

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment – 10 Oblats Avenue and Sites Designated Mixed Use Medium-rise in the Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan

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 Committee: 22

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee and Council between June 17 and July 10, 2019 : 14

Primary concerns, by individual **Heather Jarrett** (oral submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan without community consultation or support (including other area landowners)
- any changes to legal planning documents must undergo comprehensive consultation and re-negotiated with all concerned parties (community, staff, developers)
- lack of planning rationale to support anything beyond six storeys
- lack of respect for existing built structure and character and planned development

Paul Goodkey (oral and written submission)

- errors and inconsistencies in the staff report
- lack of appropriate public consultation
- exhaustive review, by all stakeholders, of the area Secondary Plan's land use designations should be conducted before a decision is made on the proposal
- lack of planning rationale to support anything beyond six storeys

- disagreement that there is ambiguity in the area Community Design Plan / Secondary Plan in respect of intended height
- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan without community consultation or support (including other area landowners)
- lack of respect for the comments of the Urban Design Review Panel
- lack of planning rationale to support anything beyond six storeys; proposal does not represent intensification

John Dance (oral and written submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan without community consultation or support (including other area landowners)
- disagreement that there is ambiguity in the area Community Design Plan / Secondary Plan in respect of intended height
- proposal does not respect and detracts from the existing heritage, and does not conform to the approved vision for the subject lands
- approval detracts from planning predictability for the area

Phyllis Odenbach Sutton, President, Old Ottawa East Community Association
(oral and written submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan without community consultation or support (including other area landowners)
- proposal does not respect and detracts from the existing heritage, and does not conform to the approved vision for the subject lands
- disagreement that there is ambiguity in the area Community Design Plan / Secondary Plan in respect of intended height
- approval detracts from planning predictability for the area and could set a precedent for similar or increased height in the area

- concerns about other reliefs that may be requested by the owner, including for rooftop amenity space, rooftop projections, and step backs above the fourth floor

Peter Tobin (oral submission)

- lack of planning rationale or community benefit to support anything beyond six storeys
- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan
- proposal is a breach of trust by the developer that undermines past collaborative efforts with the community
- approval detracts from planning predictability for the area and could set a precedent for similar or increased height in the area
- the development could result in increased short-term rental units, increased density and aggravated traffic flow

Camrose Burdon (oral submission; written submission together with Ian Kirk)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan without community consultation or support (including other area landowners)
- proposal is a breach of trust by the developer that undermines past collaborative efforts with the community and could undermine community confidence and be combative to future collaboration
- lack of planning rationale or community benefit to support anything beyond six storeys
- proposal does not respect and detracts from the existing heritage, and does not conform to the approved vision for the subject lands
- approval detracts from planning predictability for the area and could set a precedent for similar or increased height in the area

Barbara Kirk (oral submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan without community consultation or support

- proposal is a breach of trust by the developer that undermines past collaborative efforts with the community and could undermine community confidence in future collaborations
- lack of planning rationale to support anything beyond six storeys
- proposal does not respect and detracts from the existing heritage, and does not conform to the approved vision for the subject lands
- approval detracts from planning predictability for the area and could set a precedent for similar or increased height in the area

Alexandra Gruca-Macaulay (oral submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan without community consultation or support (including other area landowners)
- disagreement that there is ambiguity in the area Community Design Plan / Secondary Plan in respect of intended height
- proposal is a breach of trust by the developer that undermines past collaborative efforts with the community

Barry Davis (oral submission)

- the associated planning studies should include a pedestrian level wind study

Peter Frood (oral and written submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan
- proposal does not respect and detracts from the existing heritage, and does not conform to the approved vision for the subject lands

Lorna Kingston (oral submission)

- proposal is a breach of trust by the developer that undermines past collaborative efforts with the community and could undermine community confidence and be combative to future collaboration
- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan

- proposal does not change area density but will be detrimental to the community
- questioned whether the height increase has any correlation to the City's climate change initiatives
- questioned whether there is conflict of interest between the developers and certain Members of Council

Karen Dufton, President, Board of Directors of the Corners on Main condominium
(oral submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan
- proposal does not respect and detracts from the existing and planned development
- approval detracts from planning predictability for the area and could set a precedent

