

## Pinecrest and Queensview Stations Secondary Plan Summary Report: Document 10: Consultation and Circulation Details

Throughout the secondary plan study, multiple meetings with residents, landowners, consultants, community associations, and industry stakeholders were held. The public and stakeholder meetings included:

- June 14, 2018 – Open House #1
- November 7, 2018 – Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #1
- April 6, 2022 – Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #2
- June 21, 2022 – Virtual Open House #2
- November 2, 2023 – Stakeholder Working Group Meeting #3
- December 7, 2023 – Virtual Open House #3

The summary reports for these sessions can be found on the Engage Ottawa webpage for the Pinecrest-Queensview Secondary Plan: [Pinecrest Queensview Secondary Plan | Engage Ottawa](#).

During the public circulation for the secondary plan from October 18, 2024 to November 22, 2024, the comments received from members of the community generally focused on the topics below:

- 1) Building heights and built form
- 2) Connectivity and access to O-Train stations
- 3) Land Uses and active frontages
- 4) Pinecrest-Queensview Transportation Study and parking
- 5) Parks and greenspace
- 6) Zoning amendments

The following Sections will discuss each topics in greater detail:

### 1) Building Heights and Built Form

Concerns have been raised about the proposed 6-storey height limit in the Corridor designation. While Minor Corridors in the Inner and Outer Urban Transects in Volume 1 of the Official Plan already permit 6 storeys, in this Plan, shallow lots under 30.5m are restricted to 4 storeys due to challenges with achieving building height transitions. Lot depths of approximately 30.5 – 35 metres may reach 6 storeys if Corridor policies are met, such as minimum lot size, setbacks, and stepbacks to ensure transitions to the abutting low-rise Neighborhood designation. Even deeper properties beyond 35 metres generally receive as-of-right permissions for six storeys but are still subject to other Corridor policies such as those related to locations of vehicular access.

Staff have received requests to reduce maximum building heights to low-rise, as well as requests to increase maximum building heights into the high-rise category.

#### Specific Comments/Concerns:

- a) Residents are concerned that the six-storey height permission at 985 Pinecrest Road (Britannia United Church) conflicts with the low-rise character of the area, raises traffic and safety issues, and have concerns that future development could result in sewer overflows or other infrastructure issues.

**Staff response:** The site at 985 Pinecrest Road already permits six-storey buildings under the Minor Corridor designation in Volume 1 of the Official Plan. This is a unique through-lot on Pinecrest Road, with abutting low-rise Neighbourhood properties. As a result, a site-specific policy requiring any mid-rise buildings to step down to four storeys near low-rise properties was added to this Plan. Traffic, infrastructure, and sewer impacts will be assessed during development application reviews. Nevertheless, a site-specific policy was added

to consider traffic calming measures if vehicular access is provided via local streets (Pinewood Crescent), rather than from Pinecrest Road.

- b) There is a concern that the building height permissions in the Iris-Baxter Sector are too tall directly behind the bungalows on streets like Stanton, Soderlind, Dempsey, and Elmira.

**Staff response:** High-rise building permissions are located near O-Train stations and primarily in the Hub designation. Maximum building height permissions step down towards the edges of the Hub and where they abut the low-rise Neighbourhood designation, guided by the application of the 45-degree angular plane as set out in approved City Guidelines.

## 2) Connectivity and access to O-Train Stations

The location of the Pinecrest and Queensview O-Train stations along Highway 417 poses connectivity and safety concerns for some residents, especially south of the highway. The Plan addresses these concerns through new and improved active transportation connections identified on Schedule C – Maximum Building Heights, Connectivity and Parks.

### Specific Comments/Concerns:

- a) There is a desire for easy pedestrian/bike access to both of the LRT stations from the south side of Highway 417, particularly the Morrison Drive Sector and Iris-Baxter Sector, as the current access across the highway is limited and dangerous.

