

STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK: MIDTOWN OAKVILLE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (July 2023 – January 2024)
 (Last Updated: January 22, 2024)

Residents Associations (RA's) Feedback		
Major Focus Area	Summary of Comments	Stakeholder / Date of Submission
<p>Midtown OPA:</p> <p>Net Developable Block Area & Parkland Acquisition</p>	<p>Follow up regarding “Net Developable Block Area” discussed at CofW. In the context of this Net Developable Block Area, ownership of this developable land mass is not homogenous but diverse. Eventually, these owners might sell their land for public open space directly to the Town or to a developer for further development.</p> <p>We were told at the July 2023 Committee of the Whole meeting by USI the needed requirement of developer engagement to provide different land uses other than housing for public open spaces and community facilities. We want to know what the strategy is to accomplish this. At the July 2023 Committee of the Whole meeting, captivated by the Primary Civic Gathering Space of Emery Barnes Park in Vancouver. What deal was struck with the landowner to give up such prime property if the land was privately owned? The developer could have maximized their profitability by building condos but offered it for park space – why? Can USI or Jacobs provide best practices on strategies to help get developers “on our side”?</p> <p>Can USI and team share the “secret sauce” in which a complete community was created by navigating private land ownership and/or through developer engagement to accomplish the same? Without this fundamental understanding of the best practices now, I believe we are going forward on blind faith that the complete community in the future will in fact be a complete community. In terms of the Net Developable Block Area, can you confirm public will be provided the actual calculations of how we get to the net developable land mass? Can you provide clarity on how the town will engage Metrolinx and the region regarding their roles? When will a budget be established for land acquisition cost for future public green space and new surface roads for the proposed flyover? Concerned about the lack of attendance at the last three meetings (May 2023 public statutory meeting and all Committee of the Whole meetings). The RAs can do their part to inform members, but for the greater public town needs to be more aggressive in their outreach. What plans are in place to get the message out?</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Harry, Bronte Village Residents Association (BVRA)</p> <p>Date of Submission: August 27, 2023 (email)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA:</p> <p>Heights and Densities</p> <p>Community Benefits</p>	<p>JCRA has welcomed recent steps taken to provide a format to air concerns through the Committee of the Whole process. The Town’s decision to review the draft Midtown OPA has provided further confirmation that the Town has concerns. We continue to have concerns about certain key aspects of the development of Midtown, in particular regarding density and the ability for the Town to build the necessary infrastructure and related support systems for the community.</p> <p>Specifically, the heights of proposed towers up to 58 storeys appear to have been justified by an FSI of 10. Taken to an extreme, this FSI could result in more than 120,000 new residents in the area. That is a far stretch from “a minimum of 20,000” as required by the province. In this context, has any section of our Official Plan indicated that this is an acceptable height for multiple towers to be built in Oakville? Can a revised OPA alleviate our concern that Midtown could soon contain a dozen or more towers over 40 stories high? At the proposed heights, how many residents can be expected to occupy those residences? We know that multi-generational families and young families with children can no longer afford detached homes, and are, by default, sharing small spaces. Can you provide a reasonable estimate of expected numbers of residents that might occupy the proposed towers? Distrikt representatives stated at the July CofW that they estimate their towers may house between 5,000 and 6,000 residents. Is the estimate the sum total for all 9 proposed Distrikt towers?</p> <p>To date, 10 towers have been proposed that are double to triple the originally proposed 20 stories for Midtown. How can these heights be rationalized? At the July</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Joshua Creek Residents’ Association (JCRA)</p> <p>Date of Submission: September 12, 2023 (email)</p>

	<p>2023 CofW, the representative from Distrikt was hard-pressed to answer questions about the developer’s experience in the construction of multiple condo towers of that height. Can the Town reassure current and future residents of the towers that Distrikt can manage a construction project of this size? Serious concerns about the ability of the Town to manage the increased transit needs associated with this rapid increase in density in the already-congested Trafalgar/Cross intersection area. Additional towers are proposed up Trafalgar to north of Burnhamthorpe Rd. The scope of the increase in density in Oakville in the coming years is too rapid for our infrastructure and facilities to support. When we asked about those concerns at the July Midtown meeting, we were told that developer applications asking for more height and density are charged a Community Benefit Charge (CBC). How is this calculated and how much of all the associated costs are covered by the CBC? Can the proposed rate of growth be rationalized by the collection of CBC charges?</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA: Policy Vision & Engagement Process</p>	<p>General Comments: concern that current public engagement process will NOT yield in a vision for Midtown that meets the density target and is integrated with its surrounding neighbourhoods. The experts on the surrounding neighbourhoods are the people who live there. We believe that the quality of the vision and its public acceptance will be greatly enhanced by engagement by the consultants and planning staff in a series of workshops with a small advisory group made up of residents of these neighbourhoods. We do not think that a visioning process, for what will amount to a whole new town, should be led and conducted exclusively by people who do not live here.</p> <p>TCRA Submission – Midtown Planning Methodology: <u>Issue:</u> Concern with visioning stage of Midtown (not capturing the uniqueness of Midtown’s relationship with the Town). Oakville has a mature community culture and is an existing regional destination. Midtown is being developed in the center.</p> <p>It is believed that some future residents will select Midtown to participate in the activities and services available in the Town. They will wish to become part of Oakville. There is a methodology gap if the profile and activities of these residents are not considered as input to the Vision. Unlike some UGCs that are more standalone (for example Vaughan):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Midtown is only a km away from a renewed downtown, lakefront, and planned cultural hub; ○ Midtown will be an easy walk to Oakville Place, a regional retail center; and ○ Midtown is right on the doorstep of the mature, century old, neighborhoods of Old Oakville. <p>The Vision for Midtown should not be the same as other UGCs (emphasis on creating new urban centers). We believe the emphasis should be on integration, and that planning focus should be directed at maximizing connected community/family spaces and facilities and not on trying to force another urban “main street” into the limited space not claimed by development projects. We understand some Midtown residents will be interested in the transportation links, GO and QEW, and may have few interests in Oakville outside of Midtown. These residents need to be accommodated.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Trafalgar Chartwell Residents Association (TCRA)</p> <p>Date of Submission: September 19, 2023 (email)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>RE: Midtown Official Plan Amendment</p> <p>Midtown Letter - Jan2024 OLRA (oakvilleira.ca)</p> <p>I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible growth. I support the provincially mandated growth numbers to 2051. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Teresa, Oakville Lakeside Residents Association (OLRA) Board</p> <p>Date Submitted: December 31, 2023 (Emails)</p>

I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:

- I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks.
- I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown.
- I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km.
- I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6-story mansion blocks.
- The transition area from single-family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor
- I understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville e.g. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall.
- I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way.
- The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined.
- The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown.
- The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater, and grey-water strategies.

The OLT states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.

Midtown OPA – overall content and process

OLRA Midtown Oakville - Our Concerns:
 OLRA Board and residents have been following the progress of proposed Midtown Oakville plans including the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and have significant concerns with the options that have been presented by the Town Planners and Consultants to date, and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment. The matter is becoming urgent as within weeks this plan will become embedded in the Town’s official plan and will act as a template for developer applications to build these unrealistically tall and high-density towers.

Background:
 With Oakville’s population expected to double by 2051, there is a need for the Town of Oakville to create more livable spaces for people of all ages and income levels and purposefully plan how our municipality grows. Several areas of growth in Oakville are envisioned in the Livable Oakville plan including “Midtown Oakville”. As a key growth area, Midtown is intended to be a complete community that will focus on people and where they can live, work, and play in walkable, mixed-use neighbourhoods.

In November 2023 the planning consultants presented three concept plans that were similar in that they all would see an estimated 60,000 to 61,000 residents and 18,000 to 19,000 jobs in midtown by 2051. That equals approximately 790-800 people & jobs/hectare or 79,000-80,000 people & jobs per sq. km in a dense series

Stakeholder: Oakville Lakeside Residents Association (OLRA) Board
Date Submitted: January 21, 2024

of 40-plus story towers. For comparison: Downtown Vancouver, the densest downtown area in Canada, had 18,837 inhabitants per sq. km in 2021. Manhattan, one of the most densely populated locations in the world, in the 2020 census had 28,154 residents per sq. km. Our planners are proposing three times the density of Manhattan. We know this sounds “unbelievable”, but these are the proposed statistics and plans presented by the planners and consultants. It is time to act!

Our Current View:

Growth in Oakville and Ontario is inevitable and important but must be planned and led by the Town, not developers. To be clear: we are supportive of responsible growth for Midtown and other areas, consistent with the size of land available and ensuring livability for the community and areas surrounding it. We have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment. We believe that the best way to understand this issue is to visualize what achieving the mandated population will look like, given different scales and diversity of housing, and to discuss with Town staff and developers at the upcoming January 30th Midtown Oakville Update Meeting.

We share our current position in the following key points and ask you to consider these as you build your own opinion and share them with Town councillors and staff (instructions and draft email below).

- We would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks.
- We would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown.
- We would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 stories in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km.
- We would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6-story mansion blocks.
- The transition area from single-family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor
- We understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville eg. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall.
- We would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way.
- The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined.
- The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown.
- The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater, and grey-water strategies.

Public Feedback		
Major Focus Area	Specific Comments	Stakeholder / Date & Submission
Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023) Phasing Built Form Land Use (Mixed Use; Office)	<p>Hello Director Charles: I was at your table at yesterday's (Tuesday) workshop. Thank you for adding your insights into the discussion, and your openness to further inputs. I sent out the attached suggestion just a few days ago. You may not have had a chance to review it yet. Suggestion: a 2D Concept be developed specific to a Phase I, aligned with the Oakville Housing pledge of 7200 units in Midtown by 2031. This would be a pragmatic plan that takes into account the many constraints as they are known today. For this reason I was not able to vote in favour of any of the 3 Concepts which have been tabled. The overall Plan is important, but will no doubt see adjustments in the coming decades. For example, I can see quite a few differences from the plan/design from 2013.</p> <p>Attachment – Suggestion: Midtown Phase I Staging Concept Issue: The three 2D Midtown Concepts that have been presented do not consider near term constraints and uncertainties that would shape a Phase I implementation. It is understood that this is typical methodology when planning decades into the future, but in this case there is an urgency to meeting Oakville's Housing Pledge, and many current uncertainties that would affect next steps.</p> <p>The suggestion is that a 2D Concept be developed which aligns with the 2031 Oakville Housing Pledge of 7200 residential units in Midtown. Planning estimates predict 11,710 residents (and 7376 jobs) by 2031. The 2031 2D Phase I Concept could be based on expectation within 2031 timeframe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrolinx lands and station remain as-is • minimal new office development is attracted to Midtown, given the current high level of office vacancies • limited major retail would be attracted to Midtown, given the shifts to online shopping, and the existence of retail around Midtown at Oakville Place, and along the Cornwall / Speers corridor • A higher level education campus is not attracted to Midtown in this timeframe; since there is no prospect currently being considered for this • Provincial scope, building new access points on and off the QEW, is delayed. There is currently no schedule commitment, what-if? <p>To achieve the synergies of a walkable Urban Growth Center, the 2031 Phase I Plan should be centered around a single district where there is current interest in residential development. This area likely would be north of Cross Avenue and west of Trafalgar, close to the GO station. This 2031 Concept should be for a Liveable community with appropriate greenspace and core services required by the residents. 2D Concept Plans for 2051 and beyond would be for the other Midtown districts, building around the Phase I Plan, and would not be limited by the above constraints.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Doug</p> <p>Date Submitted: November 29, 2023 (Email)</p>
Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forecasting: appears planning is establishing block planning benchmarks before key drivers in decision making process (e.g., Transportation studies, forecasting of traffic impacts, etc.) are completed. • Lane Widening of Cross Avenue to 6 Lanes: Cross Avenue is a good candidate for pedestrian oriented activity characterized by retail. Unlike the proposed Argus/Davis retail focus, this activity will happen organically. If six lanes are required to meet future vehicular requirements, determine what works for urban settings (e.g., street parking, garage parking) to free up land for more productive uses. 	<p>Stakeholder: Bill</p> <p>Date: Email to Town Clerks (December 2023)</p>

<p>Forecasting</p> <p>Roadway</p> <p>Land Uses (Retail)</p>	<p>If 15-minute city is embraced, need for 6 lane road can be reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail – Argus/Davis: this will become a backwater since the generator of traffic will be the GO station and North of the GO station. Comparator – retail south of Walmart (devoid of meaningful street activity). • TAC Developer Meetings: Can the minutes or videos be posted for the public? 	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible growth. I support the provincially mandated growth numbers to 2051. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve.</p> <p>I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. • I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6-story mansion blocks. • The transition area from single-family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor • I understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville eg. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall. • I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater, and grey-water strategies. <p>The OLT states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Duncan</p> <p>Date Submitted: December 31, 2023 (Email)</p>

<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>We are residents of Oakville and are following the growth plans for Oakville - specifically the Midtown Oakville plans. We would like to express our deep concerns and have listed some requested actions below. While we support responsible growth - we note that this is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights not seen here before. We need to ensure the plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve. We have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). We believe that the following are essential items to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. • an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6-story mansion blocks. • The transition area from single-family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor. • We understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville eg. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall. • We kindly request a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater, and grey-water strategies. <p>The OLT states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. We agree and believe that the OPA should reflect this.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Erin</p> <p>Date Submitted: December 31, 2023 (email)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible growth. I support the provincially mandated growth numbers to 2051. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and the done is a way to ensure the livability people deserve.</p> <p>I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height 	<p>Stakeholder: Curtis</p> <p>Date Submitted: December 31, 2023 (Email)</p>

