

OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENTS –
1966 ROGER STEVENS DRIVE

ACS2019-PIE-EDP-0047

RIDEAU-GOULBOURN (21)

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS:

That Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Adopt an Official Plan Amendment to Volume 2 North Gower Secondary Plan, which modifies:**
 - i. Schedule 1, attached in Document 3, re-designating a portion of the lands, delineated by shading and a heavy outline from “Highway Commercial” to an “Industrial” designation.**
 - ii. Policies of Section 4.4 - Highway Commercial, by adding a second sentence to the first paragraph under the heading "Permitted Uses" as follows: – “Additionally, uses that are principally intended to serve the travelling public will also be permitted”;**
 - iii. Policies of Section 4.7 – Industrial, by amending the second sentence under the heading "Intent" by replacing the word "business" with the words " uses that benefit the local and regional economy.”**
 - iv. Policies of Section 4.7 – Industrial by inserting a new clause**

under Permitted Uses” stating “Notwithstanding the other provisions of this plan an industrial building designated industrial, located at 1966 Roger Stevens Drive may have a height of 22 metres”.

- 2. Approve an Amendment to Zoning By-law 2008-250 for 1966 Roger Stevens Drive to permit a warehouse and amend associated provisions detailed in Document 2.**
- 3. That Agriculture and Rural Affairs 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.**

Adam Brown, Manager, Development Review, Rural gave a few opening comments and introduced Jeffrey Ostafichuk, Planner II who spoke to a PowerPoint presentation on the report before the Committee. A copy of his presentation is held on file with the City Clerk’s office.

The Chair requested that Councillor Moffatt introduce his motion and that Legal clarify the difference between Zoning and Site Plan and Christine Enta, Legal Counsel responded.

Following the presentation the Committee heard from the following delegations:

- 1) *Karlis Adamsons
- 2) *James Graham
- 3) *Laura Tupper

- 4) *Dave Tupper
- 5) *Debbie Bishop
- 6) *James Banks
- 7) *Cristin Graham
- 8) *Jim Pearson
- 9) *Teddie Laframboise
- 10) *Sigrun Kullik
- 11) Jitka Kapsa
- 12) *Pam Chiles
- 13) *Andrea Sissons
- 14) Sandy McNiece
- 15) *Ray Steiger
- 16) *Bruce Hood

The Committee recessed at 12:45 PM and resumed at 1:10 PM

- 17) Rosie McNiece
- 18) *Gordon Kubanek
- 19) *Sarah Richardson
- 20) Colleen Murphy
- 21) *Steve Nordstrum
- 22) Randy Lavier
- 23) Jo Sullivan
- 24) *Cindy Armstrong

25) *Leigh-Andrea Watson-Brunet

26) William Duffett

27) *Jennifer Cenlin

28) Dianne Drough

29) Connie Hart

30) Anna Riley

31) James Beach – Broccolini and Steve Pentz - Novatech

[* All individuals marked with an asterisk either provided their comments in writing or by email; all such comments are held on file with the City Clerk.]

Written submissions all opposed to staff recommendations were received from:

- Paul Swanbend
- Joel Drough
- Melissa Saunders
- Katherine Duggan
- Jordan Loshinsky
- Charles and Jennifer Kearns
- Ace Powell
- Hans Fluegel
- Karen Clarke
- Pat MacGregor
- Susan Lehmann
- Allison Usher

Many of the delegations spoke on the following but not limited to the following points: (*The majority spoke in opposition to the staff recommendations*)

- More research and evaluation should be done on water, traffic studies, sewer, etc....
- The plan goes against what the community had worked on with the City in its secondary plan.
- This is not part of the Official Plan.
- The project is not environmentally friendly. There will be too much light, noise, and traffic pollution.
- The area had been contemplated as an industrial area to serve the farmers and village.
- Many feel there was lack of transparency since meetings had been rescheduled which gave less time for rebuttal.
- This is not orderly development.
- This does not reflect what the community wants within its borders.
- There is no public transportation to this site which means more cars for the up to 1,800 possible employees.
- Far too much truck traffic. Causes safety concerns for cars and school bus traffic.
- Already difficult to find labour to work on the farms, this will make it worse.
- Many studies not done and if done they are flawed working on outdated data.
- The concrete and asphalt will cause more problems during heavy rains – flooding.
- The notice distance on this size of project needs to be expanded past the

120 metres.

- Does not reflect the rural nature.
- The applicant stated that currently a warehouse would be permitted today. They feel that with the site plan they will respond to community concerns. Hope to continue the dialogue in a productive manner.
- The applicant does not have a firm plan yet for the site, everything is mere speculation and hype.

Following the delegations, staff responded to members' questions listed below:

- The site meets the provincial policy directives that it would be built beside a major transportation corridor.
- Preliminary talks have started with the Ministry of Transportation and traffic experts.
- Because of grading the 22metre height may look lower.
- The \$15 million for housing represents about 250 new units.
- It is felt that approval would give more impetus to work with the developer for a consensus on the impacts for the community.

The Chair thanked all the speakers who came out to express their concerns.

The Chair asked Councillor Moffatt to re-read his motion.

