

CLOSED CAPTIONING TRANSCRIPT – CITY COUNCIL 22 NOVEMBER, 2017 [1111]

1>> Mayor Jim Watson: GOODMORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. IF I COULD ASK YOU TO TAKE A SEAT. WE'LL BEGIN THE COUNCIL MEETING IN ONE MINUTE. [SPEAKING IN FRENCH] IF MEMBERS OF COUNCIL COULD TAKE A SEAT. THANK YOU. [1111] [1111] [1111]>> Mayor Jim Watson: FOR THOSE WHO ARE ABLE TO, WOULD YOU PLEASE RISE FOR A MOMENT OF PERSONAL REFLECTION AND REMAIN STANDING FOR THE SINGING OF OUR NATIONAL ANTHEM.>> Mayor Jim Watson: IF YOU COULD REMAIN STANDING, WE'LL ASK OUR COLLEAGUE AND FRIEND COUNCILLOR GEORGE DAROUZE WHO WILL INTRODUCE OUR FRIEND TO SING THE NATIONAL ANTHEM.>> THANK YOU GOOD MORNING Mr. MAYOR. WE HAVE A SPECIAL GUEST. KAYLEIGH STYLES. SHE IS 13 YEARS OLD AND LIVE IN THE RURAL VILLAGE AND ALSO WE HAVE HER PARENTS WITH US IN THE AUDIENCE WAYNE AND KATHERINE STYLES. SHE IS CURRENTLY ATTENDING CANTERBURY HIGH SCHOOL AND SHE'S ENROLLED IN THE VOCAL PROGRAM. SHE HAS BEEN SINGING AND ACTING AND PERFORMING SINCE SHE WAS 6. SHE LIKES POP AND THEATRE. SHE SANG AT SPORTING EVENTS SUCH AS OTTAWA 67 AND OTTAWA FURRY. SHE WORKED WITH MUSIC PRODUCERS AND HAS FOUR ORIGINAL SONGS TO HER NAME. TWO OF THE SONGS HAVE BEEN RELEASED ON ITUNE AND SPOTIFY. SHE ALSO PARTICIPATED IN JUNIOR MONTREAL THAT IS LIFE SINGING COMPETITION BEFORE CELEBRITY JUDGES SIMILAR TO THE ONE AT THE VOICE. SHE IS EXTREMELY TALENTED AND LOVES PERFORMING FOR AUDIENCES BOTH YOUNG AND OLD. WITHOUT FURTHER DELAY PLEASE HELP ME WELCOME KAYLEIGH STYLE TO SING THE ANTHEM TODAY. [APPLAUSE] O CANADA, OUR HOME AND NATIVE LAND O TRUE PATRIOT LOVE, IN ALL THYSONS COMMAND O (SINGING IN FRENCH) O GOD KEEP OUR LAND, GLORIOUS AND FREE O CANADA, WE STAND ON GUARD FOR THEE O CANADA, WE STAND ON GUARD FOR THEE O [APPLAUSE]>> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR SHARING YOUR BEAUTIFUL TALENT WITH US TODAY. IT'S AN HONOUR TO INVITE DON WINCHESTER TO THE PODIUM FOR THIS COUNCIL SITTING BUILDER AWARD. DON, IF YOU LIKE TO COME FORWARD. [SPEAKING IN FRENCH]>> Voice of Translator: I'D LIKE TO INVITE DON WINCHESTER FOR THE PODIUM FOR THE COUNCIL CITY AWARD PRESENTATION. I AM PLEASED TO WELCOME BARRHAVEN AWARD COUNCILLOR JAN HARDEN AND MICHAEL CACUSH TO JOIN US FOR THE PRESENTATION. JAN AND MICHAEL. I'D LIKE TO ALSO EXTEND A

WARMWELCOME TO THE FAMILY ANDFRIENDS OF DON WHO ARE
HERETODAY.DON HAS WORKED TIRELESSLYWORKING FOR THE BARRHAVEN
AND ATTHE COUNCIL OF BARRHAVEN.DON AND HIS WIFE HAVE BEENACTIVE
IN THE COMMUNITY SINCE

MOVING HERE FROM CALGARY IN 2011. WE HAD A MEETING IN 2017 COUNCILLOR HARDER AND MYSELF AND SENIORS OF THE COMMUNITY TO DISCUSS THE NEED OF PROGRAMS AND SERVICES FOR OLDER ADULTS IN THE AREA. THIS WAS A PRODUCTIVE START AND IN 2014 DON WAS THE CO-FOUNDER AND PRESIDENT OF THE BARRHAVEN SENIORS COUNCIL. THIS IS AN ACTIVE AND POPULAR ORGANIZATION IN THE COMMUNITY AND REGISTERED CHARITY WITH ALMOST 600 MEMBERS. THAT IS REMARKABLE. HE IS BEING RECOGNIZED FOR THE CITY BUILDER AWARD WITH ENERGY AND DELIVERING PROGRAMS OF SENIORS. BARRHAVEN ENJOY BRIDGE AND UKER CLUBS AND SOCIAL ACTIVITIES AND OTHER THINGS AWAY FROM THEIR HOMES. THE SUCCESS HAS GIVEN MEMBERS NEW FRIENDSHIPS AND SENSE OF COMMUNITY THROUGH WEEKLY ACTIVITIES AND THE BEST POTLUCKS IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD. IT'S MY HONOUR TO ACKNOWLEDGE THESE CONTRIBUTIONS WITH A CITY BUILDER AWARD. THIS AWARD RECOGNIZES PEOPLE WHO HAVE DEMONSTRATED AN EXTRAORDINARY COMMITMENT TO MAKING OUR CITY A BETTER PLACE TODAY AND FOR THE FUTURE THROUGH OUTSTANDING VOLUNTEERISM OR EXEMPT MY ACTION. DON'S LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION SKILLS WERE HONORED OVER MORE THAN 30 YEARS WORKING AT THE CALGARY BOARD OF EDUCATION THROUGH HIS WORK WITH LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL AND AS A CO-FOUNDER AND VP OF THE ALBERTA AMATEUR BASEBALL COUNCIL. NOW AS THE SENIOR ADVISER OF THE PROJECT STEERING COMMUNITY FOR

THE BARRHAVEN COMMUNITY AND 4CULTURAL
CENTRE DON'S DREAM IS TO HAVE A QUALITY NEW CENTRE FOR PROGRAMS
AND SERVICES FOR SENIORS IN BARRHAVEN. I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE
AN OPPORTUNITY TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR MANY CONTRIBUTIONS TO
THE COMMUNITY AND YOUR CITY. [SPEAKING IN FRENCH]>> Voice of Translator:
I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO THANK DON FOR HIS MANY
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMUNITY AND THE CITY. WE'D LIKE TO
CO-PRESENT THIS TO YOU AND THANK YOU FOR THE TREMENDOUS
WORK. KEEP IT UP. CONGRATULATIONS. COME OVER HERE. WE'LL GET A
PICTURE. [APPLAUSE]>> THANK YOU MAYOR WATSON AND COUNCILLORS AND
STAFF. FIRST, I WANT TO THANK MAYOR WATSON AND COUNCILLOR HARDER
AND COUNCILLOR QAQISH FOR PRESENTING THE MAYOR BUILDER AWARD
THIS MORNING. IT MEANS A LOT TO KNOW THAT WE'RE IN SOME WAY HELPING
WITH THE COMMUNITY THAT WE CHOSE UPON RETIRING. WE LIVE IN AN
EXCITING TIME IN HISTORY WITNESSING THE NEED OF A MAJOR PARADIGM
SHIFT HOW WE PLAN OUR COMMUNITIES. ONE OF MY GOALS, MAYOR
WATSON, IS TO SEE THE CITY OF OTTAWA BECOME A NATIONAL LEADER
IN PLANNING FOR MULTIGENERATIONAL COMMUNITIES. THIS WOULD ENABLE
RESIDENTS OF ALL AGES AND ABILITIES TO LEAD ACTIVE AND FULFILLING
LIVES WITHIN THEIR CHOSEN COMMUNITIES SUCH AS BARRHAVEN. RATHER
THAN HAVING TO MOVE ELSEWHERE FOR SERVICES AS THEY

AGE. 5 COUNCILLORS HARDER AND QAQISH HELPED TO BRING LAND AND PROJECT DEVELOPERS TO THE TABLE IN ORDER TO WORK WITH CITY PLANNING SO WE CAN TOGETHER EXPLORE PARTNERSHIP OPTIONS AND I VERY MUCH APPRECIATE ALL OF THEIR CONTINUING SUPPORT. MP ARIA WHOSE EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT WAS HERE TODAY FACILITATED MEETINGS WITH ME FOR FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS TO IDENTIFY FUNDING SOURCES FOR THE BARRHAVEN SENIORS COUNCIL AND THE BARRHAVEN COMMUNITY AND CULTURAL CENTRE. IN CLOSING I WOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU MAYOR WATSON FOR YOUR COMMUNITY SUPPORT OF THE BARRHAVEN SENIORS FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SAY A FEW WORDS TO COUNCIL. WE HOPE YOU WILL ATTEND YOUR NEXT POTLUCK VERY SOON. >> TELL HIM WHEN IT IS. >> FRIDAY. [LAUGHTER] [APPLAUSE] >> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU. >> THANK YOU VERY MUCH. >> Mayor Jim Watson: APPRECIATE IT. >> THANK YOU VERY MUCH. >> Mayor Jim Watson: CONGRATULATIONS AGAIN DON AND THANK YOU FOR THE GOOD WORK YOU DO. ROLL CALL PLEASE MADAM DEPUTY CLERK. [SPEAKING IN FRENCH] [ROLL CALL] >> MAYOR JIM WATSON: CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE 8TH OF NOVEMBER 2017. CARRIED. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS INCLUDING THOSE ORIGINALLY ARISING FROM PRIOR MEETINGS.

COUNCILLOR LEIPER PLEASE.

6>> THANK YOU,

CHAIR.I DECLARE POTENTIAL DEEMEDPECUNIARY INTEREST OF THE OFFICEOF THE AUDITOR GENERAL ANDREPORT ON AUDIT FOLLOW UPS ANDDETAILED AUDIT FOLLOW UP REPORTSAS MY SPOUSE CHAIRED THE BOARDOF DIRECTORS OF THE OTTAWASCHOOL OF SPEECH AND DRAMA ATTHE TIME IT CEASED OPERATIONSWITH OUTSTANDING DEBT TO THECITY.THAT IS ONE OF THE ITEMS IN THEDETAILED AUDIT FOLLOW UPREPORTS.>> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU COUNCILLOR.COUNCILLOR.>> I DECLARE A POTENTIAL DEEMEDINDIRECT PECUNIARY INTEREST INAGENDA ITEM 54A ZONING LAWAMENDMENT 325 AND 337 AND 333MONTREAL ROAD 334 MOUNT FORESTSTREET AND 273 St. ANNE AVENUEAS MY DAUGHTER IS EMPLOYED BYSHEPHERDS OF GOOD HOPEORGANIZATION IN THE SAME FUNDINGBRACKET AS THE SALVATION ARMY INTHE APPLICANT IN THE REPORTMENTIONED HERE IN AND SEE THEOPERATIONS AFFECTED BY CHANGESASSOCIATED WITH THE APPLICATION.>> Mayor Jim Watson: ARE THEREANY OTHER CONFLICTS?COMMUNICATIONS AS PRESENTED?REPORTS INTEGRITY REPORT.Mr. MARLO -- I APOLOGIZE.COUNCILLOR QAQISH PLEASE.>> THAT THE REPORT FROM THEINTEGRITY COMMISSIONER ENTITLEDINTEGRITY COMMISSIONER 2017ANNUAL REPORT THE REPORT FROMTHE OTTAWA BOARD OF HEALTHENTITLED HEALTH TRANSFORMATIONRESPONSE TO THE EXPERT PANELREPORT AND AUDITOR REPORT 13 ANDNUMBER 29 AND PLANNING COMMITTEEREPORT 54 AND TRANSIT COMMISSIONREPORT 15 AND SUBJECT OF

COMMISSIONS AND ITEMS

7EXPLANATION

REQUIREMENTS AT CITYCOUNCIL MEETING 2017 BE RECEIVEDAND
CONSIDERED THAT PURSUANT TO35.5 AND 35.6 OF PROCEDURALBYLAW 2016-
277 COUNCIL CONSIDERPLANNING AND REPORT OF 54A ANDTHE PETITIONS
LISTED ON THEAGENDA WITH RESPECT TO CLOSUREOF JOHN WOOD STREET
AND RESPECTTO SALVATION ARMY PROPOSAL BERECEIVED.>> Mayor Jim
Watson: MOTION.CARRIED.NO REGRETS TO DATE.REPORTS.Mr. MARLO IS IN
ATTENDANCE.DOES ANYONE HAVE ANY QUESTIONSON THE 2017 ANNUAL
REPORT?NO?OKAY.RECEIVED.ITEM NUMBER 2 ONTARIO'S HEALTHSYSTEM
TRANSFORMATION RESPONSETO THE MINISTER'S EXPERT PANELREPORT.[
SPEAKING IN FRENCH]Dr. LEVY IS HERE FOR ANYQUESTIONS.ANY QUESTIONS
ON THE REPORT?NO.CARRIED.COMMITTEE REPORTS AUDITCOMMITTEE
REPORT NUMBER 13COUNCIL OF AUDITOR GENERALCOUNCILLOR LEIPER
LEFT HIS SEAT.DOES ANYONE HAVE ANY QUESTIONSOR COMMENTS ON THE
AUDITORGENERAL'S REPORT.>> YES.>> Mayor Jim Watson: WE'LLCOME BACK
TO THAT, THEN.ITEM NUMBER 4 OFFICE OF THEAUDITOR GENERAL 2018
WORK PLAN.CARRIED.DESCENT BY COUNCILLOR DEANS.CITY OF OTTAWA
PARTICIPATION INTHE NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSIONSGAUCHE
NEGOTIATIONS OF LEBRETOFLATS.

HOLD. 8ITEM NUMBER 6.[SPEAKING IN FRENCH]APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL TO EXPROPRIATE LANDS FOR THE SOUTHLINK PROJECT PURSUANT TO SECTION 4 OF THE EXPROPRIATION ACT.ITEM NUMBER 7 START CITY STRATEGY.[SPEAKING IN FRENCH]HOLD.PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT NUMBER 54A WE'LL COME BACK TO AND DEAL WITH IT FIRST.BULK CONSENT AGENDA.DOES ANYONE WISH TO REMOVE ANYTHING FROM THE BULK CONSENT AGENDA.AS PRESENTED? CARRIED.PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT NUMBER 54A.[SPEAKING IN FRENCH]WE HAVE A NUMBER OF MOTIONS AND COUNCILLOR HARDER IS GOING TO START WITH SOME OPENING COMMENTS AND ASK RICK O'CONNOR TO GIVE US SOME LEGAL DIRECTION AND THEN WE WILL DEAL WITH THE MOTIONS AS I RECEIVED THEM.AND THEN WITH THE MAIN REPORT.COUNCILLOR HARDER, PLEASE.>> THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR.AS CHAIR OF PLANNING COMMITTEE I WANTED TO SAY A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE SALVATION ARMY APPLICATION WHICH AS YOU ALL KNOW IS SEEKING AMENDMENTS TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN AND THE ZONING BYLAW AND THE MONTREAL ROAD DISTRICT SECONDARY PLAN TO PERMIT A RESIDENTIAL CARRY FAULT SHELTER AND SURFACE PARKING ON THEIR PROPERTY ON MONTREAL ROAD.AS YOU SAW BY THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO ATTENDED THE PLANNING COMMITTEE LAST WEEK, THERE IS A LOT OF INTEREST IN THE PROPOSAL.WHILE THERE ARE DIFFERENT VIEWS ABOUT THE PROPOSED FACILITY, I

WANT TO THANK THE COMMUNITY 9 MEMBERS WHO
HAVE BEEN ACTIVE AND ENGAGED ON THIS FILE. I WANT TO TAKE THIS
OPPORTUNITY TO REMIND EVERY ONE WHAT IS BEFORE COUNCIL TODAY IS
A RECOMMENDATION FROM PLANNING COMMITTEE BASED ON
A RECOMMENDATION FROM OUR CITY PLANNING STAFF. AT THE END OF THE
DAY, OUR DECISION MUST RELATE TO THE LAND USE OF THE PROPOSED
APPLICATION AND MUST BE BASED ON SOUND LAND USE PLANNING
PRINCIPLES. CONCERNS REGARDING THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OR SOCIAL
IMPACT OF THIS DEVELOPMENT ARE APPROPRIATE. BUT MUST RELATE TO THE
LAND USE AND NOT THE USERS OF THE PROPOSAL. FOR EXAMPLE, MEMBERS
OF COUNCIL MAY CONSIDER THE SOCIAL OR NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPACT OF
ALLOWING 350 ADDITIONAL OCCUPANTS INTO THE NEIGHBOURHOOD BUT NOT
SOCIAL OR NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPACT OF ALLOWING IMPOVERISHED SINGLE
MEN INTO THE NEIGHBOURHOOD. ACCORDINGLY, I HAVE SPOKE TO
THE MAYOR AND HE SAID QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE FOLLOWING ARE OUT
OF ORDER OF THIS ISSUE AND ANY POTENTIAL MUNICIPAL OR PROVINCIAL
OUR FEDERAL FUNDING FOR THIS APPLICANT AND ANY PROGRAMS FOR THE
POTENTIAL USERS AND IDEAS OF CHARACTERISTICS OF THE USERS AND
SMOKING AND CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR AND DRUG USE, THE CITY'S TEN YEAR
HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS PLAN AND THE FIRST -- THE HOUSING
FIRST MODEL. ONCE THE MAYOR CAN -- ONCE THE MAYOR FINISHES HIS
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE CITY'S LEGAL STAFF
TO COME FORWARD AND BRIEFLY CLARIFY SOME

OF THE PROCEDURAL AND LEGAL 10 ISSUES RELATED
TO COUNCIL'S CONSIDERATION OF THIS ITEM. THEY PROVIDED SOME
IMPORTANT COMMENTS TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE THAT THE MAYOR AND
I FEEL ARE IMPORTANT FOR ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL TO BE AWARE OF. I
WANT TO THANK ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL FOR 98% OF YOU ATTENDED A
GOOD PORTION OF THE THREE DAYS THAT WE HEARD FROM
THE DELEGATIONS. I WOULD LIKE TO CLOSE BY FORMALLY THANKING BOTH
THE STAFF FROM THE PLANNING AND LEGAL SERVICES FOR THEIR EFFORTS
TO DATE AND FOR THEIR PROFESSIONALISM ON WHAT HAS
BEEN AN EMOTIONALLY CHARGED FILE. AND I'D LIKE TO ESPECIALLY
THANK AARON O'CONNELL THE LEAD PLANNING AND DOUG JAMES
THE MANAGER OF REVIEW FOR DILIGENCE AND THOUGHTFUL APPROACH TO
THE APPLICATION. I KNOW IT HAS NOT BEEN EASY AND I WANT TO THANK
EVERY ONE WHO HAS BEEN INVOLVED FROM COMMUNICATIONS AND
LEGAL SERVICES AND MELONEY AND HER TEAM AND MY OWN OFFICE
STAFF. YOUR PROFESSIONALISM IS NOT UNNOTED. THANK YOU.>> Mayor Jim
Watson: THANK YOU.>> I WILL TRY TO BE BRIEF. I BELIEVE THE CHAIR
ENCAPSULATED A NUMBER OF LEGAL ISSUES, AND I WILL REITERATE A
COUPLE OF THEM AND GIVE BRIEF OVERVIEW TO COUNCIL THAT THREE
ISSUES THAT ROSE WITH REGARDS TO THIS PARTICULAR APPLICATION AND
THE FIRST BEING THE APPLICATIONS OF THE 2008 COUNCIL REPORT ON
THIS MATTER -- ON A SIMILAR MATTER IN WARD 12.

THE SECOND BEING AS THE CHAIR

11 DESCRIBED THE

PARAMETERS, THE LEGAL PARAMETERS AND THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS THAT COUNCIL SHOULD BE FOLLOWING IN THIS TYPE OF INSTANCE AND FINALLY Mr. MAYOR I WOULD LIKE TO END WITH A FEW COMMENTS WITH REGARDS TO THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AND THE CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS. WITH REGARDS TO THE FIRST ISSUE ON THE 2008 REPORT Mr. MAYOR ISSUED A MEMO ON NOVEMBER 2ND WITH REGARDS TO THIS AS A RESULT OF A NOTE OF MOTION THAT WAS GIVEN AT COUNCIL AT THAT POINT IN TIME. AND ESSENTIALLY WHAT COUNCILLORS WERE ASKING IS WHETHER OR NOT ANY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED BY THE 2006 AND 2010 CITY COUNCIL AS PART OF THAT 2008 REPORT WHICH WAS WITH REGARDS TO AN INTERIM CONTROL BYLAW IN WARD 2 WOULD IN ANY WAY SHAPE OR FORM PROHIBIT OR IMPEDE THE APPROVAL OF THE COMMITTEE OR STAFF RECOMMENDATION WITH REGARDS TO WHAT IS BEFORE MEMBERS STAY. IN SHORT ANSWER OF THAT IS NOT THERE ARE NO SUCH IMPEDIMENTS AND IN LINE WITH THAT DRAW A NUMBER OF CONCLUSIONS THAT THE CITY COUNCIL KNOCKED DOWN OF POLICY DECISIONS OF A PAST CROWN AND CITY COUNCIL CURRENT OFFICIAL PLAN ALLOWS FOR CREATION OF SHELTERS AND NO PROVISION IN THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW OR PLAN THAT HAS SHELTERS ON TRADITIONAL OR ARTERIAL MAIN STREET AND NO MAXIMUM SHELTER CAP HIGHLIGHTED IN THE OFFICIAL PLAN AND NO PROHIBITIONS OR RESTRICTIONS ON SHELTERS IN THE MONTREAL ROAD DISTRICT SECONDARY PLAN AND THE SITE SPECIFIC

ZONING BEING READY IN THIS

12 INSTANCE

ADDRESSES THE RELOCATION AS SET OUT IN THE PLANNING REPORT OF AN EXISTING SHELTER AND IS THEREFORE NOT A CREATION OF A NEW SHELTER AND STAFF BELIEVE THAT HAS NO IMPACT WITH REGARDS TO THE LIMIT OF FOUR SHELTERS IN WARD 12. SECOND Mr. MAYOR WITH REGARD TO PARAMETERS OF THE DECISION MAKING AND AS THE CHAIR ALLUDED TO EARLIER, THERE IS A CONCERN AND LEGAL HAS RAISED THIS IF THERE IS A DECISION ULTIMATELY FOUNDED BY EITHER THE OMB OR ANY OTHER TRIBUNAL OR COURT, THAT THIS COUNCIL FOUNDED ITS DECISION ON THIS PLANNING APPLICATION ON NON-PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND THAT WOULD INCLUDE THE USER OF THE FACILITIES IN THIS CASE THE FUNDING FOR THIS PROCESS, THE PROGRAMS THAT ARE SET OUT THEREIN AND ANY OF COUNCIL'S POLICIES WITH HOUSING AND WHAT NOT WOULD DO A GREAT DEAL OF DAMAGE IN THIS CASE IN DEFENDING THIS MATTER THINGS LIKE THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD. IN DOING SO Mr. MAYOR WE HAVE NOT IN LEGAL'S MIND SAID THAT SOCIAL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPACT IS NOT A VALID PLANNING CONSIDERATION. IN FACT, THE OPPOSITE. WE ARE VERY CLEAR ON A NUMBER OF OCCASIONS SAYING THAT IS SOMETHING THAT MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE AND COUNCIL COULD TAKE INTO HAND. AND WE ALSO REITERATED THAT APPROPRIATE PLAN USE DOES NOT COMBINE TO THE BOUNDARIES OF THIS PROPERTY AND TALKED ABOUT -- YOU CAN TALK ABOUT THE ROADS, YOU CAN TALK ABOUT SIDEWALKS AND TALK ABOUT THINGS AROUND THE PROPERTY AND DOESN'T

END AT THE PROPERTY LINE.

