

Document 4 – Consultation Details

Initial consultation with identified stakeholders was undertaken from December 2, 2021 to January 17, 2022, which resulted in a 'What We Learned' report. This report summarizes feedback received from seven community associations, the Greater Ottawa Home Builders' Association ("GOHBA"), and the Federation of Citizens Associations.

Subsequent to this initial consultation period, two online information sessions were held on March 31 and April 5, 2022 where considerations and observations on the City's current Parkland Dedication By-law were presented by the project team. Approximately 40 people attended these two information sessions.

In addition to the online information sessions, individual meetings were held with GOHBA, one school board, and Members of Council (as requested). Three residents submitted comments and questions, and all four school boards submitted comments.

For the duration of the project, a project page on Engage Ottawa/Participons Ottawa was kept up-to-date with project details and updates as well as links to additional resources.

Residents

1. Just one final comment as it relates specifically to the recent R4 updates and the increased proportion of infill development anticipated as part of growth. When undertaking urban infill of the low-rise apartment type the density threshold is easily met by 3 or 4 units on a 33' x 100' lot for example, to always apply the density style calculation (not %) and then the 10% cap is hit with I think 3 or 4 units on a lot. So just by default then each one of those lots is paying a 10% CIL for every property (ie. on each formerly single-family lot). Whereas, in the suburban greenfield context, a developer is providing *much* less parkland or CIL per lot (ie. typically 5% of net, not including right of ways). When land is given it is at a much lower cost since it is typically undeveloped lands.

So just on an infill vs greenfield perspective under the current by-law, urban infill developers are carrying a much larger burden (as a percent of operations, or land value, or profit) than greenfield developers. It doesn't matter if the land values are higher or sale prices are higher in the urban area. It is basically a 10% parkland tax as opposed to a 5% tax. I worked as a consultant for both types of developers, I don't have any bias. But it just seems un-balanced.

In particular, since so much of new parkland acquisitions and development is taking place in suburban / greenfield areas.

The new Parkland dedication by-law will hopefully allocate a much more balanced approach either to how much infill development contributes to CIL of parkland, or at least how much is budgeted toward urban infill neighborhoods. Acquisition of new parks & parkettes in infill neighborhoods would go a long way to re-balancing what infill developers are paying vs receiving

2. There is currently a John Howard Society building being built - almost at completion - on Bell Street in The Glebe Annex. This building is exempt from the parkland dedication - as it should be. I would be very concerned to see any changes made to this exemption. I am aware that a neighbouring association is proposing no exemptions - and that is worrisome to me. Also, when a developer is building an apartment dwelling, with numerous units, some of which are affordable units - e.g. mixed housing, is there an exemption available?
3. Can you, please tell me where I can find more information on when low-rise intensification stimulates or doesn't stimulate funding for parks? My concern is that density in my neighbourhood, and neighbourhoods like it across the city, could quadruple without any discussion of the need for additional parkland. I need to know more about circumstances and rules around it.

Community Associations

1. Centrepointe Community Association

The location of the park is critical. A new park in the area where Barrhaven merges into Manotick is of NO USE WHATSOEVER to the residents of an inner city transect that has 1,000 new residents introduced into the neighbourhood. The new parks should be within 500 metres of the new intensification (TM pending) development. Why 500 metres? Walking distance for those with toddlers. Walking distance for those with mobility issues. Walking distance for people who are not inclined to drive half way across the city. If the parkland cannot be introduced, then the new development gets put on hold. This city cannot continue to transfer multi-millions of dollars of value from a neighbourhood to the development industry with the mere "sweep of the hand" without any quid pro quo.

2. City View Community Association

We want to ensure that the issues for collection of Cash-in-lieu (CIL) for City View are addressed and corrected. The City has been well-aware of our issues since we discovered these anomalies in 2018. Our records show that out of some 80 infills (160 new builds) in City View since 2013 75% did not contribute to the 'parkland fund.'

CIL fees are collected from developers when they do not or cannot provide parkland in their proposed developments. This usually occurs when a property is severed for an infill and one or two new houses are built. But Cash-in-lieu is usually not collected here in City View.

Background - City View is unique. In 1913, much of City View was divided into 25'X100' garden plots through Registered Plan 375. When construction started in the 1950's, 3 to 4 of these 'lots of record' were purchased for each house to accommodate a septic system and a well – City View became a community of modest homes on reasonably large lots! Now, with new infill development, many of these original lots are given permission to be divided into smaller lots than the current bylaws allow.

Based on Plan 375, the City considers these lots to be already severed, and therefore no CIL is collected. City View has one of, if not the lowest, park ratios in this City. Yet most of the infill development in City View is not providing any CIL funds for our much needed parkland.

These concerns were brought to the City in January 2018 but nothing has been changed. Other cities base their collection of CIL when building permits are issued but Ottawa chose to base it on 'severances'. The City View Community Association (CVCA) continues to remind the Mayor and Councillors and the Committee of Adjustments that our CIL issues need to be addressed.

The CVCA maintains that Ward 8 should be reimbursed for the parkland funds that the City has failed to collect. Also, we maintain that some of the city-wide CIL Reserve Funds could and should be used in our community. Or, to reimburse our area, City View should be designated as a 'special district' such has been done for the 'Preston-Carling District' to allow additional funding for parks. Development in City View continues to grow exponentially but 'cash in lieu of parkland funds' are **STILL not** being collected consistently or fairly.

Other comments - The City should not rely on CIL funds for parkland. It must provide other resources to obtain parkland in deficient communities. The most recent summary of CIL funds collected by wards is a clear indication that in Ward 8 there will not ever be sufficient funds to address our lack of parkland. A single building lot here sells for nearly

\$1M. The City has expressed no will in purchasing land for parkland here even when properties are identified.

