

## Appendix D

**Paul Barrette**

---

**From:** Susan Johnston & Randy Droniuk [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 16, 2020 8:30 PM  
**To:** Town Clerk; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Hopedale/South Oakville Centre redevelopment proposal

**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.

Well.... As an almost-senior-age resident in the neighbourhood (we live on Tweedsdale Cres.), I am disappointed in the development proposal! I have long felt that the Hopedale site (given the vacancies and the large Target one in particular!) would be a perfect spot for a relatively low-rise condo (maybe with a step-down profile...?) that would appeal to older residents in the neighbourhood like us who might want to downsize to a condo-style living option but stay in the neighbourhood. With its grocery store, drug store, banks, public transit connection etc. a condo with an indoor connection to the mall would be ideal – especially in winter and bad weather at other times of the year too. Such a development would also give the mall owner a good base of regular customers which should make renting the stores easier too.

What is shown in the development proposal seems to throw away that advantage by splitting up the mall into separate pieces that have no indoor link to the residential facility. And an 'institutional' residential facility is of no interest to us. A condo model is better – it wouldn't need to be just for seniors (although Hearthstone-by-the-Lake would be a good model both in terms of independence-with-support-available-if-wanted and a good-looking classic style of building in scale with a residential neighbourhood.) The redevelopment proposal does not attract me (and strikes me as being made by people who don't really understand what aging people from the neighbourhood might want/need!)

Susan Johnston

**Paul Barrette**

---

**From:** P M [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 19, 2020 3:22 PM  
**To:** Paul Barrette  
**Subject:** Re: OPA 1625.01\_1515 and 1521 Rebecca Street\_Ward 2

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.

Hello Paul,

Initial reaction is that the current proposal is better than the 3rd option presented at the SmartCentre Open House on May 2, 2019. That option with a 5-storey apartment building (80-120 units) appears to be off the table. At the time, some of us suspected that this option had only been staged to make the other 2 more palatable.

The current proposal seems closer to the 1st option having about 20 more townhouse units than the 2nd option. A big difference between this proposal and the 3 options presented at the open house is the size of the retirement facility. It was presented as a 5-7 storey structure, significantly smaller than the currently proposed 9-storey building.

I do have a question about the wording in paragraph 3 of the email I received last Friday. Will the 30 assisted living units be part of the 9-storey building? If they will be separate from the 9-storey building that will increase the building density of the proposed development site beyond what we saw at the open house.

Finally, it occurs to me now that there are some good reasons for placing the retirement facility at the northeast corner of the site, opposite the park. 1st, the seniors would have easier access to green space, which they undoubtedly would prefer if given the choice, and 2nd, at least the north side would have a good view. The problem would be with privacy intrusion to the east. Not sure whether the seniors and the eastern neighbours could both be accommodated. Could you comment on that?

Thanks for the opportunity to raise questions about this proposal. By the way, would you happen to have a drawing from Calloway REIT for the proposed development?

Regards,

Peter McMillan

---

**From:** Paul Barrette <paul.barrette@oakville.ca>  
**Sent:** January 18, 2020 7:35 PM  
**To:** P M [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: OPA 1625.01\_1515 and 1521 Rebecca Street\_Ward 2

Hi Peter,

**Paul Barrette**

---

**From:** Georgina Tziougras [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 28, 2020 7:54 PM  
**To:** Paul Barrette  
**Subject:** Objektions

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 attended the meeting at which were presented several plans for development of that part of former Hopedale Mall. Most of us were objecting to suggested density which will increase the traffic in that area more than is good for us, residents. I also object to the height of the 9 story building! Maximum 6 stories was suggested at that meeting! Thank you for "listening" to my suggestions. Georgina Tziougras

Sent from my iPad jirina



February 3, 2020

Mr. Paul Barrette, Senior Planner  
Town of Oakville  
1225 Trafalgar Road  
Oakville, ON L6H 0H3

**Reference Calloway REIT (Hopedale Inc.) - 1515 and 1521 Rebecca Street - OPA 1625.01**

Dear Mr. Barrette,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the above named development application.

