

Appendix D – Public Comments from Process

N. L. Urquhart - ___ Bomorda Drive

File Z.1516.02

Without prejudice

Further to meeting on June 15, 2017

This meeting was called to discuss the following resolution

“The Council direct Planning Services to undertake a review of subject lands and their context to determine what appropriate redevelopment exists having regard to the issues identified in the PLANNING Services report dated March 7, 2017, in consultation with local residents and the applicant”

The meeting started with all attendees signing in and marking on a map the location of their property.

Prior to the initial meeting on March 7, 17, I and some of my neighbours went around getting signatures for a petition against this rezoning and submitted it to the clerk’s office. A few of the residence who signed the petition could not or did not attend for various reasons this should be noted.

At the meeting on June 15,17 it seemed that the onus was on the residence to voice their concerns, when in fact it should also be on Dunpar Developments Inc. to show what benefit if any this development would have on the community.

Also it was stated more than once that this property” has to be developed” when in fact for over a hundred years, at least the 30 years that I have lived here and the 50 or more years that some of my neighbors lived and payed taxes here it has functioned very well. The former residences of the existing house on the property 1020 – 1042 Sixth Line, lived worked and raised families not once did someone raise the question, that their property must be redeveloped.

If you look at the map where we marked our properties in relation to the Dunpar property you have to go pretty far afield to add up to 81 residences, with this proposed development you are adding approximately 60% more residences in a very restricted area. My math might be a little off but you get the picture. You have a petition signed by most of the immediate residents that was given to the Town Clerk after the 1st informal meeting was called.

Without malice or prejudice this proposed zoning change brought forth by Dunpar Inc. and presented to the community by councillor Jeff Knoll does not conform to any of the criteria set out in the “Livable Oakville document “and if we acknowledge that this document was written by professionals (who did their due diligence) from the Planning, zoning and governing branches of the Town of Oakville then this proposal should not have seen the light of day and therefore should be denied.

The zoning should remain the same and should not be changed (from low density with a special policy overlay to in essence high density) to benefit the one at the expense of the many. Spot zoning should be frowned upon not rewarded.

If this project goes ahead we owe an apology to all those who spent time and effort to draw up this document and we owe the tax payers a refund for any and all money spent.

Brian Schiedel – email dated October 6, 2017

Hello Rob,

First let me thank you and the Town’s staff for the work you have done in facilitating these meetings.

You have given up several evenings to give this matter a full airing.

I wanted to provide my input, as I have throughout the process, on the latest submission from Dunpar.

I am sure the Town's Official Plan took a lot of people, a lot of work, at a considerable cost to develop the framework that all development requests will be governed.

It recognized the unique character and charm of this corner of the College Park neighbourhood, and set it within the building and development codes.

The Plan is clear that these properties are subject to a Special Policy Area overlay and are designated as Residential Low Density Lands.

Neither of the Dunpar proposals come close to fitting these requirements.

Most of the residents of this neighbourhood are long term home owners, as you have heard at these meetings, and they care deeply about the area.

After attending all the meetings and listening to all the presentations, there remains no reason that I can see to consider changing the density and character compatibility requirements as laid out in the Official Plan.

I could not disagree more with our councilors about accepting this proposal, though it is not acceptable nor consistent with the Official Plan, would be better than the unknown.

This is a special neighbourhood with great citizens and it deserves to be fought for.

I hope that your team will reflect this in your recommendation.

I also hope that Council will pick up the fight.

From: [Brent Janes](#)
To: [Charles McConnell](#); [Robert Thun](#); [Long Dave](#)
Cc: [Jeff Knoll](#); [Marc Grant](#)
Subject: Re: Sixth Line Development - Oct 12
Date: Thursday, October 12, 2017 15:23:13

Hi,

As there were so many questions being asked at the previous meetings, I never had a good opportunity to get this one out:

Does the planning of Oakville consider low density housing to be a thing of the past or is there plans to retain or grow it?

I have neighbours moving here from the GTA explicitly because of the single detached housing opportunities and the belief of the area retaining its unique "charm". I assume we are still called a "Town" vs. "City" due to the rest of our citizens and City Hall wanting to retain this feeling and not become a crowded metropolis but somewhere we can retreat from such conditions.

The proposed development area remaining as is or altered slightly to allow a few more single detached homes seems to me more in keeping with the best "livable" Oakville conditions for existing and future residents.

Regards,
H.Brent Janes

N. L. Urquhart - ___ Bomorda Drive

Robert & Nancy Urquhart

█ Bomorda Drive

Oakville, Ontario

L6H 1Y2

Reference: File no. Z.1516.02

Without prejudice

As all the homes in the immediate area are on large lots and not more than two stories high in keeping with the livable Oakville document, we could see this special policy area being rezoned for single family dwellings on minimum 65 foot wide lots.



