

Our Vision

The Oakville Community

Association wants to contribute to creating an engaged, safe, caring, and vibrant community where all residents enjoy a positive quality of life



**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL
APRIL 22, 2024**

MIDTOWN PROPOSED OFFICAL PLAN AMENDMENT

**THERE ARE TO MANY ISSUES AND DEFICIENCIES FOR
MIDTOWN THAT THE OPA DOES NOT ADDRESS**

MIDTOWN HAS MANY ISSUES

- **Severe traffic congestion, and public transportation deficiencies**
- **High density – greater than Manhattan is possible**
- **Infrastructure Cost (\$280 million ++)**
- **Bad parcel of land with many deficiencies to overcome**
- **Where are the children going to go to school?**
- **Spill Zone issues from the Morrison-Wedgewood Diversion Channel re lack of mapping**
- **Lack of plans for flooding and wastewater**
- **Medical Care – hospital at capacity**
- **Long casting Shadows**
- **Unhappy residents**
- **58 + storey towers do not belong in Oakville**
- **Overall lack of vision**
- **Developer finances and associated bankruptcy risks**
- **Repealing Bill 23 as it does not consider the consequences of developing a particular area**
- **Negative impact on the Oakville-Clarkson Airshed with high carbon footprints with high towers**
- **Halton Regional Official Plan Amendments (ROPA 49) – East part of Midtown is more than 800 metres from the Oakville Go Station, which is inconsistent with ROPA 49**
- **Town Consultants control public meetings and do not listen to the residents**
- **Three alternative plans presented for Midtown appear more fantasy than reality**
- **Will not help with the affordable housing crisis**

OPTIMIZE OR MAXIMIZE?

**Optimize – make the best or most effective use of a situation
– is about return on investment seeking results relative to the
investment required**

**Maximize – make as large or great as possible – is about raw
return, about getting maximum revenues and profits**

REMINDER OPTIMIZATION PREFERRED OVER MAXIMIZATION

OPTIMIZE OR MAXIMIZE?

**Edenshaw Elizabeth Developments Ltd. v. City of Mississauga decision
from the Ontario Land Tribunal**

[100] The Subject Property is underutilized in its current form and given that housing is a Municipal, Provincial and Federal priority, the Tribunal finds that the Subject Property should be intensified. However, the Proposed Development is too ambitious for the Subject Property and the proposal seeks to maximize the site, as opposed to optimize the site. One must look at what is best on a site, not what is the most and, in this case,

RECENT LAND TRIBUNAL DECISION

Edenshaw Elizabeth Developments Ltd. v. City of Mississauga decision from the Ontario Land Tribunal

[109] The Tribunal finds that the Applications seek to maximize the location of the Subject Property but fail to address other important land use planning considerations. This is a case where the Appellant is attempting to maximize, rather than optimize, the Subject Property. The Tribunal agrees with the Appellant that the Subject Property can support a building, this is but one consideration in the assessment of a development application. There are other important factors which must also be considered, including but not limited to, the size of the lot, the existing context of the entire area and the planned context. In this regard, the Proposed Development is too ambitious for the Subject Property.

RECENT LAND TRIBUNAL DECISION

OPTIMIZE OR MAXIMIZE?

Fengate Liuna Gardens Holdings LP v Hamilton (City), 2024 CanLII 33117 (ON LT) dated April 10, 2024

[91] Counsel for the Applicant submitted that the proposal is not an attempt to maximize development of the Subject Property, given revisions which resulted in a reduced unit count. Notwithstanding the reduced unit count, the Tribunal considers the proposal overly ambitious, attempting to maximize, rather than optimize development and introducing too great a change in built form and an inappropriate level of intensification into the heart of Winona North. The result would be an abrupt transformation of this low-rise, low-density suburban neighbourhood into a high-density urban environment with built forms that do not exist in harmony but, rather, compete visually and functionally with the existing built form and character. For this reason, the proposal cannot be considered to be compatible with this particular neighbourhood and is better suited to Node and Corridor areas, which are contemplated to experience greater built form changes and accommodate greater densities.

[92] Based upon the foregoing, the Tribunal finds the proposed planning instruments, and the development they would ultimately permit, are not representative of good planning and do not meet the requisite legislative tests of consistency and conformity.

ORDER

[93] The Tribunal orders that the appeals are dismissed.

THE PROPOSED OPA IS MAXIMIZING RATHER THAN OPTIMIZING Not consistent with the Land Tribunal

45 and 61 Storey Towers Proposed Near Oakville GO – 157 Cross Avenue

Before



After



CARBON FOOTPRINTS

Although some experts have long called for higher buildings to accommodate for population growth in Canadian cities, towering apartment and office buildings aren't the only solutions to increasing density, according to a recent study. Building their counterparts — mid- and low-rise buildings — can help a city grow, while keeping a significant amount of carbon out of the atmosphere.

