

Planning and Development Council Meeting
November 23, 2020

Comments Received Regarding Item No. 2
Town-initiated Official Plan Amendment - Hospital District (File No.
42.15.57)

From: [Eldon Theodore](#)
To: [Town Clerk](#)
Cc: [Tony Dableh](#); [Carly Dodds](#)
Subject: Town-initiated Official Plan Amendment - Hospital District (File No. 42.15.57)
Date: November 15, 2020 3:18:49 PM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)
[1572B - Hospital District Study - Oakville Green Developments Inc - November 15, 2020.pdf](#)

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing on behalf of Oakville Green Developments Inc.

Please accept this email as my **formal request to register to speak on the Town-initiated Official Plan Amendment - Hospital District (File No. 42.15.57)**. My intended remarks are included the attached correspondence which also serves s formal comments in writing.

Please advise if there are any questions or if you require anything further.

Thank-you.

ELDON C THEODORE, BES, MUDS, MLAI, MCIP, RPP | Partner | Planner | Urban Designer

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

7050 Weston Road, Suite 230 | Woodbridge | ON | L4L 8G7 | T 905 761 5588 x 213 | F 905 761 5589 | C 416 270 8791 | etheodore@mhbcpplan.com | [@EldonTheodore](#)

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [Linkedin](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)

Email Signature Banner Template - 2015 DRAFT 3



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.

November 15, 2020

Council
c/o the Town Clerk
Town of Oakville,
Clerk's department
1225 Trafalgar Road
Oakville, ON L6H 0H3
TownClerk@oakville.ca

Dear Members of Planning and Development Committee / Council:

**RE: NOVEMBER 23, 2020 STATUTORY PUBLIC MEETING
TOWN-INITIATED OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT – HOSPITAL DISTRICT – FILE NO. 42.15.57
OAKVILLE GREEN DEVELOPMENTS INC.
OUR FILE 1572A**

I am writing on behalf of my client, Oakville Green Developments Inc. ("OGDI"), Owners of the 15.32 ha property located at the northeast corner of Dundas Street West and Third Line, the eastern extent of the Study Area and the subject of an active Draft Plan of Subdivision application. We want to confirm our support for the Town's proposal include the Hospital District as a Growth Area within the Livable Oakville Plan, and to permit a mix of uses beyond employment, including institutional, commercial and residential uses.

Notwithstanding this, we have four concerns related to the process leading up to this Statutory Public Meeting and the current draft Official Plan Amendment ("OPA") that must be addressed. The concerns are as follows:

1. MHBC attended the November 25, 2019 Public Workshop on behalf of a number of clients including OGDI. OGDI also attended this Public Workshop separately and participated at the consultation tables. Following this Public Workshop, and having had time to review and compare the workshop material with the vision for the innovation district envisioned by OGDI, on January 18, 2020, MHBC provided formal comments and requested clarification on a number of items. Those concerns related to the proposed land uses, parks and open space, roads and blocks, building heights and increased densities from the Secondary Plan. In addition, recognizing that OGDI is a large landholder in the study area, in a location of strategic importance with a masterplan vision that is well known to the Town and Region, MHBC requested a separate stakeholder meeting be held with OGDI to discuss the concerns in detail. This submission was made to Kirk Biggar in Town Planning who on January 20, 2020 advised that the Town would be in touch for a meeting (see **Appendix A**). I can confirm that no further outreach was made and no meeting was held between Town Planning staff and/or the Town's outside consultant and OGDI's team leading

up to this Statutory Public Meeting. **Given the importance of the OGD I lands to the study area, we respectfully request the Town meet with MHBC and OGD I to give fair consideration to the concerns raised in our January 18, 2020 submission prior to any further revisions and adoption of the proposed OPA.**

2. During the Public Workshop of November 25, 2019 (and as noted previously) information and options on matters including land uses, parks and open space, roads and blocks, and building heights were shared by the Town and its outside consultant to the public. Feedback were solicited from the community on these various layers of policy change and appeared to be documented as part of the process. In considering the current form of the draft OPA, we do not understand why the Town did not follow up with a subsequent Public Workshop or meeting illustrating a preferred option based on feedback and input received to date. Furthermore, we do not understand why the draft OPA lacks the granular level of detail to which was presented to the public for input at the 2019 Public Workshop. **The Town must explain how comments received from OGD I have been addressed, what decisions were made that let to the current policy approach, and allow an opportunity to provide further input before bringing forward the draft OPA to Planning and Development Committee for consideration.**
3. The draft OPA provides minimum percentages of gross floor area being dedicated to employment in the various sub-districts of the Urban Core designation. The form of employment control was never presented at the Public Worksop, and represents new information that the public have not had the benefit to consider in advance of the draft OPA. Having reviewed all the districts in the Hospital Study Area, the Innovation District which encompasses the entirety of the OGD I lands is given the highest percentage at 65%, whereas all other districts have lesser percentages. If the rationale for this percentage is based on the original vision for the OGD I innovation district, it must be made clear that the previous percentage was based on retaining the employment designation and amplifying jobs so as not to be considered a conversion under the Growth Plan. Given the Regional MCR process and the redesignation to Urban Core, the rationale for this employment control is not longer appropriate. More specifically, OGD I was assured by Town and Regional staff that employment control mechanisms were only necessary until the Municipal Comprehensive Review process and redesignation was completed. In addition, the staff report states that each land use district has a specific employment threshold that must be met before residential uses can be considered. This is an open-ended objective as there is no indication or certainty in the draft OPA, staff report or background studies as to how the Town intends to control this threshold as part of development applications. **The Town needs to provide rationale as to why minimum employment restriction continue to be required for a mixed use designation such as Urban Core, what analysis the Town undertook to land at the differing percentages for each district, why OGD I's lands within the Innovation District must bear the highest restriction, and how the threshold for employment is intended to be controlled.**
4. Section 26.6.2 of the draft OPA provides a site-specific restriction on the Phase 1 portion of the OGD I lands, limiting heights to a maximum of 15 storeys. We object to this policy restrictions for a number of reasons: 1) The policy is redundant as the existing site-specific Zoning By-law already provides this height restriction; 2) Adding this policy will make it difficult to reconsider heights in the future as part of the evolution and build-out of the innovation district; and, 3) It is the only property subjected to a maximum height restriction. **We respectfully request that this policy be removed.**

