

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 360 Kennedy Lane East

This application was first considered by the Planning and Housing Committee at the meeting of February 27, 2023 (Report ACS2023-PRE-PS-0019). It was brought back to Planning and Housing Committee on March 20, 2023 (Report ACS2023-PRE-PS-0048)

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 Planning and Housing Committee February 27: 12

Number of delegations at Planning and Housing Committee March 20: 6

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between February 17 (the date the report was first published to the City's website with the agenda for the February 27th committee meeting) and March 17, 2023 (the deadline for written submissions, being 4 pm the business day before the March 20th committee meeting date): 32

Summary of written submissions

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

1. Email dated February 17, 2023 from Shayne Salovaara
2. Email dated February 22, 2023 from Pamela Eisener
3. Email dated February 23, 2023 from Courtney Fischer
4. Email dated February 23, 2023 from Jim Rycroft
5. Email dated February 24, 2023 from a resident
6. Email dated February 24, 2023 from Brian Dooks
7. Email dated February 24, 2023 from Fraser Maher
8. Email dated February 24, 2023 from Randa B.
9. Email dated February 24, 2023 from Jodi Doyle Brouillard
10. Email dated February 24, 2023 from Brian Tilley
11. Email dated February 24, 2023, from Farangis Faezi
12. Letter dated February 24, 2023, from Jim Brown

13. Petition submitted February 24, 2023, from Rose Marie MacLennan (in addition to oral submissions)
14. Written Comments from Alan Perks (in addition to February 27 oral submissions)
15. Written Comments from Debra Dunville (in addition to February 27 oral submissions)
16. Written Comments from Gisèle Doyle (in addition to February 27 oral submissions)
17. Written Comments from Richard Rice (in addition to February 27 oral submissions)
18. Written Comments from Jim Rycroft in addition to February 27 oral submissions)
19. Email dated March 10, 2023 from James and Sandra Menard
20. Email dated March 11, 2023 from Brian and Connie Dooks
21. Email dated March 13, 2023 from Randa El-Kadi
22. Email dated March 13, 2023 from Victoria Swinburne-Kennelly
23. Email dated March 13, 2023 from France Bidal
24. Email dated March 13 and 14, 2023 from Jim Rycroft
25. Email dated March 14, 2023 from Shayne Salovaara
26. Email dated March 15, 2023 from Gisele Doyle
27. Email dated March 16, 2023 from Jim Webber
28. Email dated March 16, 2023 from Carly Forrester, Kindred Works
29. Email dated March 17, 2023 from Farangis Faezi
30. Email dated March 17, 2023 from Jim Brown
31. Emails dated March 18, 2023 from Fraser Maher
32. Email dated March 20, 2023 from Debbie Barbesin

Summary of oral submissions

The Applicant provided an overview of the Application and responded to questions from the Committee. They were represented by the following:

- Carly Forrester – Development Manager, Kindred Works
- Andrew Hannaford – Associate, MHBC Planning
- Kinan Hewitt – Architect, KPMB

On February 27th the Committee heard the following public delegations on the report, and a summary of their respective comments are as follows:

1. Alan Perks noted this development is a welcomed addition to the neighbourhood. Outside of the issues with traffic and parking, he raised concerns with the lack of affordable and accessible ‘living in community’ housing. He spoke of the Universal Design approach which covers all needs and recommended the City, developers and architects adopt this approach with developments.
2. Gisèle Doyle spoke in support, commending the developer for including affordable and inclusive units in this development as there are currently none in Orléans. She did express concern with how the community identifies and assigns individuals to affordable units as not accessible units need to be affordable.
3. Richard Rice spoke in opposition of the proposal noting concerns related to traffic, pedestrian safety, parking and loss of greenspace and mature trees outlined in a petition submitted to the Committee.
4. Jim Rycroft stated this proposal is outside the character of the neighbourhood and expressed concerns with increased traffic congestion, lack of consideration for community risks and feels there is a need for a more sophisticated approach.
5. Debra Dunville spoke in opposition of the development, noting concerns with building height and inadequate parking spaces, stating it adversely will impact the quality of life of the neighbouring residents. Recommends that the Committee defer the proposal to ensure the land be developed at same grade as exists on Mountside Crescent and have city staff review parking requirements.
6. Rose Marie MacLennan, Queenswood United Church spoke in support of the development, touching on community engagement, importance of affordable housing in Orleans and indicated the Church is committed to continuing to work with the community to address needs and concerns.

7. Jim Brown, Vice President, Operations, Spring Living Retirement Committees* expressed concerns with the proposal negatively impacting current residents related to noise and traffic. Further, expressed concerns with the loss of greenspace.
8. Serena Sodhi spoke in favour of the proposal noting the importance of affordable housing units provided.
9. Dean Tester spoke strongly in favour of the development noting affordable housing units, proximity to transit and positive environmental impacts by limiting parking spaces.
10. Joseph Ostrovsky spoke in support noting the development is low-rise gentle intensification providing affordable rental units and reducing parking will have positive affects related to the climate emergency.
11. Leigh Honeywell spoke in favour of the application, noting affordability and proximity to transit.
12. Josh Girouard expressed concerns related to overflow parking the development will cause in the neighbouring areas.

On March 20th the Committee heard the following public delegations on the report, and a summary of their respective comments are as follows:

1. Jim Rycroft outlined reasons the committee should not approve the application in it's current form, touching on risk management implications, community engagement and traffic and parking concerns.
2. Gisèle Doyle spoke in support of the application, particularly having the opportunity for individuals with development and neurological disabilities the options to live in an inclusive and affordable home is important.
3. Richard Rice spoke to the different lifestyles of urban vs suburban residents, noting the latter are not in favour of intensification and reject the idealistic concept of the 15 minute "urban village". Housing is needed, however the City is urged to build with the community, not against it.
4. Miranda Gray spoke in support of the application, noting it is not impossible to live in the suburbs without a vehicle, and noted most issues with cars in the neighbourhood are from recreational facilities as opposed to homes and urged the Committee to support the staff recommendation without further delays.
5. Brandon Bay noted this development is a Church trying to do right by its community during a housing crisis. It is good suburban intensification; it maintains parking for rental units while moves towards safer streets with fewer cars and urged committee to approve the application.

6. Joseph Ostrovsky spoke in favour of the application, noting it will provide 81 families the opportunity to live in Ottawa, including 25 families who are struggling who live anywhere. This development will help make Ottawa into the intensified, walkable, transit-oriented city that residents here passionately believe in.

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent approximately 2.5 hours in consideration of the item on February 27 and 51 minutes on March 20, 2023.

Vote: The committee considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as presented on March 20, 2023.:

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 March 17, 2023, after 4 pm (deadline for written submissions to Planning Committee) and March 22, 2023 (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.

- Email dated March 20, 2023 from Randa El-Kadi

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

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