

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendment – 1071 Ambleside Drive (ACS2022-PIE-PS-0095)

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: 10

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between August 29 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for the meeting of September 8) and September 21, 2022 (the deadline for written submissions, being 4 pm the business day before the final committee meeting date of September 22, 2022): 14

Summary of written submissions

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

- Sharon Moon and Hower Clark letter dated November 14, 2021, opposed
- Shona Trent email dated August 24, 2022, opposed
- Robert Szabo email dated August 26, 2022, opposed
- Joan Scott emails dated August 30, 2022 and September 7, 2022, opposed
- Philip Bird letter dated September 2, 2022, opposed
- Vivian Leclerc email dated September 5, 2022, opposed
- Alan Seymour email dated September 6, 2022, opposed
- C. McClymont email dated September 6, 2022, opposed
- Gisèle Thibeault email dated September 16, 2022, opposed
- Purnima Sen email dated September 16, 2022, opposed
- Alex Lanyi letter received September 20, 2022, opposed
- Irina Kudryashova email dated September 20, 2022, opposed
- George Mavromatis letter received September 20, 2022, opposed
- Jane Anderson letter with images received September 20, 2022, opposed

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:

- Lisa Dalla Rosa, Fotenn
- Geoff Caran
- Rod Lahey (architect)

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

- Jerry Lapierre, President, Board of Directors, Ambleside One* touched on the current demographics of the neighbourhood, how the proposal fails to comply with the Cleary and New Orchard Area-Specific Policy, issues with increased congestion, height and density.
- James MacEachern understands there is a housing shortage, however, this proposal does not assist with that. Fails to comply with existing policies and is not appropriate for this street as neither New Orchard nor Ambleside are an arterial road and is out of character for the neighbourhood.
- Jane Anderson* spoke as a resident on Ambleside Drive, expressing concern with the development and the affect it will have on the current residents. The proposed development will have a negative impact on the quality of life for the current residents and is out of character for the neighbourhood.
- Andrea Cocks expressed concerns with how the proposed development will increase density in the neighbourhood, how the glare from the adjacent building will make balconies unusable and noise levels as a result of the loading dock.
- Ken Webb expressed frustration with the proposed development and how it will damage something of value currently enjoyed by residents of Ambleside Drive. Would ask that the City ensure the developer complies with existing policies.
- Sharon Moon & Howard Clark* purchased a condo at this property because of the view of the Ottawa River and proximity to the NCC parkland and

because it was not suitable for onsite density redistribution. This proposal goes against the Secondary Plan and does not meet the criteria to integrate.

- Lorna Lemay supports comments from previous speakers and added concerns related to the need for an independent Traffic Impact Assessment, Wind Impact Assessment and Community Benefits Charge.

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 2 hours and 32 minutes in consideration of the item.

Vote: The committee considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as amended by the following:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, with respect to report ACS2022-PIE-PS-0095, Planning Committee substitute Document 5 with the revised version enclosed.

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there be no further notice pursuant to Section 34 (17) of the *Planning Act*.

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 September 7 after 4 pm (deadline for written submissions to Planning Committee) and October 5, 2022 (Council consideration date): 0

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as presented.