Also, there should be more flexibility in 'sharing' or 'transferring' CIL funds between Wards and access to the city's portion. In fact, we suggest that the allocation by wards is an unfair process. Many wards meet the City's 'parkland' allocation goals, have access to woodlands and natural areas, NCC lands and recreational facilities and sports fields. Yet some communities, such as City View, that have been designated to bear a large bulk of intensification, lack the parkland to support current and proposed densities.

We would further suggest that 100% of CIL collected funds should be allocated back to the communities where they are collected.

We recently provided these comments to the current Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan public engagement process. We also submitted that our community's deficits in parkland and recreational facilities should be addressed in the new Master Plan. Nothing was done.

3. Dow's Lake Resident's Association

The Parkland by-law should define the word "Parkland" since the current by-law does not appear to. The term is also used in the Parks and Rec Master Plan but only defines "Active Parks" and "Park". Should we assume it is the same thing? Does it include that parks must be publicly accessible and not include an access fee?

Will the new by-law consider parkland in 3-dimensions or integrated into the building design? For example, would the rooftop park on the new Civic hospital be considered parkland?

How is the % area/\$ determined relative to the scale of the development? For example, in section 3 of the current by-law, Parkland requirement calculated is no more than 10% of the land area, often much less, depending on the type of development yet Ottawa's urban tree canopy target is 40%. The logic for stating a specific allocation/proportion for what is considered parkland/greenspace/recreational space is not clear.

4. Glebe Community Association

The Glebe Community Association (GCA) is a volunteer, non-profit, membership-based, and City-recognized organization advocating for a liveable, sustainable, diverse urban neighbourhood. We inform, consult, and engage with residents and other groups in the Glebe on issues of importance and promote the interests of our community with all levels of government and other organizations. On behalf of the GCA, I am pleased to

provide our comments as part of the City of Ottawa's Parkland Dedication By-law Review and Replacement. It takes the form of a motion passed by the GCA's board on April 26, 2022. The text of the motion is attached below.

WHEREAS a fundamental goal of the Glebe Community Association is that city-designated park land (per capita) [2 hectares per 1,000 residents] (not including NCC or school board held lands) be available as equally to the residents of a necessarily more densely populated downtown and inner core as it is to anyone else in the city; and

WHEREAS the reason for the City's current Parkland Dedication By-law Review and Replacement process is because of a provincial government requirement that municipalities put in place a new parkland dedication bylaw by September 18, 2022 in order to preserve the use of a formula for calculating parkland allocation requirements that is tied to the number of dwelling units created (as is the current standard set by the City of Ottawa's Official Plan and Parks and Recreation Master Plan); and

WHEREAS without a new parkland dedication bylaw, parkland requirements would be calculated based on a percentage of the area of the property being developed, and therefore make parkland less available to the residents of a necessarily more densely populated downtown and inner core; and

WHEREAS it follows that any new units added to the downtown/inner core, including those built by non-for-profit affordable housing initiatives, in whatever fashion (both building permits for additional units – as is the practice in other major Ontario municipalities – and development applications); and mixed use (residential-commercial) buildings, adhere to a clear (provincial and/or municipal) requirement/formula for hectares per-capita of new parkland; or alternatively, generate dollars cash-in-lieu (CIL) of new city-owned parks from the builders or from the City itself (particularly in the case of not-for-profit affordable housing initiatives); and

WHEREAS current deficiencies of parkland per capita in the urban core (or, as needs be, any other ward) could be addressed in the updated Parkland Dedication By-law through the designation of "special districts" that should justifiably receive 100% of CILP (rather than the current 60/40% local ward/citywide split); and

WHEREAS it is reasonable (in order to simplify the process) that calculations for required city-owned parkland per capita emanating from mix use (residential-commercial) building permits and development applications be based on whichever is the predominant usage, as long as the end result is that the amount of parkland created (or CILP received) is consistent with the city-designated park land (per capita) goal; and

WHEREAS the GCA is encouraged that City staff remain open to such stakeholder input from the community as they and their consultants (Watson & Associates) continue their preparation of the report scheduled to go to committee in May; and

WHEREAS the GCA is encouraged that in their considerations, the city and its consultants are taking into account data which demonstrates the current deficiencies in different areas of the city, particularly the downtown core and neighbouring communities, vis-à-vis parkland per-capita and the standards of the Official Plan and the Parks & Recreation Master Plan;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the GCA provides this input, as delineated above, to the City and its consultants for their consideration as they prepare their recommendations on the Parkland Dedication By-law Review and Replacement to the Planning Committee in May, in addition to the input already provided by the GCA Parks Committee.

5. Hintonburg Community Association

The Hintonburg Community Association welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Parkland Dedication Bylaw, as a result of the Province's COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act. The need for the city to require parkland dedication has become an urgent priority in Hintonburg. Our neighbourhood is significantly lacking in parkland and is experiencing significant intensification with little or no land available to develop new parks or expand on existing ones.

Access to parkland and greenspace is a key component of both physical and mental health for all citizens. As you are aware, Hintonburg is significantly parkland deficient, based on the city parkland target of 2 hectares per 1,000 residents. However, in the face of ongoing intensification and the very real lack of available land, parkland dedication is a key priority in Hintonburg.

On behalf of the Hintonburg Community Association, I respectfully submit the following recommendations for your consideration:

1. That the City of Ottawa continue to provide for the provision of parkland as a result of development (first priority), including the provision of contributions-in-lieu of parkland where parkland dedication is not feasible.
2. That the City of Ottawa implement the target parkland policies as identified in the City's Parks & Recreation Facilities Master Plan to meet population growth (e.g. 2 hectares per 1,000 residents.)