13 AGAIN, TO REITERATE

THE PLANNING LAW REGULATES LAND USE AND NOT THE USERS OF THE LAND. AS WELL AS THE PROGRAM'S FUNDING APPLICATIONS OR ANYTHING ELSE OF THE PARTICULAR APPLICANT IN THIS CASE. AND WITH REGARDS TO THAT Mr. MAYOR THAT LEADS US TO THE CONCERNS WITH REGARDS TO HUMAN RIGHTS AND ZONING ISSUES. WE INDICATED TO MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE LAST WEEK AND DO SO AGAIN THAT HUMAN RIGHTS AND TRIBUNALS AS WELL AS COURTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY IN EXERCISING THEIR AUTHORITY ON PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS BY MUNICIPALITIES ARE REQUIRED TO ENSURE THAT THEY DO NOT INFRINGE ON RIGHTS GUARANTEED UNDER EITHER THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE OR IN FACT THE CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS. AND IN FACT THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE IS IN FACT FOR CONSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES SUPERSEDES THE STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE PLANNING ACT. WHEREAS REFERENCE TO VARIOUS CASES AND I WON'T BORE YOU WITH THOSE THINGS. I WOULD DRAW FOR YOUR CONCLUSION IN CONCLUSION SORRY THAT THE MINISTRY OF MINISTER AFFAIRS REINFORCED THE IMPORTANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND ADDED THIS LEGAL TO KEY RESOURCES AND THE FIRST BEING MUNICIPAL COUNCILLORS' GUIDE FOR 2014 IN SECTION 3 WHERE THEY REFER TO THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AND FOR THE PROVINCIAL PURPOSES THE PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT SECTION 4.6 IN 2014 THAT NOW REITERATES UNDER THE PLANNING ACT STATES THAT PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT QUOTE SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED IN A WAY THAT IS

CONSISTENT WITH THE ONTARIO

14 HUMAN RIGHTS

CODE AND THE CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS. Mr. MAYOR, THAT'S
MY PROCEDURAL OVERVIEW WITH REGARD TO THE MATTER BEFORE

COUNCIL THIS MORNING. THANK YOU. >> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU VERY
MUCH. WE'RE GOING TO INTRODUCE MOTIONS FIRST. CLARIFICATION OKAY. >>

THANK YOU, Mr. CHAIR. I'M A BIT CONFUSED BETWEEN THE CHAIR'S
INTRODUCTION WHERE SHE SAID THAT QUESTIONS RELATED TO THINGS LIKE
THE HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS PLAN, OTHER SOCIAL IMPACTS WOULD BE
DEEMED OUT OF ORDER, AND THE CITY SOLICITOR'S COMMENT NOW THAT
SAID THAT SOCIAL IMPACTS ARE VERY MUCH IN ORDER. SO THOSE SEEM TO
BE DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED. I'M WONDERING IF THE CITY SOLICITOR COULD
PROVIDE CLARITY. HE SAID SOMETHING ALONG THE LINES OF SOCIAL IMPACTS
ARE INDEED LEGITIMATE ELEMENT OF COUNCIL'S CONSIDERATION OF
THE APPLICATION THAT SEEMS TO CONTRADICT THE CHAIR'S

EARLIER COMMENT. >> WITH RESPECT, Mr. MAYOR, I DON'T THINK IT
CONTRADICTS IT. IT HAS TO BE SOCIAL IMPACTS RELATED TO THE COMMUNITY
OR THE NEIGHBOURHOOD THAT RELATED TO LAND USE. WHEN WE TALK
ABOUT LAND USE, THE FACT IS THIS APPLICATION GOING TO
BE SOMETHING THAT IS GOING TO HAVE IMPEDIMENTS WITH REGARDS
TO TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING COMMITTEE WAS VERY GOOD ON
THAT AND ASKED A SERIES OF QUESTIONS WITH REGARDS TO IF THERE'S A

TRUCK COMING ONCE A WEEK, I
15THINK THE TERM
WAS TO PROVIDESUPPLIES FOR THIS PARTICULARFACILITY, IS IT AN 18
WHEELER?IS IT A SMALL PANEL TRUCK?WILL IT HAVE DIFFICULTY
GETTINGDOWN THE ROADS?WHERE IS THE APPROACH?WHAT TIME IS IT
GOING TO BEAPPROACHING?AND WILL IT AFFECT CHILDRENCROSSING FOR
SCHOOLS AND OTHERMATTERS.THOSE ARE IMPACTS, SOCIALIMPACTS ON
THE COMMUNITY.THEY ARE NOT ABOUT FUNDING ORTHE PROGRAMS THAT
THIS APPLICANTMAY BE INVOLVED IN.>> Mr. CHAIR, ON PAGE 70 OFTHE STAFF
REPORT, THE STAFFEXPLICITLY REFERENCED THEHOUSING AND
HOMELESSNESS PLAN.SO THEY ARE BALANCING THE NUMBEROF SHELTERS
WITHIN WARD 12AGAINST THE APPLICANT'S CRITERIAFOR SITE SELECTION
THATCORRESPOND WITH THE SELECTEDSITE AS WELL AS THE
COUNCILAPPROVED OUR TEN YEAR PLAN AHOME FOR EVERY ONE 2014 TO
24THAT IS OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THEHOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS
PLAN.CAN I SAFELY ASSUME THAT GIVENTHAT STAFF HAVE
SPECIFICALLYRAISED THIS IN DOCUMENT 4 OF THESTAFF REPORT THAT
QUESTIONS WILLBE IN ORDER IN RESPONSE TO THATSTATEMENT BY
STAFF?THANK YOU.>> Mr. MAYOR, THAT IS INREFERENCE TO
INFORMATIONPURPOSES ONLY AND WAS NOT TAKENINTO CONSIDERATION
OF THEDECISIONS AND THERECOMMENDATIONS THAT WERE MADEIN THE
STAFF REPORT.>> Mayor Jim Watson: OKAY.SO WE'RE NOW GOING TO GO ON
TOMOTIONS.WE HAVE A NUMBER OF MOTIONS.

COUNCILLOR FLEURY HAS A DEFERRAL 16MOTION.THIS
WILL BE THE FIRST ONE THATWE DEAL WITH AS ACCORDING TO
THEPROCEDURAL BYLAW COUNCILLORFLEURY IF YOU LIKE TO
INTRODUCETHE MOTION PLEASE.[SPEAKING IN FRENCH]>> Voice of Translator:
THANKYOU, Mr. MAYOR.I LEARNED A LOT ON THE OFFICIALPLAN THESE PAST
FEW MONTHS, INOTICED THE IMPORTANT SECTION INTHE PLAN.[END OF
TRANSLATION]26.3 STATES APPLICATIONS FOROFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENTS
OF CITYWIDE SIGNIFICANCE WILL BECONSIDERED PROVIDING
THEFOLLOWING CRITERIA ARE MET.AND THIS IS PULLED FROM
THEWEBSITE.FROM OUR CITY WEBSITE.A, THE APPLICANT POLICIES
INSECTION 4, B, THE APPLICATIONINFORMATION AND REPORT LISTED
INPOLICY 2I THROUGH -- AND THIS ISEXACTLY HOW IT'S POSTED ON
THEWEBSITE XXX, ABOVE ALL OF THESE SUBMITTED TO SEE
ADDITIONALINFORMATION OF APPROPRIATENESSOF APPROPRIATE
AMENDMENTSINCLUDING CITY WIDE ANALYSIS OFVALUATION OF THE
ALTERNATIVESUBMITTED AND WHEREAS SHOULD BEA STUDY OF
ALTERNATE SITES SUCHAS FACILITY AND COUNCIL SHOULDHAVE COPY OF
SUCH AN ANALYSISPRIOR TO DECISION, THEREFORE BERESOLVED THAT
COUNCIL DEFERCONSIDERATION OF THISAPPLICATION UNTIL SUCH TIME
ASTHE APPLICANT PROVIDES ANANALYSIS OF THE OTHER AVAILABLELANDS
AND POTENTIAL SITES TOPLANNING COMMITTEE AND COUNCIL.>> Mayor Jim
Watson: DO YOUWANT TO SPEAK TO IT NOWCOUNCILLOR?>> SO Mr. MAYOR,
CAN YOU

CLARIFY, ARE WE GOING TO GO 17THROUGH ALL OF
THE MOTIONS.>> Mayor Jim Watson: WE HAVETO DEAL WITH THIS ONE
FIRSTBECAUSE IT'S A DEFERRAL LEASEAND DEAL WITH THEM IN
SEQUENTIALORDER AND THE FLOOR IS YOURS.>> THE SALVATION ARMY
HIRED ACONSULTANT TO REVIEW DIFFERENTSITE SELECTIONS BASED ON
THEIRCRITERIAS.THOSE WERE MADE AVAILABLE BUTTHE SITES PRESENTED
EITHER THAN THE ONE IN FRONT OF US WAS NEVERPROVIDED.SO WE DON'T
HAVE A LIST OF THEEFFORTS AND THE SITES THAT WEREINCLUDED.WE DON'T
KNOW IF THE ALSO WASAPPROPRIATE.WE DON'T KNOW IF AS YOU
KNOWMEMBERS OF MY COMMUNITY DID USE THE CRITERIA AND LOOK AT
THEOTHER SITES AND WE DON'T KNOWHOW THAT COMPARES.SO THERE'S A
LOT OF INFORMATION.I KNOW MEMBERS OF COUNCIL HAVESAID WHAT OTHER
LOCATIONS, I THINK THIS IS A TRANSPARENT WAYOF GOING ABOUT THE
MATTER INLOOKING AT LANDS THAT WEREPROVIDED FROM THE
CONSULTANTSTUDY TO THE APPLICANT.>> Mayor Jim Watson: DOESANYONE
ELSE WISH TO SPEAK ONDEFERRAL.ON DEFERRAL, YEAS AND NAYS.[CALLING
OF RECORDED VOTE][CALLING OF RECORDED VOTE][CALLING OF
RECORDED VOTE][CALLING OF RECORDED VOTE][CALLING OF RECORDED
VOTE]>> YEAS 6 AND NAYS 17.>> THE NEXT MOTION THAT WE HAVEFROM
COUNCILLOR FLEURY ANDSECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKENNEY.IF YOU
LIKE TO INTRODUCE THEMOTION.>> Mr. MAYOR, SO THE MOTION INFRONT OF
US WE ARE DEALING WITH

A TOUGH MATTER.

18 I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT

TO REAFFIRM A COMMITMENT TO THE SALVATION ARMY FROM A
GENERAL STANDPOINT SO THE MOTION READS AS FOLLOWS: WHEREAS
THE SALVATION ARMY IS A LONGSTANDING SERVICE PROVIDER AND THE
WORK THAT THE ORGANIZATION DOES IS NEEDED TO HELP OUR
MOST VULNERABLE RESIDENTS IN OTTAWA, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED
THAT WE RECOGNIZE THE VALUE OF THE SALVATION ARMY BRINGS
THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SERVICES THEY OFFER AND WE APPLAUD THEIR
WORK IN OTTAWA. I HOPE THAT'S UNANIMOUS VOTE.>> Mayor Jim Watson:
DOES ANYONE WISH TO SPEAK ON THIS MOTION? IS IT NOT ON THE SCREEN?>>
NO.>> Mayor Jim Watson: WE'LL JUST HOLD FOR A MOMENT. CAN SOMEONE
GIVEN COUNCILLOR BROCKINGTON A HARD COPY OF THE MOTION.>> HE CAN
TAKE MINE.>> I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE IT'S -->> Mayor Jim Watson:
YES. COUNCILLOR QAQISH DO YOU WISH TO SPEAK TO THIS MOTION?>> I JUST
HAD A QUESTION BECAUSE YESTERDAY LEANNE CIRCULATED THE MOTION.>>
Mayor Jim Watson: CAN YOU SPEAK UP. IT'S HARD TO HEAR.>> YESTERDAY THE
LIST OF THE MOTIONS WERE CIRCULATED AND DID THAT CHANGE? OR SAME
ORDER.>> Mayor Jim Watson: COUNCILLOR FLEURY BROUGHT IT FORWARD THIS
MORNING. IT'S ON THE SCREEN NOW AND THERE'S THE SAME. MOVED BY
COUNCILLOR FLEURY AND

SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MCKENNEY

190N SUPPORT

OF THE SALVATION ARMY CARRIED. THE NEXT MOTION BY
COUNCILLOR FLEURY SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM WITH RESPECT
TO SURFACE PARKING. COUNCILLOR FLEURY. >> YES, Mr. MAYOR. THIS ONE IS
VERY IMPORTANT TO US. >> Mayor Jim Watson: DO YOU WANT TO READ THE
MOTION. >> WHEREAS THE MONTREAL ROAD SECONDARY PLAN DOES NOT
ALLOW PLOTS ON MONTREAL ROAD WHEREAS THE REPORT RECOMMENDS
THE ADOPTION OF AN OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO PERMIT
SURFACE PARKING ON THE SUBJECT LAND AND WHEREAS AS THE REPORT
RECOMMENDS THE APPROVAL OF ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENTS TO PERMIT
A DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD HAVE PARKING SPACES LOCATED IN THE FRONT
YARD SAVE AND EXCEPT WITHIN THE FIRST 13 METRES BACK FROM THE LOT
LINE ABIDING MONTREAL ROAD AND THEREFORE BE RESOLVED IN DOCUMENT
3 DETAILS RECOMMENDED ZONING OF THE REPORT BE AMENDED BY
REPLACING THE TEXT A MINIMUM OF 13 METRES FROM THE FRONT LINE AND
MINIMUM OF 26 METRES FROM THE FRONT LINE AND BE IT FURTHER
RESOLVED THAT NO FURTHER NOTICE PURSUANT TO SECTION 34.17 OF THE
PLANNING ACT. MAYBE I CAN INTRODUCE THE MATTER. >> Mayor Jim Watson:
YEAH, GO AHEAD. YOU HAVE THE FLOOR. >> SORRY ABOUT THAT. SO THE
MATTER IN FRONT OF US IS THE SALVATION ARMY HAS PROPOSED A SURFACE
PARKING OFF OF MONTREAL ROAD FOR THE USE OF THE THRIFT STORE THAT
IS NOT PART OF

THE APPLICATION IN FRONT OF US.

20WE ASKED OF A

RECENT APPLICATION OF THE CENTRE THAT THE PARKING BE UNDERGROUND AT THE WABANEAU CENTRE, SO SIMILAR CONDITION AND TO MEET THE GOALS OF MONTREAL ROAD AS A MAIN STREET. IT DOESN'T IMPEDE THE OPERATIONS OF THE SALVATION ARMY AT THIS LOCATION. BUT IT DOES MEET OUR GOALS OF MAIN STREETS AND AGAIN IT WOULD BE WEIRD FOR US TO GRANT A PARKING FOR A NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY ALTHOUGH IT IS THE SAME APPLICANT, WE DON'T KNOW OVERTIME WHAT THAT USE MIGHT CHANGE TO. >> Mayor Jim Watson: COUNCILLOR LEIPER, PLEASE. >> CHAIR, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I DO SUPPORT THIS ABSOLUTELY. IT IS CRITICAL WE'VE BEEN ASKED TO THINK ABOUT THIS APPLICATION IN LIGHT OF A VERY RESTRICTIVE LAND USE ARGUMENT IS A SHELTER SUITABLE USE ON A TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET. TO THAT END WE HAVE TO THINK ABOUT HOW WE THINK ABOUT MAIN STREETS AT LARGE. OVER ALL. HOW DO WE EXPECT TRADITIONAL MAIN STREETS IN THE CITY TO DEVELOP. ONE OF THE LAST THINGS ANY COUNCILLOR AROUND THE TABLE WANTS TO SEE FOR THE MAIN STREET IS PERPETUATE THE STRIP MALL MODEL OF BUILDINGS SET WELL BACK FROM THE STREET WITH SURFACE PARKING IN FRONT. IF WE ACCEPT THAT SURFACE PARKING IS OKAY HERE, I THINK WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A REALLY DIFFICULT TIME SAYING THAT SURFACE PARKING ISN'T OKAY IN OUR OTHER TRADITIONAL MAIN STREETS. LET'S STAND UP TODAY FOR THE

VISION THAT WE HAVE FOR THE ACTIVE SAFE PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLY TRADITIONAL MAIN STREETS THAT WE'RE TRYING TO BUILD AND SUPPORT COUNCILLOR FLEURY'S MOTION. T. >> Mayor Jim Watson: NEXT I WOULD ASK COUNCILLOR BROCKINGTON, PLEASE. >> THANK YOU, YOUR WORSHIP. AND GOOD MORNING. QUESTIONS TO STAFF, IF THIS PASSES, IF THE FLEURY MOTION PASSES, THEN THERE'S NO ON SITE PARKING AT LEAST FRONTING MONTREAL ROAD IS THAT CORRECT? AND IF SO WHERE WOULD THRIFT STORE PARK. >> Mr. MAYOR, STAFF DOES NOT SUPPORT THIS MOTION. THIS PREVENTS THE THRIFT STORE FROM MEETING THE PARKING REQUIREMENTS AND PUT THEM IN NON CONFORMITY. PARKING SPACES HAVE BEEN ELIMINATED ON THE SITE AND Mr. JAMES WOULD BE ABLE TO PROVIDE FURTHER DETAILS ON THIS. BUT NOT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION TO SUPPORT THIS MOTION. >> COUNCILLOR REFERENCED THE WABANEAU CENTRE THAT I WAS NOT MEMBER OF COUNCIL AT THAT TIME. CAN I HAVE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING THEY WERE APPARENTLY FORCED TO PROVIDE UNDERGROUND PARKING. HOW MANY SPOTS UNDERGROUND AND WHAT WAS THE RATIONALE USED IN THAT CASE VERSUS THE PROPOSAL BEFORE US? >> Mr. MAYOR, CERTAINLY EACH SITE HAS TO BE VIEWED ON ITS OWN MERITS AND EACH SITE HAS SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS DEPENDING ON THE APPLICATION. Mr. JAMES IS GOING TO ELABORATE. >> THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR.

WITH RESPECT TO THE POLICIES OF 22 THE OFFICIAL
PLAN, THE INTENT IS NOT TO HAVE PARKING RATE ADJACENT TO THE STREET
SUCH AS SIMILAR SITUATION NEXT TO THE GABRIEL PIZZA NEXT DOOR. THE
IDEA IS TO HAVE IT BACK AS PROPOSED BY THE APPLICANT IN THE SUBJECT
PROPERTY. THERE IS TO BE 13 METRES OF LANDSCAPE SPACE. THIS 13
METRES PROVIDES THREE THINGS ONE A SAFETY AREA FOR VEHICLES
COMING IN OFF MONTREAL ROAD STOPPING AND CUEING FOR VEHICLES
PARKING OUT, LEADING AND BACKING OUT OF THIS AREA. AS WELL THE
LANDSCAPING MEETS THE INTENT OF THE OFFICIAL PLAN AS IT PROVIDES AN
AREA WHERE THE PARKING CAN BE HIDDEN BEHIND THE LANDSCAPING AND
BEHIND THE BUILDINGS THERE ON EITHER SIDE OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY
AS WELL AS SHOULD THE PROPERTIES DEVELOP IN THE FULL POTENTIAL IN
THE FUTURE, THIS PARKING WOULD BE HIDDEN FURTHER. AND THIRDLY WITH
RESPECT TO THE THRIFT STORE IT IS ACTUALLY PART OF THIS APPLICATION
RIGHT NOW. IT IS BEING PROPERTY OF THE THRIFT STORE IS BEING
REZONED WITH RESPECT TO A LOADING SPACE. BUT SHOULD IT BE SEVERED
IN THE FUTURE. AS OF RIGHT NOW AND IN THE FUTURE STILL REQUIRE
PARKING. IT NEEDS A MINIMUM OF 9 PARKING SPACES. AND THE TRADITIONAL
MAIN STREET ZONING ALLOWS THIS PARKING PROVIDED OFF SITE. SO THE
BEST PART -- THE BEST LOCATION FOR THIS PARKING FOR THE THRIFT STORE
FROM A PLANNING PERSPECTIVE IS RIGHT WHERE IT IS BEING PROPOSED
TODAY. SO THAT IS WHY WE RECOMMEND THAT THIS MOTION NOT BE
CARRIED.

>> JUST TO CONFIRM, THE THRIFT

23STORE

CUSTOMERS TODAY PARK ON MONTREAL ROAD?>> Mayor Jim Watson: Mr. JAMES.>> Mr. MAYOR, THEY CAN PARK WHERE THE CONCORDE HOTEL IS TODAY BECAUSE OF SECTION 179-10 OF THE MAIN STREET AND THEY CAN PARK OF COURSE WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC PARKING ON STREETS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TIME THAT IS LOCATED ALONG THIS PART OF MONTREAL ROAD.>> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU COUNCILLOR BROCKINGTON.>> JUST IN A SIMILAR VEIN I'VE BEEN TO WABANEAU CENTRE AND I COULDN'T SEE HOW THEY HAVE SURFACE PARKING BECAUSE THEY USE PRETTY WELL THE WHOLE SITE AND DIFFERENT MATTER. THEY WEREN'T FORCED TO GO UNDERGROUND AND THE ONLY WAY TO PROVIDE PARKING, I BELIEVE? THAT IS CORRECT?>> YES, Mr. MAYOR, THAT IS CORRECT. PARKING COULD BE PROVIDED AS MENTIONED ON MAIN STREET IN THE SURFACE AREA AS LONG AS MENTION IT'S NOT PREDOMINANTLY BETWEEN THE BUILDING OF THE STREET AND THE BUILDING TAKES UP MAJORITY OF THE SITE AND THE ALTERNATIVE IS UNDERGROUND.>> THIS IS ANOTHER MATTER. YOU'RE SAYING RIGHT NOW THE SALVATION ARMY STORE DOESN'T HAVE ENOUGH ROOM AT ITS OWN SITE FOR PARKING, THAT'S WHY THEY GO NEXT DOOR, WHICH IS RIGHT ALONG MONTREAL ROAD. THAT HAS PARKING RIGHT ALONG MONTREAL. I'VE TAKEN A LOOK AT IT.>> YES.>> SEEMS TO ME THEY'RE ALREADY PARKING ALONG THE SITE.>> YES, Mr. MAYOR, THIS IS

SURFACE PARKING ALONG THE

24STREET.CITY

PARKING ALLOWED.>> WHEN I LOOKED AT THE MEMO YOU SENT AND PUTTING IT 13 METRES BACK YOU'RE ACTUALLY PUTTING IT FURTHER BACK THAN THE PARKING RIGHT NOW. BUT NOT AS FAR AS THE BYLAW WOULD SAY NORMALLY. BUT THE MAIN PARKING LOT IS I BELIEVE 52 METRES BACK. I TRY TO REMEMBER THE NUMBERS OF THINGS. SO THE MAIN PARKING IS BEHIND. THIS IS A LITTLE BIT IN THE FRONT BEFORE THE STORE.>> YES, Mr. MAYOR, THE INTENT OF THE OFFICIAL PLAN AS I MENTIONED IS NOT TO HAVE PARKING BETWEEN THE BUILDING AND THE STREET. BUT TO HAVE IT TO THE BACK AS A COUNCILLOR HAS MENTIONED. AND BY HAVING THE 13 METRES OF LANDSCAPING THERE, IT IS HIDDEN AND IT MEETS THAT INTENT. AND THE REST OF THE PARKING OF COURSE IS PROVIDED FURTHER BACK INTO THE SITE WHICH IS EVEN FURTHER HIDDEN. BUT WITH THE BUILDINGS ON EITHER SIDE OF THE PARKING THAT'S ALLOWED AND THAT LANDSCAPING IT MEETS THAT INTENT OF NOT BEING OUT ON THE STREET IN A MAIN STREET.>> SO IF WE DIDN'T DO THIS THEN, SALVATION ARMY WOULD CONTINUE ITS PRESENT STATUS THAT IS NON CONFORMITY ON PARKING BECAUSE IT DOESN'T HAVE IT ON SITE NOW AND STILL NOT HAVE IT ON SITE IF WE DIDN'T MAKE THIS APPROVAL THAT WOULD MEAN FURTHER CONGESTION ON MONTREAL ROAD FOR PARKING THAT IS ALREADY PRETTY BAD.>> YES, Mr. MAYOR. THERE WOULD BE A FURTHER

REDUCTION IN PARKING THAT WOULD 25CREATE MORE
OF A SHORT FALL.I MUST SAY THAT THAT WAS ONE OFTHE ISSUES THAT
CAME UP DURINGTHE PUBLIC CONSULTATION IN THEAT PLANNING
COMMITTEE WAS THELACK OF PARKING THAT'S BEENPROVIDED.SO IT WOULD
FURTHER EXACERBATETHAT, YES.>> BASICALLY WHAT YOU'RE TRYINGTO
HAVE IS SOMETHING PRACTICALTO REDUCE PRESSURE ON MONTREALROAD
FOR PARKING AS OPPOSED TOGIVING THEM A SPECIAL -- IF WEDIDN'T
APPROVE THIS IT DOESN'TSTOP THE DEVELOPMENT TO GOAHEAD, IT'S NOT
PARKING FOR THEDEVELOPMENT THAT IS INVOLVED ATALL AND PARKING
FOR THE THRIFTSTORE WOULD CONTINUE AND NOTCHANGE THE
STATUS.THAT'S THE WAY I'M LOOKING ATIT.IS THAT CORRECT?>> IT WOULD
REDUCE THE AMOUNT OFPARKING ON SITE AND THE THRIFTSTORE DOES
NEED A MINIMUM OF 9PARKING SPACES THAT IT WOULDHAVE TO -- IT
COULDN'T USE THESTREET PARKING FOR THAT.IT WOULD NEED TO HAVE
THEM NEXTDOOR SUCH AS BEING PROPOSED.SO THEY WOULD STILL NEED
TO HAVETHE REQUIRED PARKING ON SAY THESALVATION ARMY SITE AND
BYREDUCING THESE SPACES, YOU'REELIMINATING THOSE AND PUTS
MOREPRESSURE ON THE STREET PARKING.>> IS THIS PARKING THEY HAVE
ATTHE SITE NEXT DOOR TO THEM PARTOF THEIR ORIGINAL APPROVALS ORIS
THAT JUST BEING CONVENIENT?I'M TRYING TO THINK OFNONCONFORMING
RIGHTS MEAN YOU CAN CONTINUE DOING WHAT YOU'REDOING NOW EVEN IF
YOU DON'T MEETTHE BYLAW AND THAT BUILDING HASBEEN THERE FOR A
LONG TIME.>> THERE IS ALL ONE SITE RIGHT

NOW AND THE PARKING IS ON SITE.

