

Appendix E – Public Comments

Brian Schiedel

I have been the home owner and resident, along with my family, at [REDACTED], Oakville for the past 19 years.

The following are my concerns with the Zoning By-Law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment as filed by 1463291 Ontario Inc. for the above addresses.

Planning Justification

- The Town of Oakville Official Plan is clear that these properties are subject to a Special Policy Area overlay and are designated as Residential Low Density Lands where densities are not to exceed 10 units per site hectare.
- The proposed development vastly exceeds this maximum density at 56.5 units per hectare in clear conflict with the Livable Oakville Official Plan. This development conflicts with the objectives “maintaining, protecting, and enhancing the character of the existing residential area”.
- **There is no reason to consider changing the Official Plan.**

While I believe that the above is reason enough to turn down the application (why else would we have an official plan), I will offer several other concerns.

Wildlife Protection

- This area is home to 4-6 large hawks, foxes, opossum, deer, coyotes, and numerous other species.
- No studies of what the potential impact(s) of the proposed human density explosion will have on animals that inhabit the neighbourhood, have been submitted by the developer.
- **A wildlife impact study should be required.**

Transportation Impact Report

- The study conducted was only one day and focussed on the three intersections on the south end of the Sixth Line and assumed that only about 20% of the residents would be leaving or coming during peak times, using their cars.
- This low vehicle-use number lacks credibility. It is reasonable to assume that in three bedroom homes, at least one car per unit will be leaving and returning in peak travel times.
- The impact of the increased number of vehicles were not studied nor reported for the other intersections along Leighland Avenue, which will be affected. The four-way stop intersection at Kent Avenue and Leighland Avenue is of note in that it also has a school crossing guard.
- **The traffic study needs to be expanded to include these other intersections, over several days and under various weather conditions.**

Sustainability Concerns

- The noise study comments on the road noise that potential residents will suffer by trying to live in this development. Their recommendation to simply close the windows and turn on the air conditioning is an unacceptable increase in electricity usage, and will result in an unnecessary increase in carbon emissions in the province. New construction should be designed to reduce these harmful effects, not increase them.
- The proposed loss of large old deciduous trees on this site is unacceptable.
- I found the Geotechnical Report difficult to understand, but I believe they are reporting that the ground structure of the site is unsuitable for supporting structures (let alone high density structures) and must be removed and replaced with “engineered fill”. This sounds very un-ecological to me.
- **The environmental impact of the proposal is reason to turn down the application.**

Mario Padoan

To whom it may concern.

I am in opposition to the proposed amendments to the official plan and zoning by-law amendments at 1020 to 1042 Sixth Line. I have attended the meeting at City Hall hosted by the Planning Services Department held on November 29th 2016. I was impressed by the opportunity as resident of Oakville to be able to have a voice and to be able to express to Mr Robert Thun my displeasure for the proposed project. Although I welcome improvements to the neighborhood I have lived in with my family since 1995 and where I have enjoyed the great community that Oakville has afforded me, I am terrified at the prospect of a high density small village being erected at my doorstep. The proposed construction by Dunpar Developments Inc does not reflect the character and flavour of the area I have enjoyed with my family. This conglomeration of structures is not appealing and will affect negatively on my lifestyle.

The increase in traffic will endanger my ability to negotiate safely the 4way stop which is the only way out of Rancliffe Rd. Already in the morning when driving my kids to school I find it difficult to exit the street as commuters in a hurry will not wait for their turn to enter the intersection. This will get worse. Also I object to the mass destruction to wildlife habitat this construction will cause. We cannot afford to lose trees and vegetation in favor of brick and cement. The city was struggling a few years ago with saving The Old Oak Tree, why destroy hundreds of trees for this ugly build?

Also the noise from the newly expanded Queen Elizabeth Way will be intensified by the elimination of the buffer these trees provide to the residents near this proposed development. The noise is already quite intense and affects the enjoyment of my garden area. I cannot sleep at night with open windows and the constant buzz is an irritant one can get used to, but no one can get used to the loss of wildlife and birds visiting our gardens.

Please stop this aberration and preserve the character of my community.

Marilyn Hunter

To Whom It May Concern

After attended the information session that took place at Town Hall on November 29th, I wish to register the following concerns regarding the negative impact this proposed development will have on the unique character of the area, on the people and the environment:

1. Health

- a) The developer proposes to destroy 184 mature, healthy trees, along with countless plants, shrubs and a hedgerow of cedars. This action is highly concerning as those trees and shrubs help to mitigate the effects of CO2 seeping into the area from the backed-up traffic on the nearby highway, as well as from the traffic along the Sixth Line. They provide oxygen, absorb odors and pollutant gases, reduce UV-B exposure and muffle the sound from the QEW. The environmental study conducted on behalf of the developer fails to address the impact the destruction of so many trees will have on the health and well being of the people in the community.
- b) The consultant's report states that the sound levels for all townhouses, both night and day, are expected to exceed the Ministry of the Environment NPC-300 guidelines. The QEW sound barriers will have little effect to reduce noise due in part to the 12 meter height of the units. Since noise levels exceed guidelines, the report indicates that it will be best for the homeowners to close all windows all the time. The report recommends interior material upgrades and a/c units to be running to absorb or offset the sound. The report fails to address the health impact of living in a house ventilated strictly by a/c, with little to no fresh air.

