

## **APPENDIX D1 of PB-65-18**

### **Summary of Public Consultation on the Aldershot GO Mobility Hub Draft**

#### **Precinct Plan**

**June 2018**

## **INTRODUCTION**

On May 3, 2018, the third round of public consultation was held at the East Plains United Church for the Aldershot GO Mobility Hub. Members of the public were invited to attend and provide feedback on a draft precinct plan for the area.

The draft precinct plan was informed by public feedback gathered during the Mobility Hubs study process in 2017, including two stages of public consultation, as well as on-going technical studies. In May 2017, we heard from the community about what people value in the area, and in September 2017 we received community feedback on two draft concepts showing different options where future growth could be accommodated in the Aldershot GO Mobility Hub.

With the input received in 2017, along with information from ongoing technical studies, the draft precinct plan for the Aldershot GO Mobility Hub was produced. The draft precinct plan defines a vision for various areas within the Mobility Hub, to guide future development through the use of land such as residential and commercial, height, urban design considerations and more.

Approximately 124 people attended the public consultation event on May 3, 2018, where the draft precinct plan was presented. The event was structured as a drop-in open house with a series of display boards that provided information on the study, and described the intention statement and key directions of each precinct. Staff were present to discuss and answer questions. Comment sheets for each precinct were available to fill out or take away. An online workbook was also available to collect public comments on the draft precinct plan. Staff requested that comments on the draft precinct plan be returned by Monday June 4, 2018.

Along with the formal drop-in open house, two additional drop-in open houses were held at various locations and were open to the public, landowners and other interested parties to discuss their specific properties, interests or concerns with staff one-on-one.

The feedback received from the open houses, email and through the online workbook is provided in the following section.

## Draft Precinct Plan Feedback - May 2018

Below is the feedback received during the public consultation open houses, email and through the online workbook on the draft precinct plan for the Aldershot GO Mobility Hub. Feedback includes general comments on the Aldershot GO Mobility Hub draft precinct plan, as well as comments specific to each of the various precincts.

In addition to the formal open house on Thursday May 3, 2018 at the East Plains United Church, additional drop-in open houses took place on the following dates:

Monday May 7 – Aldershot Arena; 6:30 – 8 p.m.

Tuesday May 8 – Aldershot Library; 10:30 a.m. – noon

Feedback was received through comment sheets, emails and an online workbook that was available from May 15, 2018 to June 4, 2018.

### General Feedback

- General comments on the Overall Plan
  - Excited for the mobility hub to take shape.
  - Like the whole plan and the policy objectives.
  
- General comments on Public Realm
  - Sidewalks need to be repaired and built to accommodate all residents who don't drive.
  - The shrubs and bushes that are planted between road lanes – are they sprayed to prevent insect swarming to high-rise buildings on Waterdown/Plains Rd area.
  - Proposed green space on either side of Waterdown Rd is too narrow.
  - Love the idea of more street trees. Seating needs to be more removed from noisy Plains Rd. That would encourage more socializing.
  - We need room for patio sitting in front of the buildings. Some of the present buildings leave no room for walking and outdoor space.
  - Don't take away green space.
  - What about electric scooter carts to shuttle passengers to their locations.
  - There are currently existing issues with insect populations during the hot sunny summer months that tend to swamp over residential building balconies and patio doors. With all the proposed green projects in Aldershot, will there be pesticides to prevent such hazards for tenants living in high rise to enjoy their balconies during the summer? There are certain flowering plants such as marigolds, lavenders etc. that are insect resistant as a suggestion for consideration to build a better Aldershot.
  
- General comments on Retail and Public Services
  - We need enticing and attractive retail businesses to establish culture and 'buzz.'
  - A grocery store is a must.

