

APPENDIX C – Public Comments

David Witt – email

I would like to express some concerns with regard to this development application:

- 1) I am concerned about the only entrance being from the south west portion of Victoria St. This means that all the new traffic is funnelled onto the portion of Victoria St. on which I live. While I see that the traffic study did not show a significant impact it is my feeling that while a small number of vehicles are predicted, it will be a significant number, percentage wise, increase. I feel that the traffic will almost double. As I live at the corner of Victoria and Chalmers, I have experienced a significant amount of additional noise from lakeshore road as a result of the newish traffic lights and I now feel that traffic will again increase in front of my house. As it is, I have to be careful exiting my property due to the proximity to the corner and the curvature of the local roads and this additional traffic will only make things worse. I would like to see a similar cul-de-sac or entrance/exit at the other end of the new development as I feel this would be more considerate to all the residents on my portion of Victoria St. Surely, some significant traffic calming measures could be introduced to discourage people from driving through the new development. Since Victoria St. was always planned as a through street, providing though access with traffic calming should be expected by all residents.
- 2) I am concerned about parking for visitors. As it is, most of the houses on Victoria have narrow lots with only a single street parking space in front of the properties. There does not appear to be much additional parking in the new development and with most families owning two cars I see the potential for additional parking to spill onto Victoria St. If the development was opened to Victoria St. at both ends it would provide additional street parking, but with it only open on one end I am worried about additional cars parked on Victoria Street blocking access to current residents.
- 3) During development it is imperative that some sort of by-law be in place to prevent construction traffic from using Victoria St. There are currently two entrances to Cudmores from Lakeshore. These must be used to keep traffic to a minimum on Victoria St and to prevent damage to the street from construction vehicles. Victoria St. is a residential street while Lakeshore Rd is an arterial road design for such traffic. Victoria St. was repaved only a few years ago and I would not like to see my tax dollars wasted due to construction damage.

I would like to be informed of all meetings regarding this development. I live on Victoria St. and feel it affects me greatly but was never made aware of any meetings regarding the site. I saw the previous original development signage go up, only to see it withdrawn. The next time I was aware of the development was this past weekend when I saw the new signage. I think all residents of the neighbouring streets should be aware of what is going on and when meetings are being held. Limiting to houses within only a few hundred meters is not sufficient for such a significant development.

Azra Ross – email through Councillor O'Meara

Hi Sean -

Thanks for getting back to me so quickly! I'll look out for that public hearing date.

Yes, we did of course voice our input for all three events! I'd even been emailing Kurt directly for an update since I believe we missed attending one of the sessions due to prior commitments. I don't recall if I saw you at the last one, but if you were there you must remember me being a voice pushing some of our less than agreeable neighbours to accept this proposal as it was the best to date, and "much better" than the detached unit proposal from way back (the 22 units version I referred to in the last email).

I wanted to make sure I logged my objections and forwarded my questions as soon as possible, so here they are:

- 1) At the meeting, in part to address our original concerns about the **shadowing** and obstruction of the 40'+ monoliths that were initially proposed behind our houses, Kurt "suggested" that the semis proposed at as the border between the townhouses and our single family homes would be more of a gentle transition - we were lead to believe they would be two story semis, maybe only a bit larger than our own homes. **Item 10.3 in the Planning Justification Report** calls out the transition (final paragraph on page 51):

"...semi-detached units have been strategically positioned at the north end to act as a natural extension of the units on Ward Court. The proposed massing and scale of the proposed semi-detached units are intended to mirror that of a single detached dwelling and will result in a building footprint which resembles the same."

I see they've applied again for the 2-story / 10.5m to **3- story / 12m variance**, and pushed them closer than they were before! This is not the transition they suggested, a transition which was part of the reason I petitioned the neighbours to accept this proposal. It looked like they were actually considering our requests!

The proposal also calls for **60' x 40' semis on 1/2 the lot area** of the original zoning for semis (450 m² to 237 m²), with only 8' between houses. One HALF of the semi is larger in terms of square footage than our entire house! (EACH UNIT is 40x30', 2700 sq ft to our 30'x30', 2020 sq ft). This is an insanely large monolith with no reference that I can easily see in town. **Their quote in the Planning Justification Document is a bunch of misleading nonsense, that is exactly what we AGREED to at the meeting, but is NOT CONSISTENT with their submittal, and we are not happy.**

I will speak to the neighbours as well, but we would like to see at least that part of the variance proposal denied, and restricted to 2- stories and 10.5m, and a more reasonable lot area. I realize that the proposed elevations show 36'/11m, which is close to 10.5m, but it's that third story of windows looking down on our property that would make a huge difference.