**Staff response:** As seen on Schedule C – Maximum Building Heights, Connectivity and Parks, Stage 2 LRT upgrades will include several multi-use pathways, including linkages from Queensview Drive, Severn Avenue and Connaught Avenue to Queensview Station, along with a pedestrian bridge connecting Queensview Station to Baxter Road. Future pedestrian and cycling facilities from the Transportation Master Plan (TMP) are also identified in this Plan, including future cycling facilities across the Pinecrest bridge when it is replaced in the coming years. Additional active transportation connections are required as part of this Plan to provide short-cuts to parks and transit, particularly to shorten walking distance to O-Train stations. The Plan also suggests considering Queensview Drive for complete street funding to enhance pedestrian and cyclist safety and support new development.

- b) Many residents are happy to see the planned pedestrian and cycling infrastructure in this Plan, specifically for Queensview Drive, Pinecrest Road, and Iris Street, and the active transportation crossing of Pinecrest Road between St Stephens and Harwood Avenue.

**Staff response:** Noted, thank you.

## 3) Land Uses and Active Frontages:

The Secondary Plan requires at least one non-residential land use to be included in each new building along Queensview Drive. The intention of this policy is to have retail and commercial tenancies at-grade, to support the transformation to a mixed-use Hub, support an active public realm, and provide neighbourhood amenities in close proximity to Queensview Station.

### Specific Comments/Concerns:

- a) Some landowners suggested that amenity areas in new buildings should be considered as a non-residential use to satisfy the requirement for one non-residential land use per building fronting Queensview Drive. There is a concern

that if amenity areas do not count, it could lead to Official Plan Amendments to address market realities.

**Staff response:** Amenity spaces cannot be considered as non-residential space for the purposes of this policy. The policy for one non-residential space at grade per building was reached as part of a compromise between multiple stakeholders and the City, with flexibility for the size of these non-residential spaces. Given the goals of transforming Queensview Drive from a light industrial district to a high-density, mixed-use Hub, the provision of some non-residential uses – a minimum of one per building – is required to achieve this urban transformation.

#### 4) Pincrest-Queensview Transportation Study and Parking

The City hired Alta Planning + Design transportation and planning consultants to assess future transportation demand on Queensview Drive and its impacts on the intersections of Queensview Drive and Pincrest Road, and Dumaui Avenue and Pincrest Road. In addition, the consultants were asked to propose an intersection design concept for Queensview Drive and Pincrest Road, and for a high-level design of a controlled active transportation crossing of Pincrest Road near St. Stephen's Street and Harwood Avenue.

Additionally, there were some concerns that the Plan's lack of minimum parking space requirements could aggravate traffic and safety problems.

##### Specific Comments/Concerns:

- a) There are concerns that the study seems to indicate relatively minor increases in traffic volumes even though the City is planning for significant intensification along Queensview Drive. There are questions about whether the City over-estimated the transit mode share assumptions and therefore under-estimated the future vehicular volumes and whether the intersection at Queensview Drive and Pincrest Road will be able to accommodate future vehicular volumes.

**Staff response:** The transportation study revealed that after several large properties on Queensview Drive are eventually redeveloped in keeping with permissions in this Plan, there would be an estimated increase of 680 vehicle trips on Queensview Drive between both morning and afternoon peak periods. Based on transportation modeling, the consultants recommended that those traffic volumes can be accommodated by roughly doubling the length of the left-turn lane to 100 metres.

The assumptions for transit mode share were standard metrics for areas in very close proximity to an O-Train station. While it is possible that those assumptions are overly optimistic in the short term, the assumptions for anticipated development along Queensview Drive were very generous, which likely over-compensates for any over-estimation of transit mode share.

- b) There are some concerns with the that there is not sufficient parking mandated within the Secondary Plan, which could exasperate traffic congestion, pedestrian safety and snow clearing, especially within residential areas.

**Staff response:** This Plan supports the Official Plan's goal of reducing reliance on private vehicles over time, particularly in close proximity to rapid transit. Volume 1 of the Official Plan already does not require minimum parking in the Hub designation. This Plan specifies that the Zoning By-law may establish requirements for accessibility, visitor, or carshare spaces, as well as provisions for electric vehicles. It does not establish maximum parking thresholds, which

means development proponents can still provide parking according to market demand.