- Coffee shops and independent retail ‘mom & pop’ shops.
  - Entertainment and better water access for families and visitors.
  - I’d love to see more small retail, restaurants, patios and cafes. More small retail I can walk to would be great.
  - Carefully consider size of retail – currently very small retail results in a lot of vacancies and businesses we don’t really need more of.
  - Where are the schools for the children?
  - Need to find a way to get appropriate retail in the area so people do not need to travel by car to get necessities.
  - We have high-rises on the corner of Daryl and Plains Road but no real shops it seems we keep building apartments with small shops below them, we have more dentists, hairdressers, nail salons than we know what do with but no real shops.
  - Where will the schools go? Will children have to be bussed from the high density areas?
  - Need ways to keep the stores we love. The residents need a store like home hardware, J& G meats, turtledoves etc. We are getting all of these new building but losing the meaningful retail.
  - Requiring at least two uses is essential. Minimum heights, and maximum venting and service functions for the commercial/employment use of at least the first two floor is needed.
- General comments on Property Values and Rent
    - You can guarantee that the rents will be higher because developers do not build without profit. We also have every piece of land on Plains road being developed as townhouses or apartments.
- General comments on Public Consultation
    - We are very frustrated by the lack of a true consultative process.
    - The general walk through, pictures, comment sheets to provide feedback was a little disappointing. I was hoping for an update, a presentation, then have an open forum for comments or lead group discussions.
    - I would like to know how proposals have changed after community input. We want to know how original plans have changed because of our input. At the next meeting, please outline what feedback was given, what you have listened to, and how the plans have changed.
- General comments on Transportation
    - Additional active transportation connections are critically important due to volume of traffic on Plains as well as safety considerations for walkers/cyclists.
    - If a south service road goes in, can lanes be reduced on Plains to create more of a “main street” feel?
    - Have concerns over proposed St. Matthews’s transit access to Masonry Rd.

- St. Matthew's residential court location should remain closed to vehicle traffic. Alternate routes on Cooke and Waterdown Rd should be used.
- When put walkway on St. Matthew's years ago we were told that they would never open road to Masonry. Now 2018 it is being talked about. What about Clearview? Fewer homes affected and more rental units.
- I am always disappointed that there is rarely any focus on the number of cars added to the neighbourhood vs. the number of parking spaces vs. ability of local roads to absorb the new traffic. Plains Rd. will no longer be a street but will be the QEW part 2.
- Please don't narrow Plains Rd. Traffic is already bad.
- Given the current Burlington east-west transport issues a high population density will only exacerbate it. A plan is needed to address it.
- Where do you think all of this traffic is going to? Most of it onto Plains Road which is already so congested that most of the time it takes forever to drive across Burlington.
- Aldershot Village does not have the infrastructure to support such development and with no plans to add lanes to main routes within Aldershot/widen Plains you're creating a headache for residents. You cannot assume new residents will not be dependent on cars.
- Really must connect the GO transit station access road (on the north side of the tracks) through to King Road. This connection as a "South Service Road" is a must to provide more vehicular and active transportation access in and around the hub area.
- Strongly support the "transit plaza" concept.
- My concern is that Plains Road cannot handle much more car traffic and you cannot believe that most people living in the mobility hub will not drive.
- GO station parking needs to be addressed before any more building is done.
- With all the high-rise buildings as proposed, there will be traffic problems to the already too busy Plains Road and there is a lack of grocery stores.
- No reduction in lanes on Plains Rd.
- Queen Mary Avenue and St. Matthews Street should not be opened up for vehicle access
- If plan proceeds the neighborhood congestion will become an issue: More traffic on a local street not meant for it. 11 storeys on Clearview will add traffic to Queen Mary/St. Matthews, especially if there is no traffic light at Clearview. People will cut through the neighbourhood to get to the St. Matthews light.
- With any development we believe there needs to be sufficient parking spaces so that street parking is avoided and does not become a problem.
- There is a need to build a parking arcade or stackable parking structure to alleviate street parking in the current state. When new development and housing projects get completed near the GO station, parking congestion needed resolve to prevent accident potential.
- For the higher density areas it should be development requirement for contributing to a Mobility Hub area shuttle service