Coronation Park Residents Association has several concerns regarding this request.

1. The Livable Oakville Official Plan has identified appropriate locations for intensification and has designated growth areas to accommodate the type of development being proposed. The site at 1515/1521 Rebecca Street is not located in a designated growth area and its mixed use type of development should be focused on lands located within Oakville's Growth Areas and identified corridors.
2. The location of the development site is amidst a land use area designated for Residential Low Density housing. None of the proposed uses outlined in the application are permitted.
3. When considering intensification within stable residential communities, construction projects are to be compatible with the lot area, and lot frontages of the surrounding neighbourhood and the policies of section 11.1.9.
4. As identified above, the site is located in an older stable neighbourhood and as such applications for development are subject to Part D: Land Use Designations and Policies, Section 11.1.9 in Oakville's Official Plan (Livable Oakville). Section 11.1.9 details a number of criteria intended to maintain and protect the existing neighbourhood character. These include the need for built form, including scale, height and massing to be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. While we understand compatible does not mean the same as, it does not mean introducing multi-unit and multi-storey structures that will stand in stark contrast to the surrounding community.
5. While Livable Oakville denotes that Low Density Residential may permit a density of up to 29 dwelling units per site hectare, the actual density of the built form that currently exists is 10 . The proponent's application suggests a density of a minimum 35 units in the townhome block and a minimum density of 60+ in the high density retirement home block. When compared to the "on the ground" surrounding neighbourhood these figures represent increases of 250% and 500%. This is hardly what one would consider modest.
6. Likewise, in general, the surrounding neighbourhoods represent single detached homes of heights ranging from approximately 7m to 9 metres. A dense node of multiple attached townhouses of 12m in height and a retirement home of 9 storeys does not reflect a built form that maintains or preserves the existing neighbourhood character. Indeed, the location of the

retirement home fronting on to Rebecca with a 2.5 metre setback doesn't even reflect consistency with the applicant's other buildings in the remaining commercial area.

7. We note from the documents filed with the application that the applicant is seeking an Official Plan Amendment for the entire site at 1515 and 1521 Rebecca Street - not simply the eastern portion of the lands. The OPA requested would preserve the Community Commercial land use designation and provide special exceptions to permit residential uses in the form of multiple attached dwellings, institution uses in the form of a retirement home, a maximum height of 3-storeys for townhouse dwellings and a maximum height of 9-storeys for the retirement building. We feel this approach is unusual at best. Why would the proponent not divide the land and file an application for subdivision?
8. Likewise, no draft by-laws whatsoever have been provided for the development site. Thus, the application is a request to have Town planning staff and Town Council approve an Official Plan Amendment based on nothing more than a concept. The Planning Justification Report filed uses the following: *'seek approval for an Official Plan Amendment ("OPA") application to create a framework for the vision for the lands'*. With no documented indication of what the final built form will represent in terms of size, height, massing, FAR, appearance, parking, etc. the possibility presents itself that future by-law requests could vary markedly from current descriptions.
9. The site plan reveals that all eastbound traffic from the commercial area on the western portion of the site will be required to exit at the current traffic lights at Rebecca Street immediately opposite Savannah Gate. This means traversing a residential area in order to exit a commercial area.
10. In its Planning Justification Report, the applicant notes *"The proposed OPA will allow for medium density residential and institutional uses to build synergy with abutting lands currently used for commercial, residential, institutional (church), and park uses. The proposed institutional use will also assist the Town in reaching the projected needs of a future aging population."* Unfortunately, in identifying abutting lands, it omitted the low rise Vistamere Retirement Residence with 94 suites offering both retirement living and assisted living.

In summation, this application represents over-development. It proposes built form and density that stand in stark contrast to not only the neighbourhood abutting, but as well, to the entire community of Southwest Oakville. When weighed carefully and judged accordingly there is little to suggest that it will do anything other than result in a mass of tall, closely spaced structures that overwhelm their surroundings. To give credence to such a proposal would not only fly in the face of the protection of older stable neighbourhoods, but indeed set a dangerous precedent that will invite future applications of the same nature. While there is still time, we encourage the applicant to reexamine their directions and revise their application to a design that would be welcomed by all concerned.