The taller the building, the more carbon it emits at every stage of its life. A July [study](#) from npj Urban Sustainability found a 140 per cent increase in emissions from a neighbourhood full of skyscrapers compared to an area of low- and mid-rise buildings. The authors found increasing the number of medium-sized buildings could accommodate growing populations more sustainably than cities focused on single-family homes and skyscrapers because they emit less carbon.

Tall buildings have high emissions once they're built due to complex heating and cooling systems and other operations. But they also impact the environment before their lights are even turned on.



- **Negative impact on the Oakville-Clarkson Airshed**
- **Unnecessary increased carbon footprints**
- **Contradictory to the Town's declared climate emergency**
- **Accumulative Air Quality issues with Midtown and the Winston Churchill warehouses**

OAKVILLE-CLARKSON AIRSHED

Figure 1: Map of Oakville-Clarkson Airshed



Mayor Burton at the Standing Committee on Justice Policy on March 19, 2013,

“Air quality was of particular concern in our area because the province had already identified our airshed as a vulnerable, overtaxed airshed. There was no room in our airshed for the amounts of carcinogenic fine particulate matter, or what we call PM2.5, that would be generated by this proposed power plant.”

“Our airshed is overtaxed, as the work of the province itself had shown. So, there was quite a concern. We were very impressed that the government heard that concern and appointed the Balsillie task force to investigate and prove up the facts of the airshed.”

MIRROR MIDTOWN AFTER COPENHAGEN

OCA believes that the density levels being used by Copenhagen across its City should be used for Midtown with a possible maximum building height increased to 8 or 10 stories to add additional density.

OCA believes that Council, the Town's planning department and its development consultants should examine Copenhagen carefully to determine the concepts which could be incorporating into Midtown's development framework in order to make it a truly "Livable Town."



OCA CANNOT SUPPORT THE PROPOSED OPA

- **Will lead to the destruction of the fabric of the Town of Oakville**
- **OCA believes that the density levels being used by Copenhagen across its City should be used for Midtown with a possible maximum building height increased to 8 or 10 stories to add additional density but this is not reflected in the OPA**
- **Negative impact on the Oakville-Clarkson Airshed and unnecessary increased carbon footprints**
- **The Midtown land parcel is unsuitable for a high-density development because it is encumbered by the location of the Ford plant to the north and the proximity of the QEW and the Go Train. This creates a huge requirement for under and overpasses to be built at an initial stage and the resultant high infrastructure costs mentioned earlier.**
- **The Midtown issues which are many have not been adequately addressed in the proposed OPA**

OCA CANNOT SUPPORT THE PROPOSED OPA

TALLEST BUILDINGS IN CANADIAN CITIES

City	Population	Tallest Building in floors
Vancouver	662,248 and 2,642,845 in Greater Vancouver area	63
Victoria, BC	398,000	25
Calgary, AB	1,665,000	58
Edmonton, AB	1,281,073	66
Regina, SK	271,537	25
Saskatoon, SK	290,550	36
Winnipeg, MB	777,436	42
Toronto, ON	2,928,879	72 (CN Tower excluded)
Mississauga, ON	804,872	62
Brampton, ON	707,127	42 pending
Hamilton, ON	565,225	43
Ottawa, ON	1,021,765	45
Montreal, QC	1,800,000	52
Quebec City, QC	851,000	33
Halifax, NS	424,916	34
Oakville, ON	239,987	64 with podium

10 TALLEST BUILDINGS IN ONTARIO

City	Building	Number of Floors
Toronto	CN Tower	147
Toronto	Aura	80
Toronto	First Canadian Place	78
Toronto	Scotia Plaza	68
Toronto	The St. Regis	59
Toronto	88 Scott	58
Niagara Falls	Hilton Niagara Falls Tower 2	58
Toronto	Commerce Court West	57
Toronto	Toronto Dominion Tower	56
Mississauga	Absolute World South	56

It is not reasonable for Oakville to have 58 + storey buildings in Midtown. To put it into perspective, see the table depicts other Canadian Cities with greater population than Oakville, but their tallest building has less floors than what is proposed for Oakville, excluding Toronto. In addition, the other table depicts the ten tallest buildings in Ontario, and it appears that Oakville will be in the top five if the current proposals are allowed.

OCA CANNOT SUPPORT THE PROPOSED OPA because

In the future we do not want to hear the following:

Oakville: The Megacity that no one wanted that Burton Built

**We encourage members of Council to vote no to receiving
the proposed OPA.**



Sincerely,

OCA Board of Directors