26>> THEY'RE ARE

KEEPING THAT AND SAME OWNERSHIP.>> THE APPLICATION IS UNDER ONE OWNERSHIP. AS I MENTIONED THE REQUIRED PARKING IS OF COURSE REQUIRED. EVEN IF IT'S SEVERED IN THE FUTURE IT'S STILL -- THEY HAVE TO COME UP WITH THE REQUIRED PARKING.>> I UNDERSTAND NOW. OKAY, THANK YOU.>> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU COUNCILLOR WILKINSON. COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM PLEASE.>> THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR. JUST A QUESTION TO STAFF ON THIS MOTION, SO IT'S BEEN SAID THAT THE PURPOSE OF THE TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET PROHIBITION ON SURFACE PARKING IS TO TRY -- WELL, IS TO PROHIBIT PARKING BETWEEN BUILDING AND THE STREET. IN THIS CASE, THE PROPOSED LET'S CALL IT FRONT PARKING LOT IS BETWEEN THE BUILDING AND THE STREET, CORRECT?>> Mr. MAYOR, THE INTENT OF THE OFFICIAL PLAN IS NOT -- IS TO HAVE BUILDINGS BEING THE PREDOMINANT FEATURES ALONG TRADITIONAL MAIN STREETS. THE TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET POLICY DOES ALLOW FOR DRIVEWAYS AND DOES ALLOW AN APPARENT PLAN FOR SURFACE PARKING. AS I MENTIONED THE IDEA IS TO HIDE THIS AND HAVING IT IN THE BACK MEETS THAT INTENT AS WELL AS HAVING THAT 13 METRES OF LANDSCAPING IN FRONT ALSO MEETS THAT INTENT WITH RESPECT TO OFFICIAL PLAN POLICIES AND PARKING ON MAIN STREETS.>> SO IT'S INTERESTING TO HEAR THE OBSERVATION OR THE SUGGESTION THAT LANDSCAPE MEETS THE INTENT OF THE TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET ZONING.

THE SUGGESTION IS THAT ALTHOUGH 27THERE'S A
PROHIBITION OF SURFACEPARKING, WITHIN THE TRADITIONALMAIN STREET
ZONE, IF ONE CANHIDE THE PARKING, SO IF ONE PUTSA ROW OF HEDGES UP
SO THAT YOU DON'T SEE THE CARS, IT SOUNDS TOME THAT THAT WOULD
SATISFY THEDEPARTMENT.SO WHAT I HEARD IS LANDSCAPINGCAN MEET THE
INTENT OF THEZONING BYLAW AND IN CASES WHEREAN APPLICANT CAN HIDE
SURFACEPARKING THAT TAKES PLACE BETWEEN THE ROAD AND THE
BUILDING, THEDEPARTMENT'S VIEW IS THAT WOULD SATISFY THE INTENT OF
THE TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET PROHIBITION?>> Mr. MAYOR, IN THIS INSTANCE,
THERE'S A NARROW FRONTAGE ALONG MONTREAL ROAD WHICH WILL HAVE
THE DRIVEWAY.THE OFFICIAL PLAN FOR TRADITIONAL MAIN STREETS
SAYS THAT YOU CAN HAVE FRONTAGES -- YOU HAVE DRIVEWAYS LEADING IN
OF COURSE AND THERE CAN BE LANDSCAPING.AGAIN, THE INTENT IS TO
HIDE THAT PARKING AS OPPOSED TO A SITUATION NEXT DOOR WHERE
YOU HAVE LIKE SAY THE GABRIEL PIZZA WHERE THE PARKING IS RIGHT
IN FRONT OF THE BUILDING.IT IS THE DEPARTMENT'S POSITION THAT WITH
RESPECT TO THIS PROPOSAL, THE PARKING BEING SETBACK 13 METRES AS
AGAIN IT'S SAFE BECAUSE THERE'S CUEING AND TRAFFIC CONFLICTS MEETS
THAT INTENT AND IT WILL BE HIDDEN BEHIND THE BUILDINGS THAT ARE EITHER
SIDE OF THIS NARROW THROAT THAT COMES IN.AS WELL WHEN THOSE
BUILDINGS SAY REDEVELOP IN THE FUTURE, IT WILL BE EVEN MORE HIDDEN.>>
SO THE STAFF REPORT SAYS THAT THE TYPICAL DEPTH OF A

TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET SITE IS 2830 METRES. IN THIS CASE THE REAR PARKING LOT IS FAR BEYOND THAT. SO I DON'T HAVE ANY OBJECTION IN THIS CASE FOR THE REAR PARKING LOT BECAUSE THAT IS BEYOND THE TYPICAL DEPTH OF 30 METRES OF THE SITE. COUNCILLOR FLEURY'S MOTION WOULD SEEM TO ASK US TO ENSURE THAT WE DON'T HAVE SURFACE PARKING WITHIN 27 METRES OR 26 METRES WHICH IS BELOW THE TYPICAL TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET SITE. SO GIVEN THAT THERE IS A PARKING LOT IN THE REAR, DID STAFF EXPLORE WITH THE APPLICANT THE OPPORTUNITY TO SATISFY THE PARKING SPACE THAT IS REQUIRED THROUGH BOTH STREET PARKING AND THE REAR PARKING LOT? >> Mr. MAYOR, TO CLARIFY, THE SURFACE PARKING THAT'S BEING PROVIDED AT THE REAR OF THE BUILDING IS SPECIFIC TO THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SHELTER AND THE RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY. SO THERE'S A BYLAW REQUIREMENT THAT NEEDS TO BE MET IN ORDER FOR THOSE PARKING SPACES. THERE IS A REDUCTION BEING SOUGHT THROUGH THIS APPLICATION FOR PARKING SPACES ASSOCIATED WITH THAT SHELTER AND RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY. THAT IS THE SOLE PURPOSE OF THE PARKING SPACES IN THE REAR. THEY'RE NOT TO ACCOMMODATE MONTREAL ROAD. >> PRESUMING THE APPLICANT WANTS SPACES FOR CLIENTS TO THE THRIFT STORE WOULD THEY BE PERMITTED TO DO THAT. >> THE TRADITIONAL ZONING ALLOWS FOR PARKING ON A SEPARATE LOT AND NOT SPECIFIC WHETHER IT BE THE FRONT OR THE REAR. >> EXCELLENT. THAT'S HELPFUL THANK YOU.

>> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU

29COUNCILLOR.COUNCILLOR MCKENNEY, PLEASE.>> THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR, I JUST WANT TO GO BACK TO WHAT WE HEARD THE PAST THREE DAYS AT PLANNING COMMITTEE FROM FOLKS. ONE OF THE THINGS WE HEARD FROM THE APPLICANT, I THINK IT WAS WHEN FOTIN WAS UP PART OF THE RATIONAL OF THIS TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET SHOULD ALLOW FOR A SHELTER AS OPPOSED TO OTHERS IT WAS TRANSIT INTENSIVE CORRIDOR AS IS -- I THINK THEY USED MONTREAL ROAD AND RIDEAU STREET AS THE TWO EXAMPLES, IS THAT YOUR RECOLLECTION?>> MY RECOLLECTION Mr. MAYOR, I'M NOT SURE OF THE EXACT WORDS THE APPLICANT USED BUT MONTREAL IS TRANSIT PRIORITY CORRIDOR IN THE PLAN.>> WE HAVE A TRANSIT PRIORITY CORRIDOR AND THAT'S THE RATIONAL TO GO UP AGAINST THE TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET USES. AND YET WE'RE HERE TALKING ABOUT ADDITIONAL PARKING. THE OTHER THING I HEARD FROM RESIDENTS WAS NOT THEIR CONCERN ABOUT STAFF PARKING, BECAUSE THE STAFF PARKING IS ALL IN THE BACK. THEY WERE -- IT WAS THE CONCERN ABOUT THAT FRONT PARKING AND WHAT WOULD -- YOU KNOW, SO I THINK THAT TODAY NOT TO ACCEPT THAT, WE SHOULD NOT HAVE THIS FRONT YARD PARKING THAT WOULD SIMPLY BE FOR CLIENTS OF THE THRIFT STORE, WHICH AGAIN IS ON A TRANSIT PRIORITY CORRIDOR. I THINK WE HAVE TO EXPECT PEOPLE TO ACTUALLY TAKE TRANSIT, I DON'T KNOW WHY ON THE TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET WE WOULD BE ALLOWING EXTRA PARKING WHERE WE DON'T REQUIRE IT. SO I'M GOING TO SUPPORT

COUNCILLOR FLEURY'S MOTION.

30BASED ON THE

FACT THAT IT IS --YOU KNOW, WE ARE TRADITIONALMAIN STREETS.WE CANNOT START SCRAPING AWAY ATTHE VERY FEATURES THAT MAKE THEMLIVABLE, WALKABLE, MAIN STREETS.THANK YOU.>> Mayor Jim Watson: SOCOUNCILLOR FLEURY FORGOT ONEQUESTION HE WOULD LIKE.WE WILL GO BACK TO HIM ON ONEOCCASION.>> THANK YOU Mr. CHAIR.QUESTION TO STAFF, THEAPPLICANT -- YOU'RE USING WEIRDARGUMENT TO SAY THE APPLICATIONOF THE THRIFT STORE BUILDING ISIN PLAY BECAUSE THEY'RE ASKINGFOR A LOADING ZONE THAT ISN'TREALLY IN PLAY AND ON THE SITEOF St. ANNE STREET IS THATCORRECT AND THE LOADING AREA ISON St. ANNE AND NOT MONTREALROAD.>> THE LOADING SPACE IS THEREAND THE APPLICATION BEFORECOUNCIL TODAY INCLUDES THEREZONING OF THAT STORE.IT'S PART OF THE APPLICATION ANDIT'S PART OF THE STAFF REPORT.IT'S PART OF THE CONSIDERATIONBY COUNCIL TODAY.>> SO WHAT ARE THOSECONSIDERATIONS FOR THATLOCATION?>> GO AHEAD.>> THE EXCEPTION THAT FORMS PARTOF THE ZONING DETAILSMr. MAYOR IS PART OF THISAPPLICATION IS TO ALLOWING FORTHE LOADING ZONE.>> THAT IS IN PLAY BECAUSE OF ALOADING AREA AND FOR THAT GIVINGIT A CHANCE TO GAIN PARKING ONTHE NEXT SITE FOR THAT USE?IT'S LIKE A WEIRD WAY TO LOOK ATIT ISN'T IT?>> Mr. MAYOR, THE THRIFT STORENEEDS PARKING AND NEEDS MINIMUM

9 PARKING SPACES AS REQUIREMENT

31 OF THE ZONING

BYLAW. THEY ARE ALLOWED TO PROVIDE PARKING NEXT DOOR AS PROPOSED HERE AND ELIMINATION OF THE PARKING SPACES COULD RESULT IN THE THRIFT STORE NOT HAVING THE PARKING REQUIRED BY THE ZONING BYLAW. THEY GET TO USE NEXT DOOR FOR EXAMPLE BECAUSE OF THE PROVISIONS ALREADY ALLOWED IN THE ZONING BYLAW. >> SO Mr. MAYOR JUST TO REASSURE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL A FEW YEARS AGO WE REMOVED THE PAY AND DISPLAY ON MONTREAL ROAD BECAUSE IT ADDS SUCH LOW USAGE. THERE WAS NO ONE PARKING ON STREET ON MONTREAL ROAD. SO WE REMOVED THE PAY AND DISPLAY. THERE'S TONS OF CAPACITY ALONG THE CORRIDOR. I HOPE WE FOLLOW OUR REGULATIONS ON MAIN STREETS AND NOT ALLOWING FOR THIS FRONT YARD PARKING TO BE PERMITTED. >> Mayor Jim Watson: OKAY. SO WE HAVE COUNCILLOR FLEURY'S MOTION AND YEAS AND NAYS, PLEASE. [CALLING OF RECORDED VOTE] [CALLING OF RECORDED VOTE] [CALLING OF RECORDED VOTE] [CALLING OF RECORDED VOTE] [CALLING OF RECORDED VOTE] >> I HAVE 18 NAYS AND 5 YEAS AND TO CORRECT THE RECORD ON THE PREVIOUS VOTE THE DIVISION WAS 6 YEAS AND 17 NAYS. >> OUR NEXT MOTION IS COUNCILLOR CLOUTIER, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR REGLI ON ZONING BYLAW CHANGE TO PERMITTED SIZE OF SHELTER USE. COUNCILLOR CLOUTIER. [SPEAKING IN FRENCH] >> Voice of Translator: THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR. I'LL READ THE MOTION.

WHEREAS THE REPORT RECOMMENDS 32 THAT A
SHELTER USE BE PERMITTED ON THE SUBJECT LANDS TO A MAXIMUM SIZE OF
900 SQUARE METRES IN GROSS FLOOR AREA AND IDENTIFIED THE SIZE OF
THE PROPOSED SHELTER IS 801 SQUARE METRES IN GROSS FLOOR AREA
AND SIZE OF THE USE IS IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION WHEN
CONSIDERING LAND USE IMPACTS, THEREFORE BE RESULTED THAT THE
DOCUMENT THREE DETAILS OF RECOMMENDED ZONING OF THE REPORT 126
BE AMENDED BY REPLACING NUMBER 900 WITH 801 AND BE IT FURTHER
RESOLVED THAT BE NO FURTHER NOTICE PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION 34.17 OF
THE PLANNING ACT. [END OF TRANSLATION] TO LIMIT BY APPLICATION IN
THE BYLAW THE AREA THAT IS PERMITTED FOR SHELTER BEDS FROM 900
SQUARE METRES TO 801 SQUARE METRES. [SPEAKING IN FRENCH] >> Voice of
Translator: DOES ANYBODY HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS. CARRIED. [
END OF TRANSLATION] >> Mayor Jim Watson: OUR NEXT MOTION IS BY
COUNCILLOR BLAIS -- [SPEAKING IN FRENCH] >> Voice of Translator:
THE SECOND MOTION COUNCILLOR BLAIS AND SECONDED BY
COUNCILLOR CLOUTIER. >> THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR. I HAVE TWO. I'M NOT SURE
THEY MATTER. >> Mayor Jim Watson: THE ORDER OF RECEIVING THEM IS MINOR
OF VARIANCE. >> THANK YOU. >> Mayor Jim Watson: COULD YOU SPEAK CLOSER
TO THE MIC. IT'S HARD TO HEAR YOU. >> YES ABSOLUTELY SECTION 45
OF THE PLANNING ACT ESTABLISHES THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMUNITY

ADJUSTMENT TO AUTHORIZE MINOR 33 VARIANCES OF
THE BYLAW PASSED UNDER SECTION 34 OR SECTION 38 OF THE ACT AND
SUCH AUTHORITIES AS WELL INDICATED OF THE COMMUNITY OF ADJUSTMENT OF
THE COUNCIL OF CITY OF OTTAWA THROUGH TO ESTABLISH THE COMMITTEE
OF DECEMBER 12TH, 2001 AND DESIRE TO HAVE MATTERS RELATED TO
ANY ADDITIONAL OR EXPANSION OF THE PROPOSED SHELTER USE OF THIS
AND RETURN TO PLANNING COMMITTEE AND CONSULTATION AND
CATEGORIZED OF MINOR OR NOT AND RECOMMEND COUNCIL TO DIRECT
STAFF TO INITIATE A BYLAW TO ESTABLISH SPECIFIC CRITERIA IN RESPECT
OF ANY PROPOSED EXPANSION OR ADDITION RELATING TO 325, 327, 333
MONTREAL ROAD AND 343 AND 373 St. ANNE AVENUE AND ANY SUCH
PROPOSAL IS HEARD BY PLANNING COMMITTEE AND COUNCIL OF CITY OF
OTTAWA AND ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT ADDING IN QUOTE SHELTER AS
PERMITTED USE TO THIS LOCATION IF APPROVED SHALL NOT BE ENACTED
UNTIL SUCH TIME AS THE BYLAW REFERENCED HERE IN COMES INTO FORCE
OF 45.104 AND FURTHER RESOLVED NOTWITHSTANDING ANYTHING MADE BY
COUNCIL IN RESPECT OF 45.1.4 AND 45.1.3 APPLY TO THIS SITE
SPECIFIC AMENDMENT BEING RESTRICTION OF MINOR VARIANCE OF THE
PROVISIONS TO HAVE BYLAW BEFORE THE LAND AND BUILDING AND
STRUCTURE OF THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE DAY ON WHICH THE
BYLAW AMENDED AND THE AMENDMENT APPROVED BY COUNCIL. TO SUM THAT
UP, THIS IS TO AVOID ADDING SHELTER BEDS WITHOUT THERE BEING PROPER
PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND WITHOUT ELECTED OFFICIALS BEING PART OF
THAT CONVERSATION IN THE FUTURE IF THIS PROPOSAL DOES EVENTUALLY

GET APPROVED.

34>> Mayor Jim Watson:

THANKYOU, COUNCILLOR.[SPEAKING IN FRENCH]>> Mr. MAYOR, I JUST HAVE -
- IWOULD LIKE TO GET ACLARIFICATION FROM OURSOLICITOR.IS THERE
ANYTHING TO ADD AS TOTHE SITE PLAN?WOULD THERE BE AN OPPORTUNITY
TOWITHDRAW?THAT IS THOSE AUTHORITIES THATWOULD BE DELEGATED TO
STAFF.[PLEASE STAND BY]Ottawa City Council 11 am – 12 pm, Wednesday,
November 22, 2017... THIS MOTION TRIGGERS ANOTHER SECTION OF THE
PLANNING ACT WHICH LIMITS THE COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT UNDER
SPECIFIC STOPPAGE-- AS IT RELATES TO THIS MATTER.SO THE CITY
SOLICITOR OR CLERK-- STAFF CAN CORRECT ME BUT THESE ARE TWO
SPECIFICS OF THE ACT.>> Mr. MAYOR, PERHAPS WE CAN HAVE A PACKAGE OF
ALL OF THE MOTIONS THAT WE WILL BE ENTERTAINING.WE WOULD
APPRECIATE THAT.>> WERE THEY SENT?TO THE CLERK: WERE THEY SENT TO
MEMBERS OF COUNCIL?>> WE DON'T HAVE A COPY.I DON'T HAVE A COPY OF
THEM HERE.>> SO IT WAS SENT IN THE PROCEDURAL MEMO BUT WE WILL
GET YOU A COPY.>> THANK YOU.>> DOES ANYONE ELSE WANT ONE?THEY
WERE ALL SENT ELECTRONICALLY BUT IF YOU WOULD LIKE A HARD COPY,
JUST ASK THE CLERK.THANK YOU.COUNCILLOR MOFFATT, PLEASE.>> A
QUESTION RELATED TO THIS, NOT NECESSARILY ABOUT THIS SPECIFIC
MOTION ABOUT BUT THE IMACT OF IT ON OTHER MATTERS.THIS MOTION
ESSENTIALLY HAS THE INTENT OF ENSURING THAT ANY FUTURE ITEM
RELATED TO THIS PROPERTY-- (Unclear) WHAT PREVENTS A COUNCILLOR
FROM COMING FORWARD-- FOR INSTANCE, DECEMBER 3-- DECEMBER 6
COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENT-- 30 ITEMS GOING TO THREE DIFFERENT
PANELS.WHAT PREVENTS A COUNCILLOR IN THE FUTURE FROM BRINGING
FORWARD SIMILAR MOTIONS ON SIMILAR ITEMS IMPACTING THEIR WARD AND
DECLARING THAT, REGARDLESS OF MINOR OR MAJOR, THEY COME TO
COUNCIL?>> Mr. MAYOR, NOTHING.HOWEVER-- AND I THINK LEGAL WOULD
LIKELY ADVISE IN TERMS OF THIS MOTION-- IF IT WERE BROUGHT TO THE
ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD THAT IT WOULD BE HIGHLY UNLIKELY THAT THE
COUNCIL WOULD LOSE.>> IS THERE ANOTHER WAY TO ACHIEVE WHAT THIS
MOTION SAYS WITHOUT UNDERMINING THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE
(Unclear).>> Mr. MAYOR, THE MOTION IS CRAFTED UNDER A SECTION THAT
RECENTLY INTRODUCED TO THE PLANNING ACT-- THAT THEY MUST
CONSIDER DEALING FOR APPLICATION FOR MINOR VARIANCE.THAT DIDN'T
EXIST PREVIOUSLY.IT EXISTS TODAY.IT IS BEING BROUGHT FORWARD FOR
SITE-SPECIFIC BASIS WHEREAS INTENTION TO THE LEGISLATION-- I WILL

DEFER TO LEGAL FOR ANY FURTHER COMMENTS THEY HAVE BUT THE WAY UNDERSTAND THE LEGISLATION, IT IS MEANT TO BE CITY-BROUGHT FORWARD TO COUNCIL FOR MINOR VARIATIONS.AND OTHER MEANS AVAILABLE-- IT DOESN'T PREVENT BEING MADE TO THE COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT BUT WHEN YOU ARE DEALING WITH THE FOUR-PRONG-- INTENT OF THE ZONING BY L.A. MAINTAINED.THE OTHER, THE OFFICIAL PLAN BEING MAINTAINED.IF THERE ARE OTHERS THAT ARE INTRODUCED THAT CLEARLY STATE OR SPEAK TO IN THE INTENT OF OFFICIAL PLAN IN THIS INSTANCE OFFICIAL PLAN TO ALLOW A SHELTER-- AND IF THERE IS SPECIFIC INTENT ARTICULATED THROUGH THE SPECIFIC PLAN, STAFF CAN GO TO THE COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT AND TAKE THE POSITION THAT THAT TEST IS NOT BEING MET.SO THERE ARE OTHER MEANS, IT DOESN'T PREVENT THE COMMITTEE FROM CONSIDERING THE APPLICATION BUT IT THEN REQUIRES THE COMMITTEE TO HAVE REGARD TO WHAT AND AGAIN THEY WOULD HAVE TO GIVE CONSIDERATION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE THE ABILITY TO DEAL WITH THAT.SO THIS IS ONE TECHNIQUE.THERE MAY BE OTHER TECHNIQUES AND LEGAL MAY HAVE FURTHER COMMENTS.>> DOES LEGAL HAVE FURTHER COMMENTS?AND THE REASON WHY I ASK IS BECAUSE-- I MEAN COULD, I HAVE EVERY RURAL SEVERANCE COME TO COUNCIL?COULD COUNCILLOR LEAVER HAVE EVERY INFILL IN KITCHISSIPPI COME TO COUNCIL?JUST BY PUTTING FORWARD A MOTION THAT SAYS REGARDLESS OF BEING MINOR, I WANT IT TO COME TO COUNCIL?>> Mr. MAYOR, THEORETICALLY THAT-- THAT COULD HAPPEN.THERE IS-- THERE IS VERY LITTLE DIRECTION IN THE NEW PROVISIONS OF THE PLANNING AN ACT AS TO WHETHER-- WHETHER THIS TYPE OF CRITERIA CAN BE IMPLEMENTED ON A SITE-SPECIFIC BASIS OR CITY-WIDE BASIS.THERE IS NO DIRECTION IN THE ACT.SO IT-- TIME WILL TELL HOW THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD WILL RECEIVE THAT BUT THERE IS CERTAINLY NOTHING THAT WOULD PREVENT OTHER COUNCILLORS FROM DOING SOMETHING IN THE FUTURE, AT THIS POINT.>> THANK YOU.>> COUNCILLOR BLAIS, YOU HAVE ALREADY SPOKE ON THIS ITEM-->> TO WRAP UP-->> WRAP UP-- COUNCIL, COMMITTEE-->> OKAY, FINE.>> SO A QUESTION TO THE CITY SOLICITOR, JUST FOR CLARITY SAKE, BECAUSE COUNCILLOR FUREY ASKED ME TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYONE UNDERSTANDS THE INTENT OF THE MOTION.CAN YOU GIVE US BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF WHAT THIS MOTION WOULD DO IF IT WAS PASSED?-- OR TO ANOTHER SOLICITOR?>> Mr. MAYOR, THE INTENT WAS TO CLARIFY THAT IN THISSANCE STANCE, FOR THIS SITE, IF THERE WERE ANY CHANGES TO THE