Sincerely,

**Pamela Knight**  
President

**Donald Cox**  
Vice President

cc: Town Clerk, M. Simeoni, C.Connell, Mayor Burton, Oakville Town Council.

**Paul Barrette**

---

**From:** paul lindsay [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 12, 2020 12:43 PM  
**To:** Town Clerk; Mayor Rob Burton; Sean O'Meara; Paul Barrette  
**Cc:** kingsley and sharon  
**Subject:** official plan amendment file no opa1625.01

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

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.

To all those concerned: Council c/o the town clerk at the town of oakville, clerk's department

I wish to voice my opinion against the amendment to 1515 and 1521 Rebecca St., file no. opa 1625.01, ward 2..The reason i'm against this build is the increased traffic that will be brought to this area..It is already congested with several accidents all the time..The residents in this area have been fighting with the town of oakville and police, ever since the bridge was built at bronte rd and rebecca st...At the time, we said if the bridge was built there, Rebecca st would become like a hwy as people use it to avoid the QEW....I don't know of any other residential street in Oakville with higher speeds, and higher volume of traffic that already affect the quality of life for the residents as well as the dangers of entering or exiting their driveways..The town had promised at that time to control the area by either traffic calming measures or police presence..Neither has occurred unless we constantly pressure the parties involved..The town would be better off encouraging either more business inside the mall or to make it parkland....I also wish to be kept up to date on any and all information pertaining to this item...yours truly,

paul lindsay

[REDACTED]

oakville on

**Paul Barrette**

---

**From:** Sharon Richards [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 12, 2020 8:53 PM  
**To:** paul lindsay; Town Clerk; Mayor Rob Burton; Sean O'Meara; Paul Barrette  
**Subject:** Re: official plan amendment file no opa1625.01

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.

Hi,

I am in full agreement with Paul. I can't believe anyone would consider a measure that would further exacerbate the traffic conditions and noise pollution on Rebecca St. The most ridiculous thing is that my GPS now directs me to a side street to skip the congestion at the Third Line/Rebecca St intersection. Not to mention how incredibly difficult it has been to exit my own driveway safely. As Paul mentioned, the speeding has also gotten out of control. I do not believe it is in anyone's best interest to maximize congestion and continue to neglect the dangerous driving that is already taking place. I truly feel that our concerns are not being heard nor considered. I guess that's the state of politics nowadays.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** paul lindsay [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 12, 2020 12:42:57 PM  
**To:** townclerk <townclerk@oakville.ca>; mayor <mayor@oakville.ca>; Sean O'Meara <sean.omeara@oakville.ca>; paul.barrette <paul.barrette@oakville.ca>  
**Cc:** kingsley and sharon [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** official plan amendment file no opa1625.01

To all those concerned: Council c/o the town clerk at the town of oakville, clerk's department

I wish to voice my opinion against the amendment to 1515 and 1521 Rebecca St., file no. opa 1625.01, ward 2..The reason i'm against this build is the increased traffic that will be brought to this area..It is already congested with several accidents all the time..The residents in this area have been fighting with the town of oakville and police, ever since the bridge was built at bronte rd and rebecca st...At the time, we said if the bridge was built there, Rebecca st would become like a hwy as people use it to avoid the QEW....I don't know of any other residential street in Oakville with higher speeds, and higher volume of traffic that already affect the quality of life for the residents as well as the dangers of entering or exiting their driveways..The town had promised at that time to control the area by either traffic calming measures or police presence..Neither has occurred unless we constantly pressure the parties involved..The town would be better off encouraging either more business inside the mall or to make it parkland....I also wish to be kept up to date on any and all information pertaining to this item...yours truly,

paul lindsay

[REDACTED]

oakville on

## Paul Barrette

---

**From:** Nicholas Ross [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 16, 2020 12:16 PM  
**To:** Town Clerk; Mayor Rob Burton; Sean O'Meara; Paul Barrette  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]; Paul Lindsay  
**Subject:** Fw: Re: official plan amendment file no opa1625.01

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.

