

Distributed at the Planning and Development Council Meeting of October 5, 2020
Re: Item 4 – Public Meeting Report - Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law
Amendment - Transmetro Limited - 358 Reynolds Street - File Nos.: OPA.1613.63
and Z.1613.63

From: Carol Dunham
Sent: Friday, October 02, 2020 6:45 PM
To: Town Clerk
Cc:
Subject: Fwd: Reynolds Macdonald townhome proposal

Hi,

Please register my support for the TCRA related to stopping the medium density proposal by Transmetro Ltd on the old Medical Arts Building lands at the SW corner of Reynolds and Macdonald. Thank You.

Carol Dunham
Allan St

From: Helga Williams
Sent: Sunday, October 04, 2020 11:57 AM
To: Town Clerk
Subject: Re-Zoning Application 358 Reynolds, Oakville

Our names are Helga and Brian Williams and we reside at 200 Trafalgar Rd

We would like to register our opposition to the current redevelopment proposal at 358 Reynolds Street

The density of the proposal is far to large for a heritage area.

Helga and Brian Williams

From: Thomas Blodgett
Sent: Sunday, October 04, 2020 6:39 PM
To: Town Clerk
Subject: Re: Reynolds Opposition

I support the TCRAs opposition/ rejection of the current Reynolds plans.

Thomas Blodgett
Macdonald Road
Oakville

From: Colin Hardman
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2020 4:39 AM
To: Town Clerk
Subject: Planning and Development Council, re 358 Reynolds St

Dear Town Clerk

Attached please find my submission re the above proposed amendment.

Regards

Colin Hardman
MacDonald Road
Oakville, Ont.

Reynolds proposed amendment 2020Sept14 my comments.docx

From Colin Hardman

MacDonald Road
Oakville, Ont. L6J 2A6

2020 October 5, 2020

To Town of Oakville Planning and Development Council
c/o Clerks Dept
1225 Trafalgar Rd
Oakville
TownClerk@oakville.ca

Re Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendment
358 Reynolds St, OPA.16.13.063, Z.1613.063, Ward 3

Dear Councillors

I recently walked south on Reynolds past the new Community Centre. And I was partially blinded by the set of four floodlights that are used to illuminate the new Wyndham Manor carpark. These lights are so poorly installed that they spray more light beyond the car park than stays inside it. That got me thinking about other instances of light spillage and I believe that the Town has a bylaw requires that area lighting be from lamps around the lot boundary shining towards the buildings on the property. I recalled that there were a number of times when the owners of the Medical Arts Building at 358 Reynolds repaired their car park illumination. They always did it in the cheapest way possible by installing lights that sprayed light outwards from the building. But they would reduce the light spray significantly if we neighbours complained. It also got me to look carefully at the proposed re-development of 358 Reynolds.

I knew that the driveway was somewhere over the road from my house. On close inspection I found that the exit lane from the underground parking garage is aligned with virtually the middle of my house. From their underground garage there is a there is a steep ramp, so every night every vehicle that leaves the garage would spray their powerful head lights at my house from my front lawn up two and a half floors to my attic and back down again. Dipped headlights would provide minimal relief. And it would continue for ever.

This would be an unwarranted intrusion, a very negative change for me. There is an exit from the current car park opposite us, where for many years vehicles have left the car park on a level surface with dipped or high beams and there has never been a problem.

So I believe that the current application should be rejected. The current zoning allows for five houses and these would all have level driveways and keep their light to themselves.

There is another factor that I would draw your attention to. The proponent explains that the setback on the south side meets requirements if you measure from the property line to the main south wall of the building. But then he uses that setback to create below grade parking spaces with a load bearing retaining wall along its south side. But he does not re-measure his actual setback from the boundary line to that wall. Instead, on top of those parking spaces he adds a three-car garage size "terrace" for each of the units. The result is that the floor 1 and 2 units will have negligible light coming in at the back of their units. Maybe the "terraces" will soon be fitted with electric lights and receptacles, soon followed by heating and a "temporary" south wall about 6 feet from the terrace railing.

And one more. How does the disabled person travel from their car to their unit? Wheel the length of the parking garage then wheel up the steep vehicle ramp then along the public sidewalk to their unit? That seems like a bit of an after-thought.

Regards

Colin Hardman
[REDACTED]