- Need to establish traffic calming zones and community watches to keep the Aldershot community safe as a whole.
  - Where is the consideration for the South Service Road to ease the traffic burden east to west
  - The Mobility Hub plan must make it a requirement that the "South Service Road " from Waterdown GO Station through to King Road be ensured. This road is a key connection to help distribute inbound and outbound HUB area traffic flows and provide options from congested intersections.
  - Higher density sites must have a development requirement of contributing towards a Mobility Hub area shuttle service.
- General comments on Development/Intensification
    - Wondering why there are so many high-rises on Plains Rd/Waterdown Rd? And that the zoning exceeds 6-storeys?
    - Noticing the Aldershot mobility hub may look like another Mississauga instead of peaceful and serene surroundings like Oakville waterfront near Bronte-Burloak area.
    - I am concerned about excessive height and over-intensification and its impact on the neighbourhood. It will be difficult to turn Plains Rd into a true “main street”. It is noisy and unpleasant to walk along and hard to cross.
    - Agree with max of 6 storeys on south side of Plains.
    - We strongly oppose the current zoning changes and proposed development.
    - Please allow only a 4-storey building on the south side of Plains Rd. by Glenwood.
    - Too many high-rise building.
    - Do not see the need for transition area between Grove Park and Aldershot Park. Best to have intensity in this area as there is no housing.
    - Intensify growth in the “greenhouse” area. It will keep it away from single home dwellings.
    - Not understanding the high intensity dwellings for St. Matthew’s Avenue.
    - We are not a downtown where there are many places to visit. To disturb a long time neighbourhood that is established is not the way to go.
    - The result of such a development on Clearview Avenue would completely change the atmosphere of our community. Our views would be blocked by apartment towers. Our streets will be lined with cars and I cannot even imagine what kind of traffic this will produce. You are taking away the City’s history and replacing the scenery with concrete.
    - In Aldershot I think we have been intensified enough.
    - We feel there is too much change too fast.
    - We are concerned about the proposed condo developments as we know from neighbours they have sold their properties.
    - City infrastructure cannot handle more people and there doesn’t seem to be any plan to address this.
    - Why not build on north side of 403 - South Service Rd. and by King Rd. south of 403, vacant land.

- Curious as to the transition area between Aldershot Park and Grove Park when there is no housing in these areas. I think increasing the intensity in the greenhouse lands has the least affect on NIMBY issues.
  - Shift intensity from Queen Mary/St. Matthew's area into the greenhouse property. Win-Win.
  - Please don't put anymore buildings up in this wonderful community. We already have too many high-rise building on Plains.
- General Comments on the Clearview/Queen Mary/St. Matthew's Area
    - For the decision-makers to not exclude the St. Matthews residential neighbourhood suggests a "who cares" attitude.
    - I'm particularly concerned for the people who live along Clearview and for people in the Grove Park/St. Matthew's area.
    - Clearview Ave should not be included on the west side between Queen Mary and Plains Rd. These places should have the same low density designation as the east side.
    - Involving the Grove Park/St. Matthew's neighbourhood is a community destroyer. St. Matthew's Avenue has many lovely homes and is a great family neighbourhood.
    - Leave the west side of St. Matthew's out of the plan. The west side of Clearview is okay as it backs on to light industrial.
    - Exclude Clearview Avenue and Queen Mary from the proposed boundaries or adjust the street to be totally small single family, semi-detached and street level townhomes with basements and driveways
    - suggest townhouses for the west side of Clearview. It qualifies intensifying the neighborhood but does not drastically impact the area. - I would like to see the boundary for the mobility hub changed to exclude Clearview/Queen Mary/St Matthews. A neighborhood can be preserved and still meet intensification requirements.
    - Change the boundary for the mobility hub to exclude Clearview/Queen Mary/St Matthews.
    - We need to keep the single-family homes that exist, particularly on St Matthews, Queen Mary and Clearview and build new single-family housing to continue to bring families that want to raise their kids here.
    - Against putting 11 stories on Clearview's established neighbourhood, casting the homes in shade and creating traffic onto Plains Road at that juncture. We want the existing single family home low residential to remain for Clearview, St Matthews and Queen Mary to mitigate traffic congestion and retain community character.
    - 11 storeys is too high and should be removed from Clearview to retain the low density plan for this established neighborhood.
    - St.Matthew's should be excluded from the Mobility Hubs plan.