## 5) Parks and Greenspace

Greenspaces and parkland are highly valued by residents, and there are some concerns within the community that the Secondary Plan may not allocate sufficient greenspace to meet future needs.

### Specific Comments/Concerns:

- a) There is a large Urban Natural Feature (UNF) within the Plan area that should be more clearly identified and protected.

**Staff response:** Staff agree with identifying UNF areas within the Secondary Plan and therefore have updated Schedule A and Schedule C and added the following policy to Section 6.1: *“The City shall continue to manage the Elmhurst Park Woods Urban Natural Feature, identified on Annex A: Secondary Plan Area and Land Use Designations, as directed in Volume 1 of the Official Plan.”* This clarifies that this UNF will continue to be protected by existing policies in Volume 1 of the Official Plan.

- b) Schedule A – Secondary Plan Area and Land Use Designations placed all parks under the Greenspace designation on Schedule A, which is inconsistent with Volume 1 of the Official Plan.

**Staff response:** In Volume 1 of the Official Plan, only large and environmentally significant parks fall under the Greenspace designation, and other parks can exist and are permitted under other designations, such as Hub or Neighbourhood. The Plan did not intent to re-designate parks from Hub or Neighbourhood designations to the Greenspace designation, and meant to remain consistent with Volume 1 of the Official Plan. As a result, changes were made to Schedules to reflect existing Official Plan designations for parks and greenspaces, and are now consistent with Schedule C12 in Volume 1 of the Official Plan.

- c) There was a concern about Annex D that shows a conceptual opportunity that could potentially reconfigure Dumaourier Park, whereas there was a preference for retaining all greenspaces.

**Staff response:** The conceptual opportunity identified on Annex D is a long-term idea that is intentionally included in an Annex, and therefore does not have policy status in this Plan. New parks will be added and expanded as properties in the Plan area are developed. For example, the Plan calls for new parks on Queensview Drive and Baxter Road, and a park expansion at Parkway Park.

## 6) Zoning Amendments

This Secondary Plan includes Zoning By-law Amendments for properties in the Hub designation in order to ensure the zoning aligns with policies in the Secondary Plan.

### Specific Comments/Concerns:

- a) Concern with the application of zoning Schedule 402, which requires an increased minimum lot area and greater tower separation than typical urban standards.

**Staff response:** The changes to zoning Schedule 402 apply suburban rather than urban standards for high-rise minimum lot sizes and tower separations because the Hub is essentially a greyfield site approximately 10 Km from downtown, with many large properties that have significant redevelopment. Since there is so much development potential and generally lots of space for high-rise buildings, this change will have the effect of providing slightly more space between buildings, which will help mitigate shadow and microclimate impacts.

## CHANGES MADE TO SECONDARY PLAN

The following tables outlines the changes made to the Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment based on comments received during the October 18, 2024 – Nov 15, 2024 circulation period. Respondents include service areas within the City of Ottawa, public agencies / commenting bodies, development proponents, advocacy groups, members of the public, and community associations.

Minor grammatical changes that do not change the intent of a policy are not shown in this table.

Table 1: Changes to the Pinecrest-Queensview Secondary Plan from October 2024 – November 2024

Reference to Section in Document 1	Circulated Policy Language (October 2024) ( <del>modified or removed language</del> )	Revised Policy language (November 2024) ( <u>revised or added language</u> )	Reason for change / Feedback received during the circulation period
2.1(10)	N/A	10) <u>Front yard setbacks should be sufficient in depth to accommodate trees and other soft landscaping.</u>  11) <u>Development should minimize impacts to the urban tree canopy and seek opportunities to retain and plant trees that will provide a positive contribution to the urban tree canopy, towards the target in Volume 1 of the Official Plan of 40% canopy coverage within the Plan area.</u>	There was already a similar Corridor policy in 2.2 and there was an internal request to require the same in the Hub designation.
2.4(3)	N/A	3) <u>Front yard setbacks should be sufficient in depth to accommodate trees and other soft landscaping.</u>	Same as above.