	<p>and density, public realm amenities and road networks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; options that optimize livability of the land available for development in Midtown. ● I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. ● I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6 story mansion blocks. ● The transition area from single family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor ● I understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville eg. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall. ● I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. ● The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. ● The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. ● The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater and grey-water strategies. <p>The OLT states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree, and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible population and related growth so long as it is sustainable for the long term. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure that any growth plan is compatible with the size of land available and is consistent with the sort of livability that the current population wishes to see in our community. I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. ● I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. ● I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. ● I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6-story mansion blocks. ● The transition area from single-family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly 	<p>Stakeholder: Hugh</p> <p>Date: December 31, 2023 (email)</p>

	<p>lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not believe that the Federal or Provincial government or town officials have adequately considered the implication of proposed population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, our governments must consider all implications – air quality, water quality, availability of liveable space, congestion, over crowding of hospitals, schools and greenspace. Growth for growth’s sake is not justification enough for the resulting damage to our environment and impact on our community. The full cost of development – both direct and indirect - is inadequately reflected in your analysis. • I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all the proposed growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater, and grey-water strategies. <p>The OLT states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible growth. I support the provincially mandated growth numbers to 2051. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve.</p> <p>I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. • I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6-story mansion blocks. • The transition area from single-family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor • I understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville eg. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall. • I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population 	<p>Stakeholder: Patricia</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 1, 2024 (email)</p>

	<p>growth in a sustainable, liveable way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater, and grey-water strategies. <p>The OLT states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>RE.: Midtown Official Plan Amendment</p> <p>I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible growth. I support the provincially mandated growth numbers to 2051. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve.</p> <p>I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. • I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6-story mansion blocks. • The transition area from single-family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor • I understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville eg. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall. • I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater, and grey-water strategies. 	<p>Stakeholder: Cyrus / Dr. Shilpa</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 2, 2024 (email)</p>

	<p>The Ontario Land Tribunal states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I am born, raised and have a business in Oakville. I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible growth. I support the provincially mandated growth numbers to 2051. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve.</p> <p>I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. • I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6-story mansion blocks. • The transition area from single-family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along QEW corridor • I understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville i.e. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall. • I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater, and grey-water strategies. <p>The OLT states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Nancy</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 3, 2024 (Email)</p>

<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible growth. I support the provincially mandated growth numbers to 2051. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve.</p> <p>I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. • I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6-story mansion blocks. • The transition area from single-family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along QEW corridor • I understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville eg. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall. • Would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to ensure optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater, grey-water strategies. <p>The OLT states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: George</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 4, 2024 (email)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use (Mixed Use / Office Use)</p>	<p>Single-Use Office Zoning in today’s market conditions has a low probability of success. Mixed-Use Zoning is a financially viable alternative that creates opportunity for diverse vibrant communities. Will Midtown take a Mixed-Use Zoning approach? If not, why?</p> <p>Michael Sutherland, Director, Hatch</p> <p>"[Insert any high performing city] needs to attract the rich and talented... ..One way to balance...two governmental imperatives — help the poor and generate tax revenue from the affluent — is to view the city as a for-profit real estate development company wholly owned</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Bill</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 4, 2024 (email)</p>

	<p>by a nonprofit poverty-alleviation entity. The for-profit company focuses on keeping the city attractive to the rich, and revenue generated gets plowed into schools, etc. for [everyone].</p> <p>Cities thrived before the office was invented and can still triumph after the office has gone. Unfettered by cubicles and 9-to-5, we could achieve, more comprehensively and more joyfully than before, the city’s primordial aim: bringing people and ideas together. We need this integrative urban power now more than ever as social fragmentation, political polarization and economic inequality pull us apart. As we face the climate crisis, the allure of activity-rich neighborhoods could promote sustainable lifestyles. As we fight segregation in all its forms, dense cities can bridge our divisions. As we struggle with loneliness, an irresistibly vital street life could drag a generation of people off their phones and back toward one another."</p> <p>James A. Moore, Managing Director, Urban Solutions</p> <p>From The New York Times, discussing NYC, but applicable to cities everywhere:</p> <p>"To create a city vibrant enough to compete with the convenience of the internet, we need to end the era of single-use zoning and create mixed-use, mixed-income neighborhoods that bring libraries, offices, movie theaters, grocery stores, schools, parks, restaurants and bars closer together. We must reconfigure the city into an experience worth leaving the house for. Streets once filled by commuting crowds can be reinvigorated by those who really want to be there."</p> <p>The goal is to create cities where people really want to live, to work to visit, to participate, to engage, to be part of something urban and collective, places that may not be convenient but are always real.</p> <p>Opinion 26 Empire State Buildings Could Fit Into New York’s Empty Office Space. That’s a Sign. NYTimes.com</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>Dear Members of Council and Town Staff:</p> <p>I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible growth. I support the provincially mandated growth numbers to 2051. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and the done is a way to ensure the livability people deserve.</p> <p>I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities and road networks. • I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; options that optimize livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density 	<p>Stakeholder: Sergio</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 7, 2024 (email)</p>

	<p>in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6 story mansion blocks. • The transition area from single family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along QEW corridor • I understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville eg. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall. • I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater and grey-water strategies. <p>The OLT states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree, and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>Dear Members of Council and Town Staff:</p> <p>I am alarmed at the mess we may leave for future generations if this plan for Midtown goes ahead. While I support responsible growth and understand the provincially mandated growth numbers, this is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen, with impossible heights. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve both in Midtown and in the rest of Oakville, which will be strongly impacted by Midtown. I worry about the future of people living in such a small area.</p> <p>I have very serious reservations about the options that have been presented, to date, and the manner in which the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA) is moving forward without adequate public input. I would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings, with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • Options that meet but do not exceed the long-term provincially mandated growth numbers, and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • Options that keep building heights to a maximum of 20 storeys in Midtown. • An integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise. • Consideration for the transition area from single-family residential south of Cornwall Road, which means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor. 	<p>Stakeholder: Andrea</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 8 & 9, 2024 (duplicate emails)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comprehensive plan for how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • Inclusion of Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown <p>While I understand that the province has mandated growth in two phases, to ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated by way of a second amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville e.g. Kerr Village, Bronte GO, and the Town Hall site.</p> <p>The Ontario Land Tribunal states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I am concerned about the growth plans for Oakville and, specifically, Midtown Oakville. I would like to express my specific concerns and have some requested actions. I support responsible growth. I understand the provincially mandated growth numbers. However, this is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen, with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve both in Midtown and in the rest of Oakville, which will be strongly impacted by Midtown.</p> <p>I have very serious reservations about the options that have been presented, to date, and the manner in which the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA) is moving forward without adequate public input. I would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings, with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • Options that meet but do not exceed the long-term provincially mandated growth numbers, and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • Options that keep building heights to a maximum of 20 stories in Midtown. • An integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise. • Consideration for the transition area from single-family residential south of Cornwall Road, which means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor. • A comprehensive plan for how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • Inclusion of Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown <p>While I understand that the province has mandated growth in two phases, to ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated by way of a second amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville e.g. Kerr Village, Bronte GO, and the Town Hall site. The OLT states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Milt</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 9, 2024 (email)</p>

<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible population and related growth so long as it is sustainable for the long term. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure that any growth plan is compatible with the size of land available and is consistent with the sort of livability that the current population wishes to see in our community. I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. • I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6-story mansion blocks. • The transition area from single-family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor • I do not believe that the Federal or Provincial government or town officials have adequately considered the implication of proposed population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, our governments must consider all implications – air quality, water quality, availability of liveable space, congestion, over crowding of hospitals, schools and greenspace. Growth for growth’s sake is not justification enough for the resulting damage to our environment and impact on our community. The full cost of development – both direct and indirect - is inadequately reflected in your analysis. • I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all the proposed growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater, and grey-water strategies. <p>The Ontario Land Tribunal states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Windsor</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 9, 2024 (email)</p>
<p>Midtown Oakville OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I have been following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns and suggestions for ongoing discussions with the community so all residents can believe we have put forth the best vision for Midtown and Oakville. I understand that growth is necessary to meet the provincially-mandated growth targets given to municipalities. However, it MUST be done responsibly and I have deep concerns that the current proposed options for Midtown will not lead to responsible, affordable growth, nor will it lead to a liveable Oakville.</p> <p>I have no doubt that the Town staff have been working tirelessly towards the Midtown OPA , and I do appreciated this, but we cannot</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Monique</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 10, 2024 (email)</p>

	<p>rush into this with so many residents’ questions unanswered. I truly hope that Town staff have had every resource possible made available to them so global wisdom can be utilized in making these very important planning and density decisions. Many residents have noted some of their questions and concerns (and I share each of those concerns) on the Midtown Oakville website. Given the current information available to Oakville residents, there are too many unanswered questions across most aspects of Town planning. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. The densities proposed seem unmanageable and incompatible with the projected goals, especially ensuring the “Livability” the people of Oakville deserve.</p> <p>I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities and road networks. • I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; options that optimize livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. • I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6 story mansion blocks. • The transition area from single family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor • I understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville eg. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall. • I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater and grey-water strategies. <p>The Ontario Land Tribunal states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I believe the OPA should reflect this.</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA: Climate Change Densities</p>	<p>As a long-time Oakville resident who lives in walking distance of one of the midtown areas proposed for development (Trafalgar and Cornwall), I am alarmed by all three concepts, which would bring 61,000 new residents to the area. The projected density of 79,000 people per square kilometer greatly surpasses the population density in Manhattan (28,154 residents per square kilometer), and the idea of 45-, 40-, 30- storeys is irresponsible in terms of increased pollution, pressure on the natural environment, and strain on existing infrastructure. Even the 25-storey buildings proposed at Cornwall and Trafalgar, would create massive traffic jams on both streets, already clogged during rush hours, morning and night. I understand we need to increase housing in Ontario, but this has to be done responsibly,</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Shelly Date Submitted: January 10, 2024 (email)</p>

	<p>with decisions made collectively by residents, town officials, and experts in greenhouse gas emissions. As we've seen from the failed power plant proposal, and the failed Glen Abby Golf course conversion proposal, Oakville residents are serious about air quality, adequate infrastructure, and safety.</p> <p>This suggested population increase seems to go against Oakville's 2019 motion, declaring a climate emergency. Mayor Burton said: "Residents are urged to join in the fight against a climate crisis." I searched the Town's website for its Climate Change Strategy, but it is missing. Along with the Climate Emergency Report, Community Energy Strategy, Air Quality Report and the Built Environment in the Climate Change Strategy. As well, we need to take into account the growing problem with residential flooding in Oakville, as pavement replaces soil. On Feb. 8, 2023, the Town of Oakville warned of "potential heavy flooding." And there have been ongoing complaints of basements flooding by "downstream residents," as reported in the <i>Globe & Mail</i>, May 8, 2021: 'What an Oakville dispute tells us about flood risks for thousands of Canadian landowners'.</p> <p>A 2021 Statistics Canada study: <i>Canadian System of Environmental-Economic Accounts: Energy use and greenhouse gas emissions</i>, found that "Households consumed more than one-fifth (22.0%) of Canada's total energy used," and "Household use of motor fuels...was the main source of emissions for Ontario (15.2%)." In 2022, the average Canadian emitted 15.22 metric tons of Carbon Dioxide, according to a report published by Statista in 2023. If we juxtapose these numbers alongside the proposed land uses, we get the following equation: 15.22 metric tons X 61,000 new residents= 928,420 additional metric tons of carbon dioxide emitted. It's also clear that there would be a significant increase in motor fuel emissions, with residents and non-residents driving to and from the arts, culture, shopping, education, employment, and residential units.</p> <p>Oakville has one of the poorest air qualities in the GTA, thanks to cross-winds from Hamilton and Toronto. When my youngest child was born in 1999, he spent weeks at a time in the hospital with breathing issues that often turned to pneumonia. On many of these hospital stays, I was told by the doctors that all the children in the pediatric ward were there because of breathing issues, likely related to pollution. The air quality has only gotten worse as the temperature has risen; last summer there were at least four days when the temperature reached 40 degrees Celsius, causing air pollution alerts. The previous summer, there were at least two days of poor air quality. The US-based National Library of Medicine (NIH) wrote this on Feb. 24, 2022: "High population density appears to be associated with higher mortality rates of a range of cancers, cardiovascular disease and COPD, and a higher incidence of asthma and (curiously) club foot." Increasing population density should never be at the expense of air quality, green space, and efficient infrastructure. Hence, the Midtown Official Plan Amendment must optimise land use, not maximise it by reducing the number of storeys, increasing the green space, and thereby, lowering the population increase. I believe a recent article in a <i>National Geographic</i> newsletter, 'Urban Threats', best captures the priorities for development in the future: "Poor air and water quality, insufficient water availability, waste-disposal problems, and high energy consumption are exacerbated by the increasing population density and demands of urban environments."</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I am following the growth plans for Oakville and specifically Midtown Oakville plans and would like to express my concerns including requested actions. I support responsible growth. I support the provincially mandated growth numbers to 2051. This is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Ed</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 16, 2024 (Email)</p>