3. That in communities that are deficient in meeting the City's parkland target of 2 hectares per 1,000 residents, the allocation of contributions-in-lieu of parkland be 80% to the ward, 20% to the City-wide fund (instead of the current 60% to the ward, 40% to the City-wide fund default), and that 100% of the funds collected be allocated to any park deficient areas inside the Greenbelt, and
4. That the current City policy established in 2010 of not collecting contributions-in-lieu of parkland be rescinded."

6. Overbrook Community Association

Further to the request for feedback on the upcoming preparation in 2022 of a new Parkland Dedication By-law, we offer the following comments for your consideration at this early stage in the process.

The Overbrook Community Association (OCA) takes considerable interest in the new Parkland Dedication By-law in light of the two below problems that were clearly confirmed in the new **Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan**:

- Problem 1 – Overbrook has a deficiency, throughout the community, in not currently meeting the City's targeted minimum number of hectares of parkland per 1,000 people.
- Problem 2 – Overall new development or redevelopment will not, due to existing policies or lack thereof, provide sufficient new parkland or cash-in-lieu of parkland to meet the City's targeted minimum number of hectares of parkland per 1,000 people. In other words the parkland deficit hole will actually continue to get deeper.

These problems are not unique to Overbrook as they appear in other inner city neighbourhoods too.

On **Problem 1** the new Parkland Dedication By-law will not be a remedy. For that we see possible solution or direction to resolve the problem in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan on page 48 which sets out recommendations in the Summary of Parkland Needs Assessment one of which is "*Prioritize the acquisition of new parkland in transects and neighbourhoods that do not meet the 2.0 hectares per 1,000 people target.*" It also later says:

"Targeted Land Acquisition - Given the difficulties of acquiring new parkland through the land use planning process and redevelopment in existing neighbourhoods, targeted real

estate acquisitions will be essential to address projected parkland deficiencies. It is recommended that the development of a real estate acquisition strategy follow the adoption of this Master Plan. A targeted acquisition strategy would focus on the transect and neighbourhoods in greatest need as well as opportunities that are presented to enlarge existing parks and create new ones. Any land acquisition strategy would need to identify sources of available funding for land purchases.”

Provision Level Targets and Recommendations (on the Plan’s pages 175-176) says:
“*Prioritize the acquisition of new parkland in transects and neighbourhoods that do not meet the 2.0 hectares per 1,000 people target, as shown in Tables 52 and Maps 1 – 4.*”
We want to see an action plan for that.

We also see from the newly adopted **Official Plan**, in Section 4 - Provide new parks in the Downtown and Inner Urban Area, Policy 4.4.3 speaking of preparing an **Urban Parks Strategy** or similar document to identify the City’s preferred locations for new parks where higher density communities exist or are expected. The narrow focus for the Strategy document is though disappointing. It must be broadened to do what we are led to believe that it would do. The Official Plan’s **Big Five Moves** - see Big Move 3 – Urban and Community Design, Policy Direction 7- Develop an Urban Parks Strategy, states: “*Develop a strategy, neighbourhood by neighbourhood, to identify new parks and other public spaces and upgrades to existing parks to provide active recreation and cultural expression in the inner urban area undergoing intensification.*” It further states “*This could include a needs assessment to identify which neighbourhoods have gaps in recreation, culture and leisure lands and facilities and recommend approaches to provide opportunities/amenities at the neighbourhood scale.*”

It is **Problem 2** that the new Parkland Dedication By-law, as it applies to new development, can give high hopes to better address parkland dedication needs, be it dedication of parkland or a cash-in-lieu parkland payment. The Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan, on page 50 explains how for larger sized lots “When redevelopment occurs, the City currently requests land for parks when the lot in question is a minimum of 4,000 m² in size. The City can request that 10 per cent of the redevelopment site become dedicated parkland. A lot of 4,000 m² generates a 400 m² park; this is essentially a small urban plaza and the smallest park size in the City.” For smaller sized typical lots the Plan says “Residential lots in such areas typically range from 465 – 930 m² (5,000 – 10,000 sq. ft).” and ...

“*Thus, such redevelopment will not generate parkland, only cash-in-lieu of parkland (CILP) and only if its collection is captured by the Parkland Dedication By-law. If collected, CILP can result in a gradually increasing pot of funding that can be used to*

acquire new parkland. If it is not collected, there are few sources of funding with which to acquire new parkland. For development that does not require a Site Plan Control application, the City has not collected CILP since 2010; lot-by-lot infill development most typically does not require a Site Plan Control application. [underline added]

Without new strategies, it is anticipated that in some areas there will be limited opportunities to acquire land parcels large enough to support a variety of recreational facilities. This is particularly true for facilities that require more space, such as community centres, arenas, pools, sports fields, ball diamonds, court surfaces and skateparks. If the provision of new parkland and recreation facilities is to keep pace with population increases across the city, new parkland policies and strategies are required.”

That since 2010 CILP “holiday”, referenced in Master Plan, has never been clearly explained.

Here are some examples of what we see today in Overbrook as to parkland dedication, or not, when redevelopment or new redevelopment occurs:

1. Site plan application requirement – if the scale of development is large enough and a site plan application is required (a Planning Act approval) then we see parkland or cash-in-lieu obtained. This is good.
2. Semi-detached redevelopment – this is very common with a single detached dwelling being replaced with a new semi-detached. Existing zoning generally permits this and only a building permit is needed. Later an application may be made to the Committee of Adjustment (a Planning Act application) to sever the property into two legal parcels. No condition of approval is made to have the payment of cash-in-lieu of parkland for the doubling of the number of units on the property. This is not good.
3. Triplex redevelopment – If existing zoning permits this, e.g. R4 zone found in much of our community does, then only a building permit is needed. A tripling of the number of units occurs and as there has been no Planning Act application hence no cash-in-lieu of parkland payment. This is not good.
4. Semi-detached or triplex redevelopment – the uses are permitted under the existing zoning but say a minor variance request is needed and made to the Committee of Adjustment (a Planning Act application). However no condition of approval is made to have a payment of cash-in-lieu of parkland for the increase in the number of units on the property. This is not good.

