

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 1426 Scott Street

Note: This is a draft Summary of the Written and Oral Submissions received in respect of Zoning By-law Amendment – 1426 Scott Street (ACS2020-PIE-PS-0008), prior to City Council’s consideration of the matter on January 29, 2020.

The final Summary will be presented to Council for approval at its meeting of February 12, 2020, 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 January 29, 2020’. Please refer to the ‘Bulk Consent’ section of the Council Agenda of February 12, 2020 to access this item.

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: 4

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between January 13 (the date the report was published to the City’s website with the agenda) and January 23, 2020 (committee meeting date): 1

Primary concerns, by individual

Linda Hoad, Hintonburg Community Association (oral submission and slides)

- the site is within 400-500 metres of a transit station
- there have been considerable changes in the area since the previous request for use as a temporary parking lot, including developments that are strengthening the residential character of the street
- as a result of the Scott Street Community Design Plan, the site was rezoned to Traditional Main Street, which permits a very wide range of uses, including a 14.5 m height limit, so options for the site have increased since last time the temporary parking use was requested
- the landscaping that will be done is actually on the adjacent City property and there will be no expense to the applicant
- disagreed with a staff comment in the report about parking, suggesting it is not the City’s role to satisfy demand for parking, especially within proximity to a major employment district and two and LRT stations, and given the

Official Plan and the Transportation Master Plan discouraged parking in these locations

- there is a demand for housing in neighbourhood, and this parcel of land is zoned for residential but is vacant and underutilized

Cheryl Parrott, Hintonburg Community Association (oral submission)

- the site has been used for ‘temporary parking’ for over 12 years, many of which were without legal City approvals
- with each application that has been brought forward for the site, the Association has requested buffering be implemented, which has never materialized
- the original temporary zoning expired in 2015 and the community has been questioning what is happening since then
- there have been huge costs to the tax payer for more than 12 years, to police the site for issues around zoning non-compliance, property maintenance standards, illegal construction, roadway encroachment, and etc., and these issues will likely continue if the application is approved

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Lloyd Phillips, Lloyd Phillips & Associated Ltd. (applicant) (oral submission)

- had applied for a 3-year term but have agreed to the staff recommendation for a 2-year term
- will apply for extensions of the term if not prepared to move forward with development at end of 2-year term
- understand the concerns expressed by the HCA and the ward Councillor, but the lot has its own function in the community for the time-being in that it has reduced parking pressure on local streets
- the long-term planning goals for this property will be shared when the time is right and owner is ready; refusal of this application is not going to force development
- refusal of the application will have adverse impact on neighbourhood, on businesses who currently use it, and on the owner, who still has to pay taxes whether or not there is parking permitted
- there are examples elsewhere in the city for temporary parking zoning that have been granted extended renewals, without undermining long term intent

for the sites; this temporary parking lot does not preclude any long-term planning intent

- the owner commits to returning planter boxes (that were previously in place) in the spring

Firooz Hatami (owner) (oral submission)

- indicated his intent to buy the corner property when it is available to finish assembling the square, and to continue using the subject site for parking in the meantime. He noted his previous efforts to obtain permission to permanently use the site for parking, which he suggested is a benefit for the neighbourhood, and spoke to the costs associated with permits, site operations, snow removal and taxes, and to his desire to develop the site at a time that will assist with his retirement plans

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 25 minutes on the item

Vote: The committee considered all written submissions in making its decision. The committee voted against the staff recommendation (to approve the application). The report was sent forward to Council with no recommendation.

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between January 23 (Planning Committee consideration date) and January 29, 2020 (Council consideration date): 0

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all written submissions in making its decision and voted to reuse the application, as follows:

That Council approve that:

1. The application for an amendment to Zoning By-law 2008-250 for 1426 Scott Street to permit the continuance of a non-conforming parking lot for the period of two years be refused.
2. The reasons for the refusal of the zoning amendment are:
 - a. The site is in proximity to the LRT line and therefore a transit supportive use rather than a surface parking lot is appropriate for this location;
 - b. The Scott Street Secondary Plan encourages the redevelopment of

parking lots; and

- c. While a short-term presence of a surface parking lot was acceptable in the past as a mediated solution, this continuing presence of a non-conforming surface parking lot is not consistent with the vision for the community.