

## Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

**Note: This is a draft Summary of the Written and Oral Submissions received in respect of ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT – 124 BATTERSEA CRESCENT (ACS2017-PIE-PS-0100), prior to City Council’s consideration of the matter on 13 September 2017.**

**The final Summary will be presented to Council for approval at its meeting of 27 September 2017, 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 13 September 2017 (ACS2017-CCS-OCC-0013)’. Please refer to the ‘Bulk Consent’ section of the Council Agenda of 27 September 2017 to access this item.**

### **ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT – 124 BATTERSEA CRESCENT (ACS2017-PIE-PS-0100)**

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: 6**
- **Number of Submissions received between 15 August and 13 September 2017: 6**
- **Primary arguments in support:**
  - The zoning application is only requesting a change to the density provision on the site to allow for the intended medium intensity. Previous concerns about servicing issues have been addressed so there is no need for the current density cap.
  - The application before the committee concerns only a request to allow for additional units to maximize the opportunity available through the infrastructure. The application is not meant to address concerns regarding built form, height of building, overlook, and privacy.
  - The site is located between two parks and some outdoor amenity space will also be provided, including a grassy area and landscaping.
  - The rooftop amenity area overlooks parking, away from nearby residences.

- **Primary concerns and arguments in opposition:**

- The proposal is not consistent with the stated goal of locating higher density residential development near amenities.
- The development is not compatible with existing character of the area, which is a high-end low-density residential community. It's an odd juxtaposition, an 'urban' apartment in a 'suburban' neighbourhood.
- There are enough apartment buildings in the neighbourhood and more apartments are not needed.
- The development is too close to existing houses and there is little physical or visual separation.
- The building will be at the top of Richardson Ridge and it will tower over the tranquil Kanata Lakes neighbourhood, which may not be an appropriate neighbourhood landmark
- The development is a radical change from the luxury condos proposed earlier and neighbours did not envision or buy into this type of community.
- The proposed density is too great for a small lot and no rationale for the unit increase has been provided. A neighbourhood petition to reduce the number of units by 34 was circulated and signed by approximately 200 residents.
- The proximity of a high density building next to low density dwellings will decrease the property values of nearby homes and result in a loss of safety and privacy for nearby residents.
- The development will negatively impact the quality of life of nearby residents and make them feel uncomfortable using their rear yards.
- A sunlight/shade study should be conducted to assess impacts on nearby properties
- The following mitigation measures should be put in place: the removal of all north-facing balconies; replacement of glass along the north facing roof-top patio with frosted glass or masonry; replacement of balcony walls with frosted glass or masonry; increase to the rear yard setback on north side of building and coniferous trees to be planted on the north-face of the building; sound proofing insulation on the exterior wall of the building.
- The proposal does not provide a balance of housing types and tenures and there is no guarantee this development will create affordable housing.

- Concerns about landscaping because the increased size of building will not permit trees to be planted along the north side of the building facing the recreational pathway; therefore, there will be less privacy for pedestrians and neighbouring homeowners. The aesthetic of the development will be reduced without the trees.
- Construction of underground parking will require blasting, which could result in damage to the foundation of neighbouring properties and increased noise levels.
- Concerns that the proposed development is not an appropriate infill for this site and that residents were not informed earlier about the intent to request a zoning bylaw change. Neighbours would like the zoning bylaw amendment to be placed on hold until all the information has been amalgamated.
- The development does not support the local economy; the developer is based in Quebec and has not made any guarantees to hire construction workers or source materials from Ontario.
- Concerns about ensuring the proper construction of the balconies, based on a balcony collapse that occurred at one of the developers' other construction sites.

**Effect of Submissions on Committee Decision:**

Debate        The Committee spent one hour and nine minutes on this item

Vote:         The Committee CARRIED this item as presented

**Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:**

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