into assisted living with Amica, thus emphasizing that the need for all types of seniors’ residences and assisted living facilities is overall extremely high.

Discussion 3:

Resident 3 challenged that adding two extra storeys would block sunlight coming into townhouse properties adjacent to the new facility. Resident 3 further emphasized that six storeys would



**Appendix “F”:  
Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



destroy the overall “feel” of Lakeshore Road and suggested that the proposed amendment to the original development was entirely a business decision on Amica’s side, which did not consider the impact that additional storeys would have on local tourism and community members’ quality of living. Mr. DeBrum explained that the Government of Ontario took away the “bonusing” provision in the Planning Act that provided for the additional two extra storeys without requiring an Official Plan Amendment. Mr. DeBrum also explained that, regardless of the amendment to the Planning Act, six storeys are nonetheless contemplated for this property in the Town of Oakville’s Official Plan, and that adding two storeys will not create significant impacts to the sunlight received by adjacent residential properties. Mr. DeBrum also indicated that issues regarding shadow impacts had been considered, and were mitigated by incorporating step-backs into the upper two storeys to further mitigate potential shadowing problems. He also noted that the development had taken into consideration the Town’s terms of reference regarding shadow impact studies.

Discussion 4:

Resident 4 expressed concern that adding two storeys to the original development would result in a loss of privacy for the 14 townhouses adjacent to the east side of the proposed facility. Ms Keller responded that senior residents would largely be spending time inside the facility, that there would be perimeters added to ensure privacy, and that senior residents would not be spending extended periods of time (generally no more than one hour) outside of the building itself. Resident 4 continued to express concern that seniors would spend the majority of their time indoors looking out of their windows and down into residential properties below.

Discussion 5:

Resident 5, a private home care worker, expressed concern that there would not be sufficient parking spaces for contracted third-party private care staff who will be coming in and out of the facility 24 hours a day to provide care and transport to seniors. Ms Keller responded that the proposed new facility’s situation is different to that of the existing Amica Bronte Harbour residence, which is not licensed for higher levels of care, thus requiring third-party agencies to provide care to seniors and increasing the pressures on



## **Appendix “F”: Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



parking at the existing site. Ms Keller further emphasized that 60% of residents at the proposed new facility would be memory care and assisted living residents who would not be driving. Resident 5 concluded with comments regarding a potential invasion of privacy from senior residents looking down at their rooftop.

### **Discussion 6:**

Resident 6 agreed that more seniors’ care and housing is needed in the area but questioned whether there is sufficient commercial space, as their expectation is that the entirety of the ground floor should be commercial. Mr. DeBrum responded that the design follows the requirements set out in the Zoning By-law, which requires that the first nine metres of depth be dedicated to commercial uses. The commercial space is planned to be outward facing and is intended to animate the Lakeshore Road West as a main street. Ms Keller further emphasized that Amica has engaged Bronte BIA, as well as other community groups, and has received valuable information about some of the gaps in types of businesses serving Bronte Village.

### **Discussion 7:**

Resident 7 raised concerns about the proximity between the proposed development and 96 Nelson Street. He stressed his opinion that the proposed development is too close to the townhouse complex and that the additional two storeys would impose a big wall over the townhomes. He expressed concerns from an integration perspective, and questioned whether it is a common practice in the Town for new structures that are taller than their neighbours to be built in such close proximity. He suggested that the proposed building should have a larger east-west step-back to create more separation between the two lots. Mr. DeBrum responded that the separation between the proposed development and the townhouses is governed by the Zoning By-law and that the six storey building height is envisioned in the Livable Oakville Plan. Resident 7 questioned why the zero setback is a requirement, in response to which Mr. DeBrum reiterated that the setback is in full compliance with the Zoning By-law.