SHELTER FACILITY, IT WOULD NOT PROCEED TO THE COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT, BUT WOULD INSTEAD GO TO COMMITTEE IN COUNCIL TO REVIEW.>> SO I WOULD URGE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL TO SUPPORT THIS.I THINK IT IS A BIT OF A BELTS-AND-SUSPENDERS MOTION THAT GIVES SOME ASSURANCE AND STAFF DO NOT HAVE A POSITION ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.SO ON THE MOTION?CARRIED?DISSENT BY COUNCILLOR MOFFATT.AND KAKIS.THE NEXT ITEM IS A MOTION BY COUNCILLOR BLAIS.>> [Voice of Translator]: SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CLOUTIER.>> -- DESIGN.STAFF DON'T HAVE A POSITION ON THIS.COUNCILLOR BLAIS, THE FLOOR IS YOURS, PLEASE.>> THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR WHEREAS THE REPORT INCLUDES ON PAGE 17 SECURITY STRATEGIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED AS PART OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND WHEREAS SECTION 4 SUBBAL SUB 8 POINTS TO DESIGN, REVIEW APPLICATIONS, THAT COUNCIL WITHHOLDING POSITION WITH TWO CONDITIONS TO BE INCLUDED -->> COUNCILLOR BLAIS YOU CAN SPEAK INTO THE MIKE?IT IS HARD TO HEAR YOU?>> -- BE INCLUDED IN DOCUMENT 3.DETAILS OF RECOMMENDED ZONING AS FOLLOWS.THAT THE HOLDING POSITION NOT BE LIFTED UNTIL SITE PLAN FOR THE PROPOSAL IS APPROVED CONTAINING CONDITIONS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DESIGN MEASURES PROPOSED IN THE REPORT PROVIDED BY SECURITY THROUGH SAFE DESIGN INC. OF MAY 1 DECEMBER 17 TO THE MANAGER OF PLANNING INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT AND TWO, THAT THE IT NOT BE IMPLEMENTED UNTIL THE APPLICANT HAS IMPLEMENTED AN AMBASSADOR PLAN...IN CONSULTATION WITH THE GENERAL MANAGER OF SOCIAL SERVICES.BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THERE BE NO NOTICE FURTHER TO SECTION 17 OF THE PLANNING ACT.MAYOR, THIS MOTION STEMS FROM MANY OF THE CONCERNS RAISED DURING THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION-- OR DURING THE PUBLIC DELEGATIONS, EXCUSE ME, RELATING TO HOW THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT MIGHT HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE NEIGHBOURHOOD, AND WHAT-- OR WHAT IS MISSING IN THEIR CURRENT LOCATION IN THE BYWARD MARKET.THE APPLICANT SAID THEY ARE HAVE HAD AND THAT THEY COULD HAVE IT IN PLACE BY JUNE OF NEXT YEAR IN THE BY WARD MARKET.AND IT WILL DEMONSTRATE THAT THE APPLICANT IS, WILLING AND INTERESTED TO DO THIS TYPE OF WORK THE CURRENT LOCATION AND HOPEFULLY TRANSFER THAT GOOD WORK TO THE NEW LOCATION SHOULD THE APPLICATION BE APPROVED...>> COUNCILLOR LEIPER, PLEASE.>> THANK YOU, CHAIR.THIS MOTION SPEAKS TO MITIGATING THE ANTICIPATED SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF HAVING A SHELTERREN A

TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET. AGAIN, I THINK A NUMBER OF US ARE HAVING DIFFICULTY RECONCILING TO US-- TOLD TO US WOULD BE RULED OUT OF ORDER VERSUS WHAT WON'T. ON WHAT PLANNING GROUNDS, LAND-USE GROUNDS, IS PUTTING A HOLD ZONE TO A CHIEF AN AMBASSADOR PROGRAM JUSTIFIABLE UNDER THE PLANNING ACT?>> Mr. MAYOR, THIS HOLDING ZONE ON THIS PARTICULAR PROGRAM IS ON GEORGE STREET AND IT IS NOT CONNECTED TO THE APPLICATION THAT'S BEFORE YOU TODAY.>> IT IS, NONETHELESS-- SORRY, LOOKING AT THE MOTION ON THE AMBASSADOR PROGRAM. YEAH. SECTION 2. THAT SPEAKS TO MITIGATING SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS. I'M TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHY AN AMBASSADOR PROGRAM HAS ANY CONNECTION TO A PLANNING APPLICATION.>> Mr. MAYOR, IT DOES NOT.>> SO THIS IS COUNCILLOR BLAIS' MOTION.>> I THINK THAT-- SORRY-- THAT MAKES A POINT ABOUT THE DIFFICULTY OF THIS ENTIRE ISSUE. IF THIS IS PERMISSIBLE TO CONTEMPLATE, THEN WE HAVE NOT DONE NEARLY ENOUGH DEBATING ABOUT THE LARGER SOCIO-ECONOMIC DISCUSSION ASSOCIATED WITH THE LARGER PLANNING FILE. JUST BECAUSE IT IS INTELLECTUALLY INCOHERENT, I CANNOT SUPPORT. THAT THANK YOU, CHAIR.>> THANK YOU. DOES ANYONE ELSE WISH TO SPEAK ON COUNCILLOR BLAIS AND CLOUTIER'S MOTION? COUNCILLOR EGLI, I APOLOGIZE.>> SO IN LIGHT OF THAT, WITH Ms. SNEDDON, IS THIS MOTION OUT OF ORDER?>> Mr. MAYOR WITH REGARD THE SECOND RESOLUTION AND THE AMBASSADOR PROGRAM, LEGAL HAS RAISED CONCERNS AND WE SPOKE ABOUT THIS, I BELIEVE WITH-- WE DID TACK TO THE COUNCILLOR. THE AMBASSADOR PROGRAM IS NOT PART OF THIS APPLICATION IN FRONT OF YOU. IT IS NOT IN THE REPORT. IT IS NOT IN THE DOCUMENTATION. IT WAS RAISED WITH CERTAIN DELIGATIONS AND THERE WERE CERTAIN QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS RACED ON THAT, SO IT WOULD BE WITH THE PARTY'S CONSENT THAT THIS WOULD GO THROUGH BUT FOR SPECIFIC LEGAL REASONS, WE THINK THAT THIS SECTION 2, RECOMMENDATION 2, WOULD BE IMMINENTLY CHALLENGEABLE AT THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD AND IF I AM ASKED I WILL RECOMMEND THAT IT BE OUT OF ORDER.>> COULD I OFFER A SUGGESTION, COUNCILLOR BLAIS? WOULD YOU BE WILLING TO REMOVE SECTION 2 AND KEEP SECTION 1? I THINK THAT WOULD RESOLVE THE ISSUE BEFORE US. IS THAT AGREEABLE?>> SO, Mr. MAYOR, IF YOU WANT TO RULE IT OUT OF ORDER, THAT'S FINE. IF THE APPLICANT WANTS TO GO TO THE OMB AND CHALLENGE THE FACT THAT THEY DON'T WANT TO DO AN OUTREACH PROGRAM IN THE COMMUNITY TO SOLVE THE PROBLEMS THAT THEY WENT

TO PROPOSE TO SOLVE THEN THAT'S FINE, TOO.>> SO WE GO BACK TO COUNCILLOR ELLIE CLAREIFICATION, COUNCILLOR?>> SO CAN I SUGGEST THIS AS AN ALTERNATIVE? CAN WE-- IS IT POSSIBLE TO SPLIT THE VOTE ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS? VOTE ON RECOMMENDATION ONE AND THEN VOTE ON RECOMMENDATION TWO?>> IS THIS PERMISSIBLE. CORRECT. COUNCILLOR HARDER, PLEASE.>> CLARIFICATION ON THIS ONE. IF I RECALL FROM THE CONVERSATION THAT WE HAD, IT HAD A LOT TO DO WITH THE CURRENT SITE AND HAVING AN AMBASSADOR PROGRAM IN PLACE THERE. AND THAT WAS PROMISED, I THINK FOR THIS JUNE, AND THEN SEE HOW THAT WORKS IN PREPARATION AND, IF THAT'S THE CASE, THAT COULD BE A MOTION SEPARATE BY ITSELF AND LEADS TO CURRENTLY-- AND THEN HAVING THE AM WAS PROGRAM HAVE IT VERIFIED AS GOOD-- (Unclear) PERHAPS THE WAY COUNCILLOR BLAIS COULD GO. IMPLEMENTATION NOW. MONITOR FOR THE NEW PLACE. THAT WORK?>> I THINK COUNCILLOR BLAIS HAS GOOD INTENTION OPTION THIS. I SUGGEST PERHAPS WE REMOVE SECTION 2 TO SEND IT TO STAFF AS A DIRECTION THAT STAFF CAN LOOK INTO AND WE KEEP IT OUT OF MAIN MOTION. IS THAT AGREEABLE, COUNCILLOR BLAIS?>> MAYOR, THE SALVATION ARMY HAS COMMITTED TO THIS PROGRAM. THIS WAS THE LANGUAGE THAT WAS DRAFTED BY LEGAL AND PLANNING TO ACHIEVE THE END RESULT, SO, IT IS, YOU KNOW, CONFUSING TO ME THAT THEY NOW THINK IT IS SOMEHOW INAPPROPRIATE. BUT IF WE THINK THAT THE SALVATION ARMY WILL ACTUALLY LIVE UP TO THEIR WORD, THEN TAKE IT OUT. BUT THAT WAS NOT THE IMPRESSION I RECEIVED FROM THE COMMUNITY DELEGATIONS--[Inaudible].>> COUNCILLOR DEANS PLEASE.>> I SUGGEST WE LEAVE IT AS IT IS. SEPARATE ONE FROM TWO AND VOTE ON-->> COUNCILLOR BLAIS ASKED AS WELL FOR THAT. SO WE WILL MOVE THE ENTIRE MOTION AND VOTE FIRST ON ITEM NUMBER ONE--[Inaudible].>> THE SPIRATION IS JUST THE VOTE BEING SEPARATED. WE WILL GO YEAS AND NAYS ON ONE AND THEN ON TWO. WE WILL GO YEAS AND NAYS ON ONE AND THEN ON TWO. SO ITEM ONE? CARRIED. ITEM TWO? OKAY, CARRIED. DISSENT BY COUNCILLOR EGLI. IS THAT IT--[Inaudible] YUP. THE NEXT MOTION IS BY COUNCILLOR FLEURY, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR LEIPER WITH RESPECT OF REMOVAL OF SHELTER AS A PERMITTED USE AT 171 GEORGE STREET. (Speaking French).>> [Voice of Translator]: THANK YOU, MAYOR. SO WHAT YOU HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU, AND WE ARE ASKING TO REMOVE THE AUTHORIZATION TO HAVE A SHELTER AT 171 GEORGE STREET, ONCE THE SALVATION ARMY HAS LEFT. OF COURSE, WE WOULD LIKE THEM TO GO ELSEWHERE THAN ON MONTREAL

ROAD BUT IN THIS CASE IT IS TO COMPLY WITH THE OBLIGATIONS OF THE 2008 REPORT.>> TO REMOVE PERMITTED USE OF SHELTER AT 171 GEORGE, WHICH IS THE CURRENT SALVATION ARMY SITE.MOVED BY COUNCILLOR FLEURY.SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR LEIPER.ADDITIONAL COMMENTS?CARRIED?ADOPTED.THE NEXT MOTION.LIMITING AMENDMENT TO LIFE OF SALVATION ARMY-- COUNCIL FLEURY.SECONDED BY COUNCIL NUSSBAUM.>> THIS IS THE EXACT AS FOR THE FIRST ONE ABOUT WITH YOU THE NEW LOCATION.AS WE HAVE THE 2008 REPORT IN FRONT OF US, I BELIEVE IT IS IMPORTANT THAT, IF THE APPLICANTS WITH TO BE GRANTED THE USE AT-- ON MONTREAL ROAD BUT NEVER PURSUE IT, THAT ANYONE ELSE ANYONE ELSE COULD JUST COME IN AND USE THAT ZONE-- USE THAT USE AS PERMITTED ON THE SITE.SO-- I THINK THAT-- I KNOW-- I'VE SEEN LEGAL'S INTERPRETATION OF IT.I BELIEVE THAT IN THIS CASE, THE ONLY ONE THAT COULD APPEAL THE DECISION WOULD BE THE APPLICANT AND I DON'T SEE WHY THE APPLICANT WOULD NOT FAVOUR THIS MOTION.IN MY MIND, THE APPLICANT WOULD BE-- IF-- IF COUNCIL SO WISHES AS THAT-- WOULD GAIN THAT PERMISSION OF USE AT MONTREAL ROAD.BUT IF THAT'S NEVER EXERCISED, IT SHOULD NEVER BE GRANTED TO RESPECT THE INTENTS OF THE SEPARATION DISTANCES AND SHELTER CAP AND THAT SPEAKS TO THE REPORT AND THE ANALYSIS FROM STAFF ON THE RELOCATION AND NOT THE INCREASE OF NUMBERS.>> DO YOU WANT TO ASK THAT QUESTION-->> WELL, I GOT-->> Mr. O'CONNOR, ON YOUR-- MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT STAFF DO NOT SUPPORT THIS MOTION.>> THAT'S CORRECT, Mr. MAYOR, AND I WILL TURN IT OVER TO LAWYERS.I AGREE WITH THE COUNCILLOR THAT IT WOULD BE THE SALVATION ARMY WHO WOULD LIKELY BE THE MOST OBVIOUS ONE TO APPEAL THIS TO THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD AND IF THEY DIDN'T DO SO, I WOULD AGREE WITH THE WARD COUNCILLOR.>> OKAY.DOES ANYONE ELSE WISH TO SPEAK ON THIS?>> JUST ON-- I WASN'T-->> GO AHEAD.>> I THINK THAT'S PRETTY STRAIGHT FORWARD, EVERYONE.LIKE, IF WE ARE GRANTING A USE ON MONTREAL ROAD FOR THAT USE, WE EXPECT THE SALVATION ARMY TO USE IT.IF THEY DON'T USE IT, DON'T ALLOW FOR THAT USE TO HOLD AT THAT SITE.THE ONLY PERSON THAT CAN APPEAL US TO THAT IS THE SALVATION ARMY SO PLEASE BE COHERENT-- AND IF YOU ARE SUPPORTIVE OF THE STAFF REPORT-- IT IS A ROW LOCATION-- THEN YOU CAN'T VOTE THIS DOWN.IT COUNTERS THE OBJECTIVES OF WHAT YOUR ARGUMENTS ARE.>> ANYONE ELSE WISH TO TALK OR QUESTION THIS PARTICULAR MOTION BY COUNCILLOR FLEURY?NO?ON THE

MOTION?CARRIED.>>> THE NEXT MOTION IS TERM OF COUNCIL PRIORITIES SECTION OF THE REPORT-- COUNCILLOR FLEURY.SECKED BY COUNCILLOR BROCKINGTON.STAFF HAVE NO POSITION ON THIS PARTICULAR ITEM.COUNCILLOR FLEURY, S V.P. >> THANK YOU, MAYOR.POINT OF PRINCIPLE TO ME.WE HAVE A REPORT CARD CALLED TERM OF COUNCIL PRIORITIES.WE HAVE AMAZING STAFF THAT KEEP TRACK OF WHAT WE ACCOMPLISH.THE ONES THAT WERE RAISED FOR THIS REPORT ARE THE FOLLOWING: ADVANCE EQUITIEN INCLUSION FOR THE CITY'S DIVERSE POPULATION.2.CREATE NEW AFFORDABLE HOUSING OPERATIONS.AND, 3-- AND 3, SUPPORT GROWTH FROM THE LOCAL ECONOMY.I WILL SPEAK BRIEFLY TO THE THREE MATTERS.SO, UM-- SO FOR THE FIRST ONE, ADVANCING EQUITY AND INCLUSION, DIVERSE POPULATION, I THINK WE HAVE TO BE CAREFUL.IN WARD 12, WE HAVE THE OTTAWA NEIGHBOURHOOD STUDY WHICH IDENTIFIED MY AREA AS THE LOWEST-INCOME PER CAPITA IN THE CITY.THAT DOES NOT ADVANCE ANY ITEMS OF THAT MATTER.IN TERMS OF CREATING AFFORDABLE UNITS.YOU ARE ALL IN AGREEMENT THAT SHELTER-- LOW THEY ARE TEMPORARY, THEY ARE NOT AFFORDABLE UNITS.SO LET'S BE CLEAR ON NOT MEETING THAT GOAL.AND THEN, THREE, IN TERMS OF SUPPORTING THE GROWTH IN THE ECONOMY, I ALSO WANT TO BE CAREFUL-- LET'S IDENTIFY REAL GROWTH.THIS THIS IS A RELOCATION ALTHOUGH THERE MAY BE MORE EMPLOYEES, THE EMPLOYEES WOULD BE IN THE PROGRAMS WHERE THEY HAVE GO.AND SO IT IS NOT ADDITIONAL INTENT.IT IS NOT SOMETHING CONTROVERSIAL.IT JUST SHOWS THAT WE DO HAVE A REPORT CARD, AND WE ARE NOT JUST CHECKING BOXES AND WHAT WE BRING FORWARD AS TERM OF PRIORITY-->> COUNCILLOR, IF COULD YOU READ THE MOTION-->> OH, SORRY, IT IS BASICALLY THIS THAT THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT TERM OF COUNCIL REPORT BE REVISED TO REMOVE THE IDENTIFIED TERMS OF PRIORITIES IN THIS REPORT.>> OKAY.ON THE MOTION?CARRIED.THE NEXT MOTION IS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR EGLI, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CLOUTIER WITH RESPECT TO OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT.COUNCILLOR EGLI, PLEASE.>> UM, IT IS QUITE LONG BUT I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT TO READ IT OUT SO WHEREAS OVER THE COURSE OF THE THREE-DAY PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING TO CONSIDER THE ZONING AND OFFICIAL PLANS OF RELOCATION OF SALVATION ARMY SHELTER, MEMBERS OF COUNCIL LEARNED FROM AN ACTIVE, ENGAGED COMMUNITY THAT WANTS TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE INPUT INTO HOW THIS PROCEEDS.AND WHEREAS THE SALVATION ARMY INDICATES

THE NEEDS-- (Unclear) COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS AS IT DEVELOPS, THE SITE PLAN IN ORDER TO CONTRIBUTE TO BEING A POSITIVE IMPACT ON THE NEIGHBOURHOOD AND WHEREAS COUNCIL-- (Unclear) MUST BE BASED ON LAND USE PLANNING PRINCIPLES, COUNCIL RECOGNIZED IMPORTANCE OF EXPECTS SERVICES-- (Unclear) AND WHEREAS THE FEDERAL AND PROVISION GOVERNMENTS ARE MAKING SIGNIFICANT AND TARGETED INVESTMENTS IN HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS THAT MAY IMPACT THE PROGRAMMING FACILITY IN THE FUTURE AND WHEREAS (Unclear) NEW YEAR AND TAKE PLACE OVER NEXT SEVERAL YEARS AND THERE IS TIME FOR PRODUCTIVE AND MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE TO TAKE PLACE TO HELP SHAPE THE (Unclear) HELP TO PROMOTE CITY'S HOMELESS AND HOUSING GOALS LESSEN COMMUNITY IMPACT THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT COUNCILLOR DIRECT STAFF TO WORK WITH THE WARD-- (Unclear) THE MAYOR AND THE SALVATION ARMY TO ESTABLISH A SITE PLAN REVIEW AND PROGRAMMING ADVISORY COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF THE ABOVE-NAMED MEMBERS OF COUNCIL, RELEVANT CITY STAFF AND STAKEHOLDERS TO PROVIDE INPUT INTO THE NEXT PHASE OF THE SALVATION ARMY RELOCATION DEVELOPMENT. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT IT BE DEEMED BY THE PLANNING-- (Unclear) SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SITE PLAN REVIEW AND PROGRAMMING ADVISORY COMMITTEE BE INCORPORATED INTO THE CONDITIONS OF THE SITE PLAN. SO, IN SHORT, THIS MOTION CAME AS A RESULT-- ALTHOUGH I DON'T SIT ON PLANNING, I WAS AT THE MAJORITY OF THE PLANNING MEETINGS. I HEARD THE DELEGATIONS ON BOTH SIDES. AND WHAT REALLY STRUCK ME WAS THAT THE SALVATION ARMY DELEGATIONS AND STAFF AND CONSULTANTS WERE SITTING FIVE FEET AWAY FROM THE VANIER CONSULTANTS AND NO ONE WAS TALKING TO EACH OTHER. I DON'T SAY THAT IN A JUDGMENTAL WAY. THEY WERE NOT TALKING TO EACH OTHER BUT TALKING AT EACH OTHER, THROUGH THE CHAIR. ALL THE PEOPLE WERE IN THE ROOM TO HAVE A PRODUCTIVE CONVERSATION AND NEITHER SIDE WAS HAVING IT. IT WAS A VERY INDUSTRY YANGLAR TYPE OF THING.-- VERY TRIANGULAR TYPE OF THING. AND THEY WOULD SPEAK TO THE CHAIR AND NOT TO EACH OTHER. AND THAT STRUCK ME. AND AS A RESULT, I REACHED OUT. I HAD AN INITIAL CHAT WITH THE SALVATION ARMY AND SAID-- I THINK THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY HERE-- AND I KNOW EVERYBODY IS PRETTY WELL ENTRENCHED BUT SOMEBODY HAS TO MAKE THE FIRST MOVE TO INDICATE THAT THERE IS A WILLINGNESS TO DISCUSS, A WILLINGNESS TO COLLABORATE. AND THEY WENT OFF AND THOUGHT ABOUT IT. WE HAD

FURTHER DISCUSSIONS OVER THE NEXT NUMBER OF DAYS.I HAD DISCUSSIONS WITH SOME OF MY COUNCIL COLLEAGUES, INCLUDING OBVIOUSLY COUNCILLOR CLOUTIER, AND I WILL HAD A DISCUSSION VERY RECENTLY WITH WARD COUNCILLOR, COUNCILLOR FLEURY, ABOUT THIS VERY MOTION.AND WHILE I RESPECT COUNCILLOR FLEURY'S POSITION THAT HE CANNOT SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL OVERALL AND WE HAD A GOOD DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT, HE CANADA DID INDICATE THAT, SHOULD THIS CARRY AND SHOULD IT BE UPHELD BY THE OMB DOWN THE ROAD-- BECAUSE IT WILL END UP THERE AT SOME POINT IN ALL LIKELIHOOD REGARDLESS OF HOW WE VOTE TODAY THAT WE THINK THIS IS A GOOD PLAN AND A GOOD PATH FORWARD AND HE IS SUPPORTIVE OF HAVING A GOOD DISCUSSION AROUND BOTH SITE PLAN AND PROGRAM DELIVERY.AND I ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT THIS IS NOT SOMETHING THAT WE CAN IMPOSE ON THE SALVATION ARMY.AND IT HAS TO BE SOMETHING THAT THEY AGREE WITH AND I UNDERSTAND THAT WE ALSO HAVE THEIR CONSENT...IT WILL BE PUT ON HOLD, UNFORTUNATELY, IF EITHER SIDE GETS TO OMB BUT I BELIEVE IT SOLIDIFIES A ROLE FOR THE COMMUNITY WE HEARD FROM THAT WERE VERY IMPASSIONED, VERY ENGAGED.IT SOLIDIFIES A ROLE THAT, IF IT IS UPHELD BY THE OMB, THAT WHATEVER THE DECISION IS, YOU HAVE A ROLE HERE, A ROLE TO PLAY AND WE WILL NOT LET THE SALVATION ARMY BACK OUT OF ACKNOWLEDGING THAT ROLE.AND I DON'T THINK THAT THEY WOULD.BUT THIS MOTION SOLIDIFIES YOUR INPUT, SOLIDIFIES YOUR ENGAGEMENT IN A VERY MEANINGFUL WAY, AND, AS I SAY, HAD A VERY GOOD DISCUSSION WITH YOUR WARD COUNCILLOR THIS MORNING ABOUT THIS ISSUE.SO I WOULD URGE EVERYBODY TO SEIZE THIS OPPORTUNITY.YOU MAY NOT GET THE RESULT YOU WANT AT THE END OF THE DAY.BUT THIS WILL ALLOW SOME BRIDGE-BUILDING.SO DISCUSSION GOING FORWARD IN A COLLABORATIVE WAY TO SEE HOW THIS CAN WORK IN THE BEST WAY POSSIBLE FOR ALL PARTIES.SO, AGAIN, I WOULD URGE ALL MY COUNCIL MEMBERS TO FOLLOW THE LEAD SUGGESTED BY THE WARD COUNCILLOR AND BY COUNCILLOR CLOUTIER AND MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS MOTION.THANK YOU.>> OKAY.THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR EGLI.COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM, PLEASE.>> YEAH, THANK YOU, MAYOR.JUST SOME QUESTIONS TO THE MOVER BECAUSE I AM CONFUSED BY THE MOTION.ONE OF THE CLAUSES SAYS: WHEREAS THE NEXT PHASE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF APPROVALS FOR THE FACILITY IS EXPECTED TO BEGIN IN THE NEXT YEAR.HAVE I-- WE HAVE NOT VOTED ON THIS APPLICATION YET, SO I AM UNCLEAR WHAT WE ARE VOTED ON, NOW,