Reference to Section in Document 1	Circulated Policy Language (October 2024) ( <del>modified or removed language</del> )	Revised Policy language (November 2024) ( <u>revised or added language</u> )	Reason for change / Feedback received during the circulation period
3.2(4)	4) All new streets, whether public or private, shall have pedestrian facilities and street trees on both sides and be designed to a maximum 30 km/h operating speed in order to prioritize the safety and movement of people using active transportation.	4) All new streets, whether public or private, shall have pedestrian facilities and street trees on both sides and be designed to a maximum 30 km/h operating speed in order to prioritize the safety and movement of people using active transportation. a) <u>Notwithstanding policy 4), for the conceptual future street south of Queensview Drive, the east-west portion abutting the O-Train corridor may be a single-loaded local street that only requires pedestrian facilities and street trees one side of the street in order to maintain adequate space for the proposed park, pedestrian plaza, and development parcels identified in Annex B – Demonstration Plan for 2650, 2670, 2680, and 2700 Queensview Drive.</u>	The east-west portion of the proposed public street on the south side of Queensview Drive abutting the O-Train alignment is intended to be a single-loaded local street. The City approved 14.75 metre single-loaded local street cross-section includes a sidewalk and street trees on one side. This revision clarifies that in this location, the single-loaded street can be implemented as planned in the approved street cross-section.
3.2(5)	N/A	7) <u>Roadway construction will include the planting of street trees in the right-of-way with adequate soil volumes and hardscaping measures, as necessary.</u>	Language was added to ensure all roadway construction will include the planting of street trees with adequate soil volumes and hardscaping measures.
3.3(2)	N/A	2) <u>Building podiums should animate the pedestrian realm, contribute to a positive street wall condition, and relate to the adjacent buildings in massing, height and architectural rhythm.</u>	New policy to add clarity to the role of building podiums.
3.3(4)	N/A	4) <u>The ground floor of a building facing the public realm should be designed to be highly transparent and to animate the public realm through the incorporation of elements such as active frontages or entrances, windows, porches, and facade articulations.</u>	Updates the previous policy regarding active frontages with more detail to clarify expectations around the role of the ground floor of buildings facing the public realm.

Reference to Section in Document 1	Circulated Policy Language (October 2024) ( <del>modified or removed language</del> )	Revised Policy language (November 2024) ( <u>revised or added language</u> )	Reason for change / Feedback received during the circulation period
3.3(8)	N/A	(8) <u>Notwithstanding policy 7) above, on constrained sites, minimum tower separations may be reduced by up to 2 metres without an amendment to this Plan.</u>	Adds flexibility to avoid the need for Official Plan Amendments for minor deviations to policy 3.3(7).
3.4(2)	(2) The maximum building height of high-rise building podiums shall be four storeys in order to reinforce human scale street walls and support walkability.	(2) <u>The maximum building height of high-rise building podiums in the Plan area shall be:</u>  a) <u>Four storeys for buildings fronting local and collector streets, parks, and POPS in order to reinforce human scale street walls and support walkability and a comfortable public realm; and</u>  b) <u>Six storeys for buildings fronting arterial roads, the O-Train corridor, or Highway 417.</u>	Revised maximum building height of high-rise building podiums to add clarity and flexibility in cases where podiums would front onto very wide streets or where they would not impact the public realm.
3.4(3)	(3) Where two or more high-rise building are located adjacent to one another on the same lot, building heights should vary by a minimum of approximately ten percent to provide visual interest to the skyline. The City may consider a reduced difference in building heights where the top of buildings have different architectural expressions that ensure the buildings are distinct and add variety to the skyline.	(3) Where two high-rise buildings are located adjacent to one another on the same lot, building heights should vary by a minimum of approximately ten percent to provide visual interest to the skyline. The City may consider a reduced difference in building heights where the top of buildings have different architectural expressions that ensure the buildings are distinct and add variety to the skyline.  a) <u>Where more than two high-rise buildings are located on the same lot, a variety of building heights should be provided, that may be less than ten percent difference between buildings, with the goal of creating a varied skyline that generally steps down in height away from O-Train Stations and towards the edges of the Hub.</u>	Add clarity in cases where there are more than two high-rise buildings on the same lot.



