

Mayor Burton, members of council and town staff. My name is Tom Dugard. Colleen and I moved to [REDACTED] in fall of 1978. We never envisioned living next to a city of residential towers home to some 50,000 folks.

We have read the staff report dated May 21 2024. When we finished reading the report independently our first comment was “so what’s new”? It appeared to us that staff were just feeding the councilors what they thought they and the residents wanted to hear. I am saying staff because that is who signed this report. Perhaps it was more of the consultant’s doing than that of the staff. Admittedly there were a couple of items that were new but the basic theme was the same old same old. In our opinion there was no design thought. Yes, the towers were now shorter and to paraphrase a resident’s comments at the Ward 3 meeting last week It looks as though they took a hedge trimmer and cut all the towers down to 20 storeys maximum. I did notice however that the Home Depot property is now back in play. Did they change their mind about selling?

In paragraph one on page 19 of the report, it states the local roads are not congested. Are they referring to now or 2051? Whoever wrote this must not drive west on Cornwall and north on Trafalgar around 6:00 PM, or drive north on Trafalgar after 3:00PM. If the statement was in reference to what congestion will be like when we have 400,000 population rather than the current 200,000 then this an even more preposterous statement.

In paragraph 3 on page 21 it states there will be a new emergency services station. Is this indicated on appendix B of the report? If not, where is it to be located and why is it mentioned in a Midtown document?

On page 17 there is the reference to proposed Bill 185. While I realize Oakville must adhere to this bill whether it is logical or not. Oakville cannot insist on a minimum number of parking spaces in new builds. Where are the residents of these new towers expected to park? If there will be “parking lots” where are they to be located? Will they park on the street? I assume the mayors of the major cities/towns have complained to the minister/premier for proposing such a restriction?

The Growth Node approach used to determine where growth will occur as outlined in Table 1 is in my opinion the wrong approach to accommodating the mandated growth of our town. We already have 7 growth nodes as represented by our 7 Wards. These fictional Growth Nodes in Table 1 represent only 699.4 gross hectares whereas Oakville has 13,800 gross hectares according to the 2021 Census. The net hectares in Table 1 are 398.4 or 56.9% of the total. Using this ratio there would be 7,582.2 hectares available for development across Oakville. Why restrict the potential growth to 699.4? I do not have nor could I find the gross hectares/square kilometers by ward to further this discussion.

I am sure that some wards are completely built out and they would be exempt from future growth. But if we don't have this information, how can we decide which wards grow and which do not regardless of the Growth Node approach? To my untrained eye these growth nodes make no sense and create discord among the residents and councilors when asking Ward 3 to absorb 1174 persons per net hectare in Midtown. While many of the residents in Ward 3 are against the massive number of folks to be jammed into the 43-hectare Midtown we are also sympathetic to those wards that are already at or close to their maximum density. We are not in favor of dumping our fair share of the mandated growth onto the other wards only sharing equitably. We need to allocate the mandated population first by ward then look at growth nodes within those wards which need to increase their density. In my opinion that would be the fair way to distribute the mandated population growth.