- 2) A question for you - the arborist's report designates all the trees on the shared property line as privately owned by the landowners, not shared. It also states that it is up to the landowners to determine if this information is correct or should be disputed. They have also proposed the new fence to go on their side of the treeline. I was wondering if we should dispute this, and what would be the pros and cons of doing so? Of course we want to

preserve the summer privacy we get from the trees, and would love them to stay, but being designated as property of the landowners, does that mean we lose rights? Are financially obligated to care for the trees, say, during construction and beyond? Have to negotiate with the corporate landowners? If we don't claim them, could we risk losing them if the developer finds them to be obstructive? Your advice is greatly appreciated!

Thanks for the long ear - other than these points, we have no real concerns with the development and look forward to having this all settled! Looks like it will be a great benefit to the neighbourhood.

Darlene Weiss - email

My name is Darlene Weiss, I own the home on ____ Victoria Street, Oakville. Next door to Cudmores.

Victoria Street is a quiet street, lots of kids playing, everyone is neighbourly.

It is also a dead end street and has been since I moved in 25 years ago.

This plan is ridiculous, especially for anyone living on this Victoria Street. Being the only artery for both entering and exiting the new potential development is very unfair to say the least. It will ruin our neighbourhood.

I was told they didn't want to ruin the canopy on the Lakeshore. There are options, West Street as another artery, Lakeshore as it currently has TWO entrance/exits from Cudmores.

I truly hope you consider the effect on my neighbour if this plan of one exit/entrance goes through.

Please take this seriously, everyone on the street is very concerned, I'm sure you would be too, if this was your neighbourhood.

Ted Zahara - email

While attending three public meetings with this developer outlining proposals for building on the subject lands, I endorsed the third option currently being reviewed by the town for approval.

The one objection I have is terminating Victoria Street in a cul-de-sac at West Street. I strongly feel that it would be prudent to continue Victoria Street to end at Mississauga Street to the East.

My rationale stated at the public meetings was that the majority of the new subdivision residents would either have to travel West to Chalmers Street or exit North on Speyside street to Riverview Street to Mississauga Street to eventually travel East .

This would force new traffic on Speyside and Riverview Streets that could be avoided if Victoria was a through Street.

There also is an issue of Safety if Emergency Services needed to access the subdivision from the East.

The current N.I.M.B.Y.'s want a cul -de sac for reduced traffic BUT traffic would still be present on the current Western section of Victoria as vehicles would still have to exit on the West end of Victoria St..to access Chalmers St to get to Lakeshore Road to go East.

It is just common sense to have Victoria Street to be completed as a **Through Street**..

Darlene Weiss - email

I just received notice in the mail about the project. Which I am aware of.

In the memo it states a "proposed condominium road".

Where and what does that mean? I am hoping it will be another artery so not ALL the traffic flows on the quiet street of Victoria.

Please advise and thanks.

Ursula Greer - email

I don't know how much input you have in this case. But I would like you to know that I would like the development to have access from Lakeshore.

Nick and Sandra Aitken - email

Cudmore's Garden Centre

Cudmore's is a thoughtfully-designed and well-maintained property providing a parklike setting to all those passing by. We are disappointed, but not surprised, that the property is to be redeveloped. Our wish is that the final outcome will be a project that is a good fit and an asset to our community west of the river.

We own a home close to the Cudmore property, and have familiarized ourselves with the documents accessible on the Town of Oakville website regarding the proposed development of Cudmore's Garden Centre at 3171 Lakeshore Road West by Vogue Wycliffe (Oakville) Ltd. of Thornhill.

Our opinions regarding this proposal:

We do not believe this proposal is in any way beneficial to us, to our neighbours, or to pedestrian and other traffic moving along this stretch of Lakeshore Hwy West. The surrounding area bounded by Bronte Creek, Lake Ontario, Shell Park and Rebecca St. is zoned low density. We believe no one will benefit by a change to RM zoning, other than the developer.

The surrounding area bounded by Bronte Creek, Lakeshore Hwy West, Shell Park and

Rebecca St. has only detached dwellings. We strongly wish it to remain that way.

We do not see any justification for a change in the current zoning—other than profit.

We believe that, despite the impressive traffic study, that there will be considerable impact on the existing calm enjoyed by residents and pedestrians in the immediate neighbourhood—specifically Chalmers St, Victoria St, Speyside Dr and Riverview St.