## Parks and Open Space Precinct

- Yes, I agree with the general intent of the precinct.
- Aldershot Park used to have a summer swimming pool that was replaced by a tennis court. Could building a new pool be considered?
- Yes, I agree with the park space precinct. I also believe a recreation seniors center, lawn bowling, pool facility that is outdoors, not just a splash pad, should be included.
- I am confused as to how children will use the park to be located at Waterdown Rd. if it is sometimes full of water.
- Agree with the general intent of this precinct
  - The size of the proposed parks on the east side of Waterdown Road are shown as >1 ha or 2.47 acres. This is an aggressive size and proposed not sustainable in either location
  - On Cooke Blvd, this size would negate most of the development potential – which if OK
- The majority of the online workbook respondents agreed with the general intent of the Parks and Open Space Precinct, while some respondents indicated they did not agree and one respondent indicated “not sure”. The following comments were provided:
  - Bicycle paths are fine but St Matthews, St Mary’s and Clearview should not be thru roads for cars and buses
  - Do not like the linear park linking Aldershot Park and Grove Park. These always end up grimy and not well maintained. The side walk is there for a reason. Add a Bike lane on Gallagher road as well, creating a direct route to the Go Station. I'd much rather make use of the roads that we already have.
  - There is not a commitment to expand park space. I have seen many other neighborhoods where the planning included far more park space than proposed here.
  - The 2 parks shown at plus 1 hectare would not be really feasible.
  - While the general intent is good, who would bear the costs to implement and maintain
  - Will there be clearly defined, well-lit cycling paths going to the parks and traffic lights at intersections to keep pedestrian and cyclists safe?
  - There needs to be a paved path through grove park to the go station. With Lights!
  - Assess the future recreational needs in Aldershot and Hidden Valley Parks for population growth as well as LaSalle Park despite it being outside of the Mobility Hub.
  - New minor park at the northeast corner of Clearview and Queen Mary.
  - Both Parks indicated as >1HA (= 2.47 acres) are virtually impractical to construct. On Cooke Blvd., this would take up almost the entire area occupied by Etratech Ind. The Park located lands at the northeast corner of Waterdown Rd. and Masonry Ct. is slated for only .7 acres, the rest being flood control pond. On private lands but being represented as a public. Grove park needs work and at present is just overgrown, unkempt brush and basically unusable as such. This park should provide walkways/cycling capability directly linking the Aldershot Go.
  - On Cooke Blvd. a plus 1-acre park as shown would be too aggressive. An over 2 1/2-acre park would use almost all the land slated for buildings up to 19 storeys. This in itself is too tall and would cause shadowing of all Clearview, Queen Mary and St. Matthews.

- Cooke Blvd. at > 1 HA is an aggressive size for the land available
- The park being built on the north-east corner of Waterdown Road and Masonry Court is only .7 acres not the > 1HA shown as the majority is flood pond