## **Appendix “F”: Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



### **Discussion 8:**

Resident 8, explained that he has been a member of the BIA, and questioned the economic impact that the proposed development would bring to the neighbourhood. He further stated the opinion that that this development has a limited retail component, and questioned the parking provision. He suggested that parking is an issue across Oakville, and recommended that Amica consider dedicating all space in the building for Amica’s use and not to provide any retail component in exchange for not adding the extra two storeys. He further expressed that the supply of retail space is not the issue at Bronte. He stated that he couldn’t support a plan that creates a “tunnel”, casting greater shadows onto existing properties and public spaces. Ms Keller responded that Amica has continued to work with the BIA to address its concerns and assist in achieving its goals, and that the independent residents living in the two additional stories will assist in strengthening a vibrant community and local economy.

### **Discussion 9:**

Resident 9 is a resident of 96 Nelson Road. He expressed concern about the impacts of the proposed six story building would have on his property. He raised several issues, including the loss of sunlight and privacy, traffic congestion, and property devaluation. The resident cited an email exchange with the mayor and local councillor related to the minor variance application, in which they stated their opposition to the variance proposal. Resident 9 questioned what has changed since this time, to which Mr. Closs responded that the proposal is now being considered as an Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment, rather than a minor variance. It was also stated that the Official Plan overlay allows for bonusing, as has long contemplated the two additional storeys. In response to the variance application, although Town staff did not offer their support for the application, they did not object to the additional storeys in principle, but rather to the proposed process. Resident 9 responded that, although the proposed retirement home is seen as a positive development for the area, the impact on neighbouring properties must be considered. He reiterated that his and other residents’ concerns over the project will be brought up to Council again during the application process.

## **Appendix “F”: Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



### **Discussion 10:**

Resident 10 expressed his concern about the parking situation and the impact on residents in the area. He questioned the actual number of staff parked on the site and criticized what he labelled a lack of transparency in the calculations. He also highlighted the difficulties faced by retailers in the area due to limited space and high rental costs. The resident mentioned the church across the road from Amica Bronte Harbour, which he suggested received parking overload from staff working at the residence. He argued that visitors and shoppers were unable to find parking due to the staff taking up all the spaces for long periods of time. The resident accused the team of being intentionally unprepared with the necessary information about the parking situation and not being honest with the numbers. Ms Keller promised to follow up with the information on the parking situation at Amica Bronte Harbour. She also responded to Resident 10 by explaining that there were 65 parking spaces available for 30 staff members during a day shift for the proposed development.

Residents 3, 10 and 11 highlighted the ongoing parking issue in the area and the frustration felt by residents who believed that the staff members working at the Amica residences were taking up valuable public parking spaces.

Mr. Closs responded that the provision of parking spaces is guided by the Zoning By-law and that the proposed development is compliant and does not require any By-law exception. Resident 3 stated that, apart from the conformance with the by-law, the additional staff coming in and the built form of the proposal will affect neighbouring residents’ lives, especially considering the increased size of the building now being proposed.

Mr. Closs shared that the project team has prepared a shadow impact study and it shows the minor relative difference between the four storey building and the six storey building. Resident 3 raised his skepticism regarding Mr. Closs’s statement, to which Mr. Closs replied that the shadow impact study will be made public once it has been submitted to the Town. Resident 3 stated that the proposal is ultimately too high, and daylight will be completely blocked from the townhomes. Resident 12 added his opinion that no other buildings along this section of Lakeshore Road West have anything near the proposed height. She compared the shadow impacts of the now demolished building that was previously

## **Appendix “F”: Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



situated on 2368 Lakeshore Road West to the four-storey building that has been approved, and noted that even the approved building will have greater shadow impacts than the demolished building. Mr. Cohen acknowledged the impact of the building and stated that the team has taken shadow impacts into serious consideration.

