

Public Meeting Report
Town-initiated Official Plan Amendment – Provincial
Consistency Exercise (File No. 42.15.67)

Submission
Wanda Crichton

Appendix A – item 1.42- Livable Oakville Plan Effect and Duration

- Projected to 2051- too far ahead
- Circumstances change e.g. economy, tariff impacts , immigration levels, unforeseen events like Pandemic, government finances at all levels, climate disasters,, etc.
- Submit should **add a proviso for a mandatory assessment at designated intervals** eg. Every 4 years
- And most importantly: **Mandates looking effects of your current plan** e.g. unintended consequences, is it working, is it still viable in all aspects, does it need amending to respond to changing needs?

Item 3.7 Urban Structure Nodes & Corridors & 3.12 Corridors, Item 4 Managing Growth

- There is flawed logic in only concentrating all intensification in the areas noted
- This is all being supported on a premise that High Level Transit (defined in Glossary as subways, heavy rail, surface rail, commuter rail, light rail and buses with dedicated rights of way) exist
- We have access to Go Transit, but that only helps some residents commute, we will never have a subway or heavy rail, **nothing else as defined exists**
- There is no specific Plan, funding , or timeline for this High Level Transit, and **when it will be built & accessible** to Oakville residents
- Until that is firmed, these levels of density cannot be supported and should not be approved, & not in the SGA's alone

Item 3.7 Nodes & Corridors

- We have seen the debacle of Metrolinx failures in Toronto to launch any transit already, cost and time overruns in Mississauga
- Extensive further “intensification” should only occur at minimum simultaneously with such transit being built (disrupt once, pay once)
- To do so otherwise, makes commuting & traffic already unlivable in SGAs, and you are only making it worse by planning totally in this way
- **There is also no nuance to this plan. Blanket intensification numbers for all areas in an SGA is not logical. Why would you have the same intensification adjacent to existing neighbourhoods, vs. other never populated or strictly business areas ?** Language to support what is appropriate should be embedded.

Item 4 and 4.3

- This is to be a “Livable Oakville” plan, but that would only be for some
- Already we have insufficient schools in SGA’s, greatly diminishing the quality of life for families whose children will never go to school near their homes
- This also adds to the unnecessary traffic, stress on parents, especially if more than 1 school involved, and also long days for children with constant long busing, how is that livable?
- Insufficient green space and recreational facilities in the SGA’s
- Put more of the people where emptier schools and underused parks are, build and zone the “missing middle”

Is this level of Density totally justified?

- This level of density proposed for SGA's may not in fact I submit be entirely required
- The economy is changing due to tariffs,, immigration levels are falling, and will remain lower, etc.
- The building of High level Transit may never occur in foreseeable future
- Federal Govt is projecting highest deficit ever, is looking to cut expenses, so where will this funding come from? The Province has similar financial constraints. There is only 1 taxpayer
- I submit the population forecasts may not consider any of these factors (unless you can disclose that)
- Oakville is already exceeding its housing targets
- Seems Town is proposing excessive density zoning in SGA's, particularly in some inappropriate areas

Data last updated: August 8, 2025

Ontario's housing supply: January – December 2024

| Municipality | Ten-year housing target | Total housing progress since 2022 | Target for 2024 | Total 2024 housing progress | Progress % for 2024 | Housing Target Status |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Oakville | 33000 | 7603 | 2750 | 3679 | 133.78% | Exceeded |
| Oshawa | 23000 | 4063 | 1917 | 949 | 49.50% | Not met |
| Ottawa | 151000 | 28641 | 12583 | 7871 | 62.55% | Not met |
| Peterborough City | 4700 | 1070 | 392 | 294 | 75.00% | Not met |

Items 4 and 4.3 and 10 Sustainability

- Look to Europe..many cities have high density, but not skyscraper vertical warehousing towers for housing... and they all have highly developed transit systems (which Oakville does not)
- This does not address sustainability & climate.... Paving over more and more remaining green space, over-populating certain areas
- Population densities in SGA's of 160 to 200 per hectare are too high, it presumes an environment that does not exist, or may at best be on an undefined time line (Transit)
- All areas should be sharing in some level of intensification, we all pay same tax rate
- While some, like SGA's will have more than others , it should not be just all or none
- greater equity & sharing of intensification should occur

4.0

- Submit this wording be removed, or modified
- “Infrastructure investment shall be cost-effective and co-ordinated to support and facilitate intensification. The Town will consider planning approval, **financial and other incentives** to support the development of intensification areas.
- Other incentives needs definition, or removal. Too Vague.
- I do not want my tax payer dollars to be used to subsidize & support policies that are unfair and negatively target certain existing established neighbourhoods (e.g. Uptown Core). **I submit that this wording be removed, or that policy be applied Town-wide.** It would seem to me that infrastructure investment should be spent where most needed, & all areas of Town would welcome development e.g. Employment lands, etc.

Item 19.1.14 Beltway

- The phrasing “ consideration of surrounding land uses and existing development context” should be removed (from 19.1.14),
- **No area should have a blanket statutory exemption**
- Intensification, particularly for housing, should not rest solely in SGA’s, lots of room elsewhere for the “missing middle”
- **Term “encouraging” outside growth areas is not good enough**
- **Item 25.4.3 object to removal of “minimum growth Plans for Downtown Oakville”**, and similar, and submit that plans for growth should be developed for all areas in Town with specific targets, recognizing there will be differences due to the nature of neighbourhoods & how this may occur

Item 30.20.4 Notice Procedures

- Item a. should read 14 Business Days (not enough time, particularly where a specific delivery must occur, or statutory holidays may be involved)
- Item b. “generally” is too vague.... Be more specific
- **120 Metres is inadequate.** That is less than 400 feet. We are talking massive development e.g. in SGA’s with far-reaching implications to neighbourhoods, yet most would not receive any official notice.
- Public notices defined should include: local e-newsletters e.g. Inside Halton, Oakville News, or equivalent
- New ideas need to be considered:
- Physical notices handed out at transit station hubs, e.g. both GO Stations in sufficient time prior to any statutory meetings across Town, on buses, and available at libraries and community centres

30.4 Notice Procedures

- **Signage also needs to be put where people will actually see it,** not driving by an open space of land that has no sidewalk
- Augment signage by putting it at the nearest public space e.g. school, library, etc.
- Asking residents to look randomly at a website does not cut it.
- The Town can facilitate this by assisting each Councillor having a portal where they can post important notices for their Ward, e-newsletters, etc. rather than a bi-annual newsletter
- Be more pro-active, and make it easier for people to be informed and participate