WITHOUT HAVING VOTED ON THE APPLICATION?>> CAN WE HAVE COUNCILLOR EGLI'S MIC ON, PLEASE?>> THAT'S FAIR COMMENT, COUNCILLOR.I WAS WORKING WITH STAFF ON A VERY SHORT TIME LINE TO GET THIS DONE.STAFF IS IN THE ROOM.IF THERE IS A WAY TO AMEND TO REFLECT THE CONCERN RAISED BY COUNCILLOR EGLI.I AM HAPPY TO HAVE A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT ON THAT.>> OKAY.MY NEXT QUESTION IS WOULD SEE IT AS FRIENDLY AMEND IF WE AMENDED IT TO DEFER THIS APPLICATION, CREATE THE TIME OF COMMITTEE BEING ENVISIONED HERE, WE COULD CALLED IT PROGRAMMING ADVISORY COMMITTEE, OR THE 10 0-DAY TASK FORCE-- CALL IT WHATEVER THEY WANTED AND DO THAT WORK BEFORE COUNCIL VOTES ON APPLICATION, GIVEN THAT CLEARLY THERE WILL BE A GREATER INCENTIVE ON THE-- ON THE PART OF ALL PARTIES TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT BEFORE A COUNCIL VOTE AS OPPOSED TO AFTER.SO WOULD THAT BE CONSIDERED A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT?>> UNFORTUNATELY NOT.MY UNDERSTANDING IS-- AND LEGAL CAN WEIGH IN ON THIS, OR PLANNING-- BUT MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT, IF WE DON'T MAKE A DECISION AT THIS POINT, ON THE PROPOSAL, AS IT-- AS IT LAYS IN FRONT OF US WE RUN OUT OF TIME, I THINK, ON DECEMBER 13 AND 14, AND THE MATTER WILL AUTOMATICALLY GO TO THE OMB.AND WE DON'T HAVE A 100 DAYS TO PLAY WITH IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES.SO JUST PRACTICALLY, I DON'T THINK HOW THAT CAN WORK.BUT I THINK BY EMBEDDING THE CONCERNS, AND THE INTENT, IN THE MOTION, TO YOUR POINT ABOUT HAVING MEANINGFUL DISCUSSION-- THE PARTIES WILL HAVE TO HAVE A MEANINGFUL DISCUSSION.THEY WILL HAVE TO BE AT THE TABLE.AND I SEE Mr. O'CONNOR IS RAISING HIS HAND SO-->> IF I COULD OFFER TWO COMMENTS.COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM, WE JUST, AS YOU KNOW DEFEATED DEFERRAL.WE CAN'T BRING IT BACK AT THE SAME MEETING.DEFERRAL WAS DEFEATED.AND SECONDLY, OMB-- IT KICKS IN WELL BEYOND THE 100 DAYS.AND Mr. O'CONNOR, WORKING WITH LESLIE DONNELLY, I BELIEVE, CAME UP WITH A SUGGESTION TO HELP DEAL WITH THE ISSUE THAT COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM JUST BROUGHT UP.O'CONNOR PLEASE?>> YES, WE SUGGEST THAT AT THE END OF THE FIRST RESOLUTION, YOU ADD THE WORDS "IF I PROVED" WHICH WOULD GET YOU, I THINK, TO WHERE YOU WANT TO GO.AND THE OTHER COMMENT, THE 180 DAYS LAPS -- HE IS CORRECT-- ON DECEMBER 13 AND THAT WOULD TRIGGER THE ABILITY OF APPLICANT TO GO TO THE MUNICIPAL BOARD.IT IS NOT AUTOMATIC BUT IT WOULD MOST LIKELY BE.>> SO IT A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT--[Inaudible].>> FIRST QUESTION, COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM.NO

PROBLEM WITH THAT AMENDMENT.AND MY LAST QUESTION TO COUNCILLOR EGLI IS WITH REGARD TO THE MANDATE AND SCOPE, THERE IS SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO SITE PLAN REVIEW.I'M WONDERING WHETHER OR NOT THE MANDATE OF THIS GROUP WOULD INCLUDE LOOKING AT OPTIONS THAT OF WHICH MAY CHANGE THE CONFIGURATION, CREATE, FOR INSTANCE A SECOND SITE THAT WOULD HELP SPLIT SOME OF THE SERVICES IF THAT IS WHAT WAS DESIRED-- IS THIS-- IS THE IDEA HERE TO LOOK ONLY AT SITE PLAN AND PROGRAMMING ON THAT LOCATION, OR WOULD THERE BE A MANDATE TO LOOK AT OPTIONS-- CREATIVE OPTIONS BEYOND THE SPECIFIC SITE IN QUESTION?>> IT IS SITE PLAN.BUT, AGAIN, I LOOK TO STAFF BUT IT HAS TO LOOK AT PARTICULAR IN QUESTION.THAT DOESN'T ALLOW IT TO LOOK AT A SITE IN KANATA OR CARP OR WHEREVER.BUT ALL IT CAN DO IS LOOK AT THE FOUR CORNERS OF THIS PROPOSAL IN THIS PARTICULAR SITE.AT THE SAME TIME, I DON'T THINK ANYBODY IS STOPPED, IF SOMEBODY HAS A REALLY CREATIVE IDEA AT THE TABLE, THAT PUTS IT THERE THAT PEOPLE CAN'T DISCUSS IT, BUT IN TERMS OF THE PRACTICAL OF THIS MOTION, I THINK THEY CAN ONLY DEAL WITH THE APPLICATION IN FRONT OF THEM AND THE PIECE OF LAND IN FRONT OF THEM.>> AND PRESUMABLY IF COUNCILLOR FLEURY LISTS DELEGATED AUTHORITY FOR SITE PLAN, THEN ANY WORK DONE BY SUCH A COMMITTEE WOULD RETURN TO COUNCIL OBVIOUSLY FOR FULL APPROVAL?CORRECT?[Inaudible][Inaudible].>> Mr. MAYOR, THAT IS CORRECT.>> THANK YOU COUNCILLOR.(Speaking French).>> [Voice of Translator]: THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR.I KNOW WE HAD AN ANSWER THROUGH THIS MOTION--[Continuing in English].TO LIFT THE DELEGATED AUTHORITY FOR SITE PLAN ON THIS MOTION?>> THAT'S CORRECT.>> MERCI.COUNCILLOR TAYLOR PLEASE.>> THANK YOU.AND THANK YOU TO COUNSELORS CLOUTIER AND EGLI FOR MOVING THIS MOTION.I THINK IT WELL ARTICULATES THE FACT THAT IF APPROVED THIS IS NOT THE END OF THE DISCUSSION.AND I SPOKE A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THIS AT THE PLANNING COMMITTEE.THIS ACTUALLY SIGNALS THAT THE DISCUSSION IS VERY MUCH ALIVE AND IS GROWING SO, TO COUNCILLOR EGLI'S POINT, YOU KNOW, WHILE-- WHILE THE MOTION PUTS STRICT PARAMETERS AROUND KIND OF THE CREATION OF THIS-- OF THIS GROUP AND THE SALVATION ARMY HAS SIGNALLED WITH A PUBLIC RELEASE-- OR AT LEAST A RELEASE TO COUNCILLORS THAT THEY ARE OPENING TO EN GAUGING IN THIS PROCESS THAT, YOU KNOW, WE WIND UP IN A SCENARIO WHERE WE HAVE BOTH-- BOTH GROUPS THAT CLEARLY ARTICULATED ITS CONCERNS, THE SALVATION ARMY AND ITS PROPONENTS AND THE

COMMUNITY THAT WE HEARD FROM CLEARLY AND DILIGENTLY OVER THREE DAYS.IT BRINGS THEM INTO A SPACE TOGETHER WHERE GOOD THINGS CAN START TO EMERGE.AND NOTWITHSTANDING THE FACT THAT THEY WILL PROBABLY START THE DISCUSSION AROUND THE VERY STRICT CONFINES OF THIS SITE PLAN-- TO COUNCILLOR'S NUSSBAUM'S POINT AND CONCERN, I-- I TAKE COUNCILLOR EGLI'S TACT THAT ONCE PARTIES ARE IN A ROOM AND START WORKING TOGETHER, I BELIEVE THIS COULD LEAD TO A LOT OF POSITIVE WORK IN THE COMMUNITY AND A LOT OF POSITIVE WORK WITH RESPECT TO THIS PROPOSAL.I APPRECIATE THE MOVERS FOR MOVING IT AND I WOULD BE HAPPY TO SUPPORT IT.>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH.COUNCILLOR WILKINSON, PLEASE.>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.IT IS A VERY GOOD PROCESS.AND I THINK THE COMMUNITY WOULD HAVE LIKED US TO START THIS A WHILE BACK.THE POINT OF IT IS THAT, EVEN IF IT IS LATE, IT IS BETTER TO HAVE IT THAN NOT HAVE IT AT ALL.I THINK WE DID THIS A BIT WITH LANSDOWNE PARK.WE HAD A LOT OF CONTROVERSY AT THE BEGINNING.AND WE SET UP SOME COMMITTEE MEETINGS.AND I WAS INVOLVED WITH A TRANSPORTATION ONE THAT WORKED FOR A LONG TIME BEING IMPLEMENTED TO ENSURE THAT IS THE END RESULT WOULD NOT CAUSE DIFFICULTIES FOR THE COMMUNITY.AND THE CHANGES THAT WERE MADE AT THAT TIME, DURING THE WHOLE PROCESS, BEFORE IT ACTUALLY GOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED MADE A HUGE OPPORTUNITY TO THE COMMUNITY.THIS IS EITHER AN OPPORTUNITY-- OR YOU ARE ALL-- THE COMMUNITY IS YOU ALL VERY INVOLVED RIGHT NOW AND RATHER THAN LOSING THAT INVOLVEMENT, THE SITE PLAN IS FRANKLY, THE MOST IMPORTANT THING IN MY MIND.FOR MORE THAN THE ZONING.BECAUSE IT SHOWS WHAT IT WILL LOOK LIKE.HOW IT WILL GO.AND THEY DO CHANGE AS YOU GO AHEAD.I HAD A LOT OF CONTROVERSIAL SITE PLANS.I'M DEALING WITH ANOTHER ONE RIGHT NOW THAT IS CAUSING SOLICIT PROBLEMS IN THE COMMUNITY.WHAT YOU HAVE TO DO IS CONTINUE TO HAVE DIALOGUE.AND I DO A LOT OF DIALOGUE IN MY COMMUNITY AND I THINK YOUR COMMUNITY IS DOING THAT RIGHT NOW.AND ALTHOUGH I THINK THIS IS SOMETHING THAT YOU SHOULD AS A COMMUNITY ENDORSE DOING.YOU MAY NOT BE HAPPY WITH THE WAY THE FINAL DECISION ON THE ZONING GOES TODAY.BUT THAT NOT THE END.STORY.THIS PROPOSAL ACTUALLY PUTS THE CITY INTO A POSITION WHERE THEY ARE GOING TO WORKING WITH THE SALVATION ARMY, AND WITH THE COMMUNITY, AND THE SALVATION ARMY HAS TO TAKE PART IN THIS, BECAUSE IT WOULD MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN GETTING THEIR SITE PLAN APPROVAL, AND THAT

MEANS THAT YOU WILL ACTUALLY GET SOME OF THE DIALOGUE THAT YOU WISHED YOU HAD A BIT EARLIER.AND SO UM-- I THINK IT IS SOMETHING THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE ENCOURAGED, EVEN MORE SO-- YOU HAVE A NUMBER OF OTHER STUDIES GOING ON IN VANIER RIGHT NOW.I KNOW IT IS SOME THINGS THAT HAVE REALLY IMPORTANT FOR YOUR COMMUNITY.BECAUSE YOU ARE CHANGING A LOT.WE HAVE SEEN A LOT OF CHANGES HAPPEN ALREADY IN WESTBORO AND PLACES LIKE THAT.AND SOME ARE GOOD.AND SOME NOT SO GOOD.SOME EASY DEALT WITH.SOME ARE TOUGH.AND THIS IS ONE OF THE TOUGH ONES.AND THINK THIS IS A MOTION THAT WILL HELP ALLOW BEING THE WAY.IT HELP THE CITY MAKE BETTER DECISIONS ON THE FINAL OUTCOME OF THE SITE PLAN AND FROM THAT, I THINK IT WILL HELP YOU IN OTHER SITES THAT MAY COME FORWARD TO DEVELOP IN VANIER.AND YOU WILL HAVE A LOT OF THAT HAPPENING BECAUSE YOU ARE SO CLOSED TO DOWNTOWN THAT YOU ARE BECOMING AN ATTRACTIVE AREA FOR THINGS TO HAPPEN.(Laughter).>> AND THINGS HAPPENING HAVE IMPACTS.THEY HAVE BIG IMPACTS.SO HAVING THIS PROCESS IN PLACE WILL HELP YOU TO DEAL-- NOT JUST THIS IMPACT WHICH IS ONE BUT FUTURE IMPACTS AS WELL.AND I WILL SUPPORT THIS MOTION.I THINK IT IS VERY IMPORTANT IN THE PROCESS HAPPENING RIGHT NOW.THE ZONING IS VERY HARD FOR US TO DEAL WITH.A HARD-FACTUAL KIND OF THING.IT GIVES US A LOT OF TROUBLE BECAUSE THE ISSUES ARE NOT ZONING ISSUES.THEY ARE EMOTIONAL ISSUES.THEY ARE IMPACTING COMMUNITY ISSUES AND THAT'S WHAT THIS MOTION IS ADDRESSING SO I VERY MUCH STRONGLY SUPPORT IT.>> THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR.COUNCILLOR LEIPER, PLEASE.>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH, CHAIR.I, AGAIN, AM STRUGGLING WITH THE COHERENCY AND LOGIC OF THIS DISCUSSION.IN SEVERAL PLACES IN THIS MOTION, WE TALK ABOUT PROGRAMMING IN THE FACILITY, IN THE WHEREASES, WE TALK ABOUT THE INVESTMENTS IN HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS THAT MAY HAVE AN IMPACT ON PROGRAMMING FOR THIS FACILITY.SITE PLAN REVIEW AND PROGRAMMING ADVISORY COMMITTEE, HELPED SHAPE THE SITE PLAN REVIEW, DRAFTING CONDITIONS AND PROGRAMMING OF THE FACILITY.WE ARE AT LEAST IN THEORY, NOT CONCERNED, IN THIS DISCUSSION TODAY, ABOUT THE PROGRAMMING IN THIS FACILITY.WE ARE MAKING A ZONING DISCUSSION.WHY IS THIS MOTION COMING FORWARD WHEN WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT PROGRAMMING?WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT WHO THIS SHELTER WILL SERVE.WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT HOW IT WILL SERVE

THEM.WHAT IS THE NECESSITY OF THIS MOTION?TO DEAL WITH PROGRAMMING?IS THERE A CONCERN THAT WE THINK WE ARE GOING TO NEED TO DEAL WITH?I GUESS I WOULD ASK MAYBE THE-- COUNCILLOR EGLI TO RESPOND.AND ASK STAFF AND LEGAL WHETHER IN DEBATING THIS MOTION, IF IT PASSES, IS THE OMB THEN GOING TO TAKE A LOOK AND DETERMINE THAT, IN FACT, COUNCIL IS MAKING A DECISION ON THE BASIS OF PROGRAMMING?>> SO WHAT I WOULD RESPOND TO THAT, COUNCILLOR LEIPER, AND I WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR CONCERN, WHAT I WOULD RESPOND TO THAT IS THAT THIS MOTION DOESN'T GO TO THE APPROVAL OF THIS PROPOSAL ONE WAY OR ANOTHER.WHAT IT DOES IS, IT KICKS IN AFTER AN APPROVAL.AND COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM POINTED IT OUT AND WE MADE THAT AMENDMENT.SO THIS IS NOT PART OF OUR DECISION MAKING IN TERMS OF WHETHER WE APPROVE OR WE DON'T APPROVE THIS PARTICULAR PROPOSAL.WHAT IT SAYS, IF APPROVED, AND UPHeld BY THE OMB FOR WHATEVER REASONS THE OMB UPHOLDS IT, THEN THESE STEPS WILL COME FORWARD AND THESE THINGS WILL HAPPEN, BUT IT IS NOT ABOUT THE APPROVAL.IT IS ABOUT WHAT HAPPENS IF AND WHEN IT DOES GET APPROVED.SO, TO ME, THAT'S THE DISTINCTION AND I THINK IT IS AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION.>> IT IS AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION.AND THIS IS NOT PART OF THE BYLAW THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE CRAFTING, BUT IT HAS COME UP FOR A REASON.AND I'M JUST WONDERING IF YOU COULD HELP ME UNDERSTAND WHY WE ARE TALKING ABOUT PROGRAMMING, IN THE LARGER CONTEXT OF THIS DEBATE THAT WE ARE HAVING TODAY OVER WHETHER OR NOT TO APPROVE THE-- THE BYLAW AMENDMENTS.>> AGAIN, I FORESEE A SITUATION DOWN THE ROAD WHEN THIS MAY-- AND I SAY MAY-- MAY GET UPHeld BY THE OMB.IF IT DOES, THIS COMMUNITY AND THE SALVATION ARMY HAVE A WHOLE LOT OF TALKING TO DO.THEY HAVE A WHOLE LOT OF COMMUNICATION AND HEALING TO DO.AND I THINK THAT THIS IS A WAY IN WHICH THAT CAN BE FACILITATED.AND YOU ARE QUITE RIGHT.OUR DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IS ABOUT PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND THAT'S WHEN WE ARE FOCUSED ON TODAY.AND THAT'S WHAT THE OMB WILL FOCUS ON AS WELL, I HOPE.WHEN THEY CONSIDER WHATEVER-- HOWEVER WE VOTE TODAY.BUT AT THE UNDER OF THE DAY, YES, THERE IS GOING TO BE A NEW RESIDENT, IF YOU WILL, IN THE COMMUNITY.AND THEN IS ABOUT HAVING RESIDENT FILL FIFTH IN, AS I SAID EARLIER, AS BEST AS THEY POSSIBLY CAN.AND I THINK THAT THE COMMUNITY WAS VERY CLEAR DURING THE THREE DAYS, THAT THEY WANT TO BE-- TO HAVE DISCUSSION, THEY

WANT TO HAVE CONSULTATION ABOUT THIS NEW MEMBER OF THEIR COMMUNITY.AND THIS ALLOWS-- AND AS I SAID, ENTRENCHES AND SOLIDIFIES THE ABILITY FOR THEM TO DO THAT.BUT, AGAIN, IT DOES NOT FORM PART OF THE RATIONALE FOR WHETHER WE ACCEPT OR WE DON'T ACCEPT THE PLANNING PROPOSAL IN FRONT OF US.>> COUNCILLOR LEIPER, ANYTHING ELSE?>> NO, I WILL LEAVE IT THERE, CHAIR.>> THANK YOU.COUNCILLOR DEANS PLEASE.>> THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR.>> WELL, I ACTUALLY THINK THIS IS AN IMPORTANT MOTION.AND LIKE THIS MOTION.AND THE REASON I LIKE THIS MOTION IS PROBABLY THE SAME REASON COUNCILLOR LEIPER KIND OF DOESN'T.BECAUSE IT TALKS ABOUT PROGRAMMING.AND THE FRUSTRATION-- ONE OF THE FRUSTRATIONS THAT I'VE HAD THROUGH THIS WHOLE PROCESS IS THAT WE'VE NOT BEEN ABLE TO TALK ABOUT PROGRAMMING.AND THAT'S A REALLY IMPORTANT PART OF ALL OF THIS.AND SO-- I THINK THAT IS WHERE SOME OF THE FRUSTRATION HAS STEMMED FROM, AND SO-- YOU KNOW, I-- I CAN SEE THE HANDWRITING ON THE WALL.I THINK WE CAN ALL SEE THE HANDWRITING ON THE WALL, THAT THIS WILL BE APPROVED TODAY.IT WILL GO TO THE OMB.WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY WILL DO.BUT THE DAY MAY WELCOME THAT WE ARE GOING TO THE NEXT PHASE OF THIS.AND IN THAT PHASE, WE DO NEED TO TALK ABOUT PROGRAMMING.THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT ARE LAYING OUT STRATEGIES THAT MAY WELL CHANGE THE DIRECTION THAT WE GO INTO THE FUTURE.AND, SO, I DO THINK THAT IT IS VERY IMPORTANT THAT THERE BE PROGRAMMING CONSIDERATIONS, AS THIS THING MOVES FORWARD.AND I THINK THIS THING IS GOING TO TAKE QUITE A LONG TIME.BUT I THINK THE COMMUNITY NEEDS TO BE THERE.I WOULD LIKE TO BE THERE AS THE CHAIR OF THE COMMUNITY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE, TO GIVE SOME GUIDANCE ON WHERE I THINK MAYBE IT WOULD BE BEST TO GO.I DOES NOT THINK-- REGARDLESS.DECISION THAT IS MADE TODAY THIS IS OVER.I THINK IT IS A PROCESS, A JOURNEY AND I THINK THE COMMUNITY NEEDS TO BE PART OF THAT, A SON DO THE CHAIRS OF THE COMMITTEES, AND THE COUNCILLORS, AND THE-- EVERYONE NEEDS TO BE PART OF MAKING THIS THING WORK.WE CAN'T LEAVE ANY COMMUNITY BEHIND.AND SO TO THE EXTENT THAT THE SPIRIT OF THIS MOTION IS TO TRY AND HELP, GOING FORWARD AND BUILD SOME OF THE BRIDGES AND SOME OF THE DIVIDE THAT HAPPENED THROUGH THIS INITIAL PHASE OF THE PROCESS-- I THINK THIS IS AN IMPORTANT MOTION AND I WOULD SUGGEST TO ALL OF MY COLLEAGUES THAT THEY SUPPORT IT.>> THANK YOU,

COUNCILLOR.>> [Voice of Translator]: COUNCILLOR FLEURY PLEASE.>> THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR.I WOULD LIKE FOR BOTH COMMITTEES TO BE JOINED TO DISCUSS SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES.THE WHOLE BREADTH OF WHAT IS PROPOSED--[Continuing in English].WHAT THE MOVER OF THE MOTION BROUGHT FORWARD WHICH IS SAYING THAT, YOU KNOW, THERE NEEDS TO BE A DISCUSSION.WAS NOT TO BE CLEAR AND IT IS IMPORTANT TO BE SAID THAT MY COMMUNITY, SINCE DAY ONE, AND RIGHT UP TO NOW AND CONTINUES TO BE ALWAYS READY TO MEET.IT IS THE APPLICANT THAT HAS NOT-- THAT HAS NOT WANTED TO AMEND ANY OF THEIR SUBMISSION.>> DOES ANYONE ELSE WISH TO SPEAK TO THE EGLI-CLOUTIER MOTION?COUNCILLOR HARDER?>> YEAH, THANK YOU, Mr. MAYOR.I WANT TO ECHO WHAT COUNCILLOR DEANS WAS SAYING.THIS IS, I THINK, EXTREMELY IMPORTANT.AND WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT TOMORROW.NOT TALKING ABOUT NEXT WEEK.WE ARE TALKING ABOUT ONCE THE VERY LIKELY APPEAL IT IS DEALT WITH AT THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD.WHAT THIS DOES IS QUITE UNIQUE.WHEN A SITE PLAN IS BEFORE APPLICATION COMES IN TO STAFF, THEY ARE NOT ENGAGED WITH WORKING WITH PROGRAMMING.SO, THROUGH THE-- THROUGH THE DAYS OF THE MEETING, SEVERAL TIMES, I REFER TO COUNCILLOR DEANS, CHAIR DEANS WHO WAS SITTING WHERE SHE IS NOW AND I SAID, IN FEBRUARY, CHAIR DEANS IS GOING TO HAVE THIS IN A VERY HOLISTIC FASHION BEFORE HER COMMITTEE AND OUT OF THAT WILL COME THESE COUNCIL TERMS OF PRIORITIES FOR THE NEXT TERM OF COUNCIL WHICH THEN TAKES US ANOTHER FOUR YEARS AND WHAT WE DO THEN.AS SHE SAID, THERE ARE LIKELY GOING TO BE MANY CHANGES THAT ARE GOING TO COME AT PLAY.HOPEFULLY POSITIVE ONES, WITH REGARD TO HOMELESSNESS AND HOUSING, ET CETERA.WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY LOOK LIKE NOW.BUT THIS WILL BE THE FIRST TIME THAT A MOTION HAS BEEN PUT FORWARD THAT INCLUDES, WITH THE SITE PLAN CONSIDERATION, THE COMMUNITY, THE APPLICANT, THE LOCAL COUNCILLOR, THE CHAIR OF COMMUNITY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES, ET CETERA-- WORKING ON PROGRAMMING FOR A SPECIFIC SITE AND IT IS UNIQUE AND IT IS SPECIAL AND IT IS FOR THIS PARTICULAR LOCATION.SO I REALLY ENCOURAGE EVERYONE TO PLEASE SUPPORT IT.>> OKAY.DOES ANYONE ELSE WISH TO SPEAK TO THE MATTER?SO ON THE MOTION AS PRESENTED?CARRIED.>> THE NEXT MOTION IS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DEAN.SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR FLEURY WITH RESPECT TO BUILDING BETTER REVITALIZED NEIGHBOURHOODS, PLEASE.>> I WILL READ THE MOTION ALTHOUGH IT IS