### **Discussion 11:**

Resident 13 expressed his concern about the scope of the shadow study conducted, suggesting that studies typically requested by the Town only consist of a few dates and times during the year and might not provide a full depiction of the shadow impacts. He also questioned the definition of storey height in feet and points out that the first storey is usually taller than other floors, and that the proposed building is nearly equivalent to being 7 storeys. The Amica Team clarified that the minimum height is set out by the Zoning By-law, and that there is a minimum height for floors containing commercial space. Resident 13 then asked about the height of the elevator room and stairwell access, stating that they protrude beyond the sixth floor, further adding to the building height. Mr. DeBrum confirmed that, although they are above the sixth floor, they are permitted by the By-law. Mr. Closs assured Resident 13 that the shadow impact study will take into account the exact dimensions of the building, including the mechanical penthouse. The conversation ended with Resident 13 suggesting a more comprehensive shadow study from 6 am to 10 pm.

### **Discussion 12:**

Resident 14 expressed concern about the proposal’s proximity to her residence. She expressed a desire to see a more comprehensive set of physical plans to get a better understanding of the impact the building would have on her home and its relationship to the surrounding neighbourhood. Specifically, Resident 14 was concerned about the outdoor dining patio on the east side of the property, which is adjacent to her residence. Mr. DeBrum confirmed the existence of the outdoor area but reassured Resident 14 that the impact would be the same even if it were a townhouse, and would be greater if a restaurant or similar use were developed on site, as permitted by the Zoning By-law. Resident 14 expressed concern about the proposed restaurant use within the commercial space, and with having between 30 and 100

## **Appendix “F”: Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



people sitting outside dining near her private living space. Resident 14 also questioned if the Amica team was only concerned with meeting guidelines, and if they were truly taking into account the residents’ concerns. Mr. DeBrum reassured Resident 14 that they were there to listen and address any concerns. The conversation ended with Resident 14 reiterating concerns about the outdoor eating space being too close to private living spaces.

### **Discussion 13:**

Resident 15 expressed disappointment with the proposed development of an additional two floors, which she believes would negatively impact her property at 96 Nelson Street. She asked if the developers had ever considered changing their designs based on feedback from the community in the past, to which Mr. Closs responded that it is a common practice for developers to take all feedback into consideration before the formal submission of the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications. Mr. Closs and Mr. DeBrum also noted that the feedback received from this PIC meeting would form part of the submission, and that a summary of the comments and responses would be provided to the town staff and to everyone who attended the meeting. They acknowledged that some concerns are easier to address than others, but that the team would provide response to all significant comments.

### **Discussion 14:**

Resident 16 expressed appreciation for the initiative Amica has taken to speak to the community, and commented that affordable long-term care options are necessary for Bronte, where many aging residents are currently living, and will soon require higher levels of care. She noted that, while the industry of high-end retirement residences is excellent, there is a lack of affordability for those who cannot afford Amica’s rates. Ms. Keller responded by saying that Amica is a component of the spectrum of care and that private pay residences with licensed care relieve some of the pressures on the healthcare and provincially subsidized long-term care systems. Private pay residences help create more capacity and hence affordability in the long-term care environment. Resident 16 then commented on the impact of the building on the area, mentioning shadowing and the importance of social interaction for seniors. She believes that, although Amica has already bought the land, they



**Appendix “F”:  
Applicant’s Hosted Public Information Meeting Minutes**



should have considered that alternative uses for this property may have been more appropriate. She expressed that Bronte should be a tourist destination. Resident 16 complimented the design of the building, but she expressed belief that there could have been a more appropriate use for the land. The conversation ended with Ms. Keller acknowledging that more of every type of housing for seniors is needed, and that Amica is part of the community's solution.

**Closing Remarks:**

Mr. Coss thanked the residents for attending the PIC meeting and expressed the Amica team's commitment to work with Town planning staff to address the growing need for senior care. A resident voiced his concerns about the location of the seniors' residence, stating that it is not suitable for the area as it comes across as institutional and does not add anything to the main street or benefit the community. Mr. Coss responded by assuring the residents that Amica has worked hard to create a place that is not institutional and would be a home for the seniors, who would in turn be part of the community. He also emphasized that the retirement community would be beneficial for the seniors who helped build the community, as it would allow them to remain a part of it. The conversation ended with Mr. DeBrum inviting the resident to visit existing Amica locations for more assurance that the space is not institutional in nature.