

Planning and Development Council Meeting
October 26, 2020

Comments Received Regarding Item 2

Public Meeting Report, Randall Oakville Developments Ltd.,
Church Oakville Developments Ltd., Zoning By-law
Amendment, Z.1614.74

October 23, 2020

VIA EMAIL

Denise Baker
Partner
t. 416-947-5090
dbaker@weirfoulds.com

File

Mayor and Members of Council
Town of Oakville
1225 Trafalgar Road
Oakville, ON L6H 0H3

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of Council:

**Re: Rezoning Application: 150 Randall Street, 125 Navy Street & 143 Church Street
(Municipal File: Z.1614.74)**

We are counsel to JRB -147 Church Holdings Ltd., owners of property municipally referred to as 147 Church Street (the “**property**”). The property is immediately adjacent and abutting the proposed development at 150 Randall Street, 125 Navy Street & 143 Church Street (the “**development parcel**”) to the east and represents a “cut-out” from the development parcel. The property is improved with a one-storey building and currently enjoys a side yard setback with the existing building to the immediate west at 143 Church Street, which is part of the development parcel.

We have examined the application details contained in Municipal File Z.1614.74 and reviewed the plans, drawings, the shadow studies, the urban design brief as well as the planning justification report filed with the zoning application (the “**application materials**”) for the development parcel.

While we appreciate that the current planning policies recognize some redevelopment and intensification potential on the development parcel given its existing Official Plan designation and locational attributes, it is our client’s opinion that the proposed development as currently contemplated, constitutes an overbuilding of the development parcel which results in adverse impacts on the property.

The Applicant's proposal for the development parcel consists of a 12-storey mixed-use building with a total of 144 residential units, 5 commercial spaces on the ground floor, and two office spaces on the second floor. The mixed-use building wraps around the development parcels frontages and, in respect of the property, the proposed built form abuts the mutual property line without any proposed setback. The end result is that the property is surrounded on two sides by the proposed development.

In our respectful opinion, the application materials provide very little analysis, examination or support for the proposed easterly built form abutting the property. Accordingly, we have concerns with the proposal and in this regard raise the following issues:

1. Section 6.9.2 of the Town's Official Plan, speaks to building design and placement. The policy emphasis compatibility with the existing and planned surrounding context and undertaken in a creative and innovative manner. The proposed built form immediately abutting our clients existing built form creates significant issues of overpowering massing. The proposal lacks any ingenuity and imagination in providing a creative and innovative built form that will ensure the harmonious co-existence between the built forms.
2. The proposed development will have significant implications for the property to meet its current and future planned function. The proposed development lacks any efforts of comprehensive block integration and co-ordination and will thereby impact the future redeployment of the property's redevelopment potential. The proposed development should only be permitted to proceed in a comprehensive manner that incorporates the property.
3. The distance between buildings is a key factor in the success of any development, and in how the development fits within its context. To ensure that buildings relate well to the street and to the property consideration must be given to the space between the proposed building to protect for privacy, sunlight, and views and to ensure that the developability of the property is not adversely impacted.

4. Section 6.9.3 of the Official Plan contemplates the ability to achieve compatibility between different land uses. In this regard, the policies indicate that “development shall be designed to accommodate an appropriate transition through landscape buffering, spatial separation, and compatible built form.” The proposed development fails to achieve any of the stated policy directions. The complete elimination of any separation distance between the proposed building and the existing building is a clear sign that the proponent took a very narrow planning view for the purpose of maximizing the development envelope on the development parcel to the land use planning detriment of my client’s property.
5. Further, Section 6.9.9 of the Official Plan provides that “new development shall ensure that proposed building heights and form are compatible with adjacent existing development by employing an appropriate transition of height and form from new to existing development, which may include setbacks, façade step backs or terracing in order to reduce adverse impacts on adjacent properties and/or the public realm.” It is our opinion that the proposed redevelopment fails to conform to this policy altogether.
6. In respect of the shadow study, the proposed massing does generate off-site shadows that far exceed what is existing. These shadow implications cannot be deemed to be adequate and will adversely impact any future use of the property. As an example, the property will be partially or fully in shadow from 1:00 on in April and September and from 3:00 on in June. A shadowing is required to be minimized under the Official Plan, minimization would occur through the use of setbacks or increased setbacks and a reduction in overall building height.
7. Finally, the development concept appears to provide a pedestrian connection from Randall to Church Streets. This connection is proposed on the immediate east of my client’s property’s property line. In our opinion, besides the fact the connection will be over the most active vehicle entrance and exit on Randall Street creating

significant issues of safety, it introduces areas of conflict that otherwise do not exist on the eastern boundary of the property. This should be removed in its entirety.