	<p>size of land available and the done is a way to ensure the livability people deserve. I have serious concerns with the options that have been presented to date and the trajectory of the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA). The following are items that I see as essential to a successful outcome for the OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities and road networks. • I would like to see options that meet but do not exceed the 2051 provincially mandated growth numbers; options that optimize livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • I would like to see options that keep building heights to an average of 20 storeys in Midtown with a maximum population density in any sq. km not to exceed 20,000 per sq. km. • I would like to see an integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise and 5-6 story mansion blocks. • The transition area from single family residential to the south of Cornwall Road must be considered. This means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor • I understand the need to accommodate population growth to 2051 and beyond. To ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated as growth that would be permitted by way of an amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville eg. Speers Road, Bronte GO, Oakville Place, and Town Hall. • I would like to see a comprehensive, overall depiction of how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • The OPA must show how Oakville will provide affordable housing and by what measure this is defined. • The OPA must address Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown. • The OPA should demonstrate the use of all municipal tools available to us to ensure we optimize opportunities for energy reduction, stormwater and grey-water strategies. <p>The Ontario Land Tribunal states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree, and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>I am concerned about the growth plans for Oakville, and specifically Midtown Oakville.</p> <p>I would like to express my specific concerns and have some requested actions. I support responsible growth. I understand the provincially mandated growth numbers. However, this is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen, with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve both in Midtown and in the rest of Oakville, which will be strongly impacted by Midtown.</p> <p>I have very serious reservations about the options that have been presented, to date, and the manner in which the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA) is moving forward without adequate public input. I would like to see:</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Hank</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 18, 2024 (Email)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings, with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • Options that meet but do not exceed the long-term provincially mandated growth numbers, and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • Options that keep building heights to a maximum of 20 stories in Midtown. • An integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise. • Consideration for the transition area from single-family residential south of Cornwall Road, which means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor. • A comprehensive plan for how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • Inclusion of Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown <p>**Last but by no means least, affordable housing should be included within the mid town developments!!</p> <p>While I understand that the province has mandated growth in two phases, to ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated by way of a second amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville e.g. Kerr Village, Bronte GO, and the Town Hall site. The Ontario Land Tribunal states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA – overall content and process</p>	<p>RE: Midtown OPA</p> <p>I am concerned about the growth plans for Oakville and, specifically, Midtown Oakville. I would like to express my specific concerns and have some requested actions. I support responsible growth. I understand the provincially mandated growth numbers. However, this is the biggest development Oakville has ever seen, with building heights we have never seen before. We need to ensure our plan is compatible with the size of land available and ensures the livability people deserve both in Midtown and in the rest of Oakville, which will be strongly impacted by Midtown.</p> <p>I have very serious reservations about the options that have been presented, to date, and the manner in which the Midtown Official Plan Amendment (OPA) is moving forward without adequate public input. I would like to see:</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Tina</p> <p>Date Submitted: January 20, 2024 (Email)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple options presented on January 30th via three-dimensional renderings, with a clear explanation of height and density, public realm amenities, and road networks. • Options that meet but do not exceed the long-term provincially mandated growth numbers, and options that optimize the livability of the land available for development in Midtown. • Options that keep building heights to a maximum of 20 stories in Midtown. • An integration of a variety of “missing middle” building styles, such as mid-rise. • Consideration for the transition area from single-family residential south of Cornwall Road, which means significantly lower building heights south of the train tracks. Taller buildings should be located to the north, along the QEW corridor. • A comprehensive plan for how all our growth areas will work together to accommodate population growth in a sustainable, liveable way. • Inclusion of Green Building and Green Energy plans for Midtown <p>While I understand that the province has mandated growth in two phases, to ensure responsible growth, this should be clearly delineated by way of a second amendment to the current plan later. This will allow time for planning of other potential growth areas within Oakville e.g. Kerr Village, Bronte GO, and the Town Hall site. The Ontario Land Tribunal states that Oakville is required to optimize land use, not maximize it. I agree and believe that the Official Plan Amendment should reflect this approach.</p>	
--	--	--

Technical Agencies / Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Feedback		
Major Focus Area	Summary of Comments	Stakeholder / Date of Submission
Midtown OPA: Impact to Highway System	<p>Key Comments: MTO has been involved in process since EA stage. Number of proposed improvements to the QEW – MTO must see how changes would benefit Ministry & Highway system.</p> <p>Project Team Response: Midtown project team recognizes the role of MTO. Project team has reviewed the work done in the past. Operational and viability of changes to the network can be discussed directly with MTO. Project team would like to understand what MTO defines as a “benefit” to the Ministry and the Highway system.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Ministry of Transportation (MTO)</p> <p>Date of Submission: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1 (October 16, 2023)</p>
Midtown OPA: Flood hazards	<p>Key Comments: CH is initiating a flood hazard mapping study for Sixteen Mile Creek (multi year study). Through this work, there may be opportunity for collaboration between the Midtown Implementation Program project team and internally with the CH group responsible. CH had previously completed a flood hazard mapping study north of the QEW that identified a large spill area but have not yet identified where it continues south of the QEW.</p> <p>Project Team Response: Identified interest in following up with CH on opportunity for collaboration. Meetings between CH, consultant team, and town staff have taken place throughout fall / winter 2023 on this and will continue throughout 2024.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Conservation Halton (CH)</p> <p>Date of Submission: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1 (October 16, 2023)</p>
Midtown OPA: Community Energy	<p>Key Comments: Future Energy Oakville’s Community Energy Strategy discusses having an integrated energy Master Plan – consideration for the District Energy Plan for Midtown. Recommended project team look at how we can meet net zero.</p> <p>Project Team Response: To consider recommendation as part of work on Community Energy.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Future Energy Oakville</p> <p>Date of Submission: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1 (October 16, 2023)</p>
Midtown OPA: Community Energy	<p>Key Comments: Oakville Hydro will need to maintain existing network while building new. For Distrikt’s District Energy Plan, Oakville Hydro will need to know how it integrates with the distribution system and how renewable energy will be integrated.</p> <p>Project Team Response: to incorporate identified considerations as part of planning for Implementation Program work on Community Energy.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Oakville Hydro</p> <p>Date of Submission: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1 (October 16, 2023)</p>
Midtown OPA: School Sites	<p>Key Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does this look like in delivering a school model? • How small can we build a school – as a standalone site? • Looking to better site ourselves with the Town’s future parks. • Need at least 1 school within Midtown area (or 2) to meet projected density. • Planning to implement new urban school model. • HDSB released RFP to retain architect to see how small a school can be designed within an urban model to ensure feasibility in future. • HDSB needs to better understand how to deal with land budgeting. • Priority for HDSB to secure a good policy framework to ensure the school boards are able to secure ideal school sites (considering how 	<p>Stakeholder: Halton District School Board (HDSB)</p> <p>Date of Submission: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1 (October 16, 2023)</p>

	quickly developers are trying to get into Midtown) and determine how to secure HDSB in having a more urban zone suitable for school (zoning, setbacks, heights and massing).	
Midtown OPA: Rail Facilities	<p>Key Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request the following definitions in the PPS be included in Midtown OPA: Add rail facilities and influence areas to a schedule. Policy direction should clarify new developments would be required to meet PPS requirements for long-term protection of rail facilities. Policy direction should clarify new developments would be required to meet PPS requirements for land use compatibility regarding major facilities. Amend policies to include air quality in required mitigation measures. Revise policies to clarify sensitive land uses prohibited within required setback. 	<p>Stakeholder: CN Rail (WSP representing client)</p> <p>Date of Submission: October 19, 2022 (Email)</p>
Midtown OPA: School Sites	<p>Key Comments:</p> <p>Changing of potential school site locations in Midtown may be required as developments proceed; OPA policies should be flexible on sustainable design requirements and urban design. OPA policies should permit relocation of school sites so an OPA would not be required if a school site was changed (recommend reviewing Vision Georgetown Secondary Plan as a precedent to consider).</p> <p>Height maximums are not needed, but minimums of 4 storeys are encouraged. Interested in co-location with HCDSB but not interested in co-locating within podium of a mixed use development. Preferred form of co-location is to have separate buildings on same site to maximize impacts on construction timeline, occupancy, cost-sharing group holdouts and other funding uncertainties.</p> <p>May be optics issue with locating schools near Hydro Corridor. Interested in potential for daytime road closures/woonerfs to allow for easy drop-off and pick-up of students and staff; minimize traffic during school hours allowing for safer pedestrian space between school and adjacent park.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Halton District School Board (HDSB) / Halton Catholic District School Board (HCDSB)</p> <p>Date of Submission: School Boards meeting (November 8, 2023)</p>
Midtown Master Plans: Cultural Heritage Resources Indigenous Engagement Archaeological Assessments	<p>Key Comments:</p> <p>A description of existing conditions related to cultural heritage resources needs to be included in the Midtown Master Plan document. The existing conditions sub-section should indicate if the Master Plan is to include areas of archaeological potential or not and acknowledge that archaeological assessments will be required for future project-specific projects. The proponents should refer to an archaeological management plan or a data sharing agreement, should they exist. In their absence, the Ministry's screening checklists can help determine whether archaeological assessments will be needed for subsequent project undertakings. Critical for Evaluating Archaeological Potential and Criteria for Evaluating Machine Archaeological Potential. A statement should be included that archaeological assessments are to be undertaken by an archaeologist licensed under the OHA and that archaeological assessment reports must be submitted for MCM review prior to the completion of the EA and prior to any ground disturbance. Some municipalities may elect to have a Stage 1 archaeological assessment for Master Plan area.</p> <p>MCM recommends Existing Conditions Report be undertaken by a qualified person, which will include a historical summary of the study's area development, identifying all known or potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the study area. The findings of</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Major Case Management (MCM)</p> <p>Date of Submission: November 11, 2023 (email)</p>

	<p>the existing conditions report should be included in the existing conditions subsection of Master Plan. Community input should be sought to identify locally recognized and potential cultural heritage resources. Sources include, but are not limited to Municipal Heritage Committees, community heritage registers, historical societies, and other local heritage organizations. Cultural heritage resources are often of critical importance to Indigenous communities. Indigenous communities may have a knowledge that can contribute to the identification of cultural heritage resources; Indigenous engagement should include a discussion about known/potential cultural heritage resources.</p>	
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023) – Railway</p>	<p>Key Comments: Concerns about residential designations around railyard at Chartwell Rd and Cornwall Rd (southeast). Recommendation to consider changing land uses. CN defines railyard and where operations occur. Even though the main rail yard does not appear to be in this location, CN defines it as going right to Chartwell.</p> <p>Project Team Response: team will follow up with CN Rail (WSP) to discuss further as a next step to respond to CN Rail’s identified concerns.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: CN Rail (WSP representing client)</p> <p>Date of Submission: TAC meeting #2 (November 29, 2023)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023) – Highways</p>	<p>Key Comments: Asked why Concept C has additional highway overpass bridge (West side).</p> <p>Project Team Response: It is an active transportation connection to adjacent residential and commercial areas. Since Trafalgar Road is not ideal for active transportation, this overpass is a proposed solution to improving north-south active transportation connections. The crossing has been in the plans for a long time and design is starting shortly.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: MTO</p> <p>Date of Submission: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting #2 (November 29, 2023)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023) – Community Energy</p>	<p>Key Comments: Asked if project team has any preliminary thoughts on which design would best support a district energy system.</p> <p>Project Team Response: Project team indicated they have not yet considered this. They will have more information once the Energy Plan has been started. Nonetheless, preliminary thoughts are that Concept A may best support a District Energy system, with the diversity of land uses. Concept C is potentially the least likely to support a District Energy system. A District Energy system requires the appropriate scales and densities to be successful.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Future Energy Oakville</p> <p>Date of Submission: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting #2 (November 29, 2023)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023) – School Sites</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In favor of siting parks adjacent to school sites. • Would like to see schools sited closer to community uses to build campus approach. • Indicated surprise regarding temporary street closure areas (positive reaction). What does the closure look like? How will it be managed? Is it guaranteed? <p>Project Team Response: Project team indicated that for the OPA, policies will dictate compatibility uses close to roads (where closures could occur). At this stage, the tools for encouraging this are high level direction, outlining how to animate areas. With the transportation plan, direction can be more specific. Closures would likely be for weekends and weekend events, rather than weekdays.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: HDSB</p> <p>Date of Submission: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting #2 (November 29, 2023)</p>

