Planning Committee Report 42 May 26, 2021

53

Comité de l'urbanisme Rapport 42 le 26 mai 2021

Extract of Minutes 42 Planning Committee May 13, 2021

Extrait de l'ébauche du procès-verbal 42

Comité de l'urbanisme

Le 13 mai 2021

Zoning By-Law Amendment – 5000 Robert Grant Avenue (formerly 1000 Robert Grant Avenue)

ACS2021-PIE-PS-0054

Stittsville (6)

## Report recommendations

- 1. That Planning Committee recommend Council approve an amendment to Zoning By-law 2008-250 for 5000 Robert Grant Avenue to permit development of 18-storey, nine-storey and six-storey apartment buildings as detailed in Document 2.
- 2. That Planning Committee approve the Consultation Details Section of this report be included as part of the 'brief explanation' in the Summary of Written and Oral Public Submissions, to be prepared by the Office of the City Clerk and submitted to Council in the report titled, "Summary of Oral and Written Public Submissions for Items Subject to the *Planning Act* 'Explanation Requirements' at the City Council Meeting of May 26, 2021 subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and the time of Council's decision.

Councillor Gower introduced the following motion:

Motion No PLC 2021-42/1

Moved by Vice-chair G. Gower

WHEREAS Robert Grant Avenue is planned as the major north-south transportation corridor for Stittsville, from Fernbank Road to Palladium Drive, providing the necessary transportation needs for Fernbank residents including space for vehicles, transit, cyclists and pedestrians; and

WHEREAS Robert Grant Avenue is currently only built from Fernbank Road to

## Abbott Street; and

WHEREAS Robert Grant Avenue is scheduled to be constructed with two lanes in phases, and the final section includes Maple Grove Road to Hazeldean Road within the affordable network; and

WHEREAS a future bus rapid transit station is planned adjacent to the 5000 Robert Grant Avenue site, but is not scheduled to be built until after 2031;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the holding provision recommended by staff in Document 2 – Details of Recommended Zoning 3. d) iii) a. be revised to the following:

- "iii) The holding symbol may only be removed at such time as
  - a. The segment of Robert Grant Avenue between Abbott Street and <a href="Maple Grove Road">Maple Grove Road</a> has been constructed and opened to vehicular traffic; and";

## AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that no further notice be provided pursuant to subsection 34 (17) of the *Planning Act.*

The committee heard the following four delegations on the matter:

- Andrew Bonner (accompanied by Jennifer Kong) opposed the entire development, suggesting it is incongruent with the neighbourhood, and raised specific concerns about traffic and resulting safety impacts for families living around Blackstone Park; specifically, he suggested the development will add two to three thousand more vehicle trips down their street and will exacerbate existing traffic issues and that garage access should be limited to Robert Grant Avenue rather than permitted on Livery, which would be unsafe. He questioned the need for 18 storeys in an area not designed for it.
- Neil MacLellan contended that the application does not meet any of the three
  criteria required to amend the current by law, noting that there isn't an abutting
  major urban facility, nor a main street abutting another main street on a transit
  priority corridor and that it is unknown if a rapid transit station will be located within
  four hundred metres the property. He questioned whether there are mechanisms
  to ensure Building C will not be constructed before the extension of Robert Grant
  Avenue is completed, whether wind and shadow analyses have been completed
  and whether there should be concerns about arcing between the proposed

Comité de l'urbanisme Rapport 42 le 26 mai 2021

building and the hydro transmission lines that will be within 50 metres of it.

- Tanya Hein, President, Stittsville Village Association, noted that residents of the area have voiced great concerns that: the proposed height and density of the development would have a significant and permanent change on the character of the community and is not sensitive or compatible with the neighbouring communities; it does not provide the needed affordable housing to accommodate larger families; it will impact an already a crowded residential street with garage access on Livery; it will set a precedent as the next blocks within that 400 m radius are developed; the existing infrastructure is not adequate to support this development and will be impacted, the proposed community amenity a pathway and small piece of side walk is underwhelming.
- the applicant, as represented by Miguel Tremblay, FoTenn, and Pascale Lépine, Groupe Lépine, provided an overview of the proposal and spoke to policies that support the application; they noted that the densities proposed on the site are about 10 percent lower than densities anticipated by the Official Plan, the Fernbank Community Design Plan and the existing zoning and that the proposal redistributes density in a way to better integrate it into the site as it currently exists and as the community transitions. A copy of their slide presentation is held on file.

The following staff of the Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development department responded to questions:

- Kathy Rygus, Planner II
- Frin O'Connell, Manager, Development Review West
- ➤ Lee Ann Snedden, Director, Planning Services

The following correspondence was provided to the committee coordinator between May 3 (the date the report was originally published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and the time the matter was considered on May 13, 2021, a copy of which is held on file:

- Email dated May 3 from Arash Ghasemmehdi & Sepideh Afsar Doost
- Email dated May 3 from email sender 'Bill Allan' (unsigned)
- Email dated May 3 from Ian Butt

Comité de l'urbanisme Rapport 42 le 26 mai 2021

- Email dated May 3 from email sender 'Robyn Parsons' (unsigned)
- Email dated May 3 from Anuj (email sender 'Anuj Saxena')
- Email dated May 3 from Sharon Anderson
- Email dated May 3 from Victoria Joyal
- Email dated May 3 from Samar Akkila
- Email dated May 3 from Amanjot Singh
- Email dated May 4 from Jennifer Stewart
- Email dated May 4 from The Graingers
- Email dated May 3 (received on May 4 from Councillor G. Gower) from Adèle Mayers
- Email dated May 3 (received on May 4 from Councillor G. Gower) from Patricia Rene Lafleur
- Email dated May 4 from Bill Sobering
- Email dated May 4 from Samar El-kaseih
- Email dated May 4 from Sylvie Guilbeault
- Email dated May 5 from Bobbi Ostafichuk
- Email dated May 6 from Nargiz Babashli (received on May 6 from Councillor J. Harder)
- Email dated May 6 from Brad Joyal
- Email dated May 6 from Rachel Brazeau
- Email dated May 6 from Tara Vargas Nicol
- Email dated May 6 from Mukitul Khan
- Email dated May 7 from Simon Heaton
- Emails dated May 7 and 11from Vladamir (email sender 'Vlad D')

- Email dated May 8 from Manon Lacasse
- Email dated May 9 from Ninel and Anatoli Dermanski
- Email dated May 10 from Soni (otherwise unsigned)
- Email dated May 10 from Natalia Goncharova
- Email dated May 10 from Neil MacLellan
- Email dated May 10 from Vusal Babashov
- Email dated May 11 from Seckin Ergun
- Email dated May 11 from Peifang Zhou
- Email dated May 11 from Ben Kirkwood
- Email dated May 11 from Alison Boudreau
- Email dated May 12 from Amy Day
- Email dated May 12 from Jeff Ferguson
- Email dated May 12 from Jordan Williamson
- Email dated May 12 from Jem (email sender 'jem guler')
- Email dated May 12 from Jeff Wilk and Juliana Bravo
- Email dated May 13 from Gillian Scobie

A Petition document was also submitted by Neil MacLellan on April 20, 2020, for circulation in respect of this report and to be noted in the Minutes of this meeting, that included the names of 171 persons in opposition to the proposal.

The committee CARRIED motion 2021-42/1 and thereafter CARRIED the report recommendations as amended.