In the examples 2 and 4 above, or similar ones, this new Parkland Dedication By-law must be revised to allow for the imposition of a requirement for the parkland dedication, generally cash-in-lieu, to occur. This 2010 non-payment “holiday” must cease. Re-instating such payment would help to address Problem 2.

The concern may be how do you determine, in a non-expensive manner, the amount of cash-in-lieu of parkland payment to be made, be it a fixed amount or some sliding scale? It is undoubtedly possible to do so. This arrangement existed in the pre-amalgamation parkland dedication by-laws of the former local municipalities and in the post-amalgamation by-law until the 2010 “holiday”. There are hundreds of municipalities in Ontario and likely they too have solutions to draw on.

Site plan control and the new Official Plan – during discussion of the then proposed new Official Plan many communities expressed concern with the proposed text in the Plan’s Section 11.1 – Set the stage for Site Plan Control requirements and provisions, that stated:

“Development proposals for Low-rise residential or mixed-use buildings that fulfill the intensification objectives of the Growth Management Framework may be exempt, under limited and appropriate circumstances and requirements, from Site Plan Control or shall have reduced submission requirements and a simplified site plan process, subject to meeting defined criteria in order to streamline the process for, and lower the costs of intensification.”

Loss of the controls and features of using site plan control was the prime community concern but another would be the loss of the ability, if no Planning Act approvals are required, of an ability to obtain parkland or cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication from such redevelopment types. We do not want that.

Cash-in-lieu of Parkland Funds Policy – it is also good to note that reconsideration will occur on the current split of those funds collected, 60% to the ward and 40% to city-wide. Is such a split still appropriate? Is this one size fits approach for the City adequate given the varying level of parkland provision among the OP’s transect from inner city to rural area? In areas such as Overbrook where a moderate to severe deficiency exists in the provision of the minimum number of hectares of parkland per 1,000 people exists, perhaps an alternative split say 75% to the ward and 25% to city-wide should be used. This certainly warrants serious consideration for inclusion in the new Parkland Dedication By-law. It would clearly show that the City is serious on working to overcome those parkland provision per capita shortfalls in our inner urban transit neighbourhoods.

We trust that the above comments may inform you as to the required scope and outcome of the new Parkland Dedication By-law.

7. Vanier Community Association

The VCA welcomes the opportunity to provide initial comments as staff begin preparations for recommendations related to a new City Parkland Dedication by-law to be considered by City Council later this year.

The VCA provided a series of detailed comments on the draft of the City's New Official Plan, including on intensification and its implications for Vanier as a high density neighbourhood which lacks parkland, green spaces and recreational facilities in proportion to its growing population. Vanier's population already well exceeds the intensification targets for the inner urban transect.

The following is intended to respond to the following 3 questions pose by City staff in its Notification of December 2, 2022.

- 1) Are there issues with the current by-law you feel should be addressed?
- 2) What are the specific issues?
- 3) How do you feel that these issues can be addressed?

Given the short notice of this Notification and taking into account the intent at this stage is merely for an "[Our] initial phase is issues identification, these comments by the VCA are preliminary.

General Comments: Parkland in Vanier is about 50% of the City's target of 2 hectares per 1000 residents. Vanier's population is currently about 18,000 and its population is expected to continue to grow. Expected growth in Vanier's western sector alone is expected to be approximately 2300 units in the next 5 years based on approved or planned developments. The current park dedication bylaw will make only a small contribution to meeting the City's target in this area based on planned developments (approximately .286 Ha even if there is no cash-in-lieu) for an estimated 5000 new residents within 5 years, where the target would require 4.5 hectares, with the implication that Vanier will fall further behind in the amount of parkland per resident.

In this regard, the current bylaw is clearly inadequate. The current bylaw is effectively based on lot size, not dwellings nor number of residents, despite the OP and the Transect targets based on residential unit density. In reflecting our understanding of how the process works, it is useful to compare the following provision from the current bylaw related to high density developments currently planned or under construction:

Residential purposes at densities of 18 dwellings per net hectare or more

Parkland requirement calculated as one (1) hectare for every three hundred (300) dwelling units, but for apartments, as defined by the zoning by-law this parkland conveyance will not exceed a maximum of 10% of the land area of the site being developed

- At one development in the western sector (76 new units on less than a .45Ha lot and which entails only cash-in-lieu) would generate only .045 hectare equivalent in cash under the existing bylaw. Removal of the ceiling under the by-law not to exceed 10% of the land would alternatively provide .25 Ha in parkland equivalent (75/300 per hectare), closer to the City's new parkland per resident target in equivalence of .3Ha per 300 new residents.
- Another nearby development (60 units on a lot of .11Ha also only with cash-in-lieu) would have generated only .01 hectare cash equivalent under the current bylaw while removal of the ceiling would have .20 Ha equivalent in cash closer to the equivalent target of .30Ha per 100. A recent office tower conversion to 168 residential units nearby generated apparently no parkland dedication at all. The new bylaw should cover such conversions which are expected to grow in number.
- A larger third development in the immediate vicinity totals 1.7 Hectare and is planned to house approximately 2100 residents, representing a more than 10% increase in Vanier's population. According to the current bylaw this should represent about 7 hectares in parkland but with the ceiling provision, only 0.17 Hectare will be transferred to the City as parkland dedication. This contrasts with the City adjusted target, if applied in this case, of 4 hectares per 2000 residents, a step back resulting in a widening parkland gap for Vanier residents.

