

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-Law Amendment – 716 and 770 Brookfield Road

Note: This is a draft Summary of the Written and Oral Submissions received in respect of Zoning By-Law Amendment – 716 and 770 Brookfield Road (ACS2019-PIE-PS-0064), prior to City Council's consideration of the matter on July 10, 2019.

The final Summary will be presented to Council for approval at its meeting of August 28, 2019, 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 July 10, 2019'. Please refer to the 'Bulk Consent' section of the Council Agenda of August 28, 2019 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 Planning Committee: 3

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee and Council between June 17 and July 10, 2019 : 5

Primary concerns, by individual **Erwin Dreessen** (oral and two written submissions)

- in favour of development of these two parcels on Brookfield Road, and supportive of aiming for the Carleton University student housing market, but primarily opposed to the proposal because it does not respect Riverside Park's Secondary Plan
- the proposed nine-storey building is not an appropriate transition to the potential Canada Post buildings on the north side of Brookfield Road, which are restricted to four storeys, and the single-family houses on Egan and Hobson Roads
- ambiguity in staff's definition of 'transition' that does consider building height
- the absence of specific heights in the area Secondary Plan may be a weakness, but staff should have been more diligent in expressing the

views of the community established in the visioning and neighbourhood plan exercise

- should there be amendments to the Secondary Plan, such as to allow a 9-storey height, they should not be considered without prior consultation with the community
- objections to assertions by staff that a Secondary Plan does not trump a Zoning By-law, which runs counter to the most elementary principles of land use planning in Ontario, and concerns with statements made by City planning and legal staff in this regard.

Primary reasons for support, by individual

George Brown and Irene Brown (written submission)

- proposal is of a reasonable size and density for the area
- Mixed Use development is a very welcome addition to our neighbourhood
- the site is close to an O-Train stop (Mooney's Bay)
- it may or may not conflict with the Secondary Plan, but that only means the document is out of date with the reality of a neighbourhood that was a suburb in 1967, an edge suburb over the last 20 years and now transforming into an Urban Village

Joel Duff, President, Riverside Park Community and Recreation Association (RPCRA) (written submission)

- satisfied with community consultations and opportunity for public input into the development proposal
- feedback received by the RPCRA from neighbours and the wider community has been largely positive; residents are happy with adjustments that have been made to the proposal, most notably the adjustments to the setback from abutting residences and the removal of rear-facing balconies that would have otherwise overlooked residential properties
- current situation is untenable; the dilapidated parking lot that presently occupies the site attracts illicit activity and causes concern for local commercial and residential neighbours

- the introduction of a rapid transit station to this community brings new pressures and new opportunities; a mixed-use development project that would introduce new residential units and amenities will make the neighbourhood more self-supporting for residents and more attractive to would-be renters, home-owners and businesses

Applicant, as represented by: Barry Hobin, Hobin Architecture; Jamie Posen, Fotenn Planning and Design (oral submission)

- responded to concerns raised, noting that transition is not just about building height, but about achieving a transition in land uses between a high-density employment area to a low-density residential area; this proposal does that through a mix of uses, with proposed retail at grade and residential above

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The committee spent 15 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