2. Impact on Wildlife

The developer's environmental study did not address the negative impact the clearcutting of trees and shrubs will have on the wildlife in the area. The trees and shrubs provide a canopy and habitat for dozens of different species of animals, birds and insects. Oakville's fox, coyotes, possums and deer have already had significant swatches of their natural habitat destroyed by development. Further encroachment will put many species – particularly birds and insects – at risk.

3. Traffic Congestion and Safety

- a) A one-day study was conducted. The assumption, that only 20% of the new homeowners would be driving during peak traffic times, was offered without any supporting data. It defies logic considering the developer has plans for 189 parking spots. A revised study, conducted over several days, under different weather conditions and at different intersections needs to be conducted.
- b) There's a real risk of cars short-cutting through neighbouring streets of Bomorda and Germorda to avoid what will undoubtedly become a lengthy queue at the stop sign at the intersections of Sixth Line, Rancliffe and Leighland. Bomorda and Germorda do not have side walks. The increased traffic, especially during slippery road conditions, will put the children who walk to school at risk of being struck and injured.
- c) The developer has provided six on-street parking spots on the Sixth Line, which is a major thoroughfare. In addition to posing problems for snow and leaf removal, it is also a safety hazard for cyclists and drivers.

4. The Town of Oakville's Official Plan

The plan clearly states:

- The built form of development—including scale, height, massing, architectural character, and materials—is to be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Development should be compatible with the setbacks, orientation and separation distances within the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Where a development represents a transition between different land use designations or housing forms, a gradation in building height shall be used to achieve a transition in height from adjacent development.
- Where applicable, the proposed lotting pattern of development shall be compatible with the predominant lotting pattern of the surrounding neighbourhood.
- Surface parking shall be minimized on the site.

Presumably the plan was enacted to protect neighbourhoods like ours from overzealous developers. The above-stated zoning by-law amendment contravenes every point. I trust Council will have the resolve to honour the Plan and turn down the developer's request for re-zoning.

In closing, my parents moved to Oakville in 1959. I grew up in this very neighbourhood, moved away and came back to find significant changes; some good – some not so good. For the most part, the development in this area has been in keeping with the characteristics of the community: respecting distances between houses, set-backs, property size and above all else, low density. The proposed development would severely mar the landscape of the neighbourhood. The request for rezoning should be denied. Any development of the subject area should be required to adhere to the Town's Official Plan and maintain the qualities of this neighbourhood.

Mr. and Mrs. Jeremiah

With regard to the above proposal and having attended the meeting at Town Hall on November 29, 2016 my husband and myself would like to "ADAMENTLY OBJECT" to the above proposal. The following are our objections:

1. Changing Residential lands from "Low Density to "Medium Density" and just short of "High Density". The original proposal of 10 dwellings per hectare is NOW 56.5 dwellings per hectare. This is close to 6 times the original number of dwellings proposed originally on the Special Policy Area overlay.
2. These 3 storey plus dormers buildings are NOT in keeping with the unique character of this area of Town due to the special attributes of the large lots with single family homes with bungalows and 2 storey homes and is NOT compatible with the low density housing in the area and keeping with PART D, Section 11.9 in protecting the existing neighbourhood character.
3. We also object to the 6 parking spaces proposed on the west side of the 6th Line, just north of the North Service Road. There have been numerous accidents at this corner, one being fatal. The curve at the bottom of the 6th Line and North Service Road is especially treacherous in wet, snowy and icy conditions where cars take the curve too quickly on the opposite side of the road. With people backing out of these parking spaces there is an accident waiting to happen.
4. We are very concerned with the increase of traffic from the proposed 82 townhouses (add another 164 additional cars, as most households have 2 if not 3 cars per household) and the impact on Bomorda and Germorda Drives. People will soon learn that going on the North Service Road has time constraints as the light at Trafalgar and North Service Road only lets 3 cars at a time through. People will try and take a short cut up our roads to get to Leighland as the 6th Line and Leighland is very busy at any time.
5. As to Oakville being the most livable town in Canada and being concerned with trees being taken down, the proposed removal of 184 trees in the development and projected injury of 29

additional trees also the environmental impact on the area seems contrary to the Town of Oakville Tree Canopy Policy.

We hope the Town of Oakville will take a serious look at this proposal and also take the information people that live in this area and have for 50 years have compiled into consideration when looking at this project.

Brent Janes

Comments against Proposed Development:

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a long time resident of Oakville (17 years at ___ Germorda Drive), I am very upset that the town is considering the proposed development on the bottom of sixth line. I have read all the supporting documents and certainly don't agree with the potential impacts as stated (particularly the traffic impacts).

