

Appendix C



SMARTCENTRES®

3200 HIGHWAY 7 | VAUGHAN, ON, CANADA L4K 5Z5
 T 905 326 6400 F 905 326 0783

Minutes of Public Information Meeting

To ensure appropriate consultation was completed prior to the submission of a formal Official Plan Amendment, SmartCentres hosted a Public Information Meeting (PIM) on May 2nd to discuss the proposal with the public. This PIM is in addition to separate meetings held with local residents' groups and stakeholder in the area.

During this session, three development options were presented to the public and inputs on the options, housing types, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, as well as general comments were collected. The three options are appended to these minutes. According to the sign-in record, a total of 182 members of the community were present.

The below table contains the comments as received from attendees of the PIM:

General Comments

<u>Category</u>	<u>Comments</u>
RESIDENTIAL	
All Options	Single dwelling homes instead of townhomes along the berm on the east side. I feel the same way about all the options. We need more commercial, not less and we don't need any more townhouses and apartments. I would prefer the mall's parts to be connected, enclosed. NO units should be higher than 4-stories, as higher density would drastically change the neighbourhood and create traffic jams connecting road. 3 storey townhomes on eastern line too dense – unacceptable. Single family homes 2 storey max is acceptable.
Option 1	3 storey townhomes on eastern line too dense – unacceptable. Single family homes 2 storey max is acceptable. NO access through the Stanbury Road cul-de-sac. Not acceptable It is acceptable It's acceptable 4 stories max for the senior's residence. 5 to 7 way too tall and should be set back from the street. Op. 1 is much better than in other proposals. This appears to be the most practical of the three as it does not interrupt traffic flow and the new residences aren't too invasive. Connecting road as in Option 1 is much better than in other proposals

Option 2	<p>Potentially acceptable providing that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stanbury Road remains a dead-end road 2. The landscape berm remains in place as is 3. Single dwelling homes instead of Towns to be on the east side along the berm 4. The townhomes do not exceed two-storeys and that they have a traditional design/to be keeping with the neighbourhood. 5. The retirement residence does not exceed 3-4 storeys <p>I like option 2 the best. I am concerned about density, traffic volumes. Already problems with traffic on Rebecca so further congestion is not needed.</p> <p>It's acceptable</p> <p>4 stories max for the senior's residence. 5 to 7 way too tall and should be set back from the street.</p> <p>This one is best for the residents of the new homes but maybe not as good for those visiting the mall/offices.</p> <p>4 stories max for the senior's residence. 5 to 7 way too tall and should be set back from the street.</p>
Option 3	<p>Not acceptable</p> <p>Don't like apartments</p> <p>Not acceptable – Potential traffic issues</p> <p>No apartment – Too high – too dense population. Revera building should be turned around so “curved” back part is turned around to face Rebecca and Street light.</p> <p>No way an 8-storey apartment building belong in this neighbourhood</p> <p>This one is the most ambitious but I don't think it will fly with current residents. We have enough traffic here and adding two multi-level residences would create a horrific traffic problem.</p> <p>No building over 3-storeys – not in line with neighbourhood!</p> <p>Not good for traffic flow</p>
RETIREMENT	
Seniors Apartment	<p>Not sure about more seniors' homes – seem to have a lot already in Oakville</p> <p>Retirement residence is acceptable providing it does not exceed 3-4 storeys</p>
HOUSING TYPES PROPOSED	
General	<p>If they're affordable, then sure, but since this is Oakville, they won't be, and will likely make all nearby residences more expensive. We do need to prioritize senior living with our aging baby boomer population, so I'm not against those types of homes, but I'm not sure this is the right area. I do not think an apartment building is a good idea at all.</p> <p>No apartment building</p> <p>Low-rise, townhouses, etc. all good. 3 storey max.</p> <p>Single dwelling homes are preferred, especially along the east side where they back onto existing homes</p> <p>The design of the homes should be traditional to be in keeping with the neighbourhood</p> <p>Concerns about traffic flow and increased traffic because of increased housing</p>
SHOPPING CENTRE	
Functionality	<p>Please keep some kind of pedestrian mall – AS LONG AS SOMETHING IS DONE TO ALLEVIATE THIRD LINE TRAFFIC.</p> <p>The fact you are going to an open strip mall as opposed to what it is is very disheartening. We've been this route before. We don't have the infrastructure to be dealing with more traffic. Did anyone give any thought to how many seniors and families are in this area that need shopping?</p>

	As a senior I'm not happy about having to go outside to shop.
Bowling Alley	Signage for Bowling Alley on the exterior
	Considerations for accessibility from elevator
TRANSPORTATION	
Site Circulation	I'm unbothered by this position.
	Removing centre part of mall will make accessibility issues for many people walking from one part to the other, especially in bad weather and for our many senior citizens.
	No access through the Stanbury Road cul-de-sac.
Traffic	I am concerned about traffic and transit on Third Line, and the new study at Bronte GO Station, and how this development proposal (increased residential) and changes at Bronte GO (increased residential) will affect traffic.
	What are the plans for expansion at Third Line/ Rebecca?
	Concerns about traffic flow because of increased housing.
MISCELLANEOUS	
General	Get rid of "South Oakville Centre" name and restore "Hopedale" which is the community name, it didn't just originate with the mall back in the day.
	Disappointed that this was not a formal presentation
	Oakville needs more services, not more people. Focus on the commercial/office component and not so much on the residential component.
	We need to know why?
	Need to know –
	1. RioCan – who and need more info
	2. This design is for benefit of the developer.