

**Extract of Draft Minutes 17
Planning Committee
November 28, 2019**

**Extrait de l'ébauche
du procès-verbal 17
Comité de l'urbanisme
le 28 novembre 2019**

Zoning By-law Amendment – 250 Besserer Street

ACS2019-PIE-PS-0116

Rideau-Vanier (12)

Report recommendations

- 1. That Planning Committee recommend Council approve an amendment to Zoning By-law 2008-250 for 250 Besserer Street to permit a nine-storey apartment building, 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 December 11, 2019," subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and the time of Council's decision.**

The committee heard five delegations:

- Denis Larose¹ raised concerns about the impact of the proposal on the character of the community and the heritage home to the south of the site, and about the exacerbation of existing parking and traffic congestion due to insufficient provision of parking spaces. He asked that the building height be limited to five stories and suggested the applicant buy the property for sale at 256 Besserer and integrate it into a low rise complex more in keeping with the

¹ Submissions held on file

spirit of Sandy Hill.

- Janice Eliosoff, Condominium Board, 260 Besserer, raised concerns about building height not in conformity with current zoning, impacts on neighbourhood character, parking impacts, and impacts on quality of life. She suggested building height be restricted to a maximum of seven stories or that more underground parking within the building be provided.
- Monique Deschênes, resident 260 Besserer, questioned whether the building height is nine or ten stories, suggesting it seems taller than indicated and that it would set a height precedent for the area.
- Les Eidus suggested that the proposal, with its lack of vehicle parking, is not in keeping with the character of Sandy Hill and is not a community-building, family-supportive model, as families in that area would rely on vehicles to safely transport children to and from school.
- Carl Furney and Kirk Mawhinney, Fotenn Consultants (applicant), were present in support and to answer questions if needed and indicated support for a proposed motion regarding a visitor parking/car-sharing space (see motion 17/7, below).

The following Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development department staff responded to questions: Steve Gauthier, Planner II; Anne Fitzpatrick, Planner II; Doug James, Manager, Development Review – Central.

Ward Councillor M. Fleury was present and took part in discussion.

The following correspondence was provided to the committee coordinator for the Planning Committee between November 18 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda) and the time it was considered on November 28, a copy of which is held on file:

- Comments received from Denis Larose on November 19, 21 and 27, including a petition-type document signed by 57 persons opposed to the planned development

Motion N° PLC 2019-17/7

Moved by Councillor J. Leiper (on behalf of Councillor M. Fleury)

WHEREAS report ACS2019-PIE-PS-0116, Zoning By-law Amendment 250 Besserer Street, recommends reducing the required resident vehicular parking from 44 spaces to zero spaces; and

WHEREAS residents may occasionally need access to a vehicle; and

WHEREAS the provision of car-sharing spaces would provide an additional transportation mode option to the future occupants of the proposed development;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Planning Committee recommend that Council add the following provisions to Document 2 – Details of the Recommended Zoning under 2 a):

- **One visitor parking space may be used as a car-sharing space;**
- **The use of the visitor parking space for car sharing purposes does not result in a zoning violation for a lack of visitor parking.**

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

CARRIED

The committee carried the report recommendations as amended by motion 17/7.