To all concerned:

Allow me to chime in with Sharon and Paul. This is incredibly discouraging. The town opened that damn bridge over the objections of everyone who *knew* what the outcome would be. And now, after substantially reducing our quality of life and property values, you find yourselves having to build another bridge anyway. And apart from some increased law enforcement efforts the town has done nothing. And I don't care what the town says about 'vertical deflection devices' and your unwillingness to use them you could at least do that; you use them on other streets.

And with this new development, are you out of your minds? All those people coming and going? I can understand a street with residential homes (like those going into the old schoolgrounds on Hixon) because I understand the need for intensification but THIS MANY units? Unreal.

I'd love to know how you'd react if someone trashed your neighbourhood like this. In any case if someone gets plowed into coming and going from their home on Rebecca Street I hope they'll look to the town for redress.

Thanks

Nicholas Ross

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Sharon Richards [REDACTED]  
**To:** paul lindsay [REDACTED], townclerk <townclerk@oakville.ca>, mayor <mayor@oakville.ca>, Sean O'Meara <sean.omeara@oakville.ca>, "paul.barrette" <paul.barrette@oakville.ca>  
**Date:** February 12, 2020 at 8:53 PM  
**Subject:** Re: official plan amendment file no opa1625.01

Hi,

I am in full agreement with Paul. I can't believe anyone would consider a measure that would further exacerbate the traffic conditions and noise pollution on Rebecca St. The most ridiculous thing is that my GPS now directs me to a side street to skip the congestion at the Third Line/Rebecca St intersection. Not to mention how incredibly difficult it has been to exit my own driveway safely. As Paul mentioned, the speeding has also gotten out of control. I do not believe it is in anyone's best interest to maximize congestion and continue to neglect the dangerous



## Paul Barrette

---

**From:** Susan Johnston & Randy Droniuk [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 16, 2020 1:11 PM  
**To:** Paul Barrette  
**Subject:** South Oakville Centre (Hopedale Mall) redevelopment

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.

Hi

I had previously e-mailed comments on this - were they forwarded to you?

I have read a bit more of the supporting documents etc. on the Town's site re the redevelopment proposal. They confirm my view that a redevelopment of the former Target retail space at Hopedale Mall to residential space makes sense but that many of the specifics of this proposal don't make sense! Specifically:

- Why is the 'seniors' residential component not placed to allow indoor access to the mall? Grocery store, drug store, banking, other services are important to any residential tenant, but particularly to seniors and walking outdoors to get access to them is not viable/safe in bad weather. A related question is:

- Why is the mall being split to allow a 'road' past the Shopper's/Metro building? It seems unnecessary and greatly contributes to the lack of indoor access to key shopping sites from the 'seniors' building.

- Why is the 'seniors building a rental one and not a condo? And why is it 'seniors' and not general purpose? Yes, seniors might find this site attractive to downsize to - particularly if the indoor access issue noted above is addressed! But there is no need/reason to limit it to seniors and a condo ownership structure would be attractive to a wide demographic. (The Bronte Harbour Club started as a seniors condo many years ago but, after a court case, ended up having that restriction removed. The Bronte Mall redevelopment that was referenced in one of the documents, does not limit the rental component to seniors...)

To me, it would make more sense to put the 'seniors' building at the back of the site -or along/close to the back wall of the north-south strip of the mall, and the townhouse component shifted forward a bit to make the street view more residential. Of course, the 9 story height is too high; 5 would be more reasonable, especially if the seniors emphasis was retained - think about access/egress difficulties for older tenants in the event of power failure/elevator problems/fire, etc. A tall building is both unsightly and potentially more dangerous to the health of the tenants.

What is the style proposed for the townhouses and the seniors facility? Style will play an important role in how well the redevelopment fits into the neighbourhood.

Susan Johnston.