I moved here a long time ago and spent a fortune (at that time) to move into a single dwelling residential neighbourhood where we could raise our children and live in a manner without worry of traffic and congestion in particular. I am sure my immediate neighbours did the same and continue to do so. This proposed development will make all nearby roads busy thoroughfares with a couple hundred additional cars racing through Germorda and Bomorda Drives trying to beat the traffic congestion at the intersections of Sixth Line and North Service Road and Leighland. The traffic noise from the QEW and Leighland are bad enough now, let alone the safety issue of small children being at stake with a couple hundred cars now constantly racing through our small residential streets. And having another entrance to this development on

Rancliffe is criminal to those residents and their purchases of a quiet lifestyle backing on a greenbelt.

The town of Oakville has spent the last ten years approving variances to homes in our area to allow beautiful two story single family dwellings and attracting more of the same and jacking up all our property taxes (assessments) and reaping the rewards. This proposed development is a slap in the face of us all and must not be approved. This neighbourhood should remain zoned as is. Thank you.

I have also copied this email to Dave Long whom is heading up a more formal protest and also copied Nian (Benny) Liu whom would also like to add his name to this protest (new resident at ___Germorda Drive) and will email separately also.

Don Goldsworthy

I have two concerns about the proposed amendments.

First, in the submission to the Town by Glen Schnarr and Associates, in section 5.1, item 4 reads, "Removal of the Special Policy Overlay." This item could be interpreted as applying to the entire area covered by the Special Policy Area. I discussed this potential confusion with Alyessa Trivelli of Dunpar and she said they intended to refer only to the area being redeveloped and that they would amend the proposal to read, "4. Removal of the Special Policy Overlay for the subject lands only."

Second, I am concerned that this development, as proposed, will not be suitable for most of the people who will live there. The problem is the noise from the QEW. That unsuitability could result in frequent ownership turnover and neglect of buildings and grounds. The development could deteriorate into an area which will need more than an average amount of Town and Region resources to maintain safety and appearance. The current noise problem will be exacerbated when many of the current trees, which cushion noise, are replaced with hard building surfaces which will allow noise to bounce off.

The noise pollution is recognized by the developer, and so, the building construction is designed to ameliorate that problem. Most of those design features are intended to shield residents inside their homes. If the expectation, and rightly so, is that most people will stay indoors to avoid the noise, perhaps the homes should have more inside area. If the current proposed 81 units were reduced, to say 50 units, each having up to 50% more indoor space than the original design, more livable quiet area would be available to the residents. Increasing the height to provide more area is not practical. The proposed units already have four levels and their current proposed height is excessive when compared to the neighbourhood in general.

PETITION:

Robert and K.L. Urquhart, Gloria and Barry Moore, Irene and Robert Mordant, Thelma ledgerwood, Steve Ettinger, Stephanie and Jim Coughlin, Noelia Guarnieri, Ryan and Sonia Elliott, Jerry Kennig, David Long, Deep and Jess Gill, Mark Lee, Bacchiochi, John and S. McGinn, Konstance Alan, Joanne Prins, Phyllis Duncan, Lise Dicarielle, Steven Sharma, Brent and Ann Janes, Lisa and Jason Jacobs, Barry and Judy Carter, Wayne and Pam Jeremiah, M. Padoan, V. Cambone, Arnold and Ira Legzdins, Daniel and Isabella Juricic, Eric Singleton, Fan Fang Sun, Yeng Ganag Tan, Joe Vet, Jon Snelson, havoc Frnaklin,

1 Petition against rezoning of "special policy area"

2016-11-23

File # Z-1516-02

We the undersigned hereby affirm our official opposition to the proposed rezoning of the tract of land bordered by 16 mile creek on the west, Sixth line on the east, QEW on the south and Sunny crest lane on the north in Oakville Ontario, Canada to allow for the construction of 81 Four Storey Town Homes. This area has been designated since 1984 as a "special policy area" which limits the development of this parcel to 10 units per site hectare for environmental reasons and to protect the unique character of this area within the Town. This area has been designated a special policy area by our predecessors and being that this is an environmentally sensitive area should not be subject to over development.

This is the mission statement in the livable Oakville plan: "to enhance the Town's natural, cultural, social and economic environments by ensuring that environmental sustainability, cultural vibrancy, economic prosperity and social well-being are incorporated into growth and development decisions."

Some of the key guiding principles in this policy:

- a) minimize the Town's ecological footprint;
- b) preserve, enhance and protect the Town's environmental resources, natural features and areas, natural heritage systems and waterfronts

We believe that the building of 81 (four story) townhomes would qualify as over development and would not achieve the above goals. By rezoning a 'Special Policy Area' we would also set a precedent from which there is no turning back.

Under the mission statement and guiding principles set out in the "Livable Oakville" document of 2009, Paragraph 2.2.1, 2.2.3, 3.10, 6.9.2, 6.9.9 and 8.16.2 this area is protected from over development.

See attached sheet and reference 227 page document named 'Livable Oakville'.

Bob and Nancy Urquhart

We are opposed to this redevelopment on many levels, the environmental impact is just one. Could you please send a copy of this report

File # Z.15.16.02

If I understand correctly that they have to remove almost 200 Trees.