



July 7, 2025

Re: Midtown Oakville / Preparing the Community Planning Permit By-law

Key Directions Report

Below are some comments by a TCRA Board Member on a small number of issues in the Report:

1. Questionnaire Responses to Question 1

Page 96 of the Report –

Questionnaire Responses to Question 1 - They reflect the same views that we (TCRA) expressed – residents' voices are critical, and that we're not qualified legal or planning experts.

Answer: The open house info and this survey require extensive legal and planning study for a considered response.

Answer: Midtown will have a significant impact on current residents and their voice is critical for all development.

We note that 65% of responses came from postal code L6J.

2. Table 18 - Summary

Page 47 of the Report

This table compares Benefit Calculation Provisions in neighbouring municipalities (Burlington, Guelph, Waterloo, Brampton).

We reviewed the CPPS By-laws/proposed by-laws for each of these municipalities.

Burlington and Guelph have dollar amounts attached to affordable housing units – contributions / purchase price - which is very helpful and easy to understand. In contrast, Brampton calculations are not contained in the by-law. They have a broad statement (The City may consider the exchange of height and/or density for the provision of facilities, services and any other matters in accordance with the Downtown Brampton Secondary Plan and Planning Act requirements).

3. Sustainable Development

Page 24 of the Report

Discretionary Measures – EV charging facilities

Why is this discretionary when the proposal is for future development (2031 to 2051)?

4. Community Developments

See pages 49/51

What is covered under the CPPS and what is not? And who pays for what?

Can Town staff clearly identify community benefits - **intended for broad public use**. For example, a new library facility that may not be viable or operational without major Town investment and Town staffing, I presume is not covered under the CPPS, as opposed to “in kind” benefits such as “green” (sustainable) building elements and affordable housing units which are.

But regarding *future pedestrian bridges*, on page 49 it states - *Similarly, Schedule L6 regarding active transportation identifies future pedestrian bridges. For sites where these bridges are proposed to be provided, **the construction of the bridge would be a priority community benefit that could be exchanged for additional building height.***

In contrast, on page 50/51, again referring to a pedestrian bridge it states - *for matters such as **pedestrian bridges**, transit infrastructure, and natural heritage restoration and enhancement, **those may be funded through the townwide development charge.***

Is a future pedestrian bridge considered a community benefit - **intended for broad public use**, and treated the same as a library? Or ???

In some cases, are development charges going to be replaced with CPPS - exchanged for additional building height, rather than charges?

Additional comments

Burlington Proposed CPPS - 1.3. Guiding Principles

On page 2, under *Guiding Principles* it states - *Development will be limited to the capacity and financial capability of the Region of Halton to deliver municipal sewage and water services and the City's financial ability to provide services within the MTSA*

From a cursory review of Oakville's document, we didn't see a similar guiding principle.

Staff don't have to start from scratch or reinvent the wheel. They have several templates/ precedents from neighbouring municipalities available to them. There's an opportunity to take the very best of these documents, and Oakville's document, and create a by-law that's good for all stakeholders.