

Appendix B: Public Comments

1.

Hello,

We got notice today that about a complete application by Randall Oakville Development Ltd and Church Oakville Development Ltd for a proposed zoning by-law amendment for the maximum height from four storeys to 12.

I am against that as I would bring an increase in air pollution caused by increased traffic to our downtown core and also more noise pollution.

As a resident of downtown Oakville, living at 100 Lakeshore Road East I am impacted directly.

2.

Town Clerk Oakville

150 Randall street

I am against the change from 4 storeys to 12 storeys in the downtown core of Oakville. This represents too much of a dramatic change to the skyline of Oakville Downtown. Infrastructure, Parking, increase in population in the core will cause further congestion In an area designed for a much smaller population. I would be ok with 6 storey maximum and further monitoring of the impact.

3.

As local residents in the Oakville downtown, we've been made aware of the development proposal for 150 Randall, 125 Navy, and 143 Church Street, and the recent proposal to amend the height from 4-storeys to 12-storeys. We have some concerns:

---Could you detail on what specific by law/zoning amendments the jump from 4-storeys to 12-storeys was put forward? (ie: specific lines of zoning, etc.)

---When is the next town meeting to determine this, and how do residents attend meetings during covid?

---What checks have been put into place to prevent future downtown developments from then using this 12-storey development as a minimum height for future developers? It seems that the move is toward a downtown like what Burlington will resemble, with high tower buildings.

---What is the specific maximum height allowance allowed for developments for both the East side of the Lakeshore/Rebecca bridge and the West side of the bridges?

---What specific lines of heritage laws are in place to protect the surrounding older downtown buildings from damage during this and other developments?

---Why are homes in the heritage-protected Old Oakville able to be knocked down, despite the protection of heritage and historic buildings?

This also seems a new protocol and one that has not been publicly announced.

Please advise. Thank-you.

Concerned local residents

4

Public Information Meeting Minutes – Sept 17, 2020
attached

Public Consultation Meeting
Meeting Minutes
Randall Developments
150 Randall St., 143 Church St., 125 Navy St.
September 17, 2020 @ 6:30pm

Subject: Site Specific Zoning By-Law Amendment for a 12-Storey Mixed Use Building at 150 Randal St, 143 Church St, 125 Navy St, Oakville

Date: Held Virtually on Zoom - Thursday, September 19, 2020 at 630 p.m.

Participants (15)

- Terrance Glover (Principal at Urban In Mind)
- Kleo Isaia (Architect & Applicant)
- Jacob Dickie (Planner at Urban In Mind)

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

1. Opening Remarks and Meeting Rules

2. Presentation

Terrance Glover (Principal at Urban in Mind) presented a slide-show that described the proposed development with respect to the site's context, surrounding land uses, planning policy, zoning requirements and design considerations. In addition, he noted that a number of studies we're completed that showed support for the proposed development (heritage impact assessment, transportation impact assessment, urban design brief, shadow analysis). A concept site plan, architectural rendering and building sections we're included in the presentation.

3. Discussion

After the presentation was completed, Terrance opened the floor up to the public. The following includes the concerns/questions raised in chronological order:

██████████

██████ asked about the Town's 1970 vision for the 'Central Business District' (to be located at Trafalgar and Dundas). He wanted to know what happened to that vision and why Terrance used the term 'Central Business District' (CBD) to describe the area in which the site is located.

Terrance responded by clarifying that he used the term 'CBD' because it is the name of the zoning category that applies to the property. Terrance further clarified that the property is located within a 'Growth Area' which acts as a 'CBD' for the Town. Terrance could not provide an opinion on why the Town changed its plans for the 'CBD' from the 1970's and 1980's to now.

██████ follow-up by asking if there will be any more developments that are similar to what is being proposed in Downtown Oakville. Terrance said that he suspects that there will be more redevelopment in the area as it is situated in a natural location for growth.

██████████

██████ wanted to know why the building's mechanical roof-top was not included in the rendering shown in the presentation.

Terrance confirmed that the mechanical roof-top was not shown in the rendering because the details are still being refined. He confirmed that there are design requirements that need to be met such as screening the mechanical roof-top feature from the street view.

██████ afraid that the building will look much taller than what the rendering is showing. Terrance followed-up by stating that the mechanical roof-top feature will only be room-sized and will not encompass the entire floor of the roof-top.

██████ wanted to know where the front of the building is located.

Terrance confirmed that the front of the building will be along Navy St and that Traffic will come out Randal St.

██████ had concerns about the 0 m front yard setback requirement under the proposed (MU4 Special) zone. She interpreted that the proposed front yard setback would bring the building right on to the sidewalk.

Terrance told ██████ that the minimum front yard setback requirement is actually 1 m under the parent (MU4 Special) zone.

██████████

██████████ wanted clarification as to how the proposed 0 m minimum front yard setback requirement could accommodate for a widened pedestrian boulevard.

Terrance explained that the property owner can only build up to the property line and not within the Right-of-Way. He expressed that no lands are being taken away from the existing right-of-way, but instead that lands on the property are being used differently to accommodate for a more pedestrian friendly development.

██████████ wanted to know what the split is on the residential units (how many 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units?).

Terrance said that there will be a number of different unit sizes within the development and that he can find this information after the meeting and send it to her by email.

██████████ wanted to know what the split is on parking (is the parking for tenants only? can shoppers use the parking on site?).

Terrance said that he can find the answer after the meeting is finished and that he will send her the information by email.

██████████ expressed concerns about the lack of access to greenspace on the site and in downtown Oakville in general, especially during COVID times.

Terrance explained that there is no ideal spot for greenspace in the 'Growth Area' because it takes away from density, jobs and new uses. The new residents will have access to balconies and amenity areas within the buildings. In addition, there is a cash-in-lieu payment taken from the development that will go towards funding for new parks and park equipment within town.

██████████

██████████ likes the building and believes that it is very tasteful.

██████████ is concerned about future development in the area. Says that this is the first development in line with many to follow (domino effect). ██████████ wanted to know who to contact to get closure on this issue.

Terrance recommended that people should reach out to their local politicians and/or city planners. He also provided guidance on how to frame their concerns so that they can participate more effectively in the planning process.

██████████

██████████ wanted to know what the size of the property is.

Terrance answered 0.86 acres.

██████████ asked if the developer will be participating in bonusing.

Terrance clarified that bonusing will not be required due to the fact that the proposal is bringing zoning into conformity with the Official Plan.

██████████

██████████ voiced her concern over the development's parking access location. She is concerned that it is too close to the nearest intersection with traffic lights and that it would negatively impact traffic flows.

Terrance referenced the Traffic Study which determined that vehicular access to the site is far enough from the intersection and that there would be no significant impacts on traffic flow. According to the Traffic Study, Randall St is at a very low level of service and that the proposed development can be accommodated by the existing roadway.

██████████ wanted to know when the Traffic Study was conducted.

Terrance said that it was completed in March 2020.

██████████

██████████ sympathized with ██████████'s concerns about traffic coming in and out of the building. He sees Randall St as a main feeder through town and questioned the results of the traffic study.

Terrance clarified that the firm that completed the traffic study has a very good reputation of being objective and that the conclusions provided were sound. He followed-up by saying that he would be very surprised if the Town does not accept the report.

██████████

██████████ wanted to know if the easement shown in the Site Plan drawing was in perpetuity

Terrance confirmed that the easement is already there, it's just going to be used differently.

██████████ wanted to know more about parking requirements.

Terrance followed-up by stating that he does not know how parking will work out in the final design, but confirmed that the development will have more parking than what is required.