

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Note: This is a draft Summary of the Written and Oral Submissions received in respect of OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT – 4305, 4345 AND 4375 MCKENNA CASEY DRIVE AND 3285, 3288, 3300, 3305 AND 3330 BORRISOKANE ROAD (ACS2018-PIE-PS-0057), prior to City Council's consideration of the matter on April 25, 2018.

The final Summary will be presented to Council for approval at its meeting of May 9, 2018, in the report titled '*SUMMARY OF ORAL AND WRITTEN PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FOR ITEMS SUBJECT TO BILL 73 'EXPLANATION REQUIREMENTS' AT THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF April 25, 2018*'. Please refer to the 'Bulk Consent' section of the Council Agenda of May 9, 2018 to access this item.

OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT – 4305, 4345 AND 4375 MCKENNA CASEY DRIVE AND 3285, 3288, 3300, 3305 AND 3330 BORRISOKANE ROAD (ACS2018-PIE-PS-0057)

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 at Planning Committee: 0**
- **Number of Submissions received by Planning Committee between April 13 and April 25, 2018 : 1**

Primary concerns and arguments in opposition, by individual

❖ *Faith Blacquiere*

- the floodplain mapping update should not be undertaken at this time and the Official Plan Amendment (OPA) changes to the Secondary Plans are not critical to development applications proceeding
- the flood plain mapping should be updated by an OPA Omnibus Amendment
- the reason for this OPA is because the City would need to recognize Areas 8, 9 and 10 as Two-Zone Flood Plain Areas in order to be compliant with the Secondary Plans, which are currently not compliant with the Official Plan, not because the land is a greenfield situation that does not qualify as a flood fringe area under the City's flood plain policy, as stated in the report

- Council should not permit a landowner group challenge to the RVCA mapping; doing so will lead to further requests of a similar nature
- the City and conservation authorities have a formal process which has established priorities and funding
- Council should be providing more money on advanced tools and surveys for the existing mapping projects on the priorities list, rather than to place the RVCA in the position of defending its staff, policies and mapping
- the other studies identified in the J.F. Sabourin and Associates Inc. report (for all the land between Highway 416 and the Rideau River) should precede any mapping update
- the staff Report did not provide maps which would show the locations and extent of the parcels or the results of the J.F. Sabourin and Associates Inc. findings, which are required to understand what is being approved and proposed
- a Thirty Party Review of a conservation authority is an extraordinary measure, which could not result in changes after a mapping update, as the RVCA has the authority to make the final decision; other reviews may also be required for other developments and infrastructure projects if the water levels are impacted
- the report does not identify a requirement to consider and address impacts in the urban area; the updated flood risk mapping will also impact other South Nepean Urban Area Secondary Plans, projects and development applications which have relied on the 2005 mapping
- there are errors in the language and content of the OPA that require correction

Primary arguments in support, by individual

- *none received*

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision:

Debate The Committee approved this item on consent (without discussion or debate, other than a motion to advance it to Council the following day).

Vote: Planning Committee CARRIED the report recommendations as presented.

Effect of Submissions to both committees on Council Decision:

Council considered all written and oral submissions in making its decision, and CARRIED this item as presented.