The current bylaw with respect to developments involving 18 units or less provides: "Residential purposes at less than 18 dwellings per net hectare Parkland requirement calculated as follows: 5% of the gross land area of the site being developed Rural severance -400 m²"

- The new R4 zoning bylaw which covers much of Vanier's residential area provides for approximately 212 units per net hectare which could amount to 2-3 times the current density. The major change in the new bylaw will allow developments of 8 units on smaller lots, compared to the previously permitted 4 units per lot. Developments under the revised R4 bylaw with a typical lot size (.06 Ha) for stacked townhouses and designed for families (approximately 4 residents

per unit or 30 per development) will see under the current parkland bylaw approximately 1 sq meter of parkland per new resident (.1 Ha per 1000 residents). This is a large gap with the City target of 2 hectares per 1000 residents.

In this case, substantial intensification will result from the R4 bylaw changes with smaller lots and a doubling of dwellings permitted with a corresponding increase in the number of residents which need to be taken into account in the OP policy direction concerning parkland per capita.

- There is also concern that if new developments, for example duplex, triplexes or units with accessory units also continue to be a trend to replace single family homes, the current bylaw limited to developments requiring planning permission (ie site plan control for developments more than 4 units) will not even generate funding for new parkland to accommodate new residents.
- Similarly, Vanier is seeing an increasing number of Committee of Adjustment applications for Consent agreements to cover the severance of new developments, again avoiding the application of the Parkland Dedication bylaw. This loophole should also be closed.
- Accordingly, the VCA considers that the new Parkland Dedication bylaw needs to be comprehensive covering all development whether undergoing planning permission or not. Hence, the park dedication “holiday” afforded under the bylaw as amended in 2010 should be removed.

Conclusion:

- All in all, in many respects the current parkland dedication bylaw appears marginal in increasing the parkland per new resident, particularly for neighbourhoods with predominately R4 zoning, and does not consider any impact on the current per capita parkland gap.
- In general, the VCA supports an approach to put forward recommendation that the parkland dedication fee reflect a more realistic cost of meeting the City’s parkland target rather than having a marginal effect and relying on the City’s existing tax base. The VCA believes that the two sources of parkland funding need to work in tandem, especially in neighbourhoods like Vanier which already have a significant gap and where the Parkland dedication bylaw is only expected to cover a percentage of residents’ need for new parkland space, even for new residents.

- In this regard, a neighbourhood strategy is essential. The VCA proposes that such an approach be taken up in the new Vanier Secondary Plan to identify through the planning process land use for new parks. A secondary plan for Vanier could include a provision similar to the Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan which in effect places a freeze on public use lands in the former village. This would avoid the City's failure, recently acknowledged in Planning Committee, to abide by the Official Plan concerning the redevelopment of a former Vanier school property. In this regard, Council approved a motion which asks staff to explore such an approach throughout the City. As noted below, the Carling-Preston Secondary Plan is also relevant for a Vanier Secondary Plan.
- In this context, the VCA suggests staff consider a recommendation to amend the current bylaw which would apply to currently zoned public use lands to increase the parkland dedication provision under the relevant table under Part II Conveyance and Payments to at least correspond to the new Official Plan's parkland target, in neighbourhoods which are identified as significantly lacking in parkland.
- The VCA supports the Overbrook Community Association's (OCA) useful correlation of the Parkland Dedication bylaw to the City's Parks and Recreation Master Plan and the need to review the bylaw in light of the issues the Staff report on the Master Plan raises concerning the financial challenges related to fund parkland growth. The VCA's comments on the draft Master Plan similarly reiterated community concerns about the lack of investment in parks and recreational facilities in Vanier.
- For example, the Staff report's comments as follows "Targeted Land Acquisition - Given the difficulties of acquiring new parkland through the land use planning process and redevelopment in existing neighbourhoods, targeted real estate acquisitions will be essential to address projected parkland deficiencies. It is recommended that the development of a real estate acquisition strategy follow the adoption of this Master Plan. A targeted acquisition strategy would focus on the transect and neighbourhoods in greatest need as well as opportunities that are presented to enlarge existing parks and create new ones. Any land acquisition strategy would need to identify sources of available funding for land purchases. Provision Level Targets and Recommendations (on the Plan's pages 175-176) says: "Prioritize the acquisition of new parkland in transects and neighbourhoods that do not meet the 2.0 hectares per 1,000..."

- In this regard the OCA called for an action plan which should also include recommendations concerning the Park Dedication Bylaw. The VCA supports the OCA's recommendation that the 60/40 split of the Cash-in-lieu Parkland funds split be reviewed to consider how neighbourhoods like Overbrook and Vanier which have a low per capita level of parkland might benefit more directly from the 40% which goes to the City. Certainly, an analysis and relevant recommendations are needed in the Staff review of the current bylaw to consider how the new Official Plan's policy direction to address parkland shortage in relevant neighbourhoods could be supported in a revised Parkland Dedication bylaw.
- Related to the split between City and affected neighbourhood, is language in the new OP concerning a 100% allocation of parkland dedication payments to the affected neighbourhood if declared a "special administrative area". The Preston-Carling Secondary Plan provides a similar approach.
- Similarly, the VCA suggests that the development application process should include a more realistic analysis of the per capita level of parkland space available in the neighbourhood. In effect, the planning process should include a review similar to the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) currently required as part of development applications which would address the Parkland Impact (PIA) of developments, how the development will contribute to parkland space or whether it would add to the gap under the Parkland per capita target. If the latter, planning staff should assess mitigation either through appropriate provisions under a new Parkland Dedication bylaw, including redirection of the City share of Parkland Dedication funds, or a property tax surcharge tied to the development.
- To this end, the VCA recommends that the new bylaw make provision for the establishment of "special districts" and that language similar to the Preston-Carling Secondary Plan be put in place for such districts. The VCA considers that Vanier should be designated a "special public realm improvement district" and that a new Vanier Secondary Plan include similar language as follows mutatis mutandis:

Excerpt Preston-Carling District Secondary Plan

9.4.1 A Special Public Realm Improvement District

The City shall designate the entire Preston-Carling District shown in Schedule A of this Plan as a special public realm improvement district.