<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>– Flood Hazards</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested confirmation there is an overpass and underpass east of Trafalgar. • Asked if the underpass is feasible or most appropriate. • Due to identified spill in area, CH / project team will work together to address. <p>Project Team Response: In response to CH’s comments identified at TAC #2, the project team indicated they have looked at a preliminary view of the profile. The team is still in the process of documenting the evaluation of alternatives to the Chartwell underpass, however, this currently seems to be the most feasible option.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Conservation Halton (CH)</p> <p>Date of Submission: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting #2 (November 29, 2023)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Spill Flood Hazards Policy Direction & Discussion Paper</p>	<p>Key Comments: CH provided Midtown consultant team with “Spill Flood Hazard Policy Direction” and “Spill Flood Hazard Policy Review and Update Discussion Paper”.</p> <p>Specific spill flood hazard policies cannot be developed until CH knows where flood hazard is and the magnitude. Mapping will not be completed before the Midtown OPA. Refer to CH regulatory policies – refer to CH. A screening map can be created on a shorter timeframe through a conservative analysis of worst case scenarios – to be used by town staff when reviewing development applications in Midtown Oakville. Best not to include static map as a schedule in the Midtown OPA as mapping is ever evolving. The OP can refer to CH mapping tool, since it is a dynamic map that will be updated.</p> <p>There is currently no definition in the OP for spills. Policies need to recognize there are flood hazards. Could be a blanket warning that there is an unmapped spill that will need to be regulated in the future. Midtown OPA could be an opportunity to introduce spill flood hazards policies. The stronger the policy wording is, the better (while ensuring some flexibility). Protective policies with internal screening tool. Protection from flood hazards is collective responsibility (not just CH issue).</p> <p>Project Team Response: consultant team and town staff are in discussions with CH about spill flood hazard policies pertinent to Midtown.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Conservation Halton (CH)</p> <p>Date of Submission: December 7, 2023 (meeting and email / policy documents)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Transit Station Infrastructure</p> <p>Transit Station Access</p>	<p>Key Comments - GO station infrastructure & station access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking structure and Network Operations Centre south of the rail corridor on the west side of Trafalgar Rd are long-term transit station assets and should not be shown as redevelopment sites. This area was not indicated for redevelopment in the previous May 2023 draft OPA shared with Metrolinx. The parking structure should be included in the plan as it has implications for street layout and function. • Metrolinx has no plans to extend the platforms over Trafalgar Rd and there is no funding associated with this proposal. Nor does Metrolinx have plans to relocate the bus terminal to the hydro corridor lands east of Trafalgar Rd – no funding, these lands are not owned by Metrolinx, and this bus terminal location would lengthen walk time for bus to rail transfers risking a poor customer experience. Transportation plan for Midtown should consider a scenario in which station access remains focused west of Trafalgar Rd. • Station infrastructure within hydro corridor lands north of the rail corridor between Trafalgar Rd & Sixteen Mile Creek ravine should remain in place. • The road network should continue to support station access traffic to existing facilities including bus access, commuter and bike parking. 	<p>Stakeholder: Metrolinx</p> <p>Date of Submission: December 15, 2023 (email).</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrolinx has no funding for the proposed new road underpass on the new street; will seek to work with Town to understand plans relative to adjacent Chartwell Rd at-grade crossing. • As part of ongoing station improvements work, Metrolinx will be making improvements to the existing station facilities which should be coordinated with the Midtown Oakville planning process. The preferred plan should consider and indicate other key station assets, particularly new facilities that are planned to be delivered as part of the station enhancements. These infrastructure assets are unlikely to be removed over the lifespan of this plan. Including these station improvements would allow the plan to respond and engage with the station facilities supporting GO transit use more directly. • Metrolinx plans for long-term maintenance of the existing western pedestrian tunnel between Old Mill Rd and Lyons Lane; not shown in concept plans. <p>Key Comments – Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use planning permissions should continue to support transit-supportive densities on station lands. No explanations for the differences in height/FSI (November 2023 concepts) compared to May 2023 draft. Metrolinx encourages FSIs from May 2023 Draft OPA be maintained, particularly for lands south of rail corridor. • Parkland dedications should not be unreasonably allocated onto Metrolinx station lands, in particular the conceptual park shown south of the rail corridor may sterilize development potential on the site when combined with parking structure and associated access road. • Metrolinx has identified specific sites at Oakville GO as high-priority locations for transit-oriented development opportunities; encourages the Town to continue consideration for high density (mixed use) land uses for these sites. 	
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>School Sites</p>	<p>Key Comments: <u>Concept A: Trafalgar Central Employment Focus (PREFERRED)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Westerly school site: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Total campus size is estimated to be +/- 3.4 acres, which is above the targeted minimum campus size between school and park uses. The Board would require +/- 1.5-2 acres for the school site, pending final site layout and joint use arrangements. b) Would be beneficial to flip the school and Neighbourhood Park Site to be more central to the mixed-use residential areas, and greater coverage to the east districts of the plan. This would also allow the school to be more proximate to the Potential Community Centre. 2. Easterly School Site: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Total campus size is estimated to be +/- 6.23 acres, which is well above the targeted minimum campus size between school and park uses. The Board would require +/- 1.5-2 acres for the school site, pending final site layout and joint use arrangements. There would be greater flexibility to have open spaces on the board site in this area. b) School should be located at the north-west corner of the Community Park to have dual frontage, and full access to both Temporary Street Closure areas. It would also be beneficial to move the Potential Community Use to the west to improve access from the school. 3. General comments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Sites have good street access on all corners, between 3-4 street frontages, ideal for pedestrian access to the site. b) Block appears to be regularly shaped, which will be beneficial to efficient use of lands. c) Street, pathway & parkland systems provide good active transportation coverage; maximize walkability throughout area. 	<p>Stakeholder: HDSB</p> <p>Type of Meeting & Date: December 15, 2023 (Email)</p>

- d) Frontages are substantial, allowing for use of on-street parking and drop offs.
- e) Both sites are generally central (as presented) to the communities they will be serving.
- f) In the event the HDSB requires two sites, and the HCDSB one site, where would a third site be tentatively proposed?

Concept B: West Office/Educational Focus

1. Westerly school site:
 - a) Total campus size is estimated to be +/- 3.0 acres, which is in keeping with the targeted minimum campus size between school and park uses. The Board would require 1.5-2 acres for the school site, pending final site layout and joint use arrangements.
 - b) Campus will have three frontages to assist with access into the site, encouraging active transportation.
 - c) Would benefit from enhancements to crossings along the easterly frontage of the school site.
2. Easterly school site:
 - a) Total campus size is estimated to be +/- 2.25 acres, which is below the targeted minimum campus size between school and park uses. The Board would require +/- 1.5-2 acres for the school site, pending final site layout and joint use arrangements.
 - b) The irregular shape of the lot may also prove difficult to maximize site efficiency.
 - c) Adjacent community park is quite narrow, which could limit how outdoor play areas for the school could be incorporated with the park, and vice versa.
 - d) Would be beneficial to relocate the school symbol to the east of the block, and that advantage of the corner of the block. This would provide a more regular shaped lot, and greater adjacency with the other community park network. The retail could be relocated to the north east corner of the block to the east, or in the place of where the school was located.
 - e) The optimal location of the school symbol would be in the central block along the east frontage of the block, to be adjacent to a street closure site, and could take full advantage of both the adjacent community park to the south and community park across the road. This said, it would be required that an enhanced crossing option be provided during school hours to take advantage of the park, otherwise its use may be limited. This would offer an optimal programming solution. It may also be worthwhile to have the Community Use located closer to the school use as well. This location would provide the most central point in the eastern district. The retail could be relocated to the north west corner of the block, and face the other retail area to the west.
3. General comments:
 - a) Sites have generally good street access on all corners, which is ideal for pedestrian access to the site. With the inclusion of the recommended changes under point 2. e. above, the access would be further improved.
 - b) Blocks are not all regularly shaped, which may prove difficult for the efficient use of lands, applicable to both school and park blocks.
 - c) Street, pathway, and parkland systems provide good active transportation coverage, maximizing walkability throughout the secondary plan area.
 - d) Frontages are substantial, allowing for use of on-street parking and drop offs.
 - e) Both sites are generally central (as presented) to the communities they will be serving.
 - f) In the event the HDSB requires two sites, and the HCDSB one site, where would a third site be tentatively proposed?

Concept C: Two Employment Centres

1. Westerly school site (comparable to Concept B)
 - a) Total campus size is estimated to be +/- 3.0 acres, which is in keeping with the targeted minimum campus size between school and park uses. The Board would require 1.5-2 acres for the school site, pending final site layout and joint use arrangements.
 - b) Campus will have three frontages to assist with access into the site, encouraging active transportation.
 - c) Relocating the school to the east or west of the larger Community Park south of the east/west roadway would be ideal, as the Board could be located adjacent to a larger park, and contribute to additional amenities as a larger campus. Also takes advantage of the proposed community centre to the north. Retail uses would need be relocated. If located on the east side of the Community park, school would take full advantage of the Neighbourhood park to the east. Impacts of the rail line would need to be a consideration if there will be enough buffer for sound issues.
2. Easterly school site
 - a) Total campus size is estimated to be +/- 1.57 acres, which is significantly below the targeted minimum campus size between school and park uses. The Board would require +/- 1.5-2 acres for the school site, pending final site layout and joint use arrangements.
 - b) Adjacent Neighbourhood Park is quite narrow, which could limit how outdoor play areas for the school could be incorporated with the park, and vice versa.
 - c) Consideration should be given to relocating the Community Use adjacent to the school block, and relocate the Primary Main Street to where the former was identified. This will provide greater opportunities to co-locate two public facilities.
 - d) Consideration should also be given to relocating both the Potential School Site and the Potential Community Use to the east of the Community Park, and relocate one of the three east most parks to be along the back edge of the school and community use, which would allow for a substantially sized campus for public facilities and open space, central to the east district. Consideration for relocating or removing the separating roadway, similar to Concept A, to allow for a larger campus.
3. General comments
 - a) Sites have generally good street access on all corners, which is ideal for pedestrian access to the site. With the inclusion of the recommended changes under point 1.d., 2.d., or 2.e., the access would be further improved.
 - b) Blocks are not all regularly shaped, which may prove difficult for the efficient use of lands, applicable to both school and park blocks. Again, recommended improvements would address this concern.
 - c) The Board does have concerns whether being sited in the middle of an office district is the best location for a school, even with residential uses being proposed in the towers. This may prove more difficult in managing traffic going through school sites and parks when kids are at play, as well as during arrival and dismissal times.
 - d) Street, pathway, and parkland systems provide good active transportation coverage; maximize walkability throughout secondary plan area.
 - e) In the event the HDSB requires two sites, and the HCDSB one site, where would a third site be tentatively proposed?

Additional Comments:

Co-location with Parks / Community Facilities:

- School sites should be co-located with parks to provide for efficiencies, such as shared parking, which may reduce the overall size required for school sites. Park spaces adjacent to schools should be acquired and delivered at the same time as schools to ensure

students can access the green space, including any soft-surfaced, hard-surfaced, sport fields and play elements where appropriate. Furthermore, HCDSB would like to ensure that the school board is actively involved in the design of active and passive spaces in these parks to meet the programming needs of the adjacent or neighbouring education facilities.

- School board facilities play an important role in providing open space and recreational opportunities for the local community after school hours through shared use agreements. HCDSB is willing to work with the Town to ensure that students can access park space during school hours and the community can access space in school facilities outside of school hours through joint use agreements.
- Note that community access to certain spaces during school hours (e.g. play areas), cannot be permitted for the safety of staff and students. Staff and volunteers may need to supervise a large number of students, which may require barriers, such as fencing, to prevent access to members of the community into school use spaces and prevent elementary school-aged students from wandering outside of safe and supervised outdoor play areas (e.g. fenced kindergarten play areas).
- HCDSB willing to work with Town to create Community Use Hubs associated with school uses for benefit of students and wider community.

Parking:

- It is understood that parking will likely not be provided through on-site surface parking lots as previously provided in suburban schools. However, schools will continue to require parking to meet staff parking requirements and space to accommodate school buses and parent drop-offs/pick-ups. To meet staff parking needs, parking should be provided on-street or through underground parking garages. School buses and parent drop-off/pick-ups would need to be provided through on-street laybys or alternative methods off-site (e.g. temporary road closures during drop off/pick up periods).

Active Transportation:

- HCDSB is willing to explore active school travel measures to encourage the use of active transportation for students, including working with the Town on design interventions and programming in the community. This also has the effect of reducing vehicular traffic around school sites.