Ron Rose (oral submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan without community consultation or support (including other area landowners)
- disagreement that there is ambiguity in the area Community Design Plan / Secondary Plan in respect of intended height
- lack of community support for anything beyond six storeys
- proposal does not respect and detracts from the existing heritage, and does not conform to the approved vision for the subject lands

Jeff O'Neill (oral and written submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan without community consultation or support (including other area landowners)
- disagreement that there is ambiguity in the area Community Design Plan / Secondary Plan in respect of intended height
- approval would undo past collaborative efforts and good faith

- lack of planning rationale to support anything beyond six storeys

Francine Leduc (oral submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan
- lack of respect for past community collaboration

Erwin Dreessen, Greenspace Alliance of Canada's Capital (oral and written submission)

- deviation from the intent of the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan and without community consultation or support (including other area landowners)
- proposal is a breach of trust by the developer (and the City) that undermines past collaborative efforts with the community and approval would be morally improper
- lack of planning rationale to support the proposal
- Council should reject the proposal and set a new precedent that respects agreed-upon plans and respects the integrity of the planning process

Joel Harden, MPP, Ottawa Centre (oral and written submission)

- proposal ignores local community priorities, deviates from approved plans and vision for the area
- proposal undermines confidence in local democratic institutions and could lead to future division and disruption
- concerns about potential impact for the developer's plans around affordable housing

Rick Grimes (oral submission)

- concerns about potential impact and risks of additional height with respect to emergency response efforts

Adriana Beaman (written submission)

- proposal would contravene the agreement that the community entered into in good faith with the applicant

- proposal would contradict the guiding principles of the Official Plan and the objectives of the Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan
- proposal does not respect and detracts from the existing heritage, and does not conform to the approved vision for the subject lands
- lack of rationale to support the proposal
- approval could set a precedent for similar or increased height in the area, which deviates from and undermines the approved plan and vision for the area

Michael Dawson (written submission)

- approval would be a deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan and undermine community trust
- approval could detract from planning predictability and lead to further spot amendments
- disagreement that there is ambiguity in the area Community Design Plan / Secondary Plan in respect of intended height

Chantal Beauvais, Rector, Saint Paul University (written submission)

- supports the position of the Old Ottawa East Community Association that the proposed zoning change does not respect the understanding previously reached by the community, the City and area landowners and is not what the community wants
- concerns about the impact on existing heritage

Richard Slowikowski, President, Old Ottawa South Community Association
(written submission)

- deviation from the existing Zoning, Community Design Plan and/or Secondary Plan
- disagreement that there is ambiguity in the area Community Design Plan / Secondary Plan in respect of intended height
- proposal undermines past collaborative efforts with the community and detracts from planning predictability

Faith Blacquiere (written submission)

- disagrees with the staff opinion that the report recommendations would resolve perceived ambiguity in the Secondary Plan in respect of intended height and suggested certain changes to the recommendations are necessary if Council wishes to approve the nine-storey proposal
- indicated a number of problems with the wording and implementation of the Secondary Plan, which are resulting in ambiguity, non-conformity and error or omissions in the Plan
- opposes the nine storey proposal, as it destroys the symmetry of the Community Design Plan vision, for the sake of providing parking for a proposed grocery store; supports the position of the Old Ottawa East Community Association in the staff report, which provides a description of the intent of the CDP and Demonstration Plan
- cautioned the City not to make its decision based on fear of an appeal or on consideration of previous 'good works' by the developer

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Applicant, as represented by: Alan Cohen, Soloway Wright LLP; Barry Hobin, Hobin Architecture; Murray Chown, Novatech (oral submissions)

- provided background on area development to date, an overview of the proposal, and responded to some concerns raised
 - ❖ given the history of previous applications in the area that received approval, for heights greater than six storeys, and given language in the Secondary Plan that indicates heights in the medium rise residential area will not exceed nine storeys, the client felt nine stories would be in conformity, but applied for an Official Plan Amendment for the sake of clarity
 - ❖ the proposal is appropriate for the area, represents good land use planning, and will not detract from or be detrimental to existing heritage

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The committee spent 3 hours and 10 minutes on the item

Vote: The committee considered all written and oral submissions in making its decision and Carried the report recommendations as presented, without change.

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all written and oral submissions in making its decision and CARRIED the item without changes to the report recommendations