The City shall direct that all cash-in-lieu of park land collected through development applications within the Preston-Carling District pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act be used for the acquisition of new park land and the improvements to the existing parks within the Preston-Carling District.

The City shall direct that all contributions collected through development applications within the Preston-Carling District pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act be used within the Preston-Carling District.

The City may consider preparing an area specific Development Charges By-law for the Preston-Carling District.

8. Dalhousie Community Association

This is a message to express the Dalhousie Community Association's (DCA) support of the recommendations listed in the submission by the Federation of Citizens Associations (FCA) regarding changes to the Parkland Dedication By-law.

In particular, the DCA expresses its support of recommendation 3: "That in communities that are deficient in meeting the City's parkland target of 2 ha per 1,000 residents, the allocation of contributions-in-lieu of parkland be 100% to the ward (instead of the current 60% to the ward, 40% to the City)."

9. Huntley Community Association

My suggestion would be that the amount of land required to be set aside for parkland for any new subdivision should be increased, given the higher density requirements under the new OP. This parkland space will be required to serve many more households and individuals than in the past.

The "in lieu" costs should also be significantly increased, and should be set aside in a reserve fund for the City to purchase natural greenspace lands elsewhere when possible.

Finally, it is essential that the definition of a "park" should change. Recently, parks in new subdivisions have been conceived to be recreational play yards for young families, with slides, sand pits and swing sets. Instead, they should be either left in their natural state (if there are existing trees) or designed as a quiet, peaceful /shady space with trees, a walking path and a bench, in order to appeal to all ages.

School Boards

1. Ottawa Catholic School Board

The OCSB concerns relate specifically to the potential imposition of Cash In Lieu of Parkland requirements, should the City choose to remove schools from the list of development types currently exempt from parkland dedication.

As you are aware, schools are currently exempt under Section 14 (1)(f) of the City of Ottawa's Parkland Dedication By-law:

Section 14

(1) No conveyance of land or payment of money in-lieu under this by-law is required in the case of the development or redevelopment of:

(f) a college or university or a school as defined by subsection 1(1) of the Education Act, where the school provides for the students' outdoor recreational needs on-site at the time of development;

As far as I am aware, at no time in the past within the Ottawa jurisdiction have schools been the subject of parkland dedication requirements. There is precedent and foundation for that history.

We strongly support our coterminous school boards in the assertion that:

- Undeveloped lands owned by school boards are often used as informal public recreation spaces;
- School sites and playgrounds are accessed and used regularly by the community outside of day-operating school hours;
- The co-location of many school sites adjacent to municipal parkland enhances the community aspects of these parcels;
- Developers have already paid or dedicated land to parkland development at the time of subdivision approval; and
- Simply put, schools do not create a need for additional parkland – conversely, they are a contributor to the provision of recreational opportunities.

From a public policy perspective, the removal of this current exemption to parkland dedication requirements for schools is not justified.

It would also place an increased and unfunded financial burden on school boards and the public purse, at a time when budget shortfalls are already numerous and impactful to students and families.

We strongly oppose any consideration given to the removal of the current exemption within a newly adopted by-law.

2. Ottawa Carleton District School Board

The OCDSB Planning Department would like to provide comment on possible changes being considered by the City of Ottawa to its Parkland Dedication By-law. Our concerns relate to the potential imposition of Cash in Lieu of Parkland provisions being applied to school boards as an additional method to acquire land or money for parks through development. It is understood these changes may be considered as a result of the Bill 197, Covid-19 Economic Recovery Act, 2020.

It is our understanding that while the Planning Act (Sec 42) allows municipalities to impose such requirements, this would place an increased financial burden on publicly funded organizations such as school boards. The current City of Ottawa Parkland Dedication by-law includes school boards under the exemption requirements (excerpt sec 14, below) along with Colleges and Universities (who are, exempt under the Act).

Section 14

“ 2) a college or university or a school as defined by subsection 1(1) of the Education Act where the school provides for the students’ outdoor recreational needs on-site at the time of development”

OCDSB staff have contacted other school boards across the province and have learned that there is a varied applications across school boards with some being charged for parkland dedication, some that are not charged, some obtaining successful exemptions through appeal and some obtaining reduction in the percentage applied for the charge.

We offer the following arguments against such an enactment:

- Undeveloped lands owned by school boards are often used as informal recreation space;
- School board playgrounds are available and used regularly for community used during after-school hours;
- Co-location of many school board sites adjacent to parkland enhances the community aspect of these parcels;

- Developers have already paid or dedicated to parkland development at time of subdivision approval;
- Schools do not create a need for parks, it is the homeowner/residents who have bought the home from a developer and no doubt included a fee in the purchase price;
- Such a fee = ratepayer paying twice.

A school board has a fiduciary responsibility to protect its funding for use toward providing quality education and accommodation facilities for its students and would like to note that an imposition of such charges could place increased challenges on area school boards public funding envelope for projects.

3. Écoles Catholiques Centre-est

The CECCE would like to share with you some comments on potential changes to the Parkland Dedication By-Law. We are extremely concerned about the potential exclusion of school boards from the parkland fee exemption list and the CECCE strongly objects to this. This type of imposition on public school boards would have significant financial consequences.

As you are aware, the CECCE already contributes to the provision of outdoor spaces outside school hours. To this end, schoolyards are available to the community on evenings and weekends. Many families and community members use the schoolyards when available. We believe we contribute largely to the enjoyment of our citizens with our many outdoor spaces, albeit in an informal manner. The CECCE also has an agreement with the City of Ottawa for the use of some of its outdoor sports fields by the City during summer months. The Board is proud to be part of this and would like the City to recognize this partnership.

