

APPENDIX C:

PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Oakville's Hospital District Study Public Open House – Feedback Summary

Date: November 25th, 6:30 pm – 8:30 pm

Location: Queen Elizabeth Park Community and Cultural Centre, Rehearsal Hall

Consultation Purpose

- Introduce the Hospital District Study to members of the Oakville community;
- Share the project team's initial findings and next steps; and
- Gather feedback on the two (2) land use scenarios including recommended changes.

Project Team and Town of Oakville Staff In Attendance

- David Sajecki – Sajecki Planning, Partner
- Elyse Comeau – Sajecki Planning, Urban Planner
- Antoine Lahaie – WSP, Hydraulics
- Adrian Soo – Paradigm, Transportation Engineer
- Kirk Biggar – Town of Oakville, Senior Planner
- Diane Childs – Town of Oakville, Manager Long Range Planning
- Carly Dodds – Town of Oakville, Planner

Format

The evening began with an open house from 6:30 pm to 7:00 pm. During this time, the public reviewed project information on project display boards and engaged with members of the project team (Town and Consultants) if they had any questions or concerns.

From 7:00 pm to 7:30 pm, Town staff provided an introduction to the meeting in addition to an overview of the Palermo Village Study, followed by a presentation for the Hospital District Study given by Sajecki Planning. From 7:30 pm to 8:05 pm, participants interested in the Hospital District Study rotated between three tables, each with a unique theme:

- Table 1: Land Use + Parks & Open Spaces (2 maps, both options)
- Table 2: Roads & Blocks (1 map, both options)
- Table 3: Building Heights (1 map, both options)

Table facilitators from the project team encouraged discussions and recorded feedback. Each table asked participants to provide the following feedback for both options:

- What do you like about the options?
- What do you dislike about the options?
- What would you change / add?

Feedback

TABLE 1 – LAND USES + PARKS AND OPEN SPACES

Individual Comment Cards

- Suggest mix use on the east side of the Study Area, especially along the eastern boundary (MHBC Plan)
- Consider diverse commercial uses (MHBC Plan)
- Consider commercial uses that will benefit surrounding residents (MHBC Plan)
- Buildings that mix commercial uses are ideal – represents sound planning (MHBC Plan)
- Consider self-storage uses (MHBC Plan)

- ‘office employment special’ designation needs to be aware of compatibility with Courthouse (Infrastructure Ontario, Michael Coakley)
- ‘office employment’ and ‘office employment special’ designations need to include long-term care and affordable housing as permitted uses (Infrastructure Ontario, Michael Coakley)
- Privately owned public spaces should ensure connections to the Courthouse “public square” (Infrastructure Ontario, Michael Coakley)

Group Discussions – Overall Preferences

- Preference for Option 2 land use – look into moving the gateway to Third Line
- Preference for the flexibility of the ‘office employment special’ land use designation
- Preference for the green connections and POPs in Option 2 (Third Line and Dundas) and Hospital Gate and William Halton.
 - This POP should connect to the courtyard that is proposed across the street as part of the Courthouse development. It would be nice to have a POP on the other side of the street
- Option 2 – have live work opportunities in the ‘Urban Centre’ designation
- Mixed uses along the eastern boundary would be favourable

Group Discussions – Overall Dislikes

- Do not want high-rise around the Courthouse as it could be a public safety concern / potentially dangerous (gun violence)
- In Option 1 – the transition in land uses may not be needed to the west (office employment) because the land use / zoning for the lands outside the Study Area to the west may change over time. The industrial lands to the west could be open for development with further OP reviews

- “If I’m a doctor, I don’t want to live here” – some participants wondered who will choose to live in the Hospital District. Some participants think most people would want to live in single detached homes

Group Discussions – Suggestions

- Would like to see residential and mix of uses to the east of the life sciences (Dableh) development – would also like to see residential buildings have retail or commercial at grade in this area
- Would like to see long-term care uses within the ‘office employment’ designation and affordable housing (important and needed for Oakville)
- Would like to see daycare uses permitted along Dundas and/or as a permitted uses within the ‘office employment – special’ designation
- Important to think about the circulation of EMS vehicles
- Look into going over 15 storeys – this shouldn’t be the maximum height
- Gradual increase in heights (lower heights to the east for buffer to the subdivision development to the east of Study Area)
- Carefully consider the uses around the Courthouse

TABLE 2 – ROADS AND BLOCKS

Group Discussions – Overall Preferences

- Like the general location of roads and blocks and gateway for Option 1, but look into having more gateways
- Preference for Option 2 as there are many pedestrian connections – incentive to use green space is important

Group Discussions – Overall Dislikes

- Option 1 doesn’t have enough options for walking

Group Discussions – Suggestions

- It’s good to develop the local area, but pay attention to the road capacity which should match the speed of development
- Third Line is already busy with everyday traffic jam at rush hour. So please try to give more than one gateway around the hospital area. People tend to park south to Dundas (e.g. FreshCo plaza) to avoid expensive parking fee, so maybe build more trails within Hospital area to make it pedestrian-friendly
- It good to have this kind of conversation between government and residents

- The options should consider two gateways rather than only one, and maybe consider a gateway along William Halton Parkway

TABLE 3 – BUILDING HEIGHTS

Individual Comment Cards

- I wished the study addresses the height limit and 3.0 FSI to allow higher density (Joseph Dableh)
- Heights should be explored up to 30 storeys along the east boundary (MHBC Plan)
 - o 15 storeys, 3.0 FSi / 4.5 million total

Group Discussions – Overall Preferences

- Preference for Option 2 → benefit – critical mass for transportation
- Preference for Option 2 → generally support tall buildings for ease of and lifestyle
- Preference for tall buildings with mixed use podium levels
- Preference for multi-use buildings
- Participants like the vision of a life science and research hub

Group Discussions – Overall Dislikes

- Some participants dislike the idea of having a courthouse within the Study Area as it “doesn’t fit”
- Dislike that all tall buildings blocking line of sight (both options)
- Dislike tall buildings because they create more traffic
- Dislike for the north west pocket for taller heights in Option 2

Group Discussions – Suggestions

- o Intensification of 4.5 FSI to 5 instead of 3
- o Building increase from 15 storey higher
- o Higher buildings in the back (20 to 30 storeys to the north)
- o Help support transportation
- o Mixed use along east boundary
- o Tall buildings along eastern border to “buffer” with residential
- o Lower buildings with a large “spread” across the Study Area
- o Higher densities for high rise buildings
- o Focus taller buildings along the two corridors (Dundas and William Halton Parkway)