Schools – configuration / siting considerations:

- Note that the required site size will be determined through HCDSB’s own study and will be shared with the Town when available.
- The site should be located central to the communities and neighbourhoods it will serve, and result in the shortest walking distance for the majority of the students. Site should have access to active transportation routes, corridors, and infrastructure to reduce vehicular dependent modes of transportation.
- An elementary school should have a frontage along a collector road.
- The site should be adjacent or nearby other public facilities in order to achieve a “campus effect” and to provide coordinated services (e.g. parks, community centres, libraries).
- The site should be a safe distance away from physical and environmental hazards of all kinds, both on-site and adjacent to the site to ensure student safety.
- The site must exclude any archaeologically significant lands.
- The site is to be free from noxious gases and fumes.
- The site should avoid being adjacent to a high voltage hydropower line right of way or a natural gas pipeline or station, where possible

Midtown Landowner / Developer(s) Feedback

Major Focus Area	Summary of Comments	Stakeholder / Date & Submission
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Land Use</p> <p>Heights / Densities</p> <p>School Sites</p> <p>Parks / Open Spaces</p>	<p>LAND USE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referred to / reattached June 2022 feedback submitted to Town Clerks on the 2022 Draft Midtown OPA. • Opinion: Midtown should remain as flexible as possible in terms of land use permissions; thus all lands should have full mixed-use permissions, not be unduly restricted by policy. Requirements for specific land uses (retail, office, institutional) should be flexible to respond to market demands rather than prescribed through policy. • To this point, it should be recognized in the planning for Midtown that traditional office space development will be challenging given current market trends and increased emphasis on Work from Home (WFH) by many business organizations. There is significant evidence that demand for traditional office space has significantly declined with many existing office spaces being vacant and/or underutilized. The creation of empty office space should be avoided in Midtown. • Should the Town see a future need for office, there are policies and programs that can be developed such as a Community Improvement Plan be implemented concurrently to support office development (similar to the City of Vaughan’s program in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre). As well, the location of future office use would ideally be centralised along busier arterial roads, such as on Trafalgar Road. • The various concepts pre-determine “Main Street” and retail frontages. While we do not oppose identification of these areas, sufficient flexibility should be provided in the policy documents to ensure that the design of the GE Lands is not unduly stifled by policy requirements / restrictions. • Proposed concepts significantly undermine the economic viability of future development on the GE Lands as all options require conveyance of greater than 50% of the lands for roads, parks/other public areas rather than development. <p>Conveyance & Development Potential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on the three proposed land block concepts presented at the Nov 14 2023 COW meeting and 2nd Midtown Developers’ meeting (Nov 29, 2023). The three proposed concepts significantly undermine economic viability of future GE lands development (as all options required conveyance of more than 50% of lands for roads, parks and other public areas rather than for development). <p>Office Space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use permissions in Midtown Oakville should remain as flexible as possible – all lands should have full mixed-use permissions. Requirements for specific land uses (retail, office, institutional) should be flexible to respond to market demands rather than prescribed through policy regime. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traditional office development in Midtown will be difficult due to market trends (WFH), evidence that demand for traditional office space has significantly declined, office spaces vacant / under-utilized. ○ Should Town have future need for office, policies / programs can be developed including a Community Improvement Plan (CIP) to support office development (similar to the VMC program). <p>Main Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Block concepts proposed pre-determined “Main Street” and retail frontages. Do not oppose identification of these areas, however 	<p>Stakeholder: MHBC on behalf of Rose Corp. (interest in lands at 420-468 South Service Rd E) (“GE Lands”)</p> <p>Date of Submission: December 11, 2023 (Submission to Town Clerks)</p>

	<p>flexibility should be provided in policies to ensure design of GE lands not impeded.</p> <p>HEIGHTS / DENSITIES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other UGCs/MTSAs in Ontario have been planned / are being planned for 10-15+ FSI and 50-60+ storeys. Midtown Oakville should be comparable. The previous May 2023 draft OPA proposed a maximum 10 FSI with no height limits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do not believe there should be any max heights or densities in Midtown ○ Minimum heights / densities should be set as targets to be achieved through development review process (zoning) based on detailed submissions for each property – enables specific properties within Midtown to respond to market conditions, in alignment with provincial direction in other GTHA intensification areas. • GE lands able to accommodate significant heights and densities (due to their size, configuration, separation from existing low density residential neighbourhoods, and the lands’ single ownership status). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed FSI & heights shown on November 2023 land block concepts for GE lands fail to optimize use of the lands as directed by provincial policy. ○ Should Council wish to implement height and density maximums in the proposed Midtown OPA, they should be increased substantially from what is demonstrated in land block concepts to reflect importance of Midtown UGC in the town’s urban structure as the location to accommodate significant density in the Town. <p>SCHOOL SITES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on school requirements has not be provided. As such, pre-determining school locations within Midtown is inappropriate at this time. Concerns with Land Block Concept C (presented Nov 14 2023) as it places a number of community facilities (park, school site, community uses) on the GE Lands, in addition to the significant road infrastructure presented in the concept on the GE lands. <p>PARKS/OPEN SPACE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parkland is to be provided in accordance with the <i>Planning Act</i>. Depictions of parkland on GE Lands appear to exceed <i>Planning Act</i> requirements for parkland. Further clarity is required. • Parkland should be dispersed throughout Midtown to provide options. • Parkland dedication policies in Midtown should provide significant implementation flexibility, including provision of strata parks, POPS and other mechanisms for open space provision. • Utilization of Hydro Corridor lands should be more fully explored as option to provide parkland. 	
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Land Use</p>	<p>Overarching comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in favour of any of the presented land use block concepts. Second the comments from Rose Corporation. Reiterate same concerns and agree with need for flexibility in policies related to land use permissions and heights / densities permissions. • May 2023 Draft OPA provided opportunity to redevelop GE lands with viable mixed use. Revert back to May 2022 or May 2023 drafts. • For GE Lands, COW Midtown proposal goes beyond to a vision that limits opportunities for the required intensification in Midtown (a UGC). The 3 proposed land block concepts will not achieve this policy vision. 	<p>Stakeholder: Marian (on behalf of client - General Electric (GE) Canada, owner of lands located at 420-468 South Service Rd E) (“GE Lands”)</p> <p>Date of Submission: December 11, 2023</p>

<p>Permissions</p> <p>Heights / Densities</p>	<p>Historical Context of Midtown Oakville OPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GE provided submitted comments to the Town on the 2021 draft Midtown OPA (released March 2021), and provided presentation to PDC at the public statutory meeting on March 21, 2021 noting the following comments on the 2021 draft Midtown OPA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GE support for the increased heights and densities ○ GE support for the added residential and mixed use permissions ○ Concerns with the extensive road infrastructure reqts on its lands ○ Concerns with splitting land use designations on GE lands ○ Concerns with constraints with proposed heights schedule (notwithstanding the additional height transfers) ○ Concern with block design and cost-sharing policies • In addition to March 21, 2021 presentation at public statutory meeting, GE met with the Town’s planning staff on following occasions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May 3, 2021 ○ Sept 17, 2021 (Design Charette) ○ Oct 5, 2021 (Follow up Design Charette) ○ Nov 1, 2021 (Transportation) ○ Mar 2, 2022 (Proposed GE policy modifications) • GE met with Town Planning on May 30, 2022 after release of 2022 draft OPA – GE noted several positive changes but other major shifts in policies/schedules of concern – these included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Removal of developable lands ○ Road requirements – increased rights-of-way ○ Parking policies ○ Parks and Public Realm – volume of private land to be conveyed to Town ○ Servicing and costs • 2023 and Midtown Implementation Program: GE concern about retention of Midtown consultant team that did not participate in earlier Midtown processes and “restarted” process, proceeding without developer or landowner input (despite past 2021-2023 engagement of GE with Town staff). Key concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Move away from previous OPA directions (2021, 2022 and May 2023). Asserts that the COW policy proposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Significantly reduce height and density ▪ Increase road networks beyond those previously proposed ▪ Contemplate parkland dedications that exceed caps in Planning Act ▪ Infrastructure costs contemplated by proposed plans to deliver growth not grounded in achievable development goals ▪ Shift to land use alternatives that reintroduce dedicated office towers have caused debt and equity investors to identify area as “high risk”; increase time horizons/reconsider investment ○ Reiterate support for MHBC (Rose Corp.) submission – supportive of flexibility in policies (land use and height / density permissions) to enable transit supportive mixed use development. Current process and November 2023 options remove opportunity to redevelop GE lands with viable, mixed use development, creating significant potential that GE lands will remain vacant for years. Request reverting back to May 2023 draft OPA, and work with GE Lands & Rose Corp to develop policies. 	<p>(Town Clerks submission)</p>
---	--	---------------------------------

<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Reiteration of comments on 2022 Draft Midtown OPA</p> <p>Roadways</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>Land Use</p> <p>Heights / Densities</p> <p>Parks / Open Space</p> <p>Servicing</p>	<p>General Concerns with the 2022 Draft Midtown OPA (reshared in December 2023 with Town Clerks): Shift in plans by Town creates new policy framework that pushes development into 4 quadrants on the GE Lands dominated by height and built form, to create extremely tall towers that will achieve the new FSI and parking requirements as set out in the policy framework for the GE Lands.</p> <p>Key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road infrastructure and increased rights-of-way / parkland conveyance: not identified in the Town staff report (2022) that provides assessment / evidence to support these changes or additions (disproportionately burden GE lands). • Land uses: 2022 revisions to land use schedules to apply ‘Urban Core’ designation to all GE lands is appreciated (will allow for full range of uses). Disconnect with new policies related to relationship between those uses and the resulting built form based on large widths of publicly-conveyed land through the rights-of-way (ROW) and public parks. • Height and Density Changes: GE supports the removal of the height limits and use of FSI to direct density, however it is not feasible to optimize land use in Midtown and specifically on GE Lands. The new plan (2022) pushes development into small development blocks, resulting in very tall towers with little to no integrated public realms / mostly Town owned and separated parks. • Removal of Developable Lands: revised policies and schedules (2022) introduce increased Road Rights-of-ways over the GE lands as well as new required public parks to be conveyed, resulting in GE Lands proposed to be reduced from 11.08 ha to 6.7 ha of developable land. No other lands in Midtown have same level of public conveyance requirements. • Road Requirements: GE provided number of concerns regarding proposed road network & constraints and barriers to development on GE Lands. GE met with transportation staff to illustrate how road network can be reduced/revised while maintaining adequate movement, access and connectivity for transit/active transportation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Flyover: unclear why this flyover is needed/how it is to serve Midtown. This new road segment will change from local servicing road to more of a “Through road”, likely to attract more traffic. ○ 2022 draft OPA has increased number of roads and ROWs – in conflict with provincial, regional policies and TOC policy intent. • Parking: reductions to parking should be key objective for Midtown as directed by ROPA 48 (states parking standards and policies in SGAs should promote active transportation and public transit and not increased vehicle use). • Parks and Public realm: The 2022 policies identify and prescribe location and size of parks required (ahead of Town wide strategy and updated parkland dedication by-law to apply to Midtown). The policies do not reflect need to provide for alternative approaches including Town acquisition of additional lands. Cited VMC as a high growth area with lower parkland standard. • Promenade: revised Midtown policies (2022) require conveyance from GE Lands of 20 m promenade along Davis Road (that was previously the Cross Ave extension), 2 urban squares and 2 connector corridors with minimum width of 20 m. Additionally, policies require further 5% as POPs. Total land required for open space is 20% of GE Lands. Along with policies for road conveyances required on GE Lands, not a benefit. • Fixed POPS percentage also limits development potential. POPS needs to be flexible to not constrain unduly. Public conveyance of these large areas will not support achieving public space/public realm in timely manner. Recommend using POPS, similar to VMC approach to optimize delivery of parks and public realm. • Servicing and costs: servicing needs of Midtown should be priority. Understanding with certainty process and costs for development to achieve financial viability is key to Midtown success. Servicing infrastructure of Midtown need to advance so vision can be realized 	<p>Stakeholder: MHBC (on behalf of GE Lands Owners (420 to 468 South Service Road East))</p> <p>Date: Original submitted to Town Clerks June 4, 2022 (re-submitted in December 2023 as part of delegation to Town Clerks)</p>
---	---	---

<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Heights / Densities</p> <p>Parkland Dedication</p> <p>Land Uses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context: GE lands at 420-468 South Service Road East are approximately 11 hectares and are vacant except for the vacant former office structure to the North of site. As noted previously, GE lands represent one of the largest single owned properties within Midtown and the most significant redevelopment opportunity for Oakville. • History: in March 2021, the Town released a Draft Midtown OPA. GE submitted comments and provided a presentation to Council in support of increased heights and densities for the area, and in support of the added residential and mixed use permissions. GE expressed concerns with extensive road infrastructure requirements on its lands, splitting of land use designations on the site, the constraints of the proposed heights schedule (notwithstanding the additional heights transfers), block design and cost sharing policies. GE met with the Town other times (in addition to the aforementioned presentation to Council in 2021), including May 3, 2021; Sept 17, 2021 (Design Charette); Oct 5, 2021 (follow up Design Charette); Nov 1, 2021 (Transportation); and Mar 2, 2022 (proposed GE policy modifications). May 30, 2022 – GE met with Town following 2022 draft Midtown OPA release. Positive changes, but other major shifts in policies/schedules of concern, including: removal of developable lands; road requirements (increased rights-of-way); parking policies; parks/public realm (volume of private land to be conveyed to Town); and servicing costs. • Comments on November 2023 Land Use Block Concepts: GE concern with 2023 Midtown Committee of the Whole “Redesigning Midtown” process – see it as proceeding without developer or landowner input (in contrast to past). All 3 land use block concepts presented Nov 13, 2023 were impractical and deviate significantly from May 2022 and May 2023 draft Midtown OPAs. Among other issues, the 3 land use block concepts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Substantially reduced development height and density; ○ Increase road networks beyond those previously proposed; ○ Contemplate parkland dedications that far exceed maximums in the Planning Act ○ Considerable infrastructure costs contemplated by plans to deliver growth not grounded in achievable development goals ○ Shift in plans to land use alternatives that reintroduce dedicated office towers have caused debt and equity investors to identify area as “high risk” and to greatly extend their time horizons or entirely reconsider investment in Midtown. • Concerns the policy framework as articulated in November 2023 block concepts will further restrict/constrain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the GE Lands, the proposal presented Nov 13, 2023 “goes backwards” from an acceptable Midtown Oakville policy vision, to one that limits opportunities for required intensification in a UGC/MTSA. If Town approves any of the 3 options, GE Lands (significant land holdings in Midtown) will not be developed anytime soon. ○ Rose Corporation has provided a separate letter outlining concerns with the alternative land use options. GE Lands shares the same concerns and wholly support notion that flexibility is needed in the policies – in terms of land use permissions and height/density permissions to permit transit supportive mixed use development. • Conclusion: GE Lands appreciated the work completed by Town staff that evolved into the May 2022 draft OPA, with a view areas of concern. The former 2022 OPA provided the opportunity to redevelop the GE Lands with viable mixed use development that would achieve many of the Town’s objectives for the area. The Nov 13, 2023 presented options removed those opportunities. GE strongly encourages the Town to revert to the last staff draft OPA and work with GE and their planning consultants to address the limited areas of concern raised through the initial OPA development process (2021-2022). 	<p>Stakeholder: General Electric Canada on the lands at 420-468 South Service Road East (GE Lands) – Marian Whiteman, Legal Counsel on behalf of GE.</p> <p>Date Submitted: December 11, 2023 (email).</p>
--	--	--

