

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 100 Steacie Drive (ACS2022-PIE-PS-0077)

In addition to those outlined in the Consultation Details section of the report, the following outlines the written and oral submissions received between the publication of the report and prior to City Council's consideration:

Number of delegations/submissions

Number of delegations at Committee: 12

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between June 27 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for the July 7 meeting where the item was originally to be considered) and August 24, 2022 (the deadline for written submissions, being 4 pm the business day before the August 25th committee meeting where the item was considered): 7

Summary of written submissions

Written submissions are held on file with the City Clerk and available from the Committee Coordinator upon request:

- Email dated June 30, 2022 from Patricia and Andrew Carran, in opposition
- Email dated July 3, 2022 from Gail Curry and Christopher Davis, in opposition
- Email dated July 5, 2022 from Edwin and Grace Watts, in opposition
- Email dated July 5, 2022 from Gary Coady, with comments
- Email dated July 6, 2022 from David Barron, with comments
- Email dated August 16, 2022 from Faith Blacquiere, in opposition
- Email dated August 23, 2022 from Marianne Wilkinson, in opposition

Summary of oral submissions

The Applicant provided a slide presentation, a copy of which is on file with the City Clerk. The Applicant provided an overview of the Application and responded to questions from the Committee. They were represented by the following:

- Brigil: Marc Rivet, Jean-Luc Rivard, and Philip Thibert
- J.L. Richards & Associates: Eric Forhan

- Parsons: Austin Shih

The Committee heard the following public delegations on the report, and a summary of their respective comments are as follows:

- Robert McAulay, Kanata Beaverbrook Community Association expressed concerns with the application noting the application is premature, site is isolated, limited access to public transit, poorly lit area and parking. Slide presentation is held on file with the Office of the City Clerk.
- Ed Watts expressed concern with increased traffic congestion and inadequate infrastructure to support it as a result of the proposed application.
- Marianne Wilkinson expressed concerns with the proposed development noting the site is isolated, not close to public transit, safety concerns with traffic at intersections and drainage issues.
- Catherine Roberts spoke to a slide presentation which is held on file with the Office of the City Clerk that touched on traffic concerns and in adequate intersection infrastructure to support current traffic let alone the increase in traffic this application will create.
- Andrew Carran noted that there is in adequate infrastructure to support the increase in residents this application will bring and expressed concerns with water supply and drainage.
- Gail Currie expressed concerns with proximity to public transit, increase in intensification, site parking and further noted pedestrian safety concerns given lack of sidewalks and street lighting.
- Jayne Cody, Coady Construction expressed issues with how their company has been zoned, touched on drainage issues and hopes the application is not approved.

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 1 hour and 40 minutes in consideration of the item.

Vote: The committee considered all submissions in making its decision and recommended Council refuse the application. The report and recommendations were amended by the following:

Motion No. PLC 2022-68/1

Moved by C. Curry

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the “COMMENTS BY THE WARD COUNCILLOR” section of report ACS2022-PIE-PS-0077 indicating “The Councillor is aware of the application related to this report.” be amended as follows:

“Community members have significant concerns about the rezoning application. The area has been zoned Business Park Industrial for many years and reflects that zoning, given the neighbouring industrial and business locations adjacent. The community feels that allowing residential zoning in the middle of industrial zoning is poor planning. The community feels that this application is not thoughtful planning at all. The community feels that the traffic at the end of the road would only add to what is already considered a failed intersection, a highly congested school zone, and two dangerous traffic zones for residents given the addition of three new apartment towers nearby, on intersecting roads, also impacting the congested streets and failed intersection. Community members understand that the widening of March Road and promised BRT are assumptions that may be much further away than 2038 as we have been given as an estimate. The Community is supportive of increasing density as demonstrated by the 4000 plus units approved in Kanata North this past year, including those from today’s Planning Committee; however, overall planning and community design is not present here. The Community feels that this is an example of poor planning and ill fit. In addition, there are significant trees that will be destroyed, suggested pathways to March Road that requires trespassing on private property to get to. Finally, the neighbouring industrial businesses were not consulted and have significant concerns regarding their heavy construction vehicles and noisy business activities will have with residents living in the industrial strip.”

Motion No. PLC 2022-68/2

Moved by C. Curry

BE IT RESOLVED that the Zoning By-law Amendment for 100 Steacie Drive be refused.

Ottawa City Council

Pursuant to the *Procedure By-law*, members of the public may not make oral submissions to Council.

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between August 24 after 4 pm (deadline for written submissions to Planning Committee) and September 21, 2022 (Council consideration date): 1

Summary of written submissions to Council

Written submissions are held on file with the City Clerk and available from the Committee Coordinator upon request.

- J.L. Richards letter dated September 17, 2022, in support of the report recommendations.

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the Plannint Committee recommendations, as amended by the following:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the reasons for the refusal of the rezoning application in respect of 100 Steacie Drive are as follows:

1. The proposed development is incompatible with existing development in the area;
2. In particular, the development is in proximity to and incompatible with the industrial developments in the area;
3. The proposed development has poor access to transit and is more than 600 metre walking distance of a transit stop or station;
4. The proposed development has poor access to community amenities;
5. The proposed development creates negative impacts for pedestrians, such as isolation, lack of sidewalks and is in close proximity to commercial and industrial land uses;
6. Access to the proposed development is via the intersection of Steacie Drive and Teron Road which is a failing intersection