### **Public Service Precinct**

- Consider including a library connection to this hub.
- Greater opportunities for retail use in this area.
- Agree with the general intent of this precinct
- The majority of online workbook respondents agreed with the general intent of the Public Service Precinct, while a few respondents indicated they did not agree and one respondent indicated “not sure”. The following comments were provided:
  - I don't understand why so much land needs to be allocated to the Public Service.
  - Better utilize what is already there through expansion and upgrades. Use vacant land for increasing population density.
  - There is no traffic mitigation plan and no specified areas for the TDM strategies, they all will come after the damage is done
  - Better explanation for what is planned for these locations. I don't understand why Public Service needs all this land.
  - Extreme need for a centralized recreational centre with pool, arena, community rooms and library with population growth.
  - The allocated space and public service facilities don't seem reflective of the significantly increased population for the Mobility Hub area. Has a quantitative assessment been done of the public service levels needed for the Mobility Hub area?
  - Needs some space suitable for everyday commercial activity (grocery, financial services, LCBO)

### **Grove Park/St.Matthew's Neighbourhood Precinct**

- Believe that the Greenhouse property is prime location to build high-rise condominiums. Believe that there are no neighbours and tall buildings will not cast a shadow on the surrounding houses.
- Greenhouse property has no neighbours and is within walking distances of the train station, which makes it a reasonable location for a high-rise building.
- Fear that the street will be opened to the traffic at Masonry Court and will no longer be quiet. The noise increase will result in drastic decrease in housing prices.
- Loss of community character from the precinct.
- Do not see the purpose in disrupting existing neighborhoods.
- Do not agree with the new road to Grove Park.
- Traffic is a concern, especially with young families surrounding these high intensity roadways.
- The buildings proposed are too tall.

- Unclear as to what is proposed here, please provide more information/maps.
- Consider moving the high-rise development to the greenhouse.
- Do not agree with the idea of opening the existing bike/walk-thru paths to Masonry Road.
- Supportive of development that is 4-storeys or less (E.g. townhouses/semi-housing development).
- Consider a walking pathway to Grove Park so that pedestrians do not need to travel along Plains Road.
- Very busy, traffic filled area along Plains Road.
- Consider implementing bus stops along Plains Road and Waterdown Road.
- Consider increasing the lane width on Plains Road – a right hand turning lane would improve traffic flow and reduce congestion overall.
- Do not agree with the intent in its existing layout. This is inappropriate planning
  - While housing type direction is acceptable; the boundaries are not. Clearview Avenue in its entirety (west side of Clearview) must be included, and remain a low rise residential
  - Clearview and St. Matthew's are not to be active transportation and transit oriented. Pedestrian and cycling only, therefore streets should not be opened to Masonry Court
- In the online workbook, there was no consensus among respondents with regards to whether they agreed with the general intent of the Grove Park/St. Matthew's Neighbourhood. The following comments were provided:
  - There should not be townhouses or semis in this established neighborhood as it over populates the child friendly area, brings in lower economic housing a reduce the value if existing properties. St Matthews and Clearview road should remain as dead end streets to keep the level of traffic the same
  - Why would you not increase the density to where the greenhouses are on the top right corner and leave St. Matthews the way it is? There would be very few houses affected by this. There are no houses north and south of that location, and very few to west side.
  - should include the east and west side of St. Matthews.
  - This neighbourhood should not be a thoroughfare to the go station.
  - All of Clearview Ave. needs to be included in this precinct and really, this precinct needs to be excluded completely from the Mobility Hub boundaries. St. Matthews and Clearview Ave, streets not to be enhanced for 'active ' transport and transit. Should remain 'No Exit ' streets and only allow pedestrian and cycling access to Aldershot GO.
  - This concept does not go far enough and all of Clearview, Queen Mary and St. Matthews need to be out of the Mobility Hub boundaries and protected
  - The Aldershot Hub is 'not' a Government or Metrolinx mandated Mobility Hub there are no intentions of deeming either Aldershot or Appleby as such. This is strictly a City run initiative and as such this area including all of Clearview Ave. should be removed/protected from any proposals the City may have.
  - Prohibit some streets from connecting to the GO because Cars will leave the station and zoom out through the easiest way possible.