<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Forecasting</p> <p>Heights / Densities</p> <p>Land Uses</p>	<p>General Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitted comments on land use block concepts provided at Nov 14, 2023 Committee of the Whole meeting with respect to people and jobs (P+J) estimates, heights/densities, land use focus areas, community uses and public realm. <p>Population + Jobs Estimates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of transparency regarding source of the established targets (which are consistent across the 3 concepts presented at Nov 14 2023 CofW meeting). It is unclear if the estimates are driving the prescribed heights and densities or the opposite. Request consultants share the technical studies that informed the targets, including the planning horizon. <p>Heights and Densities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Midtown OPA should not include height and density maximums- overly prescriptive; limits site optimization in accordance with provincial policy. Recommend heights / densities be result of appropriate built form / urban design, together with other technical considerations (e.g., servicing). Recommend elimination of maximum heights and density requirements in Midtown. Should Town proceed with maximums, it is recommended they consider the use of more general and permissive policy language to permit new developments to exceed these maximums without OPAs. Current provincial and regional policy direction encourages new developments to optimize land in proximity to transit, and to plan for minimum density targets around MTSAs. Believe the current Midtown concepts are not in keeping with provincial and regional policy direction. <p>Land Use Focus Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed Use: Pleased to see to support Midtown as complete community. Office: Distrikt concerned with emphasis on “office/commercial” focus area in Concept C presented at Nov 2023 CofW given the high office vacancy rates in Oakville and Toronto and shift towards WFH with lesser demands for office uses. Request OPA team reconsider appropriateness of office land use focus and instead have it mixed with uses. Education: the Nov 14 2023 presented concepts introduced “Education” focused areas understood to be for postsecondary education facilities. Request OPA team expand on the institutions/facilities interested in locating here. <p>Community Services & Facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presented land use block concepts identified potential locations for community services, including community uses and school sites. As they relate to Distrikt’s active development applications, Concepts “A” and “B” identify a potential community use on 157-165 Cross Ave and 166 South Service Road properties. Request the OPA team detail the type of community uses anticipated in these locations in the next iterations of the concepts presented. Also request OPA team confirm that a Community Services and Facilities Study will be undertaken for Midtown to determine community uses required. 	<p>Stakeholder: Bousfields on behalf of Distrikt (3 active development applications in Midtown currently:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 217-227 Cross Ave & 571-595 Argus Rd 166 South Service Rd 590 Argus Rd <p>(deemed complete by Town; appealed to OLT)</p> <p>A fourth application anticipated to be filed regarding lands at 157-165 Cross Ave in partnership with Remington Group</p> <p>Date: December 6, 2023 (email submission)</p>
--	---	--

Public Realm Network:

- Pleased to see the removal of the Cross Ave Promenade from the 3 concepts in lieu of a more urban public realm condition along Cross Ave. Request OPA team distinguish intent of the “Primary Main Street” and “Retail Frontage” conditions in all 3 concepts
- Regarding the parks/open spaces proposed, request OPA team clarify if their locations as shown in the concepts are conceptual, and if the OPA will allow for flexibility in their size and extent without an OPA to the Plan.
 - Example: Concept “C” identifies a potential community park within the southern portion of the 157-165 Cross Ave property, directly opposite a much larger park on the south side of Cross Ave. Need to understand the park’s size/extent to evaluate appropriateness of park at location.
 - Request OPA team consider current and future development applications in Midtown by provided above noted flexibility.
- Look forward to OPA Team’s proposed policies related to parkland dedication as per Bill 23 policy directions. Distrikt is encouraged by the diversity in open spaces shown within Midtown. Requests OPA team expand on the anticipated regulations for parks and POPS, including credit towards Section 42 requirements and encumbrances.

Transportation:

- Will a transportation focused analysis of OPA policies and “Concept Options” be provided prior to a Preferred Option being selected / presented at the Midtown CofW? If so, when? Will there be another chance for engagement/feedback?

Road Network:

- Has the proposed new EB off-ramp from QEW/403 corridor (reflected in 2014 Midtown EA) that passed beneath Trafalgar Rd and connected to South Service Road east of Trafalgar Rd been eliminated from Midtown Street Network?
- Does the proposed Argus Road realignment at Trafalgar Road, passing beneath Trafalgar Road and connecting to Davis Road replace the aforementioned “new off-ramp from the QEW/403 corridor”?
- If the proposed new EB off-ramp from the QEW/403 corridor has been eliminated, does this result in a condition where there would be no shift or change in alignment of the existing South Service Road, west of Trafalgar Road? Except where the SSR would connect to Argus Road, west of Trafalgar Road?
- Presumably the new “ramp like” connection between Trafalgar Road and Argus Road would be configured as a RI/RO at Trafalgar Road? What type of control is envisioned between the resulting connection between the “ramp from Trafalgar” and Argus Road? Presumably this would accommodate “all movements” at the T-intersection?
- The concept plans (presented at November 2023 CofW) appear to change the configuration of the “elbow” in the existing Argus Road alignment. What type of change is envisioned?
 - A return to the “swoosh” of the Midtown Plan (dated Aug 31, 2021, Schedule L3)?
 - A hybrid of the “elbow” design and the “swoosh” alignments?
 - How does this affect the intersection of Argus Road and the E-W Collector Street within Midtown that is planned between Cross Ave and the SSR?
- None of the concept options seem to incorporate the “Promenade” feature that was envisioned along the North side of Cross Avenue, west of Trafalgar Road. Without this in place, are there options for vehicular access to properties along Cross Ave as a

	<p>result, recognizing the status of Cross as both an Arterial Street and prominent urban corridor?</p> <p>Transit Network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the vision to retain bus terminals on both sides of Trafalgar Road that serve the Oakville GO rail station? Assuming the Oakville GO rail station is extended across Trafalgar Road? • If bus terminals are planned for both sides of Trafalgar Road, would there be any plan to link them with a bridge across Trafalgar adjacent to the rail corridor (to facilitate transit vehicle entry and exist manoeuvring to/from the Trafalgar Road corridor – should a BRT be established along Trafalgar as is the long term transit vision? This could serve as an additional E-W Active Transportation connection within Midtown <p>Active Transportation Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are additional extensions of the Active Transportation network planned to the west (appears there is an extension close to the QEW/403 Hwy corridor to the west) or to the east (there does not appear to be planned extensions to the east towards the improved interchange at Royal Windsor) to link areas that are intensifying and would benefit from convenient non-auto linkages? • Is “Bike Way” illustrated throughout the concept options envisioned to be an “in-boulevard cycle track” or an on-street set of bike lanes? 	
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In favour of higher densities and max heights; however, encourages higher heights to maximize density in the area to full potential. • Caps on heights and densities are still too low (with November 2023 proposal). • Suggested restricting height or FSI (but not both). • Concerned about office uses considering the current work-from-home environment and declined demand for office space. • Concerned about the speed at which servicing work is progressing. • In favor of dispersion of parkland across Midtown instead of lining 1 corridor. • In favor of removal of off-ramp (provides less constraints). 	<p>Stakeholder: Distrikt Developments</p> <p>Date: Developer Meeting #2 (November 29, 2023)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p>	<p>Key Comments: Concerned about office focus and secondary schools. There is a risk these designated location would not get developed.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: Calvin (177 Cross Avenue)</p> <p>Type of Meeting / Date: Developer Meeting #2 (November 29, 2023)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heights and densities could be increased. • Noted there is opportunity in Midtown to accommodate significant density. • Will height bonusing be considered? • Noted that having concentrated land use areas may impact who develops & where. 	<p>Stakeholder: Rose Corporation (419 – 468 South Service Road East)</p> <p>Type of Meeting / Date: Developer Meeting #2 (November 29, 2023)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about office focus areas. Asked whether there will be opportunities for additional 1-1 meetings. <p>Project Team Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Height bonusing: the project team clarified that the land use planning framework in Ontario has recently changed with the removal of the bonusing tool in the Planning Act (so bonusing will not be pursued in that form). However, language in the Midtown OPA will be included to encourage and provide direction for higher densities. Concentrated land use areas: project team noted that underlying focus areas is expectation for residential uses. Concentrated areas would encourage more of one land use than another, but would be mixed use. More 1-1 meetings: project team clarified that additional 1-1 meetings will be offered again in January 2024; additionally, stakeholders can reach out to the project team directly for quick discussions as necessary. 	
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Parkland</p> <p>Densities</p> <p>EA Cost Estimate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favor of providing parks throughout Midtown. Could parkland be considered along the Hydro Corridor? Surprised by maximum densities – there is potential for higher densities. Will the EA include a cost estimate? <p>Project Team Responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parkland on the Hydro Corridor: This will be considered. Hydro Corridor parkland would not likely compensate for other parks, but it can be used as additional park space. EA Cost Estimate: The Master Plan EA will be wrapping up next summer, with costing to occur after that. The Lyons Lane EA will include a costing estimate. 	<p>Stakeholder: Corbett Land Strategies</p> <p>Date and Type of Submission: Developer Meeting #2 (November 29, 2023)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p>	<p>Context: Rose Corporation subject lands located at 420-468 South Service Road East (generally referred to as the “GE Lands”). Lands are approximately 11 ha. GE Lands are one of the largest, single owned land holdings in Midtown (represents significant opportunity for redevelopment to achieve UGC growth targets while implementing Midtown complete community vision).</p> <p>Key Comments:</p> <p>Land Use Block Concepts (presented Nov 13, 2023):</p> <p>Comments regarding the 3 land use block concepts presented at the second Developers Meeting (Nov 29, 2023): (1) Trafalgar Central Focus; (2) West Office/Educational Focus; and (3) Two Employment Centres. Key client responses / concerns with the 3 concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use: Midtown should remain as flexible as possible in terms of land use permissions. All lands should have full mixed use permissions (not restricted by policy). Requirements for specific land uses (e.g., retail, office, institutional) should be flexible to respond to market rather than prescriptive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific to office, should be recognized that traditional office development will be challenging per current market trends and increased WFH emphasis. Evidence that demand for traditional office space has declined across GTA. 	<p>Stakeholder: MHBC (planning consultant) on behalf of client (the Rose Corporation), regarding lands at 420-468 South Service Road East</p> <p>Date Submitted: December 11, 2023 Town Clerks (email)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should Town see future need for office, programs/policies can be developed (e.g., a Community Improvement Plan (CIP) can be implemented concurrently to support office development, as was done with Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC). ○ Location of future office should ideally be centralized on busier arterial roads (e.g., Trafalgar Road) ○ The 3 concepts pre-determine “Main Street” and retail frontages – Rose Corporation does not oppose identification of these areas, however encourages flexibility in policy to ensure design of GE Lands is not stifled by policy requirements ○ Broadly, the 3 land use block concepts significantly undermine economic viability of future development on GE Lands (as all options require conveyance of greater than 50% of lands for roads, parks and other public areas other than development) ● Density and Heights: Other UGCs/MTSAs have been planned/built for densities of 10-15+ FSI and heights for tall buildings of 50-60+ storeys. Midtown should be similarly planned. Previous draft OPA (May 2023) contemplated 10 FSI with no height limits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do not believe max heights/densities should be set in Midtown. Instead, minimum heights/densities should be set as targets, with specific heights/densities determined through the development process (zoning) based on detailed submissions. This allows specific properties in Midtown to be responsive to market conditions and is in alignment with provincial direction for intensification across the GTHA. ○ GE Lands (given their size, configuration, separation from existing low rise residential neighbourhoods and single ownership status) are able to accommodate significant heights/densities. The proposed FSI and heights in the 3 land use block concepts fail to optimize the site as called for in provincial policy. If Council wishes to implement height and density limits in the OPA, they should be increased considerably to reflect the important role of Midtown as an UGC in the urban structure. ● School Sites: Information on school requirements has not been provided; predetermining school locations inappropriate at this time. Particular concerns with Concept C which places number of community facilities (parks, school site, community uses, etc.) on GE Lands (in addition to the significant road infrastructure being presented). ● Parks/Open Spaces: Parkland is to be provided in accordance with the Planning Act. Depictions of parks on GE Lands in the 3 concepts appear to exceed Planning Act requirements. Clarification needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parkland should be dispersed throughout Midtown. ○ Parkland dedication policies should provide significant implementation flexibility, including provision of strata parks, POPS and other mechanisms for open space provision ○ Utilization of Hydro Corridor lands should be more fully explored as option to provide parkland in Midtown (similar to other GTA municipalities) ● Conclusions: Currently, client is not supportive of any of the 3 land use block concepts presented in November 2023. Specifically, opinion that the proposed concept plans do not have regard for Section 2 of the Planning Act, are not consistent with the PPS, and do not conform to the Growth Plan as they fail to optimize the development of Midtown as a whole and on the GE Lands. Opinion that the Town proceed with the May 2023 draft OPA (represents appropriate implementation of provincial policy and development of Midtown as a complete community). 	
Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts	Key Comments: Oakville GO Station: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reshared February 2021 presentation and Feb 2021 meeting minutes with respect to NBLC + Perkins & Will plans to assess planning 	Stakeholder: Metrolinx (Rebecca) Date: December 13, 2023 (email follow up from

