

Speers Road Corridor Study - Analysis of Comments Received

Comment	Response	Proposed Action
<p>1. Consider a thru access to get from Bridge Road to Speers Road via a pedestrian path or some sort of over walkway (west of Third Line). This would allow many residents to be able to walk/bike to Bronte Go Station without the need to go all the way out to Bronte or Third Line and then back again. As traffic continues to increase as well as the fact Bronte Go Station parking is full at most times of the day now it would be an encouraging effort to promote a Green initiative and walking (year round) to the GO.</p> <p><i>(P. Laurence, Area Resident)</i></p>	<p>Proposed policies which address this comment are included in the proposed amendment including:</p> <p>26.4.4 a) v) Road improvements shall incorporate pedestrian sidewalks and should consider opportunities for pedestrian signals, where appropriate, where limited pedestrian crossings are available.</p> <p>26.4.4 c) v) Development should incorporate improved pedestrian access from Speers Road into the adjacent residential areas where opportunities exist.</p>	<p>No modifications proposed.</p>
<p>2. a) That the Town consider redesignating the subject lands that front onto Speers Road (i.e. 2526, 2530, 2538 Speers Road) to “Business Commercial” to provide for greatest flexibility of uses on the property.</p>	<p>a) A conversion request was submitted on these properties through the Employment and Commercial Land Review. The response to the conversion request was the site is not currently recommended for conversion. However, the mix of uses permitted should be considered through a Speers Road Corridor Study that examines the planned function of the Employment Mixed Use Corridor overlay as identified in the Urban Structure Review.</p> <p>Through the Employment and Commercial Review, the property is proposed to be redesignated from “Office Employment” to “Business Employment” which maintains the lands as part of the contiguous employment area, while also providing for a greater range of permitted employment uses. Furthermore, through the Speers Road Corridor Study, a further expansion of permitted employment uses is also proposed. Staff are of the opinion that with these policy changes, a fulsome and diverse range of employment uses are available on the subject lands.</p>	<p>No modifications proposed.</p>
<p>b) That the Town reconsider the minimum two-storey building height requirement at the time of property redevelopment, on the basis that</p>	<p>b) Given the range of permitted uses that may occupy employment buildings, the range of lot sizes, the range of parking required for different uses, and the inability to</p>	<p>Modify the policy with regard to building height such that it reads:</p>

Comment	Response	Proposed Action
<p>not all future uses/tenants of the subject lands (and elsewhere within the Speers Road Corridor) require two storeys to operate/function. It is anticipated that there would be some difficulty in securing future tenants to occupy a two-storey building format, considering that there has already been some difficulty in securing tenants for the existing single-storey building format on the subject lands. On this basis, the following revision to Section 24.4.4 d) ii) of the Speers Road Corridor Draft OPA is proposed: “A minimum building height of two storeys <u>shall be encouraged</u> at the time of property redevelopment.”</p> <p><i>(MHBC for Speers/Bronte (Oakville) Ltd. - 2526, 2530, 2538 Speers Road, and 549 Bronte Road)</i></p>	<p>equate increased building height with increased employment densities (all businesses have different job needs and space requirements) it may not be feasible nor appropriate to require two storey building heights.</p> <p>Furthermore, staff have contemplated how this would be regulated in the implementing zoning. It may not be appropriate in the zoning by-law to require all buildings to be a minimum of two storeys in height. Even with the draft implementation policies which allow for the consideration for reductions in building heights to one storey [see 26.4.6 b) iii) and iv)], this would likely only be permitted through a zoning by-law amendment. In which case, it may conflict with other policy objectives in the Livable Oakville Plan which do not permit downzoning of properties.</p>	<p>26.4.4 d) ii) A minimum building height of two storeys shall be required shall be encouraged at the time of property redevelopment.</p> <p>Given the modifications to policy 26.4.4 d) ii), the following implementation policies should also be removed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26.4.6 b) iii) • 26.4.6 b) iv)
<p>3. Revisit / revise policy section 26.4.6(b)(ii) to ensure greater clarity suggesting that:</p> <p>a) the use of the auxiliary verb “may” be replaced with “shall”;</p> <p>b) the part which reads “intended to be used [] in conformity with this Plan” be clarified or possibly removed; and,</p> <p>c) the words “this Plan” be replaced by “this Special Policy Area” as the word “Plan” does not appear to be a defined term under section 29.5 of the Official Plan.</p> <p>The policy is noted below with the underlined areas of concern:</p> <p>26.4.6 (b)(ii) The uses and buildings that legally existed <u>prior to the adoption of this Plan</u> may be</p>	<p>This policy reiterates the policies found in section 28.8 of the Livable Oakville Plan in regarding the town’s approach to Legal Non-Conforming Uses, and provide clarity of the town’s current and continued approach for legal non-conforming uses.</p>	<p>Delete the policy in its entirety as it is redundant to existing policies in the Livable Oakville Plan.</p> <p>“The uses and buildings that legally existed prior to the adoption of this Plan may be permitted to continue, however, they are intended to be used and redeveloped in conformity with this Plan.”</p>

	Comment	Response	Proposed Action
	<p>permitted to continue, however, they are <u>intended to be used and redeveloped in conformity with this Plan.</u></p> <p><i>(O'Connor MacLeod Hanna for several property owners)</i></p>		
4.	<p>General comment seeking response: What are the new or different condition that will apply with regard to parking and sharing spaces?</p> <p><i>(A. Valente, 1290 Speers Road)</i></p>	<p>New parking policies are proposed under section 26.4.4 b) in the proposed amendment and include consideration of</p> <p>Shared parking areas between adjacent properties to the satisfaction of the town, which reduce the requirement for individual driveway access, and reduce required parking standards for development that demonstrates, through a transportation demand management plan and implementation strategy, a reduction in parking is appropriate.</p>	No changes proposed.