Robert & Nancy Urquhart

RECEIVED
JUN 13 2017
CLERK'S DEPT

Benny Liu – Germorda Drive – email October 4, 2017

This is Benny Liu, and I am the owner of ___ Germorda Dr. Oakville. I am writing to express my opposition to the zoning by-law amendment that proposes to turn the five big single family lots on Sixth Line and North Service Road to 81 townhouses.

I believe my neighbors have expressed how the proposed development plan violates the Livable Oakville Plan etc., but I'd like to give some personal feelings towards the matter which I believe somewhat represent what made us come to Oakville and what will continue to make people want to live in Oakville in the future, especially for younger generations.

I came from China when I was 18 years old to pursue my university and master's education and started working and living in downtown Toronto since 2013. I moved to Oakville in 2016 after my wife and I got married and started thinking about raising children. Initially, I did not want to buy a house just to leave all my city life behind, not to mention buying a house in Oakville where the matured Chinese community in North York and Richmond Hill was so far away. However, this all changed when my friend and realtor showed me the listing of ___ Germorda Dr. and showed me around the neighborhood on a cold winter night, I asked him to send in the offer immediately. The community has this incredible welcoming and comforting vibe, with apparently old but very well maintained bungalows sitting on 100 by 100 lots with huge trees, everybody had a big lawn and a garden full of flowers well-tended, houses had healthy distance with each other with no mcmanions that are five feet away from each other (which is quite often seen in Richmond Hill and North York).

For ___ Germorda – The bungalow was rebuilt in 2006 by the previous owner with additions based on the 1958 structure. It is very open concept with over-sized windows/sliding doors in every room including my master ensuite bathroom. However, with the trees, hedges and fences strategically and esthetically placed, nobody could peek into my backyard or bathrooms/bedrooms even though I am on the corner. I have seen a lot of newly built multi-million dollar houses in Richmond Hill, and I am confident that the privacy of home owner was never seen better protected in those mansions than my bungalow in Oakville. Though it does not cost much to have some trees and fences in place, the level of care and creativeness the previous owner put onto this property is unparalleled and will not be met by any builder who does mass production, and that is the most precious character of my house and literally every home owner that I have met in my neighborhood has his/her own story with the house. When I walked around the neighborhood I realized I did not see any two houses that looked identical, every house was different. Then I started realizing all the home improvements done by home owners and felt the love and care people have put in their homes and their proudness to show for it. This

is what changed my mind and this is what I believe the most precious character of the neighborhood that are quickly disappearing in the general GTA area with the fanatic real estate market that made people start looking at their houses more as investments rather than homes.

Again, I do not want to reiterate what my neighbors have said about noise, traffic or pollution that will come with the development for the next five years and then the new 81 families, but I do like to suggest the council to consider the **repercussion** if the plan is approved. There are a lot of big lots along Sixth Line, in Ranchcliffe and along the vertical portion of Germorda, and a lot of the current owners are retirees who might soon consider to sell and move. The approval of the plan will encourage more builder to come into our neighborhood, and acquiring just a handful of properties will give them enough land to build another project like the currently proposed one. Worst of all – the new builders will have a precedent to refer to. **If the town does not reject this proposal, it will not be able to reject the next one.**

I do understand nothing last forever. With the dramatic population growth of GTA, we are bound to experience increase in density in the neighborhood and I am fine with it. But the proposed plan will increase the density of population in the neighborhood barbarically, which could lead to departure of home owners in the surrounding area who value their privacy and quality of life and result in a disastrous deterioration of community quality. I would suggest we increase the density gradually and most importantly – increase the density in a more organic way that does not come at the cost of losing the current character of the community. Therefore, I will not oppose if the builder decides to divide the acquired lots into smaller lots and build two-storey houses.

Thanks a lot for your time and hope this adds some perspectives to the case.

David Long – Rancliffe Road – email dated October 12, 2017

**SUBJECT: Revised Development Proposal
Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment
1020 – 1042 Sixth Line
1463291 Ontario Inc. (Dunpar Developments Inc.)
Z.1516.02, Ward 5**

Dear Sirs,

Firstly, I would like to thank you and Councillors Knoll and Grant on behalf of the community for the time and effort you have all contributed in holding and moderating the series of evening meetings over the past few months which have enabled the residents of the area to discuss the above proposed development. This is very much appreciated as it shows your level of concern and willingness to engage with the community on important local issues.

Secondly, I would like to make the following comments on behalf of the community regarding the revised development proposal (RDP) which was presented to the community on October 5. (All references are to the Planning Services Department Report dated March 7, 2017.)

SUMMARY

The major changes to the revised development proposal are as follows:

- Reduction of the number of townhouses to be built from 81 to 65
- Increasing the setback from the Sixth Line (but only for the block of townhouses facing the Sixth Line)
- Preservation of the laneway and the coniferous trees along its southern border
- Elimination of the access to Sunnycrest Lane

In summary, while the revised development proposal marginally improves some of the planning inadequacies and deficiencies of the first proposal, it is still far from conforming to most of the important planning guidelines. Therefore it should remain unacceptable from a planning perspective.