<p>(November 2023) Oakville GO Station</p> <p>Development Potential</p> <p>Parkland</p>	<p>framework, conduct development options analyses, undertake real estate market feasibility study based on development options, land valuation analyses and develop lands disposition strategy and implementation plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development potential: higher densities near Lakeshore GO Corridor. Considerations that determine site potential: 30m rail setback (removes large chunk of site); PPUDO – potentially move to east side of site, existing tunnel on west side of site not accessible, likely a permanent condition, east tunnel in garage is accessible, bike parking, accessible parking, egress along north end of site may be required either as exit from parking garage or access to new PPUDO. • Development Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As of right development scale – examples provided in slide deck of buildings in Oakville and Burlington (range of 10 storeys, higher densities along Lakeshore GO corridor (17 to 30 storeys in Pickering; 21 storeys at Rain/Senses in Oakville and 29/44 storeys at Mimico station). ○ Paradigm condos used as an example: 3x 20-storey buildings; larger site than subject property but similar context; lesson learn in how proximity to rail line is addressed through crash wall, structured parking garage, low occupancy uses closer to tracks (likely where headed in Midtown); beneficial to project feasibility to include parking in structure as opposed to underground; Paradigm has amenities on top of parking garage too. • Parkland dedication v. CIL: 5% of site or 1 ha per 300 units (site is less than 1 ha). Questioned whether small parkette would be desirable given surrounding context. CIL may be the preferable / more effective approach here. • Parking / Site Access: opportunities for reduced parking ratios given TOD; site access (Old Mill v. Cornwall); need access for Metrolinx facilities and for residential; minimum distance between access points? Building Design: are changes being made to the existing design guidelines (2013)? Street wall v. setback - design guidelines note setback for Cornwall District – how much? Additional uses (office and retail) likely to be challenged in this location. Residential only is the preferred option; Tower spacing in higher density options. 	<p>December 5, 2023 Landowners Meeting).</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p>	<p>General Comments: overall comments on the land use block concepts presented at Nov 13, 2023 Midtown Committee of the Whole Meeting, as it relates to the Home Depot Lands at 99 Cross Avenue (which have been developed for a Home Depot and associated parking in conjunction with the adjacent Trafalgar Village Mall).</p> <p>Conclusions / Summary of Key Issues: Client is unsupportive of any of the 3 land use block concepts presented in November 2023. Specifically, opinion that the proposed concepts do not have regard for Section 2 of the Planning Act and are not consistent with the PPS and do not conform to the Growth Plan (due to failure to optimize development of Midtown as a whole and on subject lands specifically). May 2023 draft OPA should be option Town proceeds with – represents appropriate implementation of provincial policy and development of Midtown as a complete community.</p> <p>Key concerns with land use block concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Midtown should remain as flexible as possible in terms of land use permissions (all lands should have full mixed use permissions & not restricted by policy). Requirements for land use (e.g., retail, office) should be flexible to respond to 	<p>Stakeholder: MHBC (planning consultants) on behalf of Home Depot Holdings Inc (lands at 99 Cross Ave)</p> <p>Date Submitted: Dec 13, 2023 (email)</p>

	<p>market demands vs. prescriptive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traditional office will be challenging (vacancy rates post COVID). Should the town see need for office, there are policies/programs that can be used (e.g., a Community Improvement Plan (CIP) to support office development, similar to what was done in VMC). Location of future office use would be centralized on arterial roads (e.g., Trafalgar Road) ○ The concepts predetermine “Main streets” and retail frontage. Do not oppose identification of these areas, however max flexibility should be provided in policies to ensure lands not constrained unduly ○ Client wants to ensure whatever option selected, existing land use permissions for major retail will continue and be permitted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Density and Heights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other UGCs/MTSAs have been planned and are being developed for 10-15+ FSI and 50-60+ storeys – Midtown should be similarly planned. Previous draft Midtown OPA (May 2023) contemplated 10 FSI with no height limits. Do NOT believe there should be max heights and densities set for Midtown. Rather, minimum heights + densities should be set as targets, with specifics established through development review, in alignment with market conditions and provincial policy direction for other comparable intensification centres in the GTA ○ The proposed FSI and heights for all 3 concepts shown on the subject lands fail to optimize the use of these lands as per provincial policy ● School Sites: Information on school requirements has not been provided and thus pre-determining school locations is inappropriate at this time. The client has concerns with Concept B and C in particular, as they place a number of community facilities (parks and a school site) on the subject lands ● Parks/Open Spaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parkland is required to be provided for in accordance with requirements of the Planning Act. Depictions of parkland on the concepts on the subject lands appear to exceed Planning Act requirements. Clarification is required ○ Parkland should be dispersed throughout Midtown ○ Parkland dedication policies in Midtown should provide significant implementation flexibility, including provision of strata parks, POPS and other mechanisms for open space provision ○ Utilizing Hydro Corridor should be more fully explored to provide parkland in Midtown (similar to other municipalities). 	
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Rather than master plan the location of permissible uses through a block-by-block design approach, all lands should be allowed to determine the highest and best use of each site at the time of development. ● The closure of Lyons Lane would result in the Subject Lands becoming a land-locked parcel. Lyons Lane should remain as a municipally assumed road allowance. ● Rather than provide maximum regulatory standards, the Midtown policies should provide minimum height and density targets. ● The locations of parks and open space locations should be determined at the time of a development application. 	<p>Stakeholder: MHBC on behalf of landowners at 599 Lyons Lane</p> <p>Date: December 14, 2023 (email)</p>

<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Land Uses</p> <p>Roadway</p> <p>Heights / Densities</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All permissible uses should be permitted throughout Midtown - should be flexible. • Concerns about office space. It is pre-emptive to identify any blocks for education or office in absence of in-depth feasibility studies. • Regarding retail frontage as proposed on the Subject Lands in two of the Concepts, pre-determining that such uses are required at this time along Davis Road, is premature. In current market conditions, it would be suggested that the consultants undertake a Retail Market Study that looks at future trends, rather than past, historic patterns, to justify the locations for retail throughout Midtown. • The Concept Plans all show that Davis Road is to be given direct access and connection to Trafalgar Road. This will result in high volumes of vehicular traffic. • It appears that the proposed increased provision in roads is to increase traffic volumes and provide expeditious routes for major arterial road connections. • We also note that one of the concepts (Concept A – Trafalgar Central Employment Focus) proposes a mid-block connector through the 359 Davis Road property. We note that this block is smaller than almost every other block on the plan, and we don't believe a mid-block connector is required. • Recommend town establish minimum heights & FSIs rather than maximums. 	<p>Stakeholder: MHBC (on behalf of landowners at 359 Davis Road).</p> <p>Date: December 14, 2023 (email).</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Land Uses</p> <p>Built Form</p> <p>Gateways</p> <p>Transportation</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <p>Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use (Office): While it may be appropriate to locate some office space in the podiums of mixed use buildings, a substantial amount of office space, in our opinion, is not supported by the current market. We recommend that office space be permitted in the podiums of mixed use buildings, but not required. Concept B & C are both agreeable. Increase height and density. • Land Use (Mixed Use): Subject site is ideal for tall mixed use development. Impacts of shadowing on adjacent residential lands would be minimal, as none currently exist. In our opinion, a tall mixed use development containing multiple towers, rather than two lower scale residential buildings and one office building, would make sense on this landmark site. • Built Form: Station is located to the south, Trafalgar Road is located to the east, and QEW to the north. There is arguably a need to counter the urban negatives of the MTO interchange to the north, the width of Trafalgar Road and Metrolinx parking garage to the south with strong urban built form character oriented to Trafalgar Road. • Gateway: Subject site is prominent corner location and a Gateway to Midtown and should provide a sense of arrival and identify a significant place. Subject site is quite large and will have road access on all four sides, supporting diverse access points to help carry density. Subject site could potentially accommodate up to 6 or 7 towers with 750 square m floorplates with commercial and office space located within podiums, including car dealership to replace existing Oak-Land Ford Lincoln dealership. An ambitious landmark development on the subject site could play a role in ensuring that Midtown meets its goal of becoming a destination where people want to live, work and play. Lastly, the subject site is under sole ownership, serving to simplify future development efforts. <p>Specific Comments – Land Use Block Concepts A – C (November 2023):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client intent for the continued operation of Oak-Land Ford Lincoln dealership and to maintain option to incorporate this use into a future mixed use development in Midtown Oakville, which is provided for in: section 20.5.4 of the draft Midtown Oakville OPA, 	<p>Stakeholder: SGL Planning & Design Inc. on behalf of Oak-Lane Park Investments Inc., owners of 570 Trafalgar Road (currently leased to Oak-Land Ford Lincoln).</p> <p>Date: December 15, 2023 (email)</p>

	<p>released May 12, 2022: “on the lands designated Urban Core and known as 570 Trafalgar Road, motor vehicle sales and service may continue as part of a comprehensive mixed use development”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept A: places the site within a Mixed Use Office and Education Focus precinct. Clients do not envision office uses as the primary non-residential component of mixed use development on the subject site. It may be appropriate to locate some office space in podiums of mixed use buildings, substantial office space in SGL/client opinion is not supported by the current market. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Recommend office space be permitted in podiums of mixed use buildings, but NOT required. Client plans to protect option to provide for significant employment concept via a new car dealership likely in podium base. • Concepts B and C: place subject site mostly within a Mixed Use Residential precinct, though Concept B shows southern most portion of site within a Mixed Use Office and Educational Focus precinct, with required retail frontage facing a neighbourhood park. Both Concepts B and C are agreeable to client, as retail/commercial could be incorporated in addition to a new car dealership. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Subject site (Oak-Land Ford Lincoln) is a prominent location and Gateway to Midtown – should provide sense of arrival. Subject site is large – will have road access on all 4 sides to support density; and it is ideal for tall mixed use development. ○ Limiting building heights to 40 storeys (Concept A), 40-45 storeys (Concept B) and 30 Storeys (Concept C) may be overly restrictive/could impede subject site’s full potential as a prominent Midtown site. The same is true for the density maximums presented for each precinct – we are, however, aware that these numbers (6 FSI – Concept A; 6-7 FSI for Concept B; 5 FSI for Concept C) are intended to be precinct-wide, not site-specific. • Option: tall mixed use development containing multiple towers would be appropriate for the subject site – additionally, an ambitious landmark development could be role in making Midtown a destination. Redevelopment cannot happen all at once/must be phased. Client intent that the dealership will continue to operate and grow within the context of the Midtown Oakville redevelopment plans. 	
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Road Network</p> <p>Density</p> <p>Land Use (office)</p> <p>Hydro Corridor</p> <p>Municipal Finance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview / Context: Subject lands located south of the QEW, east of Trafalgar Road, on the Northeast corner of South Service Road and Davis Road. Land consists of existing 1-storey brick office building (occupied). Total site area of 0.42 ha with frontage of approximately 54 metres onto Davis Rd. • Proposal: client is proposing to demolish existing 1-storey office building to facilitate proposed mixed use development comprised of 58-storey building to contain retail, office and residential uses, underground parking, 3 floors of above ground parking, ground level commercial space, and 1 level of office space, rooftop amenities, and apartment units (1 to 3-bed size units). Proposed residential density of 9.75 FSI. Proposed total of 388 residential units with mix of 1- to 3-bedroom units <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposal was guided by the May 2023 draft Midtown OPA policies. The proposed FSI fell below the proposed 10 FSI max. <p>Overarching Comments for Concepts A – C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Alignment: not consistent with May 2023 Draft Midtown OPA. Proposed road realignment, specifically QEW underpass and Cross Ave extension do not uphold development rights to landowners. Proposed road realignment dissects subject property into 2 undevelopable parcels. 	<p>Stakeholder: Corbett Land Strategies Inc. on behalf of client related to lands at 349 David Road.</p> <p>Date: December 15, 2023 (email)</p>

- **Proposed 6-laneway on Cross Ave:** not a safe community ideal – a 6-lane roadway characterizes car-centric design.
- **FSI:** the proposed decreased FSI and building heights undermine full development potential of Midtown. Reduced FSI and heights are not consistent with May 2023 draft Midtown OPA (with max 10 FSI that would yield up to 58-storeys). Midtown is a defined growth area, an MTSA (intensification is focus); transit-supportive development. Given Bill 150 reversal of urban boundary expansions in most municipalities including Halton, there has been strong pressure to accommodate further intensification within MTSA's.
- **Hydro Corridor:** project team should reconsider use of Hydro Corridor as park for Midtown (jurisdictional examples: Green Line in Toronto, Meadoway in Scarborough, Finch Hydro Corridor Park).
- **Proposed office land use:** creates concern on full success of Midtown due to traditional employment hub shrinking post COVID. Office vacancy rates increased since 2020. Recommend reconsidering office uses and reimagine Midtown as mixed use commercial/residential focus.