We strongly join the Ottawa-Carleton District School Board (OCDSB) in making the following points and facts:

- Undeveloped school board property is often used informally by the public as recreational space;
- As mentioned, playground space and school grounds are regularly used by the community outside school hours;
- Schools located along parks reinforce the community aspect of these parcels;

- Developers have already paid for or dedicated land for park purposes at the time of subdivision plan approval;
- Schools do not create a need for parks. It is the residents who have bought the home from a developer, who undoubtedly included a fee in the purchase price. Developers tend to recoup these types of fees from buyers;
- This type of fee to school boards would mean that the taxpayer is paying a second time as school boards will have to fund this through public funds or even through education development charges.

This type of tax would certainly increase the pressure on the public funding envelope for school project applications such as new school construction, expansions, etc.

School boards are not developers and should not be treated as such. On the contrary, we are important partners who contribute greatly to the well-being of the community both within and beyond school hours. In addition to our mission in education, citizens use extensively our outdoor play spaces, school grounds and school facilities.

4. Conseil des écoles publiques de l'Est de l'Ontario

On behalf of the french language public school board for Eastern Ontario, thank you for this opportunity to provide comments regarding the City of Ottawa's review and replacement of its Parkland Dedication By-law and Cash In Lieu Policy.

We would like to express our strong support for our coterminous school boards in their response to the draft version of the revised by-law, and join them in the assertion that school sites should maintain their current exemption from parkland dedication requirements.

We welcome the opportunity to meet regarding the issue, should there be a desire to discuss and better understand the numerous impacts parkland dedication fees could have on students and families across Ottawa.

Federation of Citizens' Associations

Whereas the City of Ottawa is reviewing its Parkland Dedication Bylaw as a result of the Province's *COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act*,

Whereas the Federation of Citizens Associations (FCA) continues to see the need for the City to require parkland dedication as a result of development, and the provision of contributions in lieu of parkland where the provision of parkland is not feasible;

Whereas the FCA sees the need for policies for parkland dedication in communities that are parkland-deficient (based on the City parkland target of 2 hectares per 1,000 residents);

Therefore the FCA recommends the following:

1. That the City of Ottawa continue to provide for the provision of parkland as a result of development (first priority), including the provision of contributions-in-lieu of parkland where parkland dedication is not feasible;
2. That the City of Ottawa implement the target parkland policies as identified in the City's Parks & Recreation Facilities Master Plan to meet population growth (eg 2 hectares per 1,000 residents);
3. City staff, as part of their review of the bylaw, should consider its impacts in light of the Parks & Recreation Facilities Master Plan's target of 2 hectares per 1,000 residents and should explore opportunities and means whereby a revised bylaw can better target added density through development and building permit applications to contribute towards closing the gap, especially in neighbourhoods which are severely deficient in parkland per capita. The FCA recommends that the criteria under the relevant table under Part II Conveyance and Payments be primarily density related either to the number of units or expected number of residents;
4. That in communities that are deficient in meeting the City's parkland target of 2 hectares per 1,000 residents, the allocation of contributions-in-lieu of parkland be 100% to the ward (instead of the current 60% to the ward, 40% to the City-wide fund default). Consideration should be given to more active use of designations of "special districts" under the bylaw or in secondary plans (cf the Preston-Carling Secondary Plan);
5. And that the current City policy established in 2010 of not collecting contributions-in-lieu of parkland be rescinded.

Greater Ottawa Home Builders Association

Issue: Housing Affordability

There is no coordination of the City's housing supply/affordability and intensification policies/goals and Parks requirements – in fact Parks requirements actively work against housing affordability.

The Parkland Dedication By-law does not apply equitably for infill development, and has a significant impact for low-rise apartments under the new R4 zoning update. For example, if you have an existing single dwelling on a 33' x 100' single lot (which is most of Wellington Village, Hintonburg, Mechanicsville) that is proposed to be redeveloped at a higher density then you trigger the 'higher density' CIL contribution under the bylaw (> 18 DU/Ha). You therefore hit the 10% ceiling very quickly (usually over 4 or 5 units). That means that a high-rise building of 100 units would pay the same contribution (10% of lot value) as a 6 unit low-rise apartment.

Another recent infill project replaced two single family homes on Parkview (in Kitchissippi) with four triplexes (a total of 12 new rental units). Despite this project being exactly what City staff and the OP suggest is needed to address the void in housing for the "missing middle", the CILP for the new rental units was \$234,421.60 (plus the city appraisal fee), or an average of almost \$20,000 per unit.

The new Official Plan places tremendous importance on housing affordability. In crafting the new Parkland Dedication By-law, we would expect the city to take into consideration the impact of CIL payments on housing affordability.

The City has focused on severances and is requiring developers to pay Cash-in-lieu on each lot/unit.

CILP costs are direct increases to the final price of a home. If the City wants to promote more affordable intensification and missing middle housing, it needs to reconcile these issues – especially as discretionary costs like CILP (CILP is not required for the intensification to occur but it is a request of the city) will prevent projects from moving forward.

Solutions:

- Incorporate Parks into the Planning Department. Park planning is inherently part of the planning approval process. The current regime is too disjointed and does not create an efficient process or one that is coordinated with the City's other goals, especially housing.
- Set a sliding rate based on the number of dwelling units
- A set cap should apply to all residential development
- Improve housing affordability on infill lots directly by not charging cash-in-lieu on each severed lot.

Issue: Park Sizing / Land First Policy

In the Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan, the City notes that it does not request land for parks when the lot in question is less than a minimum of 4,000 sq metres (43,100 sq feet), as a 400 sq metre (4,310 sq foot) space is the smallest desirable size for a park.

Is there an intention to change this practice?