COMMENTS

1. The original plan had a density of 56 units per ha while the revised proposal is 45 units per ha. This is still a considerable increase in density to the surrounding neighbourhood which is zoned for a maximum of 10 units per ha. (page 2)

2. This area is not designated as a "node" for future development intensification by Town Council as implied by Livable Oakville 11.1.8. (page 10, 15, 22)

3. There is no change to the important criteria of Livable Oakville 11.1.9 for the built form of development, including scale, height, massing, architectural character and materials. The revised development uses the same design and build of townhouses as the first proposal and therefore remains out of character and therefore incompatible with Livable Oakville 11.1.9. (page 10, 16, 22)

4. While the setbacks for the townhouses facing the Sixth Line have been increased to provide a buffer from the community (see note 9), there is no change to the setback for the units which face south and are positioned immediately to the south of the laneway. The easternmost of those units, which is closest to the Sixth Line, remains a mere 2 or 3 metres from the property line and sidewalk and therefore is incompatible with Livable Oakville 11.1.9 b). (page 17)

5. To increase the setback of the units facing the Sixth Line, all the units in the north/south blocks had to be moved to the west. This has forced the most southwestern units and the access road to be moved further into the 15 metre long term stable top of bank area. This encroachment should not be allowed for the preservation of the bank under Livable Oakville 16.1.9 c). (page 12, 19)

6. The neighbourhood residents firmly believe that the Transportation Study understates the reality of potential traffic congestion in the area. Based on daily experience the rush hour traffic congestion in the area is currently very difficult for many residents yet the study concluded that the extra congestion from the development would be manageable. With 83 dwellings and (an estimated) 130 new cars accessing Sixth Line, the Transportation Study only assumed 28 cars or 22% would exit the development in the morning rush hour. We find this hard to believe and therefore are sceptical of the Study's conclusion regarding the acceptability of the additional traffic in the area. Our reference point is Rancliffe Rd. which is a similar one-access road and which experienced a higher traffic usage ratio.

7. The RDP has only one access road into and out of the development. Given that there are 67 dwellings in the RDP with (an estimated) 105 resident cars and with more cars available using temporary parking, this is a huge load factor on such a small road network and will jeopardize emergency services and rush hour circulation within the development. Cars will be backed up into the housing blocks waiting to exit. This problem remains from the original development proposal.

8. We remain concerned about the potential noise affects and the lower quality of life for the residents of this development from its location vis-à-vis the QEW. This does not meet the quality of life objectives envisioned in Livable Oakville. This deficiency has not changed.

9. The RDP remains not in conformity with The Livable Oakville Plan, Part C, Section 6 Urban Design. The units are unchanged at 4 stories in height and therefore there is no transition in building height with the

existing community. In addition there is still a significant destruction of the urban forest including both trees and large cedar hedges. The extensive urban forest on the property is part of the community's identity and also its destruction is not in keeping with the Town's new tree bylaw. (page 18)

10. I refer to The Planning Services Department Report dated March 7, 2017 Appendix E – Public Comments, and wish to point out that these public comments still remain valid with the RDP. There has been no measureable improvement with the RDP to satisfy the Town's policy guidelines which resulted in the rejection of the original proposal.

John & Donna Ratelle – Sixth Line – email dated October 18, 2017

Dear Sirs

Thank you for your efforts regarding the proposed development by Dunpar on Sixth Line.

Donna and I encourage you to recommend the revised proposal by Dunpar. We look forward to the life that the addition of a new neighbourhood will bring to a challenging group of properties. Residents on Rancliffe Road and in the area below Leighland have been spoiled by little or no traffic in the area and we all knew there would come a time when that would change with the growth of our town and surrounding communities. We would like to avoid a repeat of the Great Gulf development north of Dundas.

Today's home buyers are demanding and knowledgeable. Home builders know they must meet the challenge and we trust Dunpar will use best practice principles when designing and choosing materials to achieve quiet enjoyment within the townhome units. One of Donna's friends recently moved into her new Dunpar home on Trafalgar Road and she seems quite pleased with her purchase.

Usage of the underpass walkway will become more significant as new people move into the neighbourhood. Many will need to walk to the GO station so we ask that you work with the builder to make the approach to the walkway more inviting and safer.

As loud and disappointing as it is, we believe that the noise from the QEW is an MTO issue not a Dunpar issue and will encourage our neighbours to approach the MTO with their concerns. Many of the concerned residents with a voice at the meetings live closer to the valley and we do not believe they will experience any improvement or worsening of sound from the highway once the development is completed.

We look forward to your continued efforts on this matter and we encourage you to find a way to move this project forward.