

**Summary of Public Comments Received
since the release of the draft OPA in September 2024**

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
General	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of the direction of this OPA. • Oakville and the GTA require more roads, infrastructure, amenities, and services, rather than additional residential development, especially high density. • Policies propose highly prescriptive numerical standards that are not appropriate within an official plan. 	<p>The Midtown Oakville OPA is needed to provide updated development direction for this area of the Town. The direction responds to residential, non-residential and infrastructure needs of the Town in general and Midtown Oakville specifically.</p> <p>While Official Plans are policy documents from which more prescriptive requirements and standards are provided in implementing by-laws, it is common to include numerical standards, and in some cases required by the <i>Planning Act</i> and the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024.</p>
Consistency with Provincial Interests and Provincial Planning Statement (PPS)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies are dismissive of the growth aspirations of the Provincial Planning Statement, particularly the Ministry of Finance population and employment forecast for Halton Region. • OPA fails to recognize importance of Midtown Oakville in making a significant contribution to resolving the ongoing housing crisis. • Densities should be increased to promote land uses and built forms that allow for appropriate growth and intensification that will achieve the minimum densities and nature of development for a PMTSA contemplated by the Provincial Planning Statement. 	<p>Alignment with Provincial and Regional legislation and policy and response to housing crisis is detailed in the October 29, 2024 Special Council meeting staff report.</p> <p>Alignment with Ministry of Infrastructure transit oriented communities objectives is detailed in the January 20, 2025 Planning</p>

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chartwell Precinct policies should be revised to prioritize higher-intensity residential development to support Midtown Oakville's housing and urban growth goals. • Better alignment of Midtown policies with the province's TOC program is needed with a greater reflection of heights appropriate for a Transit-Oriented Community. 	<p>and Development Council meeting staff report.</p>
<p>Population Forecasts and Growth Targets</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum FSI should be set with the use of the Watson forecast for 29,900 residents and jobs in Midtown by 2051. 	<p>The January 20, 2025 Planning and Development Council meeting staff report explains the purpose of the Watson 2051 Forecast.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implore the Town to consider the Joint Best Planning Estimates when determining development potential of Midtown Oakville. 	<p>The Watson Report explains why an updated forecast from the JBPE is needed</p>
<p>Density and Height (too much)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much density can be harmful. • Tall buildings (i.e. 45 storeys) do not make for a livable Oakville. • Staff and developers continue to push high-rise condominiums for Midtown in spite of recent downward trends in the condo market and increased liquidation of condo projects across the GTA. • Development in the area makes sense given the transit proximity but lower density (6-8 storeys max) makes much more sense. 	<p>The October 29, 2024 Special Council meeting staff report and the January 20, 2025 Planning and Development Council meeting staff report provide the rationale for proposed minimum and maximum density of development, and proposed height thresholds.</p> <p>A market feasibility analysis was prepared by NBLC that provides an overview of trends and makes recommendations for the OPA.</p>

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise policies to acknowledge that minimum heights do not apply to additions, alterations and/or replacement of existing uses. 	<p>Policy 20.5.1 (f)(iii) has been revised to exempt additions, alteration or replacement of existing buildings from the minimum height requirement, subject to not precluding the longterm redevelopment of Midtown.</p>
<p>Density and Height (not enough)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed density permissions do not take full advantage of Midtown's strategic Major Transit Station Area location and its proximity to Highway 403. • Proposed densities do not capture the levels of growth, transit-oriented nature, and minimum densities required for a successful PMTSA. • Density around transit hubs is desirable and we have spent 9 years developing a good plan with abundant public input. • Proposed density regulations could significantly limit the area's capacity to provide a variety of housing options. • OPA limits, without justification, the number of units that can be constructed in Midtown which will contribute to the outmigration of young adults and empty-nesters from Oakville. • Implement a minimum 10 FSI for the entirety of Midtown. 	<p>The October 29, 2024 Special Council meeting staff report and the January 20, 2025 Planning and Development Council meeting staff report provide the rationale for proposed minimum and maximum density of development, and proposed height thresholds.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed density and height permissions constitute a down-designation of existing permissions on some lands within Midtown. • Previous OPA drafts proposed higher density and building height permissions than the current proposed OPA. 	<p>Staff have reviewed all existing height and density permissions for the area to ensure that permissions are the same as or greater than current permissions for this area.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft OPA unjustifiably lowers building heights to extract community benefits, undermining good planning and should be revised to restore taller buildings. 	<p>The OPA applies current (or taller) building height thresholds than what is now in the</p>