The recommendations were amended by the following motion:

Motion ARA 2019 09/03

Moved by Councillor S. Moffatt

WHEREAS Report ACS2019-PIE-PS-0132 recommends a Zoning By-law Amendment for the land known municipally as 1966 Roger Stevens Drive, including an increased height limit of 22 metres and an open space buffer

of 40 metres from the residential properties to the west; and

WHEREAS property owners in the North Gower and Kars area have expressed concern with respect to the conceptual warehouse plan related to such issues as building size, lot coverage, traffic, hydrogeology, flood plain, noise, site lighting, and landscaping; and

WHEREAS during the City's Site Plan Control process these concerns will be addressed and mitigated; and

WHEREAS there is a desire by the community to ensure the future development of the site is controlled in such a way as to be no more impactful than the maximum build out currently allowed as of right; and

WHEREAS certain uses permitted in the Rural General Industrial zone are not desirable for this property; and

WHEREAS the open space buffer can be increased and still allow the proponent's conceptual warehouse to be built;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Document 1 Location Map be replaced with the attached map to incorporate an open space buffer of 100 metres from the residential property lot lines to the west; (*new map attached*)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Document 2, Details of Recommended Zoning of Report ACS2019-PIE-PS-0132 in its entirety be amended to be replaced with the following text (*changes highlighted*):

Document 2 – Details of Recommended Zoning

The proposed change to the City of Ottawa Zoning By-law No. 2008-250 for 1966 Roger Stevens Drive:

1. Rezone the lands shown in Document 1 as follows

- a) Area A from RC to RG [xxxr]- h
- b) Area B from RC [55r] to RG [xxxr]- h
- c) Area C from RG to RG [xxxr]- h
- d) Area D from RG to O1

2. Add a new exception RG [xxxr] to Section 240 – Rural Exceptions with

provisions similar to the intent of the following:

- a) In Column II – Applicable Zones add text, RG [xxxr]- **h**
- b) In Column III – Additional Land Uses Permitted and the following:
 - bed and breakfast
 - day care
 - park
 - recreational and athletic facility
 - retail store limited to an antique store
 - craft shop or farmers market
- c) In Column IV – Land Uses Prohibited add the following text:
 - **storage yard**
 - **waste processing and transfer facility (non-putrescible)**
- d) In Column V – Provisions add the following text:
 - **The holding symbol may only be removed following approval of a site plan control application.**
 - **Maximum Height 22 metres**
 - **Maximum Total Volume of all buildings: 1,914,035 cubic metres**

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there be no further notice pursuant to Sub-section 34(17) of the *Planning Act*.

CARRIED, on a division of 4 yeas and 1 nay, as follows:

YEAS (4): Councillors E. El-Chantiry, G. Gower, G. Darouze, S. Moffatt

NAYS (1): Councillor C. A. Meehan

That Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee recommend Council:

1. **Adopt an Official Plan Amendment to Volume 2 North Gower Secondary Plan, which modifies:**
 - i. **Schedule 1, attached in Document 3, re-designating a portion of the lands, delineated by shading and a heavy outline from “Highway Commercial” to an “Industrial” designation.**
 - ii. **Policies of Section 4.4 - Highway Commercial, by adding a second sentence to the first paragraph under the heading**

"Permitted Uses" as follows: – "Additionally, uses that are principally intended to serve the travelling public will also be permitted";

- iii. Policies of Section 4.7 – Industrial, by amending the second sentence under the heading "Intent" by replacing the word "business" with the words "uses that benefit the local and regional economy."
 - iv. Policies of Section 4.7 – Industrial by inserting a new clause under Permitted Uses" stating "Notwithstanding the other provisions of this plan an industrial building designated industrial, located at 1966 Roger Stevens Drive may have a height of 22 metres".
2. Approve an Amendment to Zoning By-law 2008-250 for 1966 Roger Stevens Drive to permit a warehouse and amend associated provisions detailed in Document 2 as amended by the following:

That Document 2, Details of Recommended Zoning of Report ACS2019-PIE-PS-0132 in its entirety be amended to be replaced with the following text (changes highlighted):

Document 2 – Details of Recommended Zoning

The proposed change to the City of Ottawa Zoning By-law No. 2008-250 for 1966 Roger Stevens Drive:

1. Rezone the lands shown in Document 1 as follows

- a) Area A from RC to RG [xxxr]- **h**
- b) Area B from RC [55r] to RG [xxxr]- **h**
- c) Area C from RG to RG [xxxr]- **h**
- d) Area D from RG to O1

2. Add a new exception RG [xxxr] to Section 240 – Rural Exceptions with provisions similar to the intent of the following:

a) In Column II – Applicable Zones add text, RG [xxxr]- **h**

b) In Column III – Additional Land Uses Permitted and the
following:

- bed and breakfast
- day care
- park
- recreational and athletic facility
- retail store limited to an antique store
- craft shop or farmers market

c) In Column IV – Land Uses Prohibited add the following text:

- storage yard
- waste processing and transfer facility (non-putrescible)

d) In Column V – Provisions add the following text:

- The holding symbol may only be removed following approval of
a site plan control application.
- Maximum Height 22 metres
- Maximum Total Volume of all buildings: 1,914,035 cubic metres

3. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there be no further notice
pursuant to Sub-section 34(17) of the Planning Act.

CARRIED as amended with dissent from Councillor Meehan