Sent from my iPad

**Paul Barrette**

---

**From:** Susan Johnston & Randy Droniuk [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 17, 2020 11:25 AM  
**To:** Paul Barrette  
**Subject:** P.S. re comments on the South Oakville Centre redevelopment

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 was just looking at the Design Brief document again... I hadn't noticed the first time I scanned that, that it shows all stores in the modified mall would be with exterior entrances rather than accessed from the current interior corridor! I assume that the purpose of creating a road cutting Metro and Shoppers off from the rest of the mall is to eliminate the square footage of the mall that is considered surplus to anticipated needs.

Eliminating indoor access to the grocery store, the drug store, and all other stores in the mall just made the whole thing undesirable as a future potential housing option for us! From my perspective, Calloway has just thrown away the strong points of the mall that would make it desirable as a residential place to downsize to in the not-too-distant future... How disappointing! It certainly appears that whoever did the plan was not very creative and - in particular - did not understand the needs of the community of potential residents. A site that combined indoor access to vital shopping and services, easy access to public transit to address needs once driving a personal vehicle is either undesirable or impossible, and is located in the current neighbourhood is a very desirable thing. But it now appears to be a lost opportunity because of the poor design! What a pity...

Susan Johnston

Sent from my iPad

Date: Feb. 23, 2020

**Reference:**

Proposed Official Plan Amendment  
1515 and 1521 Rebecca Street  
Calloway REIT (Hopedale) Inc.  
File No. OPA 1625.01, Ward 2

Dear Paul –

My name is **Nader Nayfeh**, owner of the house located at [REDACTED] Stanbury Rd, Oakville [REDACTED]. I would like to provide my input and questions to the Planning and Development Council and would appreciate it if I get the Council's / Builder feedback on the below points:

1. Confirm the distance of the proposed yard setback adjacent to Lot 90 and Lot 6?
2. Confirm trees adjacent to Lot 90, Lot 6, Lot 17 and Lot 18 are not to be removed? If any needs to be removed, please specify and provide more details to the number of trees to be removed and location?
3. Currently, a concrete retaining wall of about 3 feet in height in place adjacent to the parking and Lot 90 and Lot 6. What is the plan for this retaining wall (e.g. Keep, Remove, Change)? Please provide more details to the height of the retaining wall if change?
4. Based on the proposed plan, 2-story townhomes will be built adjacent to Lot 90 and Lot 6, I would like to recommend/request the builder to erect a Chain/Iron fence at the back of the 2-story townhomes for the below reasons. Please confirm if this can be accommodated?
  - 4.1. Avoid future residents/neighbours of the proposed 2-story townhomes to extend their backyards to the fences adjacent to Lot 90 and Lot 6 as this will cause potential noises caused by the new residents of the 2-story townhomes getting closer to the fences of lot 90 and Lot 6
  - 4.2. Preserve the health of the trees in the proposed yard setback area
5. Confirm the following details around the proposed 2-story townhomes adjacent to Lot 90 and Lot 6:
  - 5.1. Maximum height of the 2-story townhomes
  - 5.2. Any plans to change the current elevations of the current parking area where the proposed 2-story townhomes to be constructed?
  - 5.3. When the 2-story townhomes are planned to start construction and completion?
6. Require more details around the Swales adjacent to Lot 90 and Lot 6 please? If there is a survey that clearly shows the proposed swales and directions of rain water adjacent to Lot 90 and Lot 6 please send to me.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require any further clarification. I will be attending the Statutory Public Meeting on Monday March 9, 2020 at 7:00PM.

Yours sincerely,

Nader Nayfeh

██████ Vickery Drive  
Oakville, ON L6L 2J3

February 20, 2020

Planning and Development Council  
c/o the Town Clerk  
Town of Oakville  
1225 Trafalgar Road  
Oakville, ON L6H 0H3

**Re: File No. OPA 1625.01, Ward 2**

With regard to Calloway REIT's current development proposal for South Oakville Centre, I have the follow comments and questions.