LENGTHY.WHEREAS DURING THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MANY RESIDENTS OF VANIER WERE CONCERNED TO SEE POSITIVE GROWTH ALONG MONTREAL ROAD STALLED OR REVERSED WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SALVATION ARMY HUB AND WHEREAS THE CITY IS CONTINUING TO...ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT FOR MONTREAL ROAD DEVELOPMENT...TERM OF COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC PRIORITY THAT USES INNOVATIVE, COLLABORATIVE AND DEFINED APPROACH...TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH, VIBRANCY AND LIVEABILITY OF PRIORITY NEIGHBOURHOODS IN OTTAWA, AND WHEREAS THEY HAVE SUCCESSFULLY WORKED IN-- (Unclear) AND SPONSOR GROUP MADE UP OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR (Unclear) FOR TARGETED NEIGHBOURHOODS INCLUDING GRASSROOTS, RESIDENT DRIVEN COLLABORATION AND THIS EXPERTISE CAN PROVIDE VALUE TO THE MONTREAL ROAD PROJECTS OUTSIDE OF THE OUTCOME OF THIS PLANNING APPLICATION, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT COUNCIL DIRECT STAFF WORKING ON PROGRAM, INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS, PROJECTS, INCLUDING THE UPCOMING MONTREAL ROAD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AND THE UPCOMING COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN, TO WORK WITH THE BUILDING BETTER REVITALIZED NEIGHBOUR 'D SPONSORS GROUP ON HOW TO INCORPORATE THE BBRN TOOLS FOR THOSE PROJECTS AND THAT THE BUILDING BETTER REVITALLED NEIGHBOURHOODS GROUP IDENTIFY THE 2018 INITIATIVE TO BE VANIER NORTH ...AND LET ME JUST SAY THAT I PROMOTED REVITALIZATION, STRATEGIC AT THIS COUNCIL TABLE.WE STARTED A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO ACTUALLY AT THE COUNCIL MEETING NEXT WE WILL BRING THE REPORTS FROM VANIER SOUTH INITIAL REPORTS HEATHERRINGTON TO THAT PLANNING COMMITTEE AND HAVING PARTICIPATED CLOSELY IN THE BBRN INITIATIVE HAS BROUGHT SUCCESS AND BROKEN DOWN A LOT OF SILOS AT THIS CITY AND THERE ARE AT LOT OF-- AND I THINK THEY HAVE DEVELOPED CROSS-DEPARTMENTALLY A LOT OF EXPERTISE IN THIS FIELD AND I THINK THIS EXPERTISE COULD BE VERY VALUABLE IN VANIER NORTH.AND WE DO HAVE SOME FUNDS LEFT IN THE BBRN INITIATIVE I THINK WE COULD WELL SPEND IN VANIER NORTH TO ASSIST THROUGH ALL OF THIS PROCESS SO WITH THAT IN MIND I'M JUST ASKING MY COLLEAGUES TO SUPPORT THAT VANIER NORTH BE IDENTIFIED FOR BBRN IN 2018 AND THIS IS NOT IN ANY WAY COUNCILLOR FLEURY IS THE SECONDER ON THIS MOTION AND IT IS NOT IN ANY WAY TO TAKE AWAY WITH RESPECT THIS...PROCESS BUT IT IS TO BE A SISTER COMPONENT TO IT.>> THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR.GOOD MOTION.COUNCILLOR BROCKINGTON PLEASE.>> THANK

YOU, YOUR WORSHIP. A QUESTION TO STAFF. WHEN COUNCILLOR DEANS FIRST CAME TO COUNCIL, SHE WANTED TO FOCUS EXCLUSIVELY ON ALBION-HEATHERINGTON. WE ASKED STAFF TO GO BACK TO LOOK AT THE ENTIRE CITY. YOU IDENTIFIED 20 NEIGHBOURHOODS. YOU RANKED THEM WHICH WERE ALBIE I DON'T KNOW, CAROLYNINGTON... I'M WANTING TO UNDERSTAND IF WE GOING TO PRIORITIZE VANIER AS THE NEXT COMMUNITY, WHAT HAPPENINGS TO CARLINGTON? DO THEY GET COMPLETELY LEFT OUT OR WILL THEY BE IN CUE FOR THE NEXT YEAR? [Inaudible]. >> POINT OF ORDER BY COUNCILLOR HARDER? >> (Unclear) ALREADY COMPLETED AS YOU SHOULD NOTE THROUGH THE COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN. THAT WAS THE PLAN WE TOOK. IT WAS ONE OF THE THREE. COMMUNITY DESIGN PLAN WAS ON GOING FOR CARLINGTON AND COUNCILLOR BROCKINGTON FOR THAT PROCESS. CARLINGTON IS NO LONGER ON THE LIST. >> OKAY, COUNCILLOR BROCKINGTON, THE FLOOR IS YOURS. >> I AM STILL AWARE OF THE CDC PLAN STILL ON GOING, THEY HAVE ARELY INVOLVED, WITH AND I WANT TO UNDERSTAND THAT ONCE VANIER IS SELECTED, CARLINGTON IS NOT-- IT WILL GO ON TO OTHER COMMUNITIES. I AM CERTAINLY INTERESTED IN CARLINGTON BUT WE IDENTIFY VANIER SOUTH AND WE RE-LOOK AT THE LIST AFTER THAT. >> COUNCILLOR? >> AT THIS POINT, THE HEATHERRINGTON AND CARLINGTON AND VANIER DID I ACTUALLY COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM WILL TELL YOU MORPHED INTO OVERBROOK THROUGH THAT PROCESS-- WAS A PILOT PROJECT. THAT IS COMING FORWARD TO PLANNING PROCESS ON TUESDAY. BUT AS COUNCILLOR DEANS SAID, THE WORK THAT WAS DONE WAS EXCEPTIONAL AND THE WAY IT CAPTURED THE HEART AND SOUL. COMMUNITIES INVOLVED WAS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT. WE DON'T HAVE A COMMUNITY ON THE LIST. THERE IS NO COMMUNITY ON THE LIST. WAS VANIER ITSELF PART OF THE ORIGINAL LIST? I THINK COUNCILLOR-- I THINK OTHER SPONSORS ON THE GROUP-- ABSOLUTELY IT WAS. BUT WE CARVED OFF THE VANIER SOUTH PIECE. SO THIS IS A FIT. IT IS NOT BUMPING ANYTHING BECAUSE THERE IS NOTHING ON THE LIST. BUT BECAUSE THERE IS MONEY THAT IS GOING TO BE SPEND ON THE CIP FOR MONTREAL ROAD IN 2018, UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF Mr. SMITH'S SHOP-- AND I ABSOLUTELY HAVE SPOKEN TO HIM HYMN ABOUT THIS-- AND UNDERSTANDING THROUGH GENERAL MANAGER JANIS PURAL AND DAN CHENIER-- MENTIONED -- (Unclear) ALL OF THE DEPARTMENTS, LIBRARY, PUBLIC LIBRARY THAT WORKED ON THIS, IT TRULY WAS A VERY GOOD ALL-CITY WORK-- THAT WAS ACCOMPLISHED BY OUR OWN STAFF. WE DIDN'T-- WE FOUND WE DIDN'T NEED

THE CONSULTANT THAT WE THOUGHT WE WOULD HAVE TO SPEND MONEY ON AND WE ALL BENEFITED ON IT-- MOSTLY, FOR SURE, THE PEOPLE IN HEATHERRINGTON AND VANIER SOUTH AND I THINK ALL THE COUNCIL SPONSORS WOULD BE ABLE TO SAY THAT WITHOUT A FACT.SO THIS IS NOT ABOUT BUMPING ANYTHING.THIS IS ABOUT TAKING THE PASSION OF THIS COMMUNITY THAT WE LISTENED TO, SIR, FOR THREE DAYS AND-- AND-- RATHER THAN WAITING FOR OMB APPEAL AND RATHER THAN BUMPING IT OUT FOR TWO YEARS, THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE ARE ABLE TO DO NEXT YEAR UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF THIS SPONSORS GROUP.>> OKAY.BACK TO COUNCILLOR BROCKINGTON, PLEASE.>> GOOD.>> YOU ARE SATISFIED?>> YEAH.THANK YOU.>> COUNCILLOR-- (Unclear).>> SO, WILLIS, WE RECEIVED A REQUEST FROM THE B.I.A., WELL PRIOR-- THIS APPLICATION-- WELL PRIOR TO THIS APPLICATION FROM THE SALVATION ARMY TO CONSIDER MONTREAL ROAD AS A C.I.P. WE DID HEAR IT IN THE MAYOR'S-- IN THE MAYOR'S BUDGET PRESENTATION.I WANT-- I WANT-- I WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU ON HOW THIS MOTION PLAYS IN AND IF IT-- IF IT AT ALL HINDERS SOME OF THOSE EFFORTS.>> Mr. MAYOR, I DON'T THINK THIS HINDERS IN THE LEAST.AS A MATTER OF FACT, I CONSIDER IT DOVETAILING ANOTHER METHODOLOGY FOR APPROACHING THE COMMUNITY-LEVEL PLANNING AND COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PLANNING AND BRINGING THEM TOGETHER.I ACTUALLY THINK IT IS BENEFICIAL TO ADVANCE THEM BOTH AT THE SAME TIME AND I THINK THAT WILL BE OF BENEFIT BOTH IN TERMS OF THE CONSULTATION AND TYPE OF INPUT WE GET AND IN TERMS OF IDENTIFYING STRATEGIC MEASURES.SO WE SUPPORT THE APPROACH.>> THANK YOU.>> OKAY.COUNCILLOR TAYLOR PLEASE ON THE MOTION.>> THANK YOU, MAYOR.AND I'M PLEASED TO SUPPORT THIS MOTION.AND THINK ONE OF THE THINGS-- ALTHOUGH I DON'T SIT ON PLANNING COMMITTEE, I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO SIT FOR THE THREE DAYS-- FOR THE VAST MAJORITY OF THE THREE DAYS AND LISTEN TO THE DELEGATIONS THAT CALM OUT.RESIDENTS FROM VANIER.OR BUS OWNERS FROM VANIER.AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT STRUCK ME WAS THAT A LOT OF WHAT WE HEARD FROM RESIDENTS WAS THEIR CONCERNS ABOUT CONDITIONS TODAY.AND, YOU KNOW, THEY ARTICULATED THAT VERY ABLY AND, TO YOU KNOW, SOME FEARS AND CONCERNS, ABOUT WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE FUTURE.BUT THE CONDITIONS TODAY WEREN'T LOST, I DON'T THINK, ON PEOPLE AROUND THIS TABLE.AND, SO YOU KNOW, WITH THE UPCOMING RECONSTRUCTION OF MONTREAL ROAD, WE BELIEVE THAT-- OR AT LEAST I BELIEVE THAT WE WILL BE ABLE TO START ADDRESSING SOME OF

THE VISUAL AND PHYSICAL CONCERNS THAT PEOPLE RAISED. THE C.I.P. WHICH IS-- IS A WONDERFUL TOOL-- WILL HELP LIFT UP BUSINESSES IN THOSE COMMUNITIES OR BUSINESSES ALONG MONTREAL ROAD WITH WHICH WILL HELP HAVE SPIN-OFF EFFECTS FOR THE COMMUNITY AROUND THERE. BUT THE BBRN-- IT WAS A PROCESS AND CREDIT TO COUNCILLOR DEANS FOR BEING THE REAL ORIGINATOR OF THE BBRN PROCESS AND COUNCILLOR HARDER FOR LEADING IT-- THIS IS ABOUT THE PEOPLE. AND THE BBRN, I THINK, POSITIONS THE COMMUNITY REALLY WELL AND BRINGS THE STAKEHOLDERS TOGETHER TO HAVE IS A THAT DISCUSSION, DIALOGUE, ENGAGEMENT, ABOUT LIFTING UP THE AREA FROM A PEOPLE PERSPECTIVE. SO WE DID HEAR STATISTICS ABOUT HOW THERE ARE CHALLENGES IN VANIER WITH-- YOU KNOW, THINGS THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO BE UP OR DO. THINGS THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO BE DOWN ARE UP. THE BBRN I THINK TAKES THE PEOPLE APPROACH OF TACKLING SOME OF THOSE CHALLENGES, THE SAME WAY THE C.I.P. WILL TAKE THE BAGS APPROACH AND THE STREET DEVELOPMENT OF MONTREAL ROAD WILL TAKE THE PHYSICAL APPROACH. AND WE HEARD THE RESIDENTS WHO CAME OWNED A SAD, WE HAVE A PROBLEM TODAY. AND WE NEED YOUR HELP TODAY. AND SO I THINK THIS REALLY ARTICULATES THAT WE HEARD THAT CONCERN AND I WOULD ENCOURAGE FOLKS TO SUPPORT IT. THANK YOU. >> GREAT. THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR TAYLOR. >> [Voice of Translator]: ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS? ON THE MOTION--[Continuing in English]. MOVED BY COUNCILLOR DEAN, SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR FLEURY. CARRIED. I HAVE NO OTHER MOTIONS BEFORE DOES ANYONE ELSE WANT TO MOVE A MOTION BEFORE WE DID TO QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS. COUNCIL FLEURY-->> JUST A QUESTION. >> ANYONE ELSE? >> COUNCILLOR FLEURY, QUESTIONS, PLEASE. >> YES, MAYOR. SO MY FIRST YES IS TO JANIS BURRELL. SO, JANIS, I WANT TO CLARIFY, DID WE, PRIOR TO THE SUBMISSION OF THE SALVATION ARMY ASK OUR REAL ESTATE STAFF TO PROVIDE THE SITES THAT ARE VACANT OR AVAILABLE AT THE CITY OF OTTAWA? >> WE DID NOT ASK FOR REAL ESTATE TO LOOK AT OTHER SITES. >> THANK YOU. >> YOU CAN CONFIRM THAT WE HAVE AN AGREEMENT FOR SHELTER SERVICES AT THE OTTAWA INN AND THE CONCORDE HOTEL? >> YES, MAYOR, WE DO HAVE AGREEMENTS WITH THOSE TWO MOTELS FOR-- FOR ROOMS FOR SHORT-TERM ACCOMMODATIONS OR OVERFLOW FOR SHELTERIERS, FAMILY SHELTERS. >> ARE YOU AWARE OF THOSE SHELTERS THAT WOULD FIT UNDER VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACROSS THE CITY. >> I'M NOT AWARE OF (Unclear) ACROSS

THE CITY, ADDRESSES.>> WE NEVER ASKED THE PROVINCE FOR THAT LIST?JUST FOR KNOWLEDGE?>> PERSONALLY, I HAVE NOT.THEY ARE NOT FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION.THOSE SITES ARE CONFIDENTIAL.>> BUT (Unclear) ZONED APPROPRIATELY, SO PERHAPS A DIRECTION TO STAFF THAT WE DO INQUIRE WITH OUR PROVINCIAL AND FEDERAL PARTNERS ON ANY CORRECTIONS OR ANY SHELTERS THAT THEY WOULD FUND SO THAT WE HAVE A RECORD OF THEM.>> Mr. MAYOR, I GUESS I WOULD LOOK TO MY COLLEAGUES IN PLANNING IN TERMS OF THE DEFINITION.>> I THINK WE-- I THINK ON THOSE ITEMS-- THEY ARE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL OBVIOUSLY FOR SAFETY REASONS SO I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE THAT WE OBTAIN THAT LIST.I THINK IT HAS TO REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL FOR THE SAFETY OF THE WOMEN.THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING.Mr. O'CONNOR, COULD YOU OFFER A COMMENT?>> THAT WOULD BE MY UNDERSTANDING AS WELL.>> Mr. MAYOR, DID I KEEP THE LIST, CONFIDENTIAL, AS YOU KNOW AS PART OF THE DELIBERATION AND DISCUSSION.I HAVE NOT RELEASED ANY OF THOSE ADDRESSES AND I DO BELIEVE THAT, BECAUSE OF THE SETTLER CAP AND SEPARATION DISTANCES, THAT WERE APPROVED AS PART OF THE 2008 REPORT THAT WE NEED TO HAVE AN OPEN EYE TO THAT MATTER.IT DOESN'T CHANGE THEIR GREAT WORK AND EFFORTS, BUT I DO THINK THAT IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE FOR Mr. WILLIS AND HIS TEAM TO HAVE ACCESS TO THAT LIST.NOT FOR PUBLIC USE BUT TO PROTECT THE WOMEN IN THIS CASE MUCH.>> I GUESS I'M JUST NOT COLLAR.GETTING THE ADDRESSES-- WHAT WOULD BE THE PURPOSES OF HAVING THE ADDRESSES.>> BECAUSE THEN WE WOULD HAVE A BETTER, CLEARER, MORE OPEN DISCUSSION ON-- STAFF ARE SAYING THEY RESPECT THE SHELTER CAP.THEY BELIEVE THAT IT IS RELOCATION.BUT, MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THERE ARE 12 SENATORS-- IF WE LOOK AT THOSE DESCRIPTIONS.SO TO CLOSE THAT PORTION OF THE UNCLOSED DEBATE, I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT FOR PLANNING STAFF TO HAVE THAT INFORMATION.>> Mr. MAYOR, WE HAVE REVIEWED THE 12 LOCATIONS THAT COUNCILLOR FLEURY IS REFERRING TO AND THOSE LOCATIONS, ACCORDING TO THE DEFINITION IN THE BYLAW, ARE EITHER COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTRES, GROUP HOMES, HEALTH-AND-RESOURCE CENTRES, RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES.THEY ARE NOT SHELTERS.WE FOUR SHELTERS IN WARD 12.(please stand by) >> I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT IS APPROPRIATE AND I'M RULING IT OUT OF ORDER.NEXT QUESTION, PLEASE.>> MR. WILLIS CAN YOU REMIND COUNCIL WHERE SHELTERS ARE CURRENTLY PERMITTED AND IN WHICH ZONES IN THE CITY THEY ARE PERMITTED. >>

MR. MAYOR WE HAVE IDENTIFIED TO THE STAFF REPORT -- MS. O CONNELL WILL ADD TO THIS.WE DO NOT PERMIT SHELTERS ON -- >> I'M ASKING A QUESTION TO MR. WILLIS, HIM AND I HAVE HAD THIS CONVERSATION BEFORE.I'M ASKING FOR PUBLIC RECORD.WHERE SHELTERS ARE CURRENTLY PERMITTED.>> Mayor Jim Watson: MR. WILLIS IS ENTITLED TO REFER TO A MEMBER OF STAFF. >> MR. MAYOR, MS. O CONNELL WILL PROVIDE YOU THE LOCATIONS WHERE WE STATE IS PERMITTED.I WANT TO MAKE MEMBERS AWARE THAT ALTHOUGH IT'S NOT IDENTIFIED IN THE OFFICIAL PLANS SPECIFICALLY THAT DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE WOULD NOT PERMIT IT.>> Mayor Jim Watson: COUNCILLOR FLEURY. >> I THINK SHE -- >> MR. MAYOR, OFFICIAL PLANS, SHELTERS ARE INCLUDED IN THE PERMITTED USE SECTION.THAT STATES WHERE THE DEVELOPING BYLAW PERMITS -- DEVELOPING COMMUNITY, CENTRAL AREA AND MIXED AND VICTIM -- >> MY LAST QUESTION IS SO ON AVERAGE AT THE CURRENT LOCATION ON GEORGE STREET, WE HAVE THREE CALLS PER YEAR PER CLIENT.I DID THE MATH FROM LAST TIME.IF WE WERE TO USE THE SAME RATIO, IT'S AN INCREASE IN CALLS OF OVER A THOUSAND PER YEAR TO THE NEW LOCATION.I WANT TO HEAR FROM PLANNING, DID WE WORK WITH OTTAWA POLICE SERVICE TO DO THAT, TO HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE LAND USE IMPACT ON 179 GEORGE?WERE WE AWARE OF THE STATISTICS AND HOW DID THAT PLAY ON TO THE COMMENT ON PAGE 17 WHICH STATES THAT THERE WOULD BE NO -- THAT THIS PROPOSAL WOULD CAUSE NO UNDUE ADVERSE IMPACTS? >> MR. MAYOR, THE ANSWER HAS A FEW DIFFERENT PARTS.THE APPLICATION BEFORE US IS A SITE SPECIFIC APPLICATION.CALLS RELATED TO OTTAWA POLICE AS A RESULT OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOUR ARE NOT PART OF WHAT WE REVIEW THROUGH THE SUBJECT APPLICATION.THAT BEING SAID, THROUGH THE CIRCULATION PROCESS, OTTAWA POLICE ARE CIRCULATED AS PART OF THE APPLICATION PROCESS.THEY DID NOT COME BACK WITH CONCERNS RELATED TO THE SUBJECT SITE LOCATION BEFORE US.AND I WOULD ADVISE COUNCILLORS AND COMMITTEE THAT ONE OF THE PERMITTED USE ON THIS SUBJECT SITE IS AN EMERGENCY SERVICE LOCATION.SO THERE IS A POSSIBILITY FOR EVEN SUCH A USE AS IN A PARAMEDIC STATION OR A FIRE AMBULANCE STATION ON THE SUBJECT SITE WITHOUT ZONING AMENDMENTS.>> Mayor Jim Watson: QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS?COUNCILLOR QAQISH.IT'S FIVE MINUTE.I GIVE LEEWAY TO COUNCILLOR FLEURY WHO WILL WRAP UP WITH COMMENTS.QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS. >> IT'S A QUESTION TO STAFF.WITH REGARDS TO THE OFFICIAL

PLAN CURRENTLY WE SEE THE SHELTER USE IS NOT PERMITTED ON THE MAIN STREET AND THAT'S WHERE THE APPLICATION IS BEFORE US.IT IS IN GENERAL URBAN.IT WOULD BE FOR EXAMPLE BEHIND IN THE STREETS BEHIND IN THE MIDDLE OF A RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD, IS THAT CORRECT? >> IN THE OFFICIAL PLAN, THAT'S CORRECT.>> I THINK COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM MADE THIS POINT ABOUT US HAVING THE OP WRONG.WHEN WE REVIEW THE OP, IT MAKES SENSE WE WOULD HAVE IT ON A MAIN STREET RATHER THAN IN THE MIDDLE OF THE COMMUNITY AS IN THE OP.IS THAT SOMETHING WE WOULD LOOK TO CHANGE IN THE NEXT OFFICIAL PLAN?>> MR. MAYOR WE WILL BE STARTING A PROCESS FOR THE OFFICIAL PLAN REVIEW IN 2019 AND THERE'S A NUMBER OF THINGS WE WILL BE LOOKING AT.AND IT RANGES FROM SOUP TO NUTS.WE ARE CROSSING THE WHOLE GAMBIT.WE ARE TAKING A LOOK AT HOW SPECIFIC WE GET IN POLICY DIRECTION AND FOCUSSED ON HIGH LEVEL AND WHETHER WE CONTINUE THE SAME APPROACH IN TERMS OF BROAD LAND USE OR WHETHER WE TAKE A DIFFERENT PATH.I THINK THIS ITEM HAS IDENTIFIED THAT THERE'S A NEED TO INTRODUCE POLICIES THAT SPEAKS TO ISSUES AROUND OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND THOSE THINGS WILL BE ADDRESSED. >> WHAT WAS THE LOGIC OR THE RATIONALE AT THE TIME OF NOT PERMITTING IT ON A TRADITIONAL BUT BEING OKAY IN THE MIDDLE OF A RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY AS A DESIGNATION?>> MR. MAYOR, SO WHEN OP 8967 WHICH WAS THE PREVIOUS PLAN WAS BROUGHT FORWARD, IT INCLUDED MAIN STREET AS AN AREA WHERE SHELTERS COULD BE CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE.THROUGH THE PROCESS OF THE 2008 STUDY THAT COUNCILLOR FLEURY -- AND THERE WAS A FURTHER REVIEW IN TERMS WHETHER OR NOT SHELTERS SHOULD BE ALLOWED ON TRADITIONAL MAIN STREETS.THE DECISION WAS TAKEN NOT TO CARRY THAT FORWARD.IN PART, IT REFLECTS THE FACT THAT MAIN STREET IS SIGNIFICANTLY ACROSS THE CITY IN THIS PARTICULAR INCIDENT WE HAVE A SITUATION WE ARE ON A SITE SPECIFIC BASIS.IT WORKS.IT CAN BE INTEGRATED INTO THE MAIN STREET WITHOUT COMPROMISING THE OBJECTIVE FOR MAIN STREET.AND I THINK EVEN THE DISCUSSION THAT WE HEARD AT PLANNING COMMITTEE BE THE SITUATION ON THE GEORGE STREET LOCATION WHERE THE SHELTER IS RIGHT ON THE SIDEWALK AND THE COMMON AREA FOR THE SHELTER IS WITHIN THE PUBLIC REALM.TRADITIONAL MAIN STREETS FOR THE MOST PART ARE SHALLOW IN TERMS OF THEIR LOT DEPTH AND NOT BE ABLE TO SUPPORT THE FUNCTIONS AND NEEDS TO ENSURE APPROPRIATE FUNCTIONING OF THAT