We believe that an unfair and possibly dangerous burden will be put on the families living on the adjacent section of Victoria St. by the addition of 35 families using the same section of road. To us, the completion of Victoria St is a logical and safer option since it provides two means of egress and ingress as shown in the current town plan.

The single access looks to us as a poorly conceived, congested and potentially hazardous (for emergency vehicles) solution.

The documents did not include a drawing depicting the Lakeshore Hwy elevation. The site plan does show three buildings with nearly identical setbacks for all dwellings. Surely we can expect a more sensitive solution to what is aesthetically the most important aspect of the project from a neighbourhood point of view.

Conclusion:

We do not believe the current offering by this developer is in any way a good fit or an asset to our area.

We believe a change in zoning should only be granted if it improves or enhances a neighbourhood, not simply because it maximizes the returns for developers.

Stuart Ellis – email

It has come to my attention that the proposed development on the Cudmore Property, 3171 Lakeshore Road West will result in all traffic from said development using Victoria and Speyside to access Chalmers, Lakeshore and Bronte Road.

The letter sent earlier this month seemed to indicate there would only be 5 properties accessing Victoria and Speyside. Apparently this is not the case, and in reality we are looking at 100 parking spaces resulting in 100 cars entering and exiting via Victoria and Speyside. This volume of vehicles will negatively impact the immediate neighbourhoods of Victoria and Speyside.

I would like to indicate our extreme opposition to this plan as this would dramatically change the environment of our community.

It would seem obvious that access to the new development via Lakeshore would be more direct for the residence and less intrusive on the surrounding neighbourhoods. Extending the road travelling through the development west, turning right on to Lakeshore would not impact the number of units in the development or impact any existing residence on the surrounding streets.

I would like to know if there is any further action we can take, or opportunity to discuss this action further and hopefully find a mutually positive solution.

I look forward to hearing back from you on this issue as soon as possible.

Rob Hall and Gail K. - email

As occupants and owners of a home on Speyside Drive we have concerns regarding the proposed development of a subdivision on the Cudmore Nursery property.

- 1) In your Notice of Complete Application for the proposed plan of this subdivision it did not seem very clear to us which street (s) this development will access to and from. You mention "5 units will have access from the proposed extension of Victoria, terminating in a cul-de-sac, with the 30 remaining units having access from a proposed condominium road". Thank you for your phone call back to me clarifying this. We are now aware that all traffic from the 35-unit residential development will be exiting westbound onto Victoria Street in the most recent proposal.

We have talked to a number of neighbours all of whom have been confused by the error. Most are thinking that there are only 5 homes that would be able to go west on Victoria, and not 35. Everyone thinks there is another exit going West or that it's going to exit on Lakeshore just like the Cudmore property presently does. You should definitely send another letter out, to all residents on Speyside, Victoria, Willard, Ulman, Riverview and Chalmers. You should spell it out so there is no misunderstanding. Be upfront and let the neighbourhood know that the plan is for :

- 1) 35 units,
- 2) 100 parking spaces, so I assume 100 cars!!!
- 3) High Density housing in a low density area, on the Cudmore property,
- 4) and that the plan is to have them all exit west, ONE EXIT ONLY FOR ALL 35 UNITS, all pushing WEST AND NORTH TO GET TO THE QEW through these narrow streets that we live on.

- 2) Now that we know that the plan is to extend Victoria Street calling it a "cul de sac" and then to have a sealed oval "condominium road" with all traffic from the 35 units being pushed out going west on to Victoria Street, we have grave concerns about this. I have lived on Speyside Drive for 35 years. It is a nice, peaceful street that for the most part you drive on only if you live on it. There is a mix of seniors, and young families with young children and pets. The 35 proposed units are most likely going to have at least 2 cars per household, (parking for 100) which means another 100 vehicles will be driving up Speyside Drive or driving westbound on Victoria Street and rolling up Chalmers to get to Mississauga Street, then to Rebecca Street and then ultimately to Bronte Road or Burloak Drive to get to the QEW.

- 3) In our opinion this plan does not take into account the impact this traffic will have on this pleasant, peaceful, low traffic community. In whose interest is this proposed development? Certainly it is not in the best interest of anyone who lives in our neighbourhood. The developer, however, stands to benefit immensely, as it is in their benefit to pack as many properties as possible into that small parcel of land. This neighbourhood is presently low density, single detached housing. Why is it even being considered that townhouse, and semi-detached dwellings can enter into this equation? I'm thinking it's all about money. This

proposed plan should still be for single family dwellings exiting onto Lakeshore Road. Put the traffic out onto the main arteries more directly and not through quiet residential streets.