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider elimination of prescribed height thresholds and density maximums to allow for the optimization of the land adjacent to the existing GO Station and future transit infrastructure. 	<p>Livable Oakville Plan for Midtown. The OPA carries forward the past practice of height and density bonuses using the Community Planning Permit System.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed OPA will result in many site-specific OPAs and ZBAs and OLT appeals because the area is not planned appropriately. 	<p>As a Protected Major Transit Station Area, once policies and schedules are approved by the Minister, refusal or a non-decision pertaining to certain private application matters are not subject to appeal.</p>
<p>Building Height Threshold</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bonusing provision allows for no additional floor space to offset the cost of the community benefits because the maximum FSI is fixed. A landowner can simply obtain the same floor area for their proposed development under the threshold with a different building configuration. Building above the threshold simply results in more expensive housing. 	<p>The policy framework of the OPA includes maximum densities and threshold building height. This transparent policy framework followed by the implementing Community Planning Permit By-law is intended to inform future land transactions and temper land speculation. Furthermore, the policy framework is provides the flexibility for the land owner to choose to develop above or at/below the height threshold.</p>
<p>Bonusing</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frustrated that all versions of the proposed OPAs removed bonusing policies which allowed increases in building height in exchange for the provision of public benefits. Removal of bonusing policies, in combination with density and height maximums, restrict potential of this SGA and infringe upon non-negotiable growth targets. Return bonusing provisions. 	<p>The current Official Plan bonusing provisions were authorized by section 37 of the <i>Planning Act</i> have been repealed. Consequently, the Official Plan is being updated and the OPA is applying the Community Planning Permit System,</p>

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
	<p>which permits the provision of specified facilities, services and matters in exchange for a specified height or density in a more transparent manner.</p>
<p>Urban Design and Built Form Policies</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defer to urban design guidelines instead of incorporating regulatory measurements in a policy document. • Zoning By-laws are the more appropriate tool to regulate height, bulk, location, size, floor area, spacing, character and use. • The 35-metre tower separation above the 25th storey is excessive and unnecessary given the existing 30-metre requirement below the 25th storey. • A 35-metre tower separation is unreasonable when tower floor plates may be constrained to ~800 square metres. Reduced shadowing, an attractive public realm and wind mitigation can still be achieved with a reduced tower separation. • Consider reducing the minimum tower separation distance to 25 metres, a standard already applied to tall buildings in other transit nodes within the GTHA. • Support the flexibility provided by not prescribing tower floor plate sizes. • Ensure that proposed buildings do not cast unwanted shadows on the neighbourhood north of the QEW. 	<p>Urban Design and Built Form policies will be implemented through new (updated) Urban Design Guidelines and the Community Planning Permit By-law. The CPP by-law will identify standards and provide criteria for variations to them. The by-law and approval of development permit applications will be informed by the design guidelines.</p> <p>The October 29, 2024 Special Council meeting staff report provides information regarding tower separation, tower floor plate, and shadow impact.</p> <p>During the November 27, 2024 Open House, staff provided a 3D virtual model of a conceptual build out of Midtown. This modelling included a demonstration of shadows that could be cast on adjacent lands. The model showed that the casting of shadows from tall buildings in Midtown onto lands north of the QEW would occur in the early morning during the spring and fall equinoxes, with smaller shadows occurring in the summer months.</p>