Conclusion / Next Steps: Request project team to consider the following:

- Update Midtown EA (2014) & prepare cost benefit analysis.
- Explore alternative road alignment that does not compromise development potential in Midtown Oakville.
- Reconsider 6-laneway road on Cross Ave to prevent car-centric development.
- Reconsider density and heights proposed for Midtown – should consider higher densities and heights (per provincial housing target).
- Enhance concepts to provide for diverse land use mix that best represents a complete community.
- Explore proposed uses for Hydro Corridor (pedestrian space).
- Reconsider standalone office land use – focus on mixed use commercial and residential focus.

Specific Comments:

- **Road Network:** the preferred road network for the 3 land use block concepts is consistent with the Town initiated OPA of 2017 (based on the Midtown Class EA in 2014). There are concerns with this, as it negates development potential of 349 Davis Road property. To facilitate development of a 58-storey development, the proposed QEW off ramp underpass must be realigned to not impede the proposed development.
 - **Proposed underpass connecting to Davis Rd and proposed extension of Cross Ave result in a fragmentation of the lands.**
 - Proposed expropriation of land eliminates development potential and frustrates density targets established by Town.
 - The road realignment does not reflect the May 2023 draft OPA where Town intended to conduct further study and find alternatives to configure South Service and Davis Roads.
 - Given concern with the preferred road network, request Town to provide further information on rationale for the proposed realignment of Cross Ave and the underpass. Specifically, requesting a cost-benefit analysis to be undertaken. Appears the significant cost to construct underpass does not result in meaningful benefit in terms of improving service levels in surrounding road network.
 - Expect the Midtown EA (from 2014) will be updated.
 - **Proposed Road Alignment:** opinion that using the existing Davis Rd alignment for the proposed extension will be more efficient (uses existing municipal infrastructure and allows for potential development opportunities). Will support Town in

	<p>achieving its density targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic analyses was completed by CF Crozier & Associates to accurately characterize impacts on traffic with and without the underpass off-ramp. Analysis indicated that the intersection of Trafalgar Rd and QEW EB off-ramp is projected to operate without material change in level of service in PM peak hours with or without underpass off-ramp. Furthermore, the implementation of a second auxiliary right turn lane can improve operations in future without need for the underpass off-ramp. ▪ Traffic analyses indicated traffic volumes that do not justify cost of this improvement. Based on this, strongly recommend planning staff to consider utilizing existing Davis Td alignment for proposed extension (more sustainable) as this option will utilize existing municipal infrastructure. Also request MTO explore addition of a second right turn storage lane to QEW eastbound off ramp connection to Trafalgar Road post-2030. Such an improvement would be less complex/less costly than potential underpass off-ramp improvement. Prior costing from 2014 Midtown EA (preliminary cost estimates) for underpass and other improvements were forecast to be \$15.5M for Trafalgar Interchange, based on Town’s 2012 capital budget rates. This cost does not reflect today’s inflation rates (3-5% increase typically from 2013 to end of 2019), along with material and supply chain shortage cost increases. ▪ The significant cost of the underpass cannot be justified on the fact that it would not result in any meaningful improvement in the functioning and service levels of the road network. There is more validity in establishing an active transportation link between the east and west sides of Trafalgar Road. ▪ If an underpass is to be pursued, recommend it be designed as a pedestrian/cycling trail which would discourage auto use and congestion in favor of active transportation within the MTSA. The 2014 Midtown Oakville EA must be updated to reflect the current cost/benefit analysis and current active transportation needs relative to vehicular connections. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Municipal Financial Impact: the proposed mixed-use development on subject property will bring strong revenue stream to the Town (consisting of significant one-time DC and building permit revenue and annual on-going real estate assessment cash flows). Critical a cost-benefit analysis is prepared to justify if the proposed underpass and road network would negate the development potential of the subject lands. 	
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about office focus. • Height and density should be increased. • Concerns with road network. • Consider using hydro corridor as a park. 	<p>Stakeholder: Corbett Land Strategies (on behalf of 1539059 Ontario Inc. at 359 Davis Road).</p> <p>Date: December 15, 2023 (email)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA (September 2023 Feedback)</p>	<p>Context: John Sidler is the current owner of lands at 482 South Service Road East and 566, 572 and 574 Chartwell Road. These lands comprise approximately 9.068 acres in the Chartwell District (per the draft May 2023 OPA).</p>	<p>Stakeholder: John, current owner of lands at 482 South Service Road East and 566, 572 and 574 Chartwell Road.</p>

<p>Road Network</p> <p>Land Uses</p> <p>Railway Setback</p>	<p>General Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encouraged by the proposed OPA regarding provision of a mix of residential housing, creative green space and employment uses. Can envision positive impact the integration of the green space along the railway lines and properties will have. Road Network Proposed: The location of the north south road (now proposed to be located on the subject property lands) will eliminate possibility of rebuilding where existing building of 482 South Service Road stands (setback requirement from Morrison Creek – client perspective that the creek is a neglected waterway that serves as a rudimentary stormwater management system). Client preference that the Town reconsider the need for this proposed road, given there is a potential crossing of the QEW further west that would provide the necessary function. Land Use and Railway Setback: Concerned that none of the client property is to be designated residential. Opposed to this. Understand that this position must be taken as CN wishes a significant setback due to their railyard. However there is no railyard west of Chartwell Road and over last 50 years there has been no activity in that area that backs onto the subject property. No consideration seems to have been given to how developers deal with the CN. Building materials, location of above ground parking, land use and landscaped areas are all critical items that are considered with CN setbacks. A recent development in Toronto negotiated a 30-metre set back. Open to further discussions with the Town/consultants on this matter. 	<p>Date Submitted: September 5, 2023 via email from David Nelson on behalf of John Sidler – Letter and Attachment (Map) demonstrating subject lands.</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Proposed road</p> <p>Land Uses (office)</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <p>The subject property, and the most easterly block of the proposed development, is naturally divided by the existing natural heritage feature. It would seem obvious to respect this natural division and to locate residential development to the west of the natural heritage feature and employment development to the east of the natural heritage feature.</p> <p>482 South Service Rd. E. property is significantly impacted by the proposed north-south road to the west of it. This road appears to occupy a significant portion of this property with the result that at the north there is only a narrow strip left, which the plan has identified as a Neighbourhood Park. This does not seem like an appropriate use of this land. It would seem counter-intuitive to locate a park so close to the QEW. The proposed road should be shifted to the west to allow a reasonable lot area to remain so that these lands could be developed as residential. In the event that Davis Rd. were to be extended to Chartwell (shown in red dashed line) which is not on these concept drawings but I understand that the Town has considered, this would further impact the development potential of my property and lead to a sub-optimal traffic situation on Chartwell Rd. I would urge the Town to question if this extension is necessary.</p> <p>Given the stagnant market for office buildings and changing patterns of work post-Covid I am also concerned that traditional office uses are no longer appropriate. If these lands were to include an office component I would urge the Town to consider a mixed use option. I visualize a 4 storey podium with office uses surmounted by residential uses.</p>	<p>Stakeholder: John, current owner of lands at 482 South Service Road East and 566, 572 and 574 Chartwell Road.</p> <p>Date: December 15, 2023 (email)</p>
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heights / Densities: The relationship between height and FSI may be problematic in some instances. We have done the calculation for 627 Lyons Lane and consider that an FSI of 7 would work for us in that it gives us a height of 40 storeys. Roadway / Access: How are you providing access to the Trafalgar Road frontages under Concept A? We suggest that traffic patterns 	<p>Stakeholder: David (627 Lyons Lane)</p> <p>Date and Type of Submission: December 15, 2023 (Email)</p>

<p>Heights / Densities</p> <p>Roadway</p> <p>Parkland / Hydro Corridor</p>	<p>could be improved from their current situation if individual sites are serviced from internal streets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parkland: Some use of the hydro corridor for active and passive parkland should be considered. It seems that a parkland ratio of 12% of total land area cannot be obtained through the current legislation. The figure presented seems to be based on a total area around 100 ha (12 ha parkland being shown as 12% of the area). The developable area is in the range of 40 ha and legislation indicates that where the lot are less than 1 ha in area the cap on parkland conveyance is 10 % of the lot area. Where the lot is 5 ha in size the cap is 15%. A substantial amount of parkland needs to be purchased by the Town of Oakville and we need to find a willing seller. • Land Use Block Concepts (development pipeline considerations): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When it comes to how concepts were arrived at, were any current applications taken into consideration? Some of the higher density existing applications seem to land in somewhat higher density precincts in Concepts A and B and partially in Concept C, whereas our project, with the current application being based on an FSI of 4.5 and 27 stories (based on old Planning Act / bonusing provisions; our intention has been to change this once the Town failed to hear our application prior to the Planning Act changes), always seems to fall in lower density residential precincts. ○ Are you able to share rationale for why the western and north western portion of midtown never seems to land in the higher density range on either of the concepts? ○ We were of the thought that abutting the natural border of the Sixteen Mile Creek so that height and density would not feel abrupt, (with some of the best views in Midtown) and casting the least shadows on any other parts of midtown, it would make sense to have more density here than shown in Concepts A and C. 	
<p>Midtown OPA: Land Use Block Concepts (November 2023)</p> <p>Land Use</p> <p>Oakville GO Station Infrastructure</p> <p>Road Network</p>	<p>Key Comments:</p> <p>Background: Oakville GO station an important hub in the regional transportation network. Metrolinx is currently investing in improvements in the station and the Lakeshore West GO rail corridor that will support growth in Midtown Oakville.</p> <p>Land Use Block Concepts: Metrolinx was presented the new Land Use Block concepts at the November 29, 2023 Technical Advisory Committee and Landowner Engagement Committee meetings. The land use block concepts differed significantly from the Schedules presented to Council in May 2023 (draft Midtown OPA). Two areas of main concern with the land use block concepts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First – representation of future station infrastructure. • Second – the potential impacts on Metrolinx-owned lands. <p>Densities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use planning permissions should continue to support transit-supportive densities on station lands. • No explanations have been provided for the differences in heights and FSI figures shown on the Nov 2023 concepts compared to the previous May 2023 draft OPA. • Metrolinx has identified specific sites at the Oakville GO station as high priority locations for upcoming transit oriented development opportunities. Metrolinx encourages the Town to continue consideration for high density, mixed use land uses for these sites to deliver housing and infrastructure benefits while delivering expanded station infrastructure • Metrolinx encourages that FSI figures from the May 2023 draft OPA be maintained, particular for lands south of the rail corridor. 	<p>Stakeholder: Metrolinx, Station Planning (Marcus)</p> <p>Date Submitted: December 15, 2023 (email)</p>

Parkland: Parkland dedication should not be unreasonably allocated onto Metrolinx station lands, in particular the conceptual park shown south of the rail corridor may impede development potential on the site when combined with the parking structure and access road.

Metrolinx Station Infrastructure:

- Parking structure and Network Operations Centre south of the rail corridor on the west side of Trafalgar Road are long term transit station assets and should not be shown as redevelopment sites. This area was not indicated for redevelopment in the previous May 2023 draft OPA shared with Metrolinx.
- Metrolinx has no plans to extend the platforms over Trafalgar Road and there is no funding associated with this proposal. Nor does Metrolinx have plans to relocate the bus terminal to the hydro corridor lands east of Trafalgar Road – there is no funding associated with this, and these lands are not owned by Metrolinx. Furthermore, the bus terminal location would lengthen the walk time for bus to rail transfers risking a poor customer experience. The transportation plan for Midtown should consider a scenario where station access remains focused West of Trafalgar Road.
- Station infrastructure within the hydro corridor lands north of the rail corridor between Trafalgar Road and Sixteen Mile Creek ravine should remain in place.
- As part of ongoing station improvement work, Metrolinx will be making improvements to existing station facilities which should be coordinated with the Midtown Oakville planning process.
 - The preferred plan should consider and indicate other key station assets, particularly new facilities planned to be delivered as part of station enhancements.
 - These infrastructure assets are unlikely to be removed over the lifespan of this plan.
 - Including these station improvements would allow the plan to respond and engage with the station facilities supporting GO transit use more directly.
- Metrolinx plans for the long term maintenance of the existing Western pedestrian tunnel between Old Mill Road and Lyons Lane which is not shown in the concept plans.

Road Network: Road network should continue to support station access traffic to existing facilities including bus access, commuter parking and bike parking.

Next Steps: Metrolinx requests an opportunity to provide feedback prior to the next iteration of the land use concepts being made public/to Town Council. Specifically requesting:

- **Station Workshop:** recommended starting point is a staff and technical team workshop in Early January 2024 focused on planned station improvements and the immediate parking lot lands to facilitate coordination of development plans and near term station infrastructure improvements for upcoming TOD opportunities.
- **Landowners Group:** Metrolinx remains a committed partner and welcomes opportunities to participate with landowners in early 2024 to further understand parkland and servicing implementation strategies in the UGC.