Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 841, 845, and 855(A) Grenon Avenue

Note: This is a draft Summary of the Written and Oral Submissions received in respect of Zoning By-law Amendment – 841, 845, and 855(A) Grenon Avenue (ACS2020-PIE-PS-0030), prior to City Council's consideration of the matter on May 27, 2020.
The final Summary will be presented to Council for approval at its meeting of June 10, 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 May 27, 2020'. Please refer to the 'Bulk Consent' section of the Council Agenda of June 10, 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: 9

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between April 27 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and May 14, 2020 (committee meeting date): 1

Primary concerns, by individual

Denise DeShaw and Todd Tobin (oral and written submission)

- was concerned about impacts the proposed development would have on their own neigbouring property and the neighbourhood in general, including: blocking of views; impeded emergency access; loss of greenspace; loss of historical value (existing house); loss of light; lowered property value; incompatibility with existing neighborhood character and sense of community. They opposed the change to R4 zoning for the area

Michael Wright, Wright Consulting Services (oral and written submission)

- was retained by property owners at 855 Grenon Avenue to analyze the proposal
- indicated that R4 zoning creates development that is not a good fit for the area and that the neighbours feel the proposal should be scaled back

Kristi M. Ross, Barrister & Solicitor, on behalf of 855 Grenon Property Management Inc. (oral and written submission),

- requested the proposal be rejected as over-building of the site
- suggested that R3 zoning would be most appropriate
- raised concerns about adverse impacts, including setbacks, easement access, shadowing, and loss of privacy
- indicated her clients were prepared to support a motion being proposed by Councillor Kavanagh, which would provide for a development that would be a better fit for the neighbourhood

Lisa Zanyk, 855 Grenon Property Owners Association (oral and written submission)

- suggested the application represents up-zoning without respecting criteria that govern R4 zoning and is bad urban planning
- raised concerns about adverse impacts on the neighbourhood
- asked that up to R3 zoning be permitted, but if R4 was approved, that there be no variances permitted

John R. Williams, Rockport Lane Residents Association (oral and written submission)

- indicated the Association would support redevelopment of the site and a change in zoning, but only if certain conditions were met
- suggested the building as proposed is not compatible with the existing context of the immediate area and will not enhance and complement its desirable characteristics
- recommended the proposal be rejected and raised specific concerns about safety and accessibility (related to sidewalks and parking); tree loss and lack of greenspace; collection and disposal of garbage and recycling; inadequate setbacks that pose problems for delivery services

Michael Abraham, Secretary, Rockport Residents Association (oral submission)

- indicated the proposed design is overreach and would have significant impacts in terms of noise, traffic, privacy, emergency access, greenspace, and aesthetics for the community
- suggested development must be in keeping with what exists in the neighbourhood currently

Julia McKinnon (oral submission)

- raised concerns about adverse impacts, including shadowing; loss of greenspace access; accessibility and safety issues for pedestrians (lack of sidewalk, snow and ice removal issues; increased traffic); shortage of development in area that lend itself to home-based childcare; development not in keeping with the neighbourhood

Joel Ferraz (oral and written submission)

- raised concerns about overdevelopment of the site; tree removal; safety (lack of sidewalk, winter conditions, increased traffic and parking on street)

Darrel B. Kent, CCC No. 268 (Marina Bay Condominium) (written submission)

- raised concerns spot rezoning and privacy implications in abutting rear yards and suggested the application be rejected or approved subject to including the required setbacks and parking
- suggested this is unsustainable intensification caused by failing to follow the Official Plan guidelines for intensification
- raised concerns about loss of mature tress
- said the built form does not address surrounding properties and is not sensitive intensification

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Murray Chown and James Ireland, Novatech (applicant) (oral and written submission)

- provided arguments in support of the proposal, including: site appropriate intensification; affordable housing option; enclosed parking; height compatibility with neighbourhood and less than is permitted; tree replacement plan; lack of development options due to site footprint

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 1 hour and 50 minutes on the item

Vote: The committee considered all written submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as amended by the following motion:

Therefore be it resolved that Planning Committee recommend to Council that Document 2 be amended to add the following provision:

1. **Minimum interior side-yard setback for the southerly property line is 3 metres.**

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

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between May 14 (Planning Committee consideration date) and May 27, 2020 (Council consideration date): 0

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all written submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as amended by the Planning Committee.