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
Unit Type / Size	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 35% of units should be 2 or more bedrooms. 	<p>The October 29, 2024 Special Council meeting staff report and the January 20, 2025 Planning and Development Council meeting staff report provide the rationale for proposed policy.</p>
Transportation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic is already busy during peak times and excessive development without the required supporting infrastructure will make congestion worse. • Ensure that there are good connections with areas north and south of Midtown. • Create more choices for mobility by linking people and places with a transportation system that includes workable roads and a sustainable financial plan. • Transportation schedule/plan does not provide separation of vehicles, pedestrians and bikes in key approaches to the west and south of Midtown boundaries. • Vision for Midtown as an urban community where residents do not own cars is not reflective of reality. Ensuring that future developments incorporate appropriate amounts of parking is an issue that needs to be addressed. • Prioritizing public transit over personal vehicles is essential for Midtown Oakville’s transportation strategy. • Where there are no parking minimums, there needs to be sufficient transit infrastructure and service nearby as well as shared parking facilities for visitors. 	<p>The October 29, 2024 Special Council meeting staff report and the January 20, 2025 Planning and Development Council meeting staff report provide the rationale for proposed transportation policies and schedules. As noted in the reports, the phasing policies as well as Town master and capital planning processes are intended to work together to ensure that infrastructure is provided in lockstep with new development.</p>
Future Road Alignments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various landowners have requested that the proposed alignments of future local roads on the Midtown schedules be revised to avoid their lands. 	<p>Through the ongoing Midtown Transportation Plan, and in consultation</p>

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
	with landowners, more precise road alignments will be determined.
Parks	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various landowners have requested that the Parks (Conceptual) overlay shown on the Midtown schedules be removed from their lands. • Pleased with the revised distribution and reconfiguration of parkland in the latest OPA. • Parks must be a priority for Midtown and provision of parks must coincide with the phasing of Midtown. However, this could be difficult due to the limited availability of affordable land for parks in Midtown. • Dense urban centres with insufficient play space and community centres will have an adverse impact on the mental well-being of children in these areas. 	<p>The October 29, 2024 Special Council meeting staff report and the January 20, 2025 Planning and Development Council meeting staff report provide the rationale for proposed parkland policies and schedules, and manner of their acquisition.</p>
Schools	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School construction needs to coincide with development, not built AFTER significant development occurs. • A lack of places to play, exercise or even walk safely to school is not the future I want for my children. 	<p>Policies in the OPA, including Policy 20.4.2 (b) provide guidance regarding the provision of schools in Midtown.</p>
Non-Residential Floor Area Requirement	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the reduction of the non-residential GFA requirement from 18% to 12%. • The 12% non-residential space requirement is too prescriptive and too high given low demand for office uses, risking development viability and hindering Midtown Oakville’s growth. • Instead of a percentage requirement for non-residential uses, policies should simply state the intent for retail and commercial uses. 	<p>The October 29, 2024 Special Council meeting staff report and the January 20, 2025 Planning and Development Council meeting staff report provide the rationale for proposed non-residential floor area requirement policies of the OPA.</p>

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that ground floor non-residential space be required on specific streets and additional non-residential space be bonused through a 1-to-2 ratio of non-residential to residential floor area above the maximum FSI requirement. • Many of the condo developments already across the town only seem to attract nail salons, barber shops, small convenience stores which is not an approach to build a thriving community. Space sufficient for grocery stores, schools, and other larger retailers, corporate offices, restaurants helps to enable a community to develop and thrive. • Concerned about the possible displacement of existing commercial service center uses and other amenities already well-used within Midtown. • Policies do not permit existing retail and commercial uses to continue as interim uses, that could be altered and modified as needed, prior to intensification. 	<p>A new definition for <i>Non-Residential Needs Analysis</i> (NRNA) is provided in the Recommended OPA. Subject to the findings of the NRNA, a reduced minimum GFA may be permitted.</p> <p>Overall, the policies direct that Midtown provide more commercial, office, etc. uses along with the addition of residential development.</p>
Mid-block Connections	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should indicate that mid-block connections within large blocks follow established lot lines or new lot lines for new development. 	<p>Schedule L6: Active Transportation conceptually identifies the location of mid-block connections. Actual connections will be determined through the development approval process and may be informed by Area Design Plans.</p>
Flood Hazard	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulating flood hazards in the draft OPA is premature since Conservation Halton's mapping is not yet finalized. 	<p>The policies provided in the OPA are implementing long established Provincial flood hazard policies, now provided in the Provincial Planning Statement, 2024.</p>