Reference to Section in Document 1	Circulated Policy Language (October 2024) ( <del>modified or removed language</del> )	Revised Policy language (November 2024) ( <u>revised or added language</u> )	Reason for change / Feedback received during the circulation period
3.5(1)	N/A	(1) <u>Parks are a permitted land use in all designations in this Plan.</u>	This new policy provides additional clarity that parks are permitted in all designations.
3.5(5)	N/A	5) <u>Development should minimize impacts to the urban tree canopy and seek opportunities to retain and plant trees that will provide a positive contribution to the urban tree canopy, towards the target in Volume 1 of the Official Plan of 40% canopy coverage within the Plan area.</u>	Language was added to reflect the urban tree canopy target in Volume 1 of the Official Plan.
6.1(10)	N/A	10) <u>The City shall continue to manage the Elmhurst Park Woods Urban Natural Feature, identified on Annex A - Secondary Plan Area and Land Use Designations, as directed in Volume 1 of the Official Plan.</u>	Added to reflect the Urban Natural Feature (UNF) on Schedule C12 in Volume 1 of the Official Plan, and to delineate it on Schedules A and Schedule C.
Section 6.2 Preamble under 2600 Queensview Drive	N/A	<u>The policies in this Plan, in combination with Annex C – Demonstration Plan for 2600 Queensview Drive, establish a vision and guidance for redevelopment of this strategically important site, located between Queensview Station and Queensview Drive. Given the lack of direct road right-of-way frontage at Queensview Station, it is critical that the redevelopment of 2600 Queensview Drive facilitate safe and attractive pedestrian connections through this site, between Queensview Drive and Queensview Station. In addition, redevelopment of this property will play an important role in the animation and passive supervision of public spaces that contribute to the experience of accessing Queensview Station.</u>	New language was added to the 2600 Queensview preamble to strengthen the vision and emphasize the strategic importance of this site.

Reference to Section in Document 1	Circulated Policy Language (October 2024) ( <del>modified or removed language</del> )	Revised Policy language (November 2024) ( <u>revised or added language</u> )	Reason for change / Feedback received during the circulation period
6.2(10)	(10) Two separate privately owned public spaces (POPS) should be provided as follows:	10) Two separate privately owned public spaces (POPS), <u>parks or plazas</u> should be provided as follows:	Instead of only referring to POPS, flexibility was added so that these two locations could be POPS, parks or plazas, to be determined upon development application.
6.2(16)	(16) The proposed pedestrian plaza, identified as a proposed active transportation connection on Schedule C - Maximum Building Heights, Connectivity and Parks, shall be a privately-owned public space (POPS) that provides private amenity space and publicly accessible pedestrian connections to facilitate access to Queensview Station. The pedestrian plaza should include all of the following:	16) The proposed pedestrian plaza, identified as a proposed active transportation connection on Schedule C – Maximum Building Heights, Connectivity and Parks, shall be a privately-owned public space (POPS) that provides private amenity space and <u>wide and inviting publicly accessible</u> pedestrian connections to facilitate access to Queensview Station. The pedestrian plaza should include all of the following:	Clarification that this future pedestrian space must be relatively wide (for a pedestrian walkway) and publicly accessible.
Section 7 Preamble		<b>Baxter-Iris Sector – Hub Designation</b> <b>Baxter-Iris Sector – Corridor Designation</b> <b>Baxter-Iris Sector – Neighbourhood Designation</b> <b>Baxter-Iris Sector – Greenspace Designation and Parks in other Designations</b>	Added details to preamble to set out a vision and expectations for each land use designation within this Sector.