- The west side of Clearview Ave, in its entirety must be included in this precinct and for the same housing types and remain low rise residential or this precinct, including all of Clearview Ave., Queen Mary and St. Matthews, must be totally excluded from the Mobility Hub boundaries. Permitting 11 storeys on the west side of Clearview would destroy the entire neighbourhood community character, leading to land speculation, pressure for overintensification, traffic congestion and sun shadowing.
- The entire street of Clearview Ave needs to be included, not just half. This proposal goes against the OP in that any development or increased density would be directed away from any established neighbourhoods. This is a total contradiction suggesting 11 storey towers on the West side of Clearview. They must remain as is with only pedestrian and cycling access to the GO at the existing pass through on St. Matthews.
- Neighbourhood extends to opposite side of Clearview - include in the Grove Park / St. Matthews Neighbourhood designation. Clearview/Queen Mary/ St. Matthews to be removed from the scope and to remain a low density established neighbourhood in its entirety and to be carved out the same as White Oaks.
- Both Clearview and St. Matthews should not be through streets for any vehicular traffic or active transportation and the pass through at St. Matthew's to remain only pedestrian /cycling only.

#### **Aldershot Main Street Precinct**

- There is need for a grocery store/retail. Farmboy would be a great addition to the neighborhood.
- Food stores are needed in Aldershot.
- Higher development along the western end of Plains Road will have a lower impact and less impact on our property values.
- There should not be any development greater than 3 storeys along this Western side of Plains Road.
- Do not assume that all residents are not commuting by train, traffic will increase for auto.
- There needs to be a greater community aspect in this plan.
- No provisions for seniors or affordable housing in the plans displayed – higher rent.
- Stores are leaving because there is too high of a rent and there are already too few.
- No parking for shoppers.
- Show 3-D renderings so that we can see the plans more clearly and the scale of the proposals as well – easier to evaluate.
- Consider a greater setback between the buildings and the roads – create a better village atmosphere (cafes etc.).
- Do not agree with the intent of the Aldershot Main Street Precinct – the intention is to fulfill the Plains Road Village vision and the key here is Village. The development form is not acceptable on the north side of Plains as mid-rise to 11 storeys

- Change the heights on both sides of Plains Road to be a maximum of 6 storeys to be consistent with areas already developed or being developed from Waterdown Road to King Road
- Sustainability – not every complex or development should be required to have ground floor retail/commercial. There is already an abundance of empty units in the existing complexes.
- We want development along Plains Road, for the most part, to remain at 4 stories maximum, to reduce problems with shadowing, traffic congestion, and impact on neighbouring single family homes. We do not want to see the beautiful tree canopy be dwarfed by a corridor of tall buildings. Traffic along Plains Road is congested already and imbalanced development will lead to the kind of traffic that Plains Road cannot handle. We are experiencing too much traffic congestion at the end of the work day as it is.
- I do not agree that the maximum building height on either side of Plains Road should be 6 storeys. Four storeys would be more appropriate; I also do not agree that there could be a maximum of 11 storeys where properties are not adjacent to low-rise residential uses
- The concept needs to include something that will make the street walkable and pedestrian friendly. Green space and trees that are currently along each side of the existing street accomplish this. Wide concrete sidewalks with few trees and no green space, such as have been put in along the redeveloped areas of Plains Road, do not.
- In the online workbook, there was no consensus among respondents with regards to whether they agreed with the general intent of the Aldershot Main Street Precinct. The following comments were provided:
  - this new proposal provides no incentive for redevelopment. The plan for intensification is valid but this current proposal does nothing to sway current long-term owners to enhance/develop further the older structures in this corridor. The cost to increase / redevelop to 6 stories is not cost effective.
  - Buildings should be no higher than 6 storeys to ensure Aldershot does not get overpopulated.
  - should max at 6 stories on both sides
  - All of Plains Road should be 6 storeys only to maintain the Plains Road Village concept.
  - Following principled and strict planning concepts, we should work with owners of the north side of Plains Rd. to develop to heights that will encourage them to tear down the inefficient and dated structures and replace them with our concept for the mobility hub.
  - The current proposal does not address the current low rise structures that will not find it cost effective or beneficial to redevelop to 6 stories.
  - Parking, where are people going to park to use the services. And what will the minimum sizes of the retail establishments be? Aldershot has very few useful or interesting retail choices. If you don't insist on large spaces the services we need will never come.
  - Requirement for retail / 2 uses in all these locations just does not make sense as they would be unsustainable as is evident by the already empty units in existing complexes along Plains Road.