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
Rail	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The required Metrolinx easement is unlawful, granting it undue control over development approvals and should be removed. 	The recommended policy 8.11.6 has been modified.
Requirement vs. Flexibility	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the utilization of 'shall' to ensure that policies are directive but remain flexible to recognize site-specific anomalies. 	Where appropriate, some policies have been modified from “shall” to “should.” Please see Appendix B: Policy Comparison.
Landowner Group / Cost-sharing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with the need to have landowner coordination. Ask for greater flexibility in policies. Policies will delay advancement of lands wishing to develop immediately and delay ultimate funding and construction of the identified facilities needed for a complete community. The requirement for Midtown Oakville landowners to join a cost-sharing landowner group does not align with the respective development timelines of the area's landowners which range from immediate to long-term which limits the effectiveness of a landowners group as an effective cost-sharing tool. Policies do not establish an appropriate framework to facilitate development of lands in the short-term. Policies may prevent an application from being deemed complete. Recommend that it is geographically more logical to establish smaller landowner groups based on precincts or small areas, rather than a single landowner group. 	Section 20.6.4 Landowner Agreements/Cost Sharing is modified. Please see Appendix B which highlights the changes that have been made to this section of the OPA to address the listed concerns.

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertain as to whether any form of landowner agreement or cost-sharing arrangement will still be formalized in light the province’s TOC program. • The timing and phasing of development across such a large area as Midtown with multiple landowners may disproportionately saddle landowners with costs that do not benefit them. • The OPA should not have a requirement for cost-sharing as a condition of proceeding with development. • Policies need to acknowledge existing development approvals and provide the ability for such development to proceed without the need to enter into a cost-sharing agreement. 	
Community Planning Permit System (CPPS) Conditions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CPPS condition policies risk thwarting development, are not reasonable, and defeat the purpose of providing certainty in the development process. • They do comply with the requirements of O. Reg. 173/16. • Policies are confusing when it refers to exceeding the maximum height and/or density thresholds and a subsequent sub-policy states that development shall be lower than the permitted maximum height or density provided in this plan. 	<p>Section 28.15 Community Planning Permit System is modified.</p> <p>Please see Appendix B which highlights the changes that have been made to this section of the OPA to address the listed concerns.</p>
Cost to Tax Payers	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff report does not indicate the total cost for which tax payers will be responsible. 	<p>The October 29, 2024 Special Council meeting staff report and the January 20, 2025 Planning and Development Council meeting staff report, as well as the June 3, 2024 Special Council Meeting Staff Report, and the November 27, 2024 Open House Panels (Number 39) provide</p>

Summarized Comments (grouped by theme)	Town Response
	information regarding cost estimates for public infrastructure in and around Midtown and how they are to be funded.
Exceptions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that approvals granted to properties previously, by way of site-specific exceptions, continue to be permitted within the Midtown OPA policies. 	<p>The January 20, 2025 Planning and Development Council meeting staff report provides information in terms of how these exception policies are integrated within the policies and schedules of the OPA.</p>
Green Building Standards	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement green building standards for Midtown sooner than later. • Require timber construction as preferred building material. • Policies should indicate preference to developments that exceed minimum green building standards. 	<p>The January 20, 2025 Planning and Development Council meeting staff report and the November 27, 2024 Open House Panels (Number 34) provide information in terms of how sustainable development measures are addressed in the OPA and through future Town initiatives.</p>