An even better alternative would be to designate Cudmore lands as a Heritage site, it's being there well over 100 years. Buy the land and turn it into a community park, something the community would benefit from.

- 4) It is also of concern that the Developer was consigned to submit a traffic flow study/survey to support their plans. The developer, who has everything to gain from getting this successfully passed should be the last person to be submitting a positive traffic flow study. Who does the proposed exit from the new residential development benefit? Certainly not the existing residents of our area, but the Developer has everything to gain. The Town of Oakville should be taking care of their long-term taxpayers and residents, and required traffic flow /impact studies should be completed independently by the Town.

Why were local residents, our neighbours, not consulted in this so -called traffic study /why not a survey? The key here is that if someone has a big self interest you shouldn't get them to provide you with a traffic flow study that will influence your decision. Ask the people in the area if they agree with 35 units being built, and then exiting westbound only on Victoria Street. Ask them to comment on how this change will affect their quality of life in their neighbourhood. This needs to include all residents on Victoria, Chalmers, Speyside, Ulman, Riverview and Mississauga Streets. We will not benefit from the increased traffic flow. We do not want the noise, pollution and potential for accidents in our neighbourhood of young families with children and seniors.

Please remember the people of this area were here long before the Developer, and should and must be given first consideration.

Tony and Wendy Vassallo.- email

I would like to formally object to the proposed site access of this subdivision.

We are resident owners of a home on Speyside Drive. It is my understanding that there will only be one access to the project. This will be on the west side of Victoria Street. This proposal will increase the amount of traffic on Speyside Dr and Riverview St. considerably. I attended the meeting held for the community and voiced my concerns but was basically brushed off with the representative stating its only 35 units it won't increase the traffic that much. I disagree. Considering that most households today have at least 2 cars and some households more than 2 as adult children are living with parents for longer than in the past, I feel there is the potential for substantial increases traffic on Speyside Dr and Riverview Street. Most cars heading north will undoubtedly turn right on Speyside and right onto Riverview to access Mississauga St. I have lived on Speyside for 30+ years and have already noticed an increase in traffic over the last few years. When my children were growing up there was a street hockey game every day as all the children on the street would join in to play. The occasion to call "car" was limited and usually only from cars returning to the immediate neighborhood. While most the the children who played street hockey have grown up and moved away, there are younger families moving into the neighborhood replacing some of the older seniors who have passed on or moved to other locations. It would be a pity if these children do not have the same opportunities our children did to enjoy outdoor play without having to worry about cars speeding off to work or wherever.

The project will likely proceed, which I am not against but would like to see both ends of Victoria opened to accommodate the cars exit from this project. It would at least cut the amount of potential cars travelling up and down Riverview and Speyside Dr.

Thank you for your time.

Rob & Lynn Buchelt – email

I would like to initially express my concerns regarding the current proposal for the Cudmore property.

A letter was sent from the town regarding plan and zoning bylaw amendments dated October 8. The explanation given with regards to access for the proposed 35 unit development indicates five units to have access from the proposed extension of Victoria Street terminating in a cul-de-sac with the 30 remaining units having access from a proposed condominium Road. This is very ambiguous and when you do some research you realize that the condominium proposed road that is mentioned, essentially funnels into the cul-de-sac.

This in essence routes all the traffic from this development to exit via Victoria Street. 35 units with potentially 100 parking spots and all this traffic will come out via the cul-de-sac. I live on Speyside Dr which connects off of Victoria St. South. It doesn't take much imagination to forecast that the majority of the traffic will most likely exit on to our street to make its way to the QEW. Our quiet neighborhood street - which in fact is much narrower than a "regular" street, does not need this kind of traffic.

Most of the residents have lived here some from onset with a mix of retirees and new families and we picked this location because of its quiet nature.

I myself moved from a neighbourhood where the small bungalow's that were built in the 50s were all being torn down to developers and oversized, overpriced new houses were built. I moved because of that reason, to specifically this neighbourhood where it appeared that the tear down & over build process wouldn't happen.

So now this proposal turns our quiet neighbourhood, where kid's actually are out playing on the streets, into a freeway. A causeway for 35 oversized buildings which will also change the overall nature of this community.

What happened to this Town that wasn't going to become an overgrown city?!!
What happens in this development when there is a potential hazard (fire ambulance etc) and there is only one way in & out of this development? How is that safe planning?

On top of all of this you are taking a plot of land zoned for I believe 21 single-family homes and stuffing in a total of 35 units (oversized!) an increase of over 50%!
The plan and all of the information that is available to see is extremely difficult to understand and decipher.

