

## Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

### Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment – 30 Cleary Avenue

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: 18

Number of written submissions received by Planning and Housing Committee between August 19 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and August 27, 2024 (the deadline for written submissions, being 4 pm the business day before the committee meeting date): 3

#### Summary of written submissions

The following written submissions were received by, and are filed with, the Office of the City Clerk, and distributed to Committee Members:

- Letter dated July 24, 2025 from Jacquelin Holzman
- Letter dated July 25, 2024 from Allan Ramsay
- Email dated August 27, 2024 from David Chernushenko

#### Summary of oral submissions

The Applicant/Owner as represented by the following were present and provided an overview of the Application and responded to questions from Committee. A copy of the slide presentation is filed with the Office of the City Clerk.

- Tyler Yakuchuk, Fotenn
- Rodney Wilts, Theia Partners Inc.
- Roberto Campos, Figurr Architects Collective
- Andrew Harte, CGH Transportation

The Committee heard from the following delegation:

1. Justine De Jaegher, First Unitarian Congregation of Ottawa describes social justice initiatives of the congregation and noted proposed housing initiatives would further serve their mission of using the campus to build supportive housing.

2. David Fraser acknowledges the need for housing, however, does not support building at all costs. The buildings would be more appropriate moved to the east and feels rights as a property owner are not being respected.
3. Cathy Connor, Ontario Aboriginal Housing Services spoke in support of the application noting there is sustainable development, are close to the LRT and have been accepted by the First Unitarian Church.
4. Chuck Shields, Vice President, Canadian Unitarian Council – spoke to how the Congregation wants to contribute to meeting Ottawa’s needs for services, for children, and for the elderly. In keeping with the commitment for social justice, the congregation decided to add to the affordable housing, noting its proximity to transit and supporting a 15-minute neighbourhood.
5. Eric Meter, Minister, Canadian Unitarian Council spoke to the Congregations social justice work.
6. Margaret Linton is pleased the plans recommend protective measures for the greenspace as well as an opportunity to build affordable housing.
7. Jacquelin Holzman, Board of Governors, Unitarian House acknowledges the amount of gravel and asphalt in the area that is used for parking, however it is also a safe area for vulnerable seniors to exercise and for kids to play. Tree retention makes this campus special, but safety is more important and are requesting that the holding by-law be expanded to require an easement for vehicular access in addition to the pathway and watermain.
8. Jennifer Luong, P. Eng., Senior Project Manager/Transportation/ Traffic, Novatech explained she was retained to review the transportation impact assessment report. The site is accessed by a single driveway on Cleary Avenue. The access on Richmond Road was closed for Stage 2 LRT. The holding provision should include the pathway connection from Richmond Rd. as onsite traffic will approach transportation of Canada threshold of 1000 vehicles per day or 100 vehicles per hour. A second access should be considered.
9. Dr. Ian Arnold M.S.C. spoke to the health and safety impacts from increased traffic on the residents of the Unitarian House of Ottawa. A copy of the slide presentation is held on file with the Office of the City Clerk.
10. Alex Campbell, M.A., M.Ed, Retired Lay Chaplain Unitarian Church, reiterated health concerns of senior residents. Quality of life of those living in the neighbourhood needs to be maintained and an alternative entrance is necessary.

11. Janet Beauvais, Retirement Floor Liaison Residents Association, Unitarian House focused on the safe walkability of the future proposed campus and expressed concerns with traffic safety during and after construction.
12. Heather James Noted concerns related to traffic. The study provides a poor basis for understanding how traffic will evolve in the neighbourhood and supports retaining the second entrance to the site.
13. Susan Glass, Woodroffe North Community Association would like a guarantee that the developer will make its best efforts to ensure the walkway is included in the plans and that the buffer zone is maintained.
14. Bill White expressed privacy concerns related to the proposed development and the effects on their property.
15. Martha Turnbull spoke to health and safety concerns related to children and teenagers in the area.
16. Allan Ramsay noted the proposed development is not compatible with the character of the neighbourhood, lacks appropriate transition that will result in privacy issues and does not conform with the guiding principles of the Secondary Plan. A copy of his slide presentation is held on file with Office of the City Clerk.
17. Pardeep Koonar expressed disappointment proposal, the stream is stagnant, and the trees are immature, although respect should be given to the fact that there are memorial pots on the site, it should not be at the detriment of the property owners to the west. Developers should be required to go back and alter the development proposal.
18. Bob Armstrong provided clarity on the number of voting members the church has as well as non-members that attend church and activities. Support the idea of the a second entrance and believe in the importance of what the church is trying to accomplish regarding affordable housing, densification of accommodations, proximity to the LRT and reconciliation.

## Effect of Submissions on Planning and Housing Committee

**Decision:** Debate: The Committee spent approximately 3 hours in consideration of the item.

**Vote:** The committee considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as presented.

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 19<sup>th</sup> after 4 pm (deadline for written submissions to Planning and Housing Committee) and September 4, 2024 (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.