**1) The impact of the proposed development on local transportation should be addressed more thoroughly.**

The traffic estimates provided are said to suggest that peak-hour traffic to/from the Subject Lands will decline considerably. Of course, that assumes that the currently vacant retail space would eventually be used – a reasonable assumption. However, in projecting the number of trips in/out, the Transportation Report fails to factor in the shifting of traffic from the Savannah Gate entrance to the southwest access off Rebecca. This redirection of traffic will not be insignificant as Savannah Gate will no longer be, or should no longer be, an access route to GoodLife Fitness, Winners, the CIBC and TD ABMs, Tavolo as well as the Beer Store, which is to be removed according to the current proposal and possibly positioned next to the LCBO. Traffic into/out of the Subject Lands may be reduced, but it will be offset by increased traffic through the southwest Rebecca Street entrance to South Oakville Centre. Furthermore, there will only be two ways out of the Subject Lands – one through the South Oakville Centre parking lot and one to Rebecca Street. The effects on mall traffic and Rebecca Street traffic will not be negligible and should not be dismissed as I believe has been done in the Transportation Report.

**2) The proposed development should provide seniors with easy and safe access to Hopedale Park.**

Hopedale Park will likely be an important place for seniors to go in order to get outdoors for fresh air and a change of scenery – not as trivial as it might seem to those of us who are younger. With 161 units there could be significant pedestrian traffic flow between the seniors' building and the park. Under the proposed plan, exactly how far would seniors have to go and about how long would it take at the pace of a wheelchair? Would you prepare estimates of the distance, the duration from point to point and the volume of foot- and wheelchair traffic between the seniors' residence and the park?

Based on the current development proposal, access to the park by seniors will be along internal private roads. On one side, seniors would have to cross 4 intersections, and on the other side, they would have to cross 17 driveways. Either way, seniors would be at greater risk than if they had a uncrossed sidewalk straight through.

Finding a better access route for seniors would likely be more developer-friendly than re-working the entire proposal to accommodate a re-positioning of the seniors' residence to the north side of the Subject Lands across from Hopedale Park. The advantages to seniors of relocating the residence would be considerable in terms of the improved and safer access to the park. It would also benefit the north-facing residents who would then overlook the park and the south-facing residents who would no longer overlook Rebecca Street. The eastern and western vistas would be mostly unchanged.

**3) The proposed development should further accommodate seniors' quality of life in view of the additional profits engendered in the current proposal's enhancement of the scenarios presented at the May 2, 2019 Public Open House.**

Three scenarios were presented. Option 3 was highly improbable owing to the 5-storey apartment building's substantially higher density. The other two options represented the seniors' residence as being 5-7 storeys instead of the currently proposed 9 storeys. In addition, the townhouse counts were lower than the 86 currently proposed – 82 and 67, for Options 1 and 2, respectively. In view of this move towards greater density since the Public Open House, perhaps some additional consideration for seniors, numbering 161+, could be given as mentioned in 2) above.

**4) The Town's approval should be site-specific and conditioned on Hopedale Mall's unique place in the Third Line and Rebecca Street neighbourhood.**

Hopedale Mall represents an historic community hub centred at Third Line and Rebecca. The Official Plan Amendment can be approved in that context, as a substantial portion of the new residences will continue to serve the existing community. A compromise to accept the proposed 2-3 storey townhouse subdivision would represent a significant concession by the community to development as the townhouse complex is clearly not in keeping with the character of the existing residential neighbourhood which it borders.

Setting a precedent for allowing similar medium-density developments would be disruptive to the stable, low-density residential communities south of the QEW. While some do not believe that planning decisions set precedents, their argument appears disingenuous. A precedent is an example of what is permissible whether it's cited in technical jargon or in the more common language of 'adherence to the character and integrity of a stable residential community.' The Town should specifically note that the South Oakville Centre location is historically unique for our community and only for that reason is entitled to rezoning by amending the official plan.

**5) The development proposal should be credited with endeavouring to balance a variety of incongruous commercial and community interests.**

The current proposal has attempted to address the issue of excessive verticality by transitioning the 9-storey tower of the seniors' residence and by limiting the height of the east-facing townhouses to 2 storeys.

The seniors' residence may eventually be generally well-received as beneficial to the community, since it provides the means for long-term community residents to continue to live where they want and somewhat balances the gentrification of older Oakville.

In closing, thank you for the opportunity to comment and ask questions about this development proposal.

Regards,

Peter McMillan