- Land off Emery behind the fire station could also be used for mixed use with commercial on ground floor.
- Any development on either side of Plains between Howard and White Oaks must be limited to 6 storeys to maintain continuity with the rest of Plains Road and maintain the Aldershot Village vision.

### **Mid-Rise Residential Precinct**

- Move the high density, high rise condominiums into the greenhouse property.
- Consider putting parks on either side of the railway.
- Are there any transition buildings required?
- Believe that this area should be strictly intended for low-rise development.
- The character of the existing community should be retained.
- Do not agree with the intent
  - The west side of Clearview must be removed from this concept and to be inclusive of the Grove Park/St. Matthew's Precinct. Low-rise type only.
  - Plains Road and Howard area are already fully developed with recently completed projects of 6,8,10 and 12 storey towers and townhomes. This area would seem complete
  - Why would the Metrolix property be shown unless it was actually developable and not more parking?
- I do not agree that the maximum building height should be 11 storeys along Clearview Avenue or Masonry Court adjacent to Clearview, or to the east of Grove Park. This height of building is not what families moving out of Toronto condos and high-rises are looking for. They are looking for affordable low-rise townhomes and single family housing, not another high-rise.
- In the online workbook, there was no consensus among respondents with regards to whether they agreed with the general intent of the Mid-rise Residential Precinct. The following comments were provided:
  - Some of the areas are too close to existing residential areas and are taking place of some exiting residential areas.
  - There should be no mid-rise on Clearview or behind the houses on the north side of Queen Mary. We do not want people looking into our backyard and overcrowding this quiet neighborhood.
  - Would like to see the residential status of this area maintained.
  - The west side of Clearview must be removed from this precinct as it is already an established low-density street of single homes in an established neighbourhood.
  - The entire west side of Clearview Ave. up to the Etratech Inc. property line must be removed from this concept and be inclusive in the Grove Park/St. Matthews Neighbourhood Precinct.

- The west side of Clearview must be removed from this precinct or concept and to be inclusive in the Grove Park/St. Matthews precinct
- Move the section on Clearview over one street (to east side of Cooke). Remove the section south of Masonry court.
- Mid-rise area should be increased on the greenhouse property and decreased along Clearview due to existing and non-existing housing

### **Emery/Cooke Commons Precinct**

- Yes, I agree with the general intent of the precinct.
- We hope you will relocate the concrete plant. The white dust is polluting our homes.
- Do not agree with the complete intent
  - The maximum building heights of 19 storeys is too high for these areas and Aldershot as a whole
  - Again, requiring complexes to achieve 2 uses could leave portions of the buildings empty. Not large enough to sustain a grocery store. The whole hub does not identify a shopping location
- Ensure that the existing light industrial uses are protected under zoning to ensure the City actively encourage and retain employment within this area
- Use zoning to enforce how a minimum of two uses is specified and can be quantified. Perhaps it is a percentage based on gross floor area (GFA) or derived from the density? Our current approach of having no minimum criteria for retail is not working
- I think 19 storey is too high for the Emery/Cooke Commons Precinct, this height limit should be the MAX in the Aldershot mobility hub – so this building height should be for Aldershot GO Central precinct. We are Aldershot village, not a major city with the means to support these heights. This is not meant for Aldershot.
- 19 story maximum height is way too high on Cooke. - To the East, It's right adjacent to Clearview and the Grove Park/St. Mathews low density residential area. I suggest 6 to 8, subject to provisions to retain existing business potential. – Emery is a different context; less concern with 19 storey maximum – could still have serious problems for roads, public amenities, air pollution and other impacts
- In the online workbook, there was no consensus among respondents with regards to whether they agreed with the general intent of the Emery/Cooke Commons Precinct. The following comments were provided:
  - These high-rise buildings should only be between Emery and Howard where there are not established neighborhoods. Lots of land and easy to get to the GO. Leave the Clearview homes so they do not back onto these.
  - You already built high rises opposite Howard that have few useful services and absolutely no community feel. How would this be different. 19 stories is way too high. The buildings will shadow the houses and streets behind them.