How does the developer get to choose his own traffic impact study?
Not only is Speyside Dr a narrow street but so is Victoria St., Willard St. and Ullman Road. Again making more traffic unwanted.

I've been a Tax payer in Oakville for quite some time, it would seem only fair that we get some consideration rather than these developers for a change. Or is that too much to ask?!

Leslie and Dave Coules - email

My husband and I are the owners and occupants of a home at ____ Speyside Drive and we have grave concerns regarding the proposed development on the Cudmore Nursery property.

We are the original owners of our home and have lived on Speyside Drive for the last 36 years. We bought our home because it was in a beautiful residential area where we knew families could raise their children in a quiet, safe neighbourhood without fear of excessive traffic using our road. The only traffic we have is that of the people who currently live on our street.

We have become aware of the proposed **Cudmore development of 35 units** that will have **only 1 entry** exiting westbound onto Victoria Street (as stated in the most recent proposal)!!

We were under the belief that only 5 homes would be able to go west on Victoria to Speyside and Chalmers Streets and the remaining 30 having access to another exit. We and our neighbours in the area were under the impression that there was to be another exit onto Lakeshore Road , where the current Cudmore property presently does, and not just one exit onto Victoria Street. This means that if there are 35 units there will be at least 70 cars coming and going from the one Victoria Street entrance. If the plan is to have them all enter and exit west that means **70 cars** will be pushing West and North to get to the QEW through our narrow streets daily. That means Speyside Drive will be heavily travelled daily and this volume **does not include the current homeowners** and their vehicles which will only add to the congestion, noise and danger on our quiet street.

The other issue we have is regarding the proposed **35 high density units in a low density area** on the current Cudmore property. The area is currently low density single family houses. Why are townhouses and semi-detached units even being considered???? The proposal should be single family units facing onto Lakeshore Road. This also reduces density but puts the traffic onto the main arterial roads directly and not onto small residential streets.

Why were we, the area residents, not consulted on the traffic flow study/survey done by the Developer???? The Town of Oakville should be taking care of their long term taxpayers and residents and be transparent with the people who live in the area, not a Developer who has a big financial self interest in the project. We have not been asked to comment by survey or direct notification on these changes by the Developer, shouldn't we be consulted? You need to ask the areas resident to comment on how this proposal, both traffic, noise, pollution and housing density, will affect their and our quality of life in this neighbourhood.

Would it not be a better alternative to designate the Cudmore lands as a Heritage site and buy the land and turn it into a community park??

Please remember that this neighbourhood of young families, children, grandchildren and seniors were here long before the Developer and we should be given first consideration to what happens to our community. We live here.

Thank you for reviewing our concerns and we look forward to further dialogue on this matter before shovels hit the ground.

The Residents of Ward Court - email

Dear Mr. Thun -

Thank you for meeting with the residents of Ward Court in early October. We would like to summarize our concise and unified list of concerns, for attachment to the application.

1. The preservation and protection of the treeline is of primary importance. As the trees were originally planted as boundary trees, though perhaps not exactly on the property line as per the applicant's Arborist's report, they were certainly intended as such and we, as a group, would like to request that they be treated as boundary trees and therefore protected as per section 7 of Appendix C of By-Law 2017-038.
2. The proposed zoning amendments to RL8, we feel, would allow for homes that are out of character with our neighbourhood and community. Though there is no amendment requested to the setbacks, the amendments to number of stories, height, lot and floor areas will create homes that are not consistent with the current zone's semi-detached provisions.
3. We are particularly concerned with the applicants request for three story homes backing onto our properties. Their construction on our rear lot lines is intrusive in comparison to our surrounding site lines, not to mention the negative impact such structures would have on our privacy and the overall enjoyment of our properties.
4. We would ask that the fence separating the properties on Ward Court and the new development be 2.5m in height.
5. Finally, we would like to note that the application is not at all consistent with what the developer's representatives presented to the residents during the Community Consultation Process. We feel that the meetings were very much misrepresented in the Planning Justification Document, which is disheartening, and appears to be deceptive. As a further example, Tables 3 and 4 in the Planning Document (page 38) appears to deliberately leave out the Proposed values which deviate the most from current zoning.

As members of the Oakville community we recognize the need for growth and the challenges future planning entails. Nevertheless, we endorse the growth plan established several years ago by the town of Oakville but creating exemptions to existing by-laws as this proposal wishes to do, is not in keeping with that plan.

Thank your you time, and please keep us informed as this review progresses.