Given the above, it is our opinion that presenting this draft OPA at the November 23, 2020 Statutory Public Meeting is premature as the evolution of this public process from the November 20, 2019 Public Workshop to this Statutory Public Meeting lacks transparency. At the very least, meaningful consultation must occur with MHBC and OGDl prior to an updated OPA being brought back to Planning and Development Committee.

We reserve the right to modify or provide additional comments following the statutory public meeting.

We look forward to meeting with the Town to work through the details of our concerns and possible solutions.

Yours truly,

MHBC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Theodore', written over a large, loopy oval shape.

Eldon C. Theodore, BES, MUDS, MLAI, MCIP, RPP
Partner | Planner | Urban Designer

cc. *Joseph Dableh, OGDl*
Tony Dableh, OGDl
Carly Dodds, Town of Oakville

APPENDIX A

Eldon Theodore

From: Kirk Biggar <kirk.biggar@oakville.ca>
Sent: January 20, 2020 12:20 PM
To: Eldon Theodore
Cc: ; Tony Dableh; Carly Dodds
Subject: RE: Oakville Hospital Study - Feedback

Hi Eldon,

Thanks very much for the feedback. I have shared it with the study team for review and of course we will be in touch for a meeting.

Sincerely,

Kirk

Kirk Biggar, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner, Policy Planning
Planning Services

Town of Oakville | 905-845-6601, ext.3968 | f: 905-338-4414 | www.oakville.ca

[Complete our Community Development customer service survey](#)

[Canada's Best Place to Live \(MoneySense 2018\)](#)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
<http://www.oakville.ca/privacy.html>

From: Eldon Theodore <etheodore@mhbcplan.com>
Sent: January 18, 2020 11:38 AM
To: Kirk Biggar <kirk.biggar@oakville.ca>
Cc: ; Tony Dableh
Subject: Oakville Hospital Study - Feedback
Importance: High

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Kirk;

I am writing on behalf of my client, Oakville Green Developments Inc., owner of the block at the northeast corner of Dundas Street West and Third Line, relative to the Oakville Hospital Study currently being undertaken by the Town and its outside consultants. Please accept this correspondence as our formal response on behalf of my client to the study to date. We have concerns that the study has not fully considered or advanced the long term vision for our client's holdings, one that was presented in 2015 as part of an original application, and continues to be a vision my client seeks to implement.

Comments relative to information presented to date are as follows:

- 1) Land Use – While the preference would be for land use option 2 as it provides for urban core and urban centre uses which contemplate our client’s vision, clarification on what the permitted uses would be within these zones is needed.
- 2) Parks and Open Space – While our preference would be Option 1, where the POPS is located central to the plan, there are general questions around why this is labelled Parks and Open Space when there are no public parks identified in the study boundary. If the identified POPS are part of the parks and open space vision, and play a function in the green infrastructure of this node, it is only appropriate that they count toward parkland dedication.
- 3) Roads and Blocks – Clarity is required on the status of proposed roads, as there is no indication of what would be public vs. private. Our preference would be that it remain flexible to ensure the best development outcome is not encumbered by this restriction.
- 4) Building Height – While Option 1 would be our preference, we are concerned that this study’s approach on height is limiting; reflecting the as of right height does not represent change or progress from a policy perspective. My client’s vision called for heights in the 30 storey range which based on design principles can be transitioned from sensitive residential areas to the south or east. These heights and densities are also critical to achieve a successful health sciences innovation hub envisioned by the Town and my client. The proposed maximum heights should be increased to achieve this objective.

Given my client’s land holdings represents a quarter of the study area, it would be beneficial to have a separate stakeholder meeting to discuss our concern.

We look forward to hearing back from you on this matter.

Thank-you

ELDON C THEODORE, BES, MUDS, MLAI, MCIP, RPP | Partner | Planner | Urban Designer

MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

7050 Weston Road, Suite 230 | Woodbridge | ON | L4L 8G7 | T 905 761 5588 x 213 | F 905 761 5589 | C 416 270 8791 | etheodore@mhbcplan.com | [@EldonTheodore](https://www.instagram.com/EldonTheodore)

Follow us: [Webpage](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Vimeo](#)



This communication is intended solely for the named addressee(s) and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, protected or otherwise exempt from disclosure. No waiver of confidence, privilege, protection or otherwise is made. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, please advise us immediately and delete this email without reading, copying or forwarding it to anyone.