- Don't like the setback requirements - would prefer to see orientation to the street (frequent transit corridor). Keep the active transportation linkages.
- The maximum development heights too tall for the area.
- The heights that are being proposed are too tall. 19 storeys would cause Sun shadowing as far as St. Matthews to the east
- Nothing taller than 12 should be permitted. Requiring complexes to achieve 2 uses could leave portions of buildings empty. What is needed somewhere in this precinct is shopping, specifically a grocery store.
- sun shadowing would be an issue for any properties to the East of Cooke Blvd.
- requiring a building to have 2 uses would lead to vacant ground floor units.
- area is already business and employment driven. Why would this be substituted with residential that provides neither in it's present form?

### **Aldershot GO Central Precinct**

- Increase the height in this area. It has the smallest impact on the surrounding neighbourhood.
- The general intent of the Aldershot GO Central was valid at the start, if it remained only at the GO; maximum building height of 30 storeys is outrageous. 20 maximum right at the GO
- Need to include shopping amenities
- We disagree with proposed 30 stories on Waterdown Road. This will cause even more potential traffic congestion on Waterdown and Plains Roads, as well as potential shadowing on established neighbourhoods. We want to see density targets met in a more balanced way, not in growth that turns Aldershot into a mini Mississauga. We are in favour of exceeding greenspace targets.
- I do not agree that the maximum building height should be 30 storeys. Fifteen or twenty would be more reasonable. We do not need to create an eyesore like the downtown Toronto condo developments in Burlington.
- This entire concept is predicated on Burlington becoming even more of a bedroom community to Toronto than it already is. There does not appear to be any effort to attract existing/new businesses/commercial enterprises to this area to retain/increase local employment opportunities and to attract the employees of those existing/new businesses/commercial enterprises to live in the local area served by local transit.
- The maximum building height is too high. The 30 storey height is excessive and may create sun-shadowing on the Clearview and adjacent community, as well as significant traffic onto Waterdown/Plains.
- In the online workbook, there was no consensus among respondents with regards to whether they agreed with the general intent of the Aldershot GO Central Precinct. The following comments were provided:
  - 30 storeys will increase population that will exceed the resources of the area and the city.

- 30 storeys is a massive amount of people in a small area. Way too much traffic for a small village. Max 6 storey should be the limit.
- With thoughts of creating such high density high rises, the population consensus tends to lean closer in favor of having a grocery store rather than just mom & pop stores where prices seem to be more reasonable for the aging or near retirement population where some may need to spend frugally to maintain measurable standard of living.
- too high and too dense
- This precinct area should allocate a site or two for higher end Office Employment (i.e. close to the GO Station)
- Mobility Hub areas should allow for LOS F for the intersections at peak hours...  
Notwithstanding that, implementation of Traffic Signal enhancements to modulate signal timings on a real-time basis is seemingly critical to optimize the physically constrained intersections.
- Waterdown will become so busy you will need other options to move cars around the area without making already established neighbourhoods dangerous.
- The Aldershot GO precinct would only be viable if it remained right at the GO station  
Everything centralized right at the transit location and at that location only.
- 30 storeys is definitely not a height that is acceptable anywhere in Aldershot.