Solutions:

- Despite the forthcoming Land First Policy, the City needs to codify its practice of not requesting land when the lot in question is less than a minimum of 4,000 sq metres (43,100 sq feet).
- Allow the developer flexibility to offer to build, but the city should not require, a privately owned park for lots less than a minimum of 4,000 sq metres (43,100 sq feet). These spaces can contribute greatly to the City's urban spaces goals without the need for the City to build, maintain, secure, insure, etc.
- In the case where land is requested, then a long-term land lease should be an option. This way the developer/planning department remain in control of how it can make highest and best use of the site area including the flexibility of making use of the area under the future park (to build infrastructure and underground parking). A park only needs the surface of the land for its needs

Issue: Site & Park Location Planning

The location of the park on the site is often dictated by the City. Parks often wants a square shaped piece of land at the best part of the site (closest to the intersection or road frontage). This moves buildings away from the street and forces buildings into smaller remaining developable areas of the site, preventing the best utilization and intensification of the site (and does not consider how new OP building height transition requirements could affect development).

It feels like we are designing buildings around future parks rather than designing buildings to be more dense and best fit into the neighbourhood.

Solutions:

- When park land is required, allow the Developer to work with the Planning Department to create the best public and/or private park space for the existing and future needs of the community. The current Parks department practice

effectively controls where buildings may be built on a site and this creates many intensification and design issues.

Issue: Land Utilization

Parkland is not being used efficiently, and the demand for “unencumbered” land is a barrier to innovative solutions – eg. district energy or geothermal heating under the park, or access ramps and underground parking lot layouts.

There is also a conflict with Infrastructure’s expectation that infill development will have to manage more stormwater on site.

Solutions:

- Allow flexibility in use below grade.
- Expand the type of land deemed acceptable so that Parks to do their part to make more efficient use of land and infrastructure within new communities (as per the guidelines of Building Better Smarter Suburbs).
- Acknowledge in the by-law that SWM can be incorporated in parks as long as the planned and future use of the park is not going to be negatively impacted.
- Better coordination with schoolboards and other public recreation facilities to co-locate park and recreation amenities.

Issue: Dedication Calculation

When defining cash-in-lieu payment values the City misinterprets 'as the day before the granting of draft approval' for their appraisals and uses comparable of current serviced land values. This is wrong.

The Planning Act states that parkland may be requested as a condition of subdivision (section 51.1 -large tracts of land subdivision approval) which is different than land that is being otherwise subdivided (consents and intensification type development) and hence section 42 applies. In the case of a CILP, the valuation date is different depending on the type of development seeking approval. According to section 51.1(4) the value is set the day before draft approval – in order to reflect the raw land value unimproved by the next-day issuance of draft plan approval. According to section 42(6.4) “the value shall be determined as of the day before the day the [first] building permit is issued”. The bylaw should clearly state what date applies to the different types of development.

Additionally, the bylaw must state that the “development area” is the area seeking development approval rather than the entire parcel of land unless the land owner agrees to the entire parcel being considered at the time of the specific application. If the entire site is considered then any park dedication or payment must be clearly off-set or credited to any subsequent phases. The current bylaw indicates that “gross land area” is the basis of the calculation for commercial, industrial and residential less than 18 dnh, however for densities over 18 dnh it states “land area of the site being developed”. This is where industry has been running into problems with interpretation.

“Gross Land Area” is defined in the bylaw as “the total area of the land to be developed excluding constraint lands such as: wetlands, unstable slopes, ravines, water courses, flood plains and other similar constraint lands, that normally would be conveyed to the City through the development process”. The City in its review should revisit the definition and ensure that it is consistently applied.

Solutions:

- The rate is to set the day before the first building permit is issued or the day before draft approval, as appropriate.
- The city must provide a clear accounting/reporting of how the required parkland dedication has been calculated and if CILP, what was paid when and at what rate.
- Gross Land Area means the total area of the land subject to the development excluding lands within the site outside of the construction limits of the development and constraint lands such as: wetlands, unstable slopes, ravines, water courses, flood plains and other similar constraint lands, that normally would be conveyed to the City through the development process”.

Issue: Park Construction

There is an issue where a park development plan is agreed upon but due to other development factors the park may not be built for a few years at which time the city seeks to add additional amenities or value. This should not occur but rather once the park development plan is agreed to by the city that is what is to be constructed without additions if constructed within a reasonable period of time (5 years).

Another issue is the time it takes for the city to approve a park design. The intention behind having a developer build a park was so the park could be delivered in a more timely and cost effective way. To date the experience has been it takes the city a very

long time to approve the park design which means the park is not being constructed at the same time as the surrounding development which results in additional costs.

- There should be an option where an owner/developer can provide a park construction payment to the city and then the developer is relieved of the obligation to construct the park. The payment (within a reasonable period of time) would be based on an approved park plan and the corresponding budget.
- If the City plans to incorporate park development budget formulas in the by-law, the inputs must be agreed upon, transparent and not permit 'add-ons'.
- The city must apply the park bylaw as written. It cannot expand when a rate may be applied that is inconsistent with the bylaw.
- Allow the developer flexibility to offer to build a privately owned park as compensation. This space could be incorporated into the development and would create a larger open area for both residents and non residents of the future site. POPS land should be subtracted from the parkland dedication owing, and any CIL collected should be redirected back towards the design and construction costs of the POPS. The City can condition, if the owner/developer agrees, that the POPS be designed to current park development standards and the POPS be available to the public during standard City park hours. POPS serve the same purpose to residents as a city owned park of a similar size - but removes the ongoing maintenance and liability from the City.

Issue: Parks and Landowner Groups

The city should have a consistent approach as to how parkland and park construction is to occur across the city in different landowner areas/groups. The city must also recognize that once a parkland dedication and/or park construction agreement is established that it is the governing document that applies over the duration of the agreement & development of the area