In conclusion, please accept this correspondence as our client's objections to the current proposal. We hope and expect through the continued processing of the application that there are opportunities for dialogue between Town staff, the applicant and our client, with the goal of resolving these concerns.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "DBaker", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Per: Denise Baker
Partner

DB/bt

cc: Client
Paul Chronis, WF

From: [Lori Mann](#)
To: [Town Clerk](#)
Subject: Proposed 12+ storey development in downtown Oakville. LOCATION: 150 Randall Street, 125 Navy Street and 143 Church Street.
Date: October 22, 2020 9:27:26 AM

Attention to: Tricia Collingwood, Senior Town Planner
LOCATION: 150 Randall Street, 125 Navy Street and 143 Church Street.

Hi Tricia,

My understanding is that the downtown Oakville area (Randall/Navy/Church Street area) was re-designated from Central Business District (CBU) to Urban Core. With this change the maximum height permissions were increased from 4-storeys to the proposed 12-storeys. *However, the official plan review is ongoing and still in the draft stage:* Zoning permissions have still not been cemented, therefore, I am formally requesting that the maximum height of new developments be returned to 4-storey maximum in order to fit with the surrounding heritage buildings that make downtown Oakville unique and cherished.

I will also join the virtual meeting on Monday, October 26 at 6:30pm:
[youtube.com/TownofOakvilleTV](https://www.youtube.com/TownofOakvilleTV)

Kind regards,
Lori Mann.

From: [Laurie Lawson](#)
To: [Town Clerk](#)
Subject: Proposed development in downtown Oakville
Date: October 22, 2020 2:12:44 PM

To the Senior Planner,

I'm not against high-rise buildings but typically, when a developer wants to build, they're interested in maximizing profit and that means maximizing size 12 storeys. In this case, a highrise would negatively impact the city's historic downtown core and is too tall for the neighbourhood with its current mix of low-rise homes, businesses and heritage properties. Livability is impacted negatively as there is a reduced connection between the residents of the development and the "street". In addition, traffic is already an issue in downtown Oakville and sure to be exacerbated with a large complex such as the proposed development.

I understand that Rob Burton and the Town of Oakville are currently embroiled in active and pending law suits as they push for rapid development and perhaps this should be a consideration in moving forward. I believe the Town should adhere to the original intent of the Official Plan and retain the 4 storey maximum for this particular area of Randall, Navy and Church Streets.

Consider this to be my submission to Members of Council as well as a request to be notified of the decision on the proposed by-law amendment.

Laurie Lawson
River Side Dr., Oakville

From: Carolyn McMinn
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 3:26 PM
To: Tricia Collingwood
Subject: Randall/Navy/Church Sts development

Hi Tricia,

I'm planning to delegate on behalf of the TCRA at the meeting on October 26.

We look forward to this new development and believe it will be very beneficial to downtown Oakville. We need more smart, conscientious development! However, we are concerned that there is only one entrance/exit for the apartment residents, office and business workers (and possibly their customers - if any parking is available for that purpose).

We are also concerned about the fact that the traffic study was conducted in March 2020 - during March break, which commenced March 6th for private schools, March 13th for public and Catholic schools, and the covid-19 lockdown which started the following week. 281 parking spaces will add significantly to the already congested streets, especially with the single entrance/exit point being so close to the intersection of Randall and Navy. Not to mention people exiting east on Randall to turn north onto Trafalgar in the mornings on their way to QEW/403/go-train. Then, the reverse in the evenings, as people return home and turn across the east-bound traffic on Randall in order to access the carpark.

I would like to speak to you directly whenever it is convenient. Please let me know when suits you.

Kind regards,

Carolyn McMinn
President, TCRA
ph:

From: Concerned Citizens

Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2020 3:00 PM

To: Tricia Collingwood <tricia.collingwood@oakville.ca>

Subject: Randall/Navy/Church Street Development--Concerned residents

To Tricia Collingwood,

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

From: [GIZZARELLI, MARIA](#)
To: [Town Clerk](#)
Cc:
Subject: Council Meeting October 5th
Date: October 2, 2020 9:43:24 AM

Hello, we received the link to the agenda and town meeting scheduled for October 5th at 6:30pm. I was looking for reference to the property on 150 Randall Street, 125 Navy Street and 143 Church Street.

I do not see reference to this property on the agenda.

I would like to submit my question for the named property above.

I have a copy of the Urban Design Brief of February 2020.

Under section 4.0 Policy Content

Sub section 4.1.5 Urban Core

12.5.1 Permitted Uses

I would like council to question the following:

“ Entertainment facilities and hotels may be permitted.”

Our thoughts this area is not suited for a hotel. How do you handle the parking for the hotel and drop off and pick up?

What is meant by entertainment facilities? This is too broad of a term.

Please have council address our issues above. We would like to listen to the discussion on this property.

Can you clarify whether this will be discussed on Monday October 5th.

Regards,

Martin and Mary Gizzarelli

Speers Road

Oakville, Ontario

L6K 0H9

From: [Larry Cooper](#)
To: [Town Clerk](#)
Subject: Proposed By-law Amendment
Date: August 16, 2020 6:18:49 PM

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.

Larry Cooper
lakeshore rd east