OPERATION.SO I THINK THE RIGHT ANSWER WAS TAKEN AT THAT TIME.SHELTERS ARE RECOGNIZED AT BEING PROBATIVE AND HIGH END MIX USE AREAS.THEY ARE DOWNTOWN AND THE FIVE ZONES IN THE RESIDENTIAL WHERE -- IS GENERALLY THE HIGHER INTENSITY, HIGHER ORDER ZONES.WHERE THERE'S A VARIETY OF SERVICES THAT SUPPORT FOR THE NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE THAT ARE USING THE FACILITIES.>> BUT THEN HOW WOULD WE JUSTIFY PUTTING THIS IN A GENERAL URBAN ZONE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY WITH THE CURRENT OP. >> THE GENERAL AREA COVERS A BROAD SWATH OF THE CITY AND INCLUDES AREAS THAT HAVE VARIOUS ZONES ATTACHED TO THEM.IN TERMS OFFER -- YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT THE OFFICIAL PLAN.IT SPEAKS TO FURTHER LIMITATIONS ESTABLISHED.IN THE CASE OF OUR ZONING BYLAW, SHELTERS ARE NOT PERMITTED IN THE LOWER DENSITY -- >> IF YOU LOOK AT THE NEIGHBOURHOOD AND THE STREETS BEHIND WHERE THE CURRENT SITE IS THAT'S GENERAL URBAN.IT WOULD BE PERMITTED THERE. >> CORRECT. >> THAT'S WHAT I WAS ADVISED. >> NOT PERMITTED BY THE ZONE.YOU HAVE TO GO THROUGH A REZONING.YOU JUST DON'T NEED AN OFFICIAL PLAN ARE AMENDMENT.IN THIS CASE WE ARE DEALING WITH THIS BECAUSE IT'S NOT A DECISION UNDER THE USE OF OP WHERE SHELTERS ARE ALLOWED AS IT IS IN GENERAL URBAN BUT YOU NEED A REZONING.>> JUST TO GO BACK TO THE FIRST QUESTION, IN THE FUTURE YOU WOULD BE LOOKING TO CLIMATE CHANGE THIS, THE DESIGNATION FOR THE MAIN STREETS WHEN IT COMES TO SHELTERS?>> WE WOULD LOOK AT A WHOLE BUNCH OF THING US AND THAT WOULD BE ONE. >> BUT STAFF DIDN'T RECOMMEND THAT IN THE LAST PLAN. >> IT WAS IDENTIFIED AS A PERMITTED USE -- AFTER A DIRECTION FROM COUNSEL TO LOOK AT THE PROHIBITIONS ON MAIN STREET. >> WHAT YEAR WAS THAT?>> THAT WOULD HAVE OCCURRED IN 2010, I BELIEVE.>> OKAY.THANK YOU.>> Mayor Jim Watson: QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS.COUNCILLOR CHERNUSHENKO, PLEASE. >> EVEN IF IN THE END WE DON'T ALL CHOOSE TO VOTE IN THE SAME WAY, I HAVE HELD OFF UNTIL TODAY MAKING A FINAL DECISION HOW I'M GOING TO VOTE.I INDICATED FOR A NUMBER OF WEEKS I'M LEANING AGAINST THIS PROJECT AND LEANING TOWARDS VOTING NO.AND NOT JUST BECAUSE I WANT TO SIT ON THE FENCE AND SEE WHICH WAY THE WIND IS BLOWING BECAUSE IT'S THAT COMPLICATED.WE HAVE DUELLING EXPERTS ON BOTH SIDES TELLING US HOW A WELL BUILT DESIGN BUILT FACILITY WILL OFFER SERVICES OF ALL KINDS THAT DON'T CURRENTLY EXIST AND HELP THE PEOPLE IN NEED AND

WE HEARD FROM THE OTHER SIDE WE ARE MOVING AWAY FROM A MODEL OF LARGE SHELTERS AND CENTRALIZED FACILITIES TOWARDS HOUSING PEOPLE, TOWARDS OFFERING THEM SUPPORT WHEREVER THEY LIVE.THEY ARE COMING IN JUST TODAY ON BOTH SIDES ALL OF WHICH WELL ARGUED, PRINCIPLED COMMENTS AND YET THEY ARE ON BOTH SIDES.I LISTENED TO FEEDBACK FROM MY CONSTITUENTS WHO ARE NOT DIRECTLY AFFECTED BY TRY TO UNDERSTAND THE SITUATION BOTH OF THE PEOPLE WHO WOULD BENEFIT FROM THIS FACILITY AND THE COMMUNITY IN WHICH IT WOULD BE HOUSED AND DOES NOT FEEL ADEQUATELY CONSULT AND HEARD UP TO THIS POINT IN THE ULTIMATE PROPOSAL THAT CAME FORWARD.ULTIMATELY I REACHED A CONCLUSION I NEED TO VOTE AGAINST THE PLAN AMENDMENT AND THE REZONING AND IT COMES DOWN TO THIS.THE -- WE ARE FORCED HERE TODAY, THE TESTAMENT IS ALL OF THE WELL MEANING MOTION WE JUST PASSED TO FORCE THE HAND OF THE PROPONENT TO DO THE THINGS THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN PART OF THEIR PROPOSAL IN THE FIRST PLACE.WE ARE VOTING ON A TECHNICALITY WHERE WE ARE NOT SUPPOSED TO TALK ABOUT PEOPLE AND SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACT WE NEED TO PASS MOTIONS TO MAKE THEM DO THAT.THAT'S THE KIND OF THING THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN PART OF THE PROPOSAL AND THE CONSULTATION IN THE FIRST PLACE.IF ON A TECHNICALITY I'M NOT VOTING ON WHAT IS IN FRONT OF ME, I WILL DO IT ANYWAY.BECAUSE IF BY DOING THAT I CAN ON ONE MORE OCCASION REMIND A PROPONENT THAT IT IS YOUR JOB TO ENGAGE WITH THE WARD COUNCILLOR, NOT FOR US TO GO CHASING YOU, BECAUSE WE WANT TO KNOW WHAT YOUR PLANNING ON DOING.IT'S YOUR JOB TO COMING US AND TELL US WHAT YOU PLAN TO DO AND WE CAN SAVE EVERYONE A LOT OF GRIEF BY GUIDING YOU THROUGH A BETTER PROCESS.WE MAY NOT IN THE END SUPPORT WHAT YOU'RE DOING BUT PEOPLE WILL BE HEARD THROUGHOUT THAT.AND THE MEETINGS WILL NOT REQUIRE US OR THE PEOPLE IN THE GALLERY TO SIT THROUGH 180 WHATEVER THE COUNT WAS, PRESENTATIONS BECAUSE THAT WILL HAVE HAPPENED IN SOME FORM OR OTHER.IN THE END, THAT'S WHAT IT COMES DOWN TO ME.THERE ARE ADVANTAGES THAT WILL ACCRUE TO THE PEOPLE WHO WILL BE SERVED.THERE ARE LIKELY TO BE NEGATIVE IMPACTS TO THE COMMUNITY IN MY OPINION AS A RESULT.IS IT AN EVEN SPLIT?I DON'T KNOW.BUT I DO KNOW THAT THIS CAME ABOUT IN THE WRONG WAY AND WE SHOULDN'T BE IN THE POSITION OF BEING THE BAD GUY, TELLING PEOPLE WHO NEEDED SERVICES, SORRY, WE ARE NOT OFFERING TO, OR TELLING THE COMMUNITY I'M SORRY

I'M RAMMING THIS DOWN YOUR THROAT.FOR THAT REASON I'M GOING TO HAVE TO VOTE NO. >> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR McKENNEY, PLEASE. >> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.I SAT THROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE LAST WEEK ALL THREE DAYS AND LISTENED VERY CAREFULLY.I HAVE TO SAY IT'S, YOU KNOW, IT WILL GO DOWN AS ONE OF THE MORE DIFFICULT DECISIONS I HAVE HAD TO MAKE AS COUNCIL AND IT'S THE SAME FOR MANY OF US AROUND THE TABLE.WE DO HAVE PEOPLE WHO ARE HOMELESS TODAY AND WITHOUT SHELTER AND WITHOUT SHELTER SYSTEMS THAT HAVE NOWHERE TO GO.AND FOR THAT REASON, YOU KNOW, I HAVE ALWAYS SUPPORTED THE SHELTERS, THE SHELTERS IN MY WARD.I THINK OF CORNER STONE WHICH IS A WONDERFUL SPACE FOR WOMEN TO BE EXPERIENCE SHELTER.WE HAVE TWO OF THEM, ONE IN THE EVENING IS A SHORT-TERM AND WE HAVE SOME SUPPORTIVE HOUSING THAT THEY OFFER.AND IT'S IRONIC WE ARE HAVING THIS DEBATE ON NATIONAL HOUSING DAY.WE HAVE GOT -- WE KNOW AS A COUNTRY WE ARE FAILING ON HOUSING, ON HOUSING PEOPLE.BUT AGAIN, YOU KNOW, A SHELTER IS JUST NOT A HOUSE.IF YOU GO HOME THIS EVENING AND YOU DON'T OWN THE SHEETS OR THE PILLOW YOU'RE SLEEPING ON OR THE BED YOU'RE SLEEPING IN AND YOU DON'T HAVE A KEY, IT'S NOT A HOME.AND IT IS EASY TO SAY, YOU KNOW, WELL, WE NEED SHELTERS UNTIL WE BUILD THOSE HOMES, BUT THE FACT IS, YOU KNOW, AND WHERE I STRUGGLED ON THIS ONE THE MOST WAS ON THE EXTRA 100 BEDS AND I KEPT ASKING MYSELF AND I TRIED TO GET FROM STAFF AND I WAS ASKING THE WRONG QUESTIONS.I ASKED WHERE THEY SHELTERS?ARE THEY FUNDED LIKE SHELTERS AND I WAS TOLD NO.THESE ARE NOT SHELTERS.THEY ARE PROGRAM BEDS.AND IN THE END THAT'S WHAT IS IMPORTANT.IT'S THE 100 BEDS.SHORT-TERM SHELTERS, THE VERY PURPOSE OF A SHELTER IS TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION IN EMERGENCY SITUATIONS UNTIL A PERSON IS ABLE TO RETURN TO HOUSING.TOO OFTEN WE HEAR STORIES OF PEOPLE LIVING IN SHELTERS FOR MONTHS OR YEARS.I REMEMBER HEARING A STORY ABOUT A PERSON GRADUATING FROM UNIVERSITY LIVING IN A SHELTER AND I DIDN'T THINK THAT WAS A GOOD NEWS STORY.IT'S HAPPENING.AND IT WILL CONTINUE TO HAPPEN.IF WE ARE BUILDING A 350-BED FACILITY, WHEN YOU WALK INTO THE FIRST 140 BEDS, WHAT ARE YOUR CHANCES OF GETTING OUT BEFORE YOU GET TO THE PROGRAMMING.YOU WERE THERE AND IT'S NOT THE WAY WE SHOULD BE HOUSING PEOPLE.WE HAVE A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WHO, YOU KNOW, WE ANTICIPATE WILL BE COMING OUT WITH THEIR NATIONAL HOUSING

STRATEGY, AND THAT STRATEGY WILL, YOU KNOW, WILL NOT INCLUDE INCREASING OUR SHELTER SYSTEM.IT WILL TALK ABOUT THINGS LIKE, YOU KNOW, RENT SUPPLEMENTS, FIXING UP THE HOUSING WE HAVE AND BUILDING MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMMUNITY.I WANT TO FINISH WITH JUST A QUICK STORY, AND I TOLD IT THE OTHER DAY BUT IT'S SO IMPORTANT.OTTAWA COMMUNITY HOUSING IS PLANNING ON BUILDING NEW AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE WARD I REPRESENT.AND THERE WILL BE AT LEAST THIS MANY, 3, 4, 500 AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS AND WE WILL BE WELCOMING INTO OUR COMMUNITY, INTO OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD, A LARGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN AFFORDABLE HOUSING.PERHAPS MANY OF THEM OUT OF THE MISSION, SALVATION ARMY, FAMILIES WHO WILL BE LIVING HERE.WHEN WE ANNOUNCED THAT, THE COMMUNITY THAT I REPRESENT WAS THRILLED.THEY WERE SO HAPPY BECAUSE IT WILL BE A MIXED INCOME, MIXED USE, DIVERSE, COMPLEX COMMUNITY WHERE EVERYBODY WILL HAVE A FIGHTING CHANCE AT THE END OF THE DAY FOR THEIR KIDS TO PROSPER, FOR THEM TO PROSPER.WHEN THEY GO HOME AT NIGHT, THE HOUSING THAT WE WILL PROVIDE FOR THEM WILL BE THEIRS.THEY WILL HAVE A KEY.THEY WILL BE ABLE TO WALK IN.THEY WILL BE ABLE TO INVITE FRIENDS.AND THEY WILL BE ABLE TO CALL THAT A HOME.AND THAT'S WHAT WE NEED TO BE, YOU KNOW, FIGHTING FOR AND WORKING FOR AND FOR ME THIS IS A BIT OF A -- OF OUR RESPONSIBILITY, THANK YOU.>> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU.IF I COULD THANK MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE FOR THE RESPECT YOU HAVE SHOWN.I APPRECIATE THE CONTINUATION OF THAT.IT'S VERY MUCH APPRECIATED.COUNCILLOR LEIPER HAS THE FLOOR. >> THANK YOU.I DON'T KNOW ANY OF US WILL CHANGE MINDS AT THIS POINT BUT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT WHILE THE CHAIR OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND THE MAYOR HAVE WITHIN THEIR PREROGATIVE TO RULE QUESTIONS OUT OF ORDER AND TO GUIDE THE DEBATES THAT WE HAVE, THEY CANNOT TELL YOU ON WHAT CONSIDERATIONS ANY OF US HERE CHOOSE TO VOTE.NO ONE CAN BE INSTRUCTED.WE CAN BE ONLY BE ADVISED.AND YOU HAVE ADVICE FROM OUR CITY SOLICITOR YOU CAN'T VOTE TO EXCLUDE VULNERABLE POPULATIONS IN THE CITY AND I AGREE WITH THAT ADVICE.BUT THE MANY OF YOU WHO ATTENDED PLANNING COMMITTEE.YOU HEARD EXPERT ADVICE THAT IS ACTUALLY A RESPONSIBILITY AND OUR OBLIGATION TO DO OUR PLANNING ON THE BASIS OF BUILDING HEALTHY COMMUNITIES FOR EVERYONE.THE CASE LAW I HAVE SEEN BEARS THIS OUT AND I PREFER THE LEGAL COUNCIL FOR THE RESIDENTS AT THIS POINT.THEY ARE NOT

PERMITTED ON OUR TRADITIONAL MAIN STREETS.MY ASSERTION IS WE MAKE THAT DISTINCTION ON THE BASIS THAT SHELTERS RAISE COMPLEX ISSUES THAT HAVE TO BE RAISED IN A NEIGHBOURHOOD AND CITY WIDE BASIS.I'M VOTING NO TODAY BECAUSE THE DENSITY AT THIS SITE IS INAPPROPRIATE WHERE IT IS SO DEEPLY EMBEDDED IN THE RESIDENTIAL ZONE AROUND IT.THIS IS NOT WHAT PLAN, CALL AN EDGE CONDITION WE SEE ON A TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET.THERE HAS BEEN NO SUFFICIENT CASE MADE TO MY MIND THAT A SHELTER USE IS APPROPRIATE ON A TRADITIONAL MAIN STREET AND I KNOW GROUPS LIKE THE FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS, ALL OF THE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATIONS ARE WATCHING VERY CLOSELY TO SEE WHAT WE ARE GOING TO DO TO PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF OUT OF TMS.THE DECISION HAS BEEN MADE IN A TOO NARROW OF FRAME WORK.WE HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO DEBATE THE FACTORS RESIDENTS THINK WE SHOULD.THEY CAN ONLY COME AWAY CONFUSED.WE AMENDED THIS BYLAW WITH SOCIOECONOMIC SITUATIONS THIS MORNING.WE DETERMINED WE NEED TO TALK ABOUT PROGRAMMING IMPACTS AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF THOSE WITH SITE PLAN THIS MORNING.WE ARE TOLD IT'S INDEFENSIBLE TO VOTE AGAINST -- AND BUILD A HEALTHY VANIER MOVING FORWARD OF THE HUNDREDS OF PEOPLE WHO ENGAGED WITH US DIRECTLY THROUGH THIS PROCESS AND THE THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN A WATCHING THIS PROCESS ACROSS THE CITY DESERVE BETTER AND MORE COHERENT AND CARING.COLLEAGUES, I HOPE YOU WILL JOIN ME IN REJECTING THIS APPLICATION.>> Mayor Jim Watson: COUNCILLOR TAYLOR, PLEASE.>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. MAYOR.FIRST I WOULD REITERATE TO THOSE CONCERNED ABOUT ONGOING ENGAGEMENT IT'S NOT THE END OF THE DISCUSSION, I SAID THAT EARLIER.BUT THIS PROCESS SHOWS EVERY PROMISE OF HAVING GROWING ENGAGEMENT FROM THIS POINT FORWARD.BOTH AS A RESULT OF THE COUNCILLOR MOTIONS PASSED TODAY AND STATEMENTS BY THE SALVATION ARMY.GROWING COLLABORATIONS IS THE PATH FORWARD.IT SHOULD HAVE HAPPENED IN THE BEGINNING, GRANTED.IT DIDN'T BUT I BELIEVE IT'S IN THE FUTURE.TODAY, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS GOING TO RELEASE THEIR HOUSING STRATEGY AND MUCH OF WHAT WE BELIEVE AND UNDERSTAND IS GOING TO BE IN THERE WILL ADDRESSES AFTER HOMELESSNESS, POVERTY, ADDICTIONS, MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGES AND THE LIKE.THE SOCIAL DETERMINANTS ARE IMPORTANT.TO POSITIVELY INFLUENCE THESE DETERMINANTS IS OUR

RESPONSIBILITY. NOTWITHSTANDING OUR DESIRE TO GATHER AROUND THE TASK OF ENDING HOMELESSNESS BY TACKLING THE CAUSE, WE MUST REALIZE AS LONG AS THERE ARE PEOPLE, THERE ARE GOING TO BE PEOPLE WHO ARE HOMELESS. SOME OF PEOPLE WILL NEED ACCESS TO A SHELTER. BEYOND THIS, WE JUST ENSURE THAT THE SHELTERS ARE PURPOSE BUILT, POSITIVE SPACES WHERE PEOPLE MOVE THROUGH THE EMERGENCY STATE PROGRAM AND INTO THEIR OWN HOUSING SUPPORTED BY PROGRAMMING AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE. THE PROPOSED SERVICE HUB HAS AN EMERGENCY SHELTER COMPONENT AND AND OTHER SERVICES. TO GET PEOPLE THROUGH THE EMERGENCY ROOM AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE. WE COULDN'T BUILD A HOSPITAL WITHOUT AN EMERGENCY ROOM AND NEITHER SHOULD WE BUILT A SERVICE HUB WITHOUT THESE PROGRAMMING ELEMENTS WITHOUT ENSURING THE PRESENCE OF AN EMERGENCY SHELTER COMPONENT. WHAT WE STRUGGLED WITH WITH AN OPIOID CRISIS AS A RESULT OF THE INFLUX OF REFUGEES, ONE DAY NEW CANADIANS. THERE WILL BE THE NEXT CRISIS, THE NEXT PRESSURE, THE NEXT NEED, HAVING ADEQUATE FLEXIBLE SPACES IS A NECESSITY. MY HOPE IS THAT WE ARE COLLECTIVELY SO PROGRESSIVE AND SUCCESSFUL IN OUR WORK TO ADDRESS AND END HOMELESSNESS THAT BY THE TIME THIS DEVELOPMENT IS BUILT WE ARE IN A PLACE WHERE MUCH OF THE WORK DONE THERE WILL BE REDIRECTED TO OTHER SERVICES. TO BE CLEAR I SUPPORT A HOUSING FIRST MODEL. I SUPPORT MOVING PEOPLE INTO HOMES BY DIVERTING THEM FROM HOMELESSNESS TO BEGIN WITH. I SUPPORT THROUGH USE OF TOOLS WE HAVE AT OUR DISPOSAL. WE CAN'T BE TOO PROUD TO SAY WE ARE LEAVING PARTNERS ASIDE IN OUR FIGHT AGAINST HOMELESSNESS. THAT IS WHY I'M VOTING IN FAVOUR OF THIS TODAY. >> I THINK WE HAVE SAID IT BUT IT BEARS REPEATING THIS HAS BEEN ONE OF THE MOST DIFFICULT DECISIONS PUT IN FRONT OF THIS COUNCIL THIS TERM WITHOUT QUESTION. I WANT TO BRIEFLY TAKE AN OPPORTUNITY TO THANK THE PEOPLE THAT HAVE MADE IT POSSIBLE TO HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT THIS, AN OPEN DISCUSSION ABOUT THIS THROUGH LAST WEEK. I WANT TO POINT OUR CHAIR HARDER AND COUNCILLOR CHERNUSHENKO WHO GUIDED THE COMMUNITY AT LARGE THROUGH THREE DAYS OF MEETINGS. I WANT TO THANK THEM IN PARTICULAR FOR WHAT THEY HAVE DONE. I DON'T SIT ON PLANNING BUT I CHOSE TO GO TO THE MEETINGS AND I WAS THERE FOR THE BULK OF THEM, AND I THANK BOTH THE SALVATION ARMY FOR MEETING WITH ME AND DREW FOR LEADING ME ON A SITE VISIT OF THE LOCATION AND

ANSWERING LOTS OF QUESTION FOR ME.WE HAD GOOD DIALOGUE ON THE STREET.IT WAS VERY COLD THAT DAY.WE ASKED OUR QUESTIONS QUICKLY AND MOVED AS QUICKLY AS WE COULD.I APPRECIATE THE ENGAGEMENT AND THE OPENNESS TO HAVE THOSE DISCUSSIONS.AND, YOU KNOW, TO COUNCILLOR TAYLOR SAID SOME OF WHAT I WANTED TO SAY.EVERYBODY IN THE ROOM UNDERSTANDS, ACKNOWLEDGES AND HAS RESPECT FOR THE ISSUE THAT WE DO HAVE A HOMELESS PROBLEM.I DIDN'T SEE ANYBODY SAY THAT WAS NOT THE ISSUE.I AGREE WITH COUNCILLOR TAYLOR WE SHOULD HAVE A CONTINUUM OF CARE.ONE SOLUTION DOES NOT FIT OFF, AND THIS -- I THINK THIS DOES IT.I RESISTED THE TERM SHELTER FOR THIS FACILITY.THERE IS A SHELTER COMPONENT TO IT WITHOUT QUESTION.BUT WHEN I FIRST HEARD ABOUT THIS, BEFORE I STARTED ASKING QUESTION, I THOUGHT THE SALVATION ARMY WOULD PICK UP WHAT THEY HAD IN THE MARKET, PUT IT ON THE BACK OF THE TRUCK AND DROP IT IN VANIER.THAT'S NOT WHAT'S HAPPENING HERE AS FAR AS I CAN TELL.AND IN MAKING THAT DECISION, I WANT TO POINT OUT, IN MAKING THAT DECISION I WAS STRUCK BY THE RESIDENTS OF VANIER WHO CAME OUT AND SPOKE AND I THANK YOU FOR DOING THAT.AND BY THE RESIDENTS OF OUR CITY THAT ARE RECIPIENTS OF THE SERVICE THAT'S PROVIDED BY GROUPS LIKE THE SALVATION ARMY AND THE MISSION WHO TALKED ABOUT THEIR PERSONAL EXPERIENCES AND SHOWED A GREAT DEAL OF COURAGE COMING HERE AND SHARING WITH US.DR. TURNBULL AND PETER TILLY WHO WORK IN THIS AREA EVERY DAY HAD A LOT OF INTERESTING AND HELPFUL THINGS TO ADD TO THE DISCUSSION. I CONTINUED TO MICHAEL POLLUND MICHAEL IS A VERY GOOD LAWYER.HOWEVER, I BELIEVE MICHAEL WOULD HAVE BEEN EQUALLY PERSUASIVE ON THE OTHER SIDE.WHY I SAID THAT IS HE IS A GOOD LAWYER.FROM A PLANNING PERSPECTIVE WHICH IS WHAT WE ARE SUPPOSED TO BE TALKING ABOUT TODAY OF I WANT TO THANK JOHN SMITH.HE TOOK THE TIME TO SIT DOWN AND WADE THROUGH THE REPORT WITH ME AND ANSWERED QUESTIONS AND SOME OF THE INTERESTING THINGS HE POINTED WAS THE TERM HE USED WAS CONTEXT.IT'S ABOUT THIS LOCATION.IT'S ABOUT THE UNIQUENESS OF THIS LOCATION, THE DEPTH OF THE LOCATION THAT PUTS IT IN A DIFFERENT CATEGORY THAN A LOCATION NECESSARILY WE HAVE HEARD ON BANK OR PRESTON STREET.THE DEPTH OF THE CURRENT SITE PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY TO DO SOMETHING DIFFERENT THERE AND PROVIDES A SITE THAT IS NOT WHAT YOU WOULD NORMALLY SEE ON OUR MAIN STREETS.AT THE SAME TIME IT RESPONDS TO

THE CONSIDERATIONS WE DO LOOK AT TO DETERMINE WHETHER SHELTER SHOULD GO. PROXIMITY TO TRANSIT, HIGH PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC. A NUMBER OF THINGS THAT DO QUITE FIRMLY FIT INTO THE PLANNING SITUATION. I ALSO WANT TO POINT OUT AS MUCH AS I TRY TO, I COULDN'T GET AWAY FROM THE FACT THERE'S AN ELEMENT OF PEOPLE ZONE. NOT INTENTIONALLY BUT IT WAS THERE. WE RECEIVED A LETTER OVERNIGHT, AND I JUST WANT TO QUOTE FROM IT. THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT PEOPLE DON'T HAVE THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE THEIR NEIGHBOURS. AND THAT COMES FROM THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION. WE ARE WORKING WITH THEM AND COLLABORATING WITH THEM. AND HOPES IS THAT THE PROCESS THAT GOES FORWARD FOR THIS COMMUNITY AND THIS SOCIAL CAREGIVER THEY WORK TOGETHER AND COME UP WITH A SOLUTION EVERYBODY CAN LIVE WITH. >> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM, PLEASE. >> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR. AND BECAUSE I SIT ON PLANNING COMMITTEE I'VE HAD EXTENSIVE OPPORTUNITIES TO SPEAK TO DIFFERENT ELEMENTS OF THIS FILE, AND I LISTENED CAREFULLY TO MY COLLEAGUES AND WAS PARTICULARLY TAKEN WITH THE COMMENTS BY COUNCILLOR McKENNEY AND COUNCILLOR LEIPER WHO I HAVE HAVE ENCAPSULATED A LOT OF MY VIEWS ON THIS ISSUE. SO I AM JUST AT THIS STAGE GOING TO LIMIT MYSELF TO A FEW COMMENTS ON THE PLANNING RATIONALE BECAUSE AT THE END OF THE DAY, AND AS COUNCILLOR LEIPER SAID IS ABOUT THE PLANNING RATIONALE AND NOT. WE KNOW THAT'S THE DECISION THAT IS BEFORE US IS WHETHER WE ACCEPT THE ADVICE FROM STAFF WE SHOULD BE AMENDING OUR ZONING BYLAW TO PERMIT A USE THAT WE AS A COUNCIL DECIDED IS NOT A PERMITTED USE. STAFF ADVISED THE REASON WE ARE DOING THAT IS ON THREE REASONS. THE FIRST IS THAT THIS IS A RELOCATION OF AN EXISTING SHELTER. AND I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT THAT IS NOT A PLANNING ARGUMENT. THAT IS A PIECE OF CONTEXT PERHAPS. IT SPEAKS TO THE -- IS DOES NOT JUSTIFY AMENDING OUR OFFICIAL PLAN. THE SECOND ARGUMENT THAT STAFF WANT US TO CONSIDER IN LOOKING AT THIS APPLICATION IS THE FACT THAT THE FORM HAS BEEN DESIGNED TO MITIGATE LAND USE AND MINIMIZE IMPACT. THERE'S A LOT OF FOCUS AND COUNCILLOR EGLI MADE MENTION TO IT THIS IS A DEEP LOT. DEEPER THAN A TRADITIONAL LOT. THE PROBLEM IS IT'S A LOT THAT BACKS UP TO A RESIDENTIAL ZONE THAT DOES NOT PERMIT A SHELTER USE. ONE CAN MAKE THE ARGUMENT THAT IT IS IS DEEPER LOT, WE ARE TALKING ABOUT A BUILT FORM THAT IS AN ESSENTIALLY ENCROACHING ON WHAT WOULD NORMALLY BE A RESIDENTIAL

ZONE SITE WHICH AGAIN DOES NOT PERMIT THE SHELTER.THE THIRD ARGUMENT THAT STAFF PROVIDE IN THE REPORT IS THE SUBJECT DEVELOPMENT DID NOT -- AND THAT'S A STATEMENT THAT ONE CAN MAKE.THE PROBLEM IS IT'S A STATEMENT THAT REQUIRES EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT IT.AND NOWHERE IN THE -- SOMEWHERE AROUND 80 PAGES OF STAFF REPORT AND COMMENT IN ANSWER TO RESIDENTS TO QUESTIONS DID I SEE ANY CONSIDERATION, ANY DATA ON WHY IT WAS LOOKING AT THE ECONOMIC ELEMENTS, THE COMMERCIAL ELEMENTS WHICH ARE REALLY AT THE HEART OF THE OFFICIAL PLAN.THE PLAN AND THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW SPEAK OF THE MAIN STREETS ARE TO BE THE COMMERCIAL HEART OF OUR NEIGHBOURHOODS.AND THERE WAS NO EVERYDAY PROVIDED TO SUPPORT THE STATEMENT.I WOULD HAVE BEEN OPEN TO HEARING THAT EVIDENCE HAD IT BEEN OFFERED BUT IT WASN'T.AND SO WE ARE LEFT WITH THREE REASONS TO AMEND THE PLAN AND THE ZONING BYLAW WHICH IN MY MIND ARE UNCONVINCING.IN THAT'S WHAT WE ARE ASKED TO VOTE ON THIS AFTERNOON NOW NOTWITHSTANDING THE VALID AND IMPORTANT SOCIAL SERVICE ELEMENTS THAT OTHERS HAVE RAISED.IF THAT'S WHAT WE ARE ASKED TO VOTE ON, I DON'T THINK THERE'S ANOTHER OPTION THAN TO DEFEND OUR PLAN AND THE ZONING BYLAW AND CONSIDER A LEGITIMATE APPLICATION TO AMEND THOSE WHEN THERE IS EVIDENCE THAT THERE IS NO UNDUE ADVERSE IMPACT.AND BECAUSE THERE IS NO EVIDENCE PROVIDED THAT AND THE BURDEN OF PROOF IS ON THE APPLICATION AND ON THOSE WHO WANT TO CHANGE OUR MASTER PLANNING DOCUMENT TO DEMONSTRATE THAT, AND THAT HAS NOT BEEN DONE IN THIS CASE, I REALLY SEE NO OTHER CHOICE IN THIS CASE BUT TO VOTE NO.THANK YOU.>> Mayor Jim Watson: OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS?IF NOT, COUNCILLOR FLEURY, PLEASE.>> I WANT TO BEGIN BY -- >> Mayor Jim Watson: SORRY.SORRY.I THINK COUNCILLOR DEANS IS GOING TO SPEAK.WE WILL LET YOU SPEAK.APOLOGIZE. >> I JUST FELT A NEED TO SAY A FEW WORDS ON THIS APPLICATION.LET ME SAY WHEN SALVATION ARMY CAME TO SEE ME IN JUNE WHEN THEY HAD TABLED THEIR APPLICATION, I WAS VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THE APPLICATION BECAUSE I RECOGNIZED THAT ALTHOUGH IN A PERFECT WORLD WE WOULDN'T NEED SHELTERS, OUR REALITY IS WE DO.WE NEED GOOD SHELTERS AND A PURPOSE BUILT GOOD SHELTER IS AN IMPORTANT FOR US TO HAVE AND FOR CITIZENS AND I CARE ABOUT OUR VULNERABLE CITIZENS AND THAT'S WHY THIS DEBATE HAS BEEN SO FRUSTRATING FOR ME.JUST SO FRUSTRATING.BECAUSE I THINK ALL OF

US SHOULD BE PUTTING THOSE CITIZENS IN THE FOREFRONT OF THIS DISCUSSION.AND I THINK AS A COMMUNITY WE COULD DO A LOT BETTER THAN WE HAVE DONE ON THIS DEBATE.THIS ACTUALLY HAS SICKENED ME, THIS DEBATE.BECAUSE WHAT WE HAVE IS AN ORGANIZATION DOING GOOD WORK IN THE COMMUNITY FOR OUR MOST VULNERABLE CITIZENS THAT COME FORWARD AND YET THERE HAS BEEN NO COMPROMISE ALONG THE WAY.THERE'S A COMMUNITY THAT FEELS THAT THIS WILL HAVE AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON THEM THAT FEELS THIS DOES NOT FIT WITH THE SPIRIT OF OUR OFFICIAL PLAN.AND INTERESTING, YOU KNOW, THEY MAKE GOOD ARGUMENTS, COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM MADE PLANNING ARGUMENTS THAT WOULD LEAD TO THAT.AT THE END OF THE DAY, WHEN YOU TRY TO HELP YOUR MOST VULNERABLE CITIZENS, I THINK WE DO NEED SHELTER.I'M NOT CONVINCED WE NEED ALL OF THE BEDS THAT ARE -- AND I'LL TALK ABOUT THAT IN A MINUTE.I THINK WE NEED A SHELTER.THIS TO ME HAS BEEN A FAILURE OF PROCESS.THERE ARE NO WINNERS TODAY.THERE ARE NO WINNERS.SALVATION ARMY MAY WIN THIS VOTE, BUT HAVE THEY WON THE COMMUNITY? ANY TIME YOU DIVIDE A COMMUNITY THE WAY THIS COMMUNITY IS DIVIDED, THIS IS NOT A WIN FOR ANY OF US.THIS IS NOT A WIN FOR THE COMMUNITY OR THE SALVATION ARMY AND I THINK WE CAN DO BETTER AND THAT'S WHAT I HAVE SAID TO EVERYONE WHY ARE WE HERE?WHY WITH ARE WE HERE DEBATING DIVIDING OUR COMMUNITY?WHEN WE ALL WANT TO HELP OUR MOST VULNERABLE CITIZENS AND WE NEED TO HELP THEM.WE NEED TO FIND A WAY TO DO THAT IN A POSITIVE WAY.NOT THIS WAY.SHOULD WE ALLOW THE BOARD TO MAKE A DECISION SO IMPORTANT TO THIS COMMUNITY?NO.WE SHOULD DO IT.THIS IS A FAILURE OF LEADERSHIP.WE HAVE FAILED.WE HAVE FAILED THIS COMMUNITY BY BEING HERE TODAY HAVING THIS DEBATE AND DIVIDING THIS COMMUNITY AND I BELIEVE WE CAN DO BETTER THAN WE ARE DOING BY FORCES THIS VOTE TODAY.AND THAT'S I WOULD LIKE COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM'S MOTION TO HAVE THE CITY MANAGER LEAD SOME SORT OF A GROUP TO FIND A MIDDLE GROUND.THERE HAS BEEN NO COMPROMISE HERE.THERE HAS BEEN NONE.AND THAT'S NOT GOOD ENOUGH.WE ALL FAILED AND WE SHOULD ALL BE TRYING TO FIND A WAY TO HELP OUR VULNERABLE CITIZENS AND THAT'S HOW I REALLY, REALLY FEEL.IT DOESN'T MATTER HOW I VOTE BECAUSE THERE'S NO WIN TO ME IN NEITHER SIDE OF THIS.IN THIS ARGUMENT.AND I THINK WE CAN DO BETTER AND I REALLY FEEL WE SHOULD BE TRYING TO FIND A BETTER WAY.IF WE GET IN THE SAME BOAT AND ROW IN THE SAME

DIRECTION WE CAN GET IT DONE.WE ARE NOT IN THE SAME BOAT.WE ARE NOT ROWING IN THE SAME DIRECTION AND WE ARE NOT GETTING IT DONE.WE ARE DIVIDING A COMMUNITY AND I THINK THAT'S TERRIBLE.SO I'M NOT HAPPY ABOUT IT.I'M NOT HAPPY AT ALL HOW THIS HAS GONE.IN TERMS OF THE ISSUE AS AROUND THE YOUTH, I THINK THAT HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS IN CANADA, IN ONTARIO, AND IN THIS CITY IS GOING IN A BIT OF A NEW DIRECTION.AND I DON'T THINK THE SALVATION ARMY SHOULD EXPECT THAT WE WILL FUND ALL OF THOSE BEDS BECAUSE AS COUNCILLOR McKENNEY APPROPRIATELY POINTED OUT, WE NEED TO HOUSE PEOPLE.WE SHOULDN'T BE LEAVING THEM IN THE SHELTER.IF SOME OF THOSE BEDS COULD BE BETTER AT HOUSING PEOPLE PERMANENTLY THAT'S WHERE THE MONEY SHOULD GO.WHEN IT COMES TO RIGHT DOWN TO IT, HOW AM I GOING TO VOTE?HONESTLY I'VE BEEN AWAKE ALL NIGHT THINKING ABOUT THIS.IT'S NOT AN EASY DECISION FOR ME.I REALLY THINK THAT WE CAN DO BETTER AND FOR THAT REASON I'M NOT GOING TO SUPPORT THE APPLICATION.>> Mayor Jim Watson: DOES ANYONE ELSE WISH TO SPEAK?[Speaking French] >> I WANT TO BEGIN BY THANKING MY COMMUNITY IN RECORD NUMBERS TO PRESENT A UNITED VOICE TO NOT SUPPORT.>> Voice of Translator: VANIER IS STRONG AND UNITED. WHATEVER THE VOTE IS, VANIER WILL BE WINNING.[END OF TRANSLATION] >> I WANT TO THANK THE LOWER TOWN FOR THE MATURITY IN COMING FORWARD IN OPPOSING THE APPLICATION.THE REASON WE ARE HERE IS BECAUSE OF SHELTER IS NOT PERMITTED USE ON THIS PROPOSED LOCATION.IT'S NOT PERMITTED USE ON MAIN STREET AND THAT'S CLEAR IN OUR PLAN.NOR WAS IT CONSIDERED IN THE SECONDARY PLAN FOR MONTREAL ROAD APPROVED.IT'S A TRAGEDY THAT THAT APPLICATION CAME DOWN TO A VOTE OF LAND USE GROUNDS.ON LAND USE PLANNING GROUNDS.WE EXPECT MORE FROM AN ORGANIZATION FUNDED BY DONORS.THE APPLICANT COULD HAVE CHOSEN SITES THAT HAD THE PERMITTED SHELTER USE WHICH THERE ARE MANY LOCATIONS IN OUR CITY.WE THEN WOULD HAVE NOT FIND OURSELVES IN THIS POSITION.>> Voice of Translator: DECIDING TO GO AHEAD WITH THE MOST COSTLY AND DIVISIVE SOLUTION IS NOT GOOD.IT WILL REQUIRE CAPITAL INVESTMENTS THAT ARE SIGNIFICANT.IT WILL COST A LOT OF MONEY TO THE CITY YEAR AFTER YEAR TO SUPPORT THIS MODEL.[END OF TRANSLATION] >> -- \$4.6 MILLION MORE TO SUPPORT SHELTERS THAN WHAT WE HAD PLANNED.THE MODEL IS DRAINING OUR RESOURCES AND MINIMIZING THE SHIFT TO INVEST IN A LASTING SOLUTION.AS GOVERNMENT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO BE OPEN

AND TRANSPARENT AND BE CLEAR WHERE THE GAPS ARE.WE HAVE HOUSED 350 CHRONIC HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS. THE REALITY IS THAT MORE INVESTMENT AND HOUSING ARE NEEDED TO SEE A REDUCTION IN SHELTER USE.WHEN COUNCIL APPROVED THE TEN YEAR HOUSING PLAN, MANY OF YOU WERE AROUND TO APPROVE THE PLAN AND WE KNEW THE GOAL WAS TO DECENTRALIZE OUR SHELTERS.A CLOSURE OF SHELTERS TO INVEST IN SPECIALIZED HOUSING PROJECT LIKE THOSE PRESENTED BY THE MISSION WHO ARE DECENTRALIZING THE -- LIFE HOUSE AND CENTRE TOWN, IT'S TOWARDS NEW MODELS OF THE CLOSURE WAS BY ATTRITION TOWARDS NEW SERVICES.>> Voice of Translator: A VOTE AGAINST TODAY'S PROPOSAL DOES NOT SHOW THAT WE HAVE ANY DOUBT AS TO THE SALVATION ARMY OR THEIR SERVICES.IT'S NOT JUST A ZONING ISSUE.IT IS CLEAR NO PLAN ALLOWS THIS USE ON A MAIN STREET.ONLY 140 BEDS IS INSULTING.A SHELTER ACCORDING TO THE DEFINITION MEANS AN ESTABLISHMENT PROVIDING TEMPORARY SHELTER FOR PEOPLE WHO NEED EMERGENCY SHELTER AND INCLUDE HEALTH CARE COUNSELLING AND SOCIAL SERVICES.PROPOSAL OFFERS THAT.TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATIONS.AS IT DOES NOT OFFER A HOME TO INDIVIDUALS WHO WOULD STAY IN ANY OF THE 350 BEDS TO USE THE TEMPORARY NATURE.THEREFORE IT CAN NOT BE UNDER THAT CATEGORY.STAFF AGREED WITH THE IMPORTANT COMPONENTS FROM THE 2008 REPORT.THEY AGREED THERE IS A SHELTER CAP OF FOUR SHELTERS IN WARD 12 AND THE SEPARATION DISTANCES NEEDED BETWEEN SHELTERS.PAGE 9 OF THE PLANS REPORT.HOWEVER, WHAT THEY REFUSED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THERE ARE 12 SHELTERS IN WARD 12.THERE ARE TWO MOTELS WITH CITY AGREEMENTS FOR FAMILY SHELTERS ALONG MONTREAL ROAD AND 6 SHELTERS FOR WOMEN SEEING SITUATIONS OF VIOLENCE.NOT A DELEGATION COULD EXPLAIN WHY THEY THOUGHT THE LOCATION WAS THE BEST APPROACH ON MAIN STREET.THERE WERE DIFFERING OPINIONS WHICH WAS OUTSIDE OF THE CONSIDERATION OF PLANS COMMITTEE.NOTHING WAS PRESENTED THAT WOULD JUSTIFY PUTTING 350 SHELTER BEDS ON A MAIN STREET.>> Voice of Translator: -- IS AMONG THE MOST VULNERABLE OF OTHER WARDS IN THE CITY.WE TALK ABOUT DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC DIVERSITY.THIS IS ALSO NEEDED ON A SOCIAL LEVEL.WE HAVE INITIALS FROM THE CRIME PREVENTION OTTAWA, BUT YES NEED TO DO MORE. [END OF TRANSLATION] >> VANIER WORKED HARD TO REMOVE THE STIGMA OF CRIMINALITY THAT'S HAUNTED US.MUCH ATTENTION AND EFFORTS ARE NEEDED AND IT BEGINS WITH IMPORTANT

ATTENTION TO MONTREAL ROAD.MY COMMUNITY IS NOT AFRAID OF WELCOMING SOCIAL SERVICES, SOCIAL SERVICES PROVIDERS.WE HAVE MANY INCLUDING ONE OF THE EIGHT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING MODEL RECENTLY BUILT BY THE JOHN HOWARD SOCIETY TO NO OPPOSITION, I MIGHT ADD. THOSE WERE 42 MEN WHO CAME FROM SHEPHERD OF GOOD HOPE.WE ARE AFRAID OF A COMMUNITY WITH CONCENTRATED POVERTY WILL JEOPARDIZE -- IN ACTIVE MEMBERS OF THE CITY.>> Voice of Translator: THE SALVATION ARMY PROPOSAL TO A HALT SO OPTIONS IN TERMS OF LOCATION CAN BE CONSIDERED OF MY DOOR HAS ALWAYS BEEN OPEN AND I WANT TO WORK WITH THE SALVATION ARMY AND THE CITY STO BRING A SOLUTION SUPPORTED BY CALL, THE STATUS QUO IS A SHORT-TERM OPTION AS WE WORK WITH THE SALVATION ARMY ON HOW TO BEST INVEST \$50 MILLION.WHAT YOU NEED IS A HOME.YOU NEEDED SERVICES, SURE, THAT DOESN'T MEAN WE SHOULD REINSTITUTIONALIZE OUR MOST VULNERABLE.>> Mayor Jim Watson: THANK YOU.THIS IS AN EMOTIONAL ONE.THE PEOPLE OF VANIER FEEL STRONGLY ABOUT THEIR COMMUNITY.>> Voice of Translator: IT'S CLEAR THAT THE VANIER RESIDENTS CARE A LOT FOR THE MEMBERS THAT LIVE IN THEIR COMMUNITY. [END OF TRANSLATION]>> ALL OF THESE ARE IMPORTANT VOICES.>> Voice of Translator: ALL THE VOICES ARE IMPORTANT. [END OF TRANSLATION]>> RECONSTRUCTION OF MONTREAL ROAD.AND THE UPCOMING IMPROVEMENT PLAN.MY INFORMATION FOR COUNCILLOR FLEURY IN ADVOCATING FOR THE CIP AND THE FUNDS TO REDEVELOP MONTREAL ROAD.THE STATUS QUO ON GEORGE STREET IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.[Speaking French]>> 70 DELEGATIONS, MANY OF WHO ARE RESIDENTS OF VANIER WHO SPOKE PASSIONATELY AND PERSONALLY ON THEIR PERSPECTIVE ON THIS APPLICATION.ISSUES EXPRESSED WILL BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMUNITY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES COMMUNITY IN FEBRUARY WHEN THEY REVIEW THE CHANGES TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING STRATEGY AND THE CITY'S TEN YEAR HOUSING STRATEGY.I SUPPORT HOUSING FIRST.I'VE BEEN WORKING WITH STAFF ABOUT THE PROVINCIAL, FEDERAL, AND LOCAL LEVELS TOWARDS THE GOAL OF REDUCING OUR RELIANCE ON SHELTERS OVER THE LONG-TERM.LIKE MANY OF YOU I'M SADDEN TO SEE WE NEED EMERGENCY SHELTERS IN THE 21ST CENTURY.THIS PROPOSAL MOVES OUR CITY IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION AS IT CONTAINS THE REDUCTION OF SHELTER SPACES AND CREATES SUPPORTIVE HOUSING BEDS.>> Voice of Translator: AS ALL OF YOU, I'M DISAPPOINTED THAT WE STILL NEED EMERGENCY SHELTERS, BUT THIS PROPOSAL PUTS US ON THE RIGHT PATH.[END OF TRANSLATION]>> THE

CURRENT BED CAPACITY SIMPLY DO NOT COME CLOSE TO MEETING THE NEEDS AND THE PROVISION OF TREATMENT AND CARE IS ESSENTIAL TO HELPING SOME MEN EXIT HOMELESSNESS. YOU HAVE HEARD FROM THE FORMER CHIEF OF STAFF HE BELIEVES IN THIS MODEL AND THE NEED FOR A CONTINUUM OF CARE TO MEET RESIDENTS WHERE THEY ARE IN THEIR JOURNEY. HE WAS CLEAR. HAVING MANY SERVICES UNDER ONE ROOF IS BETTER FOR CLIENTS. THEY DON'T HAVE THE LUXURY OF DRIVING FROM ONE PART OF THE CITY TO ANOTHER FOR TREATMENT OR COUNSELLING. >> Voice of Translator: AS I MENTIONED, DR. TURNBULL SAID IT'S BETTER TO HAVE ACCESS TO THE SERVICES UNDER ONE ROOF BECAUSE THEY DON'T HAVE THE LUXURY OF DRIVING FROM ONE SIDE TO ANOTHER. [END OF TRANSLATION] >> IT'S HARDER TO GET THE SERVICES OR THE MORE DISTANCE BETWEEN SERVICES, THE LESS LIKELY VULNERABLE RESIDENTS ARE TO ACCESS THE SERVICES TO TURN THEIR LIVES AROUND OR TO SAVE THEIR LIVES. WE MUST BE CLEAR. BEFORE COUNCIL TODAY IS A PLANNING APPLICATION THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED ON SOUND PLANNING PRINCIPLES FOR USE OF THE LAND. >> Voice of Translator: THE APPLICATION BEFORE YOU IS A PLANNING ISSUE AND THAT IS LIMITED TO PLANNING. [END OF TRANSLATION] >> WHAT IS BEFORE US, 85% OF THE SITE MEETS THE ZONING DEFINITION OF A CARE FACILITY AND DOES NOT REQUIRE COUNCIL APPROVAL. IT HAS BEEN RAISED WHETHER THIS LOCATION IS THE BEST FOR THIS FACILITY. RESPECTFULLY THAT'S NOT THE QUESTION BEFORE COUNCIL. EVERY ORGANIZATION FOR PROFIT OR NOT FOR PROFIT HAS THE LEGAL RIGHT TO ASK THE CITY FOR ZONING CHANGE. IT'S UP TO THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND COUNCIL TO ASSESS WHETHER IT'S APPROPRIATE TO PERMIT THIS SHELTER ON THIS SITE. OUR PROFESSIONAL PLANNING STAFF ARE PREPARED A REPORT BASED ON THAT -- OF THE PLANNING ACT. >> Voice of Translator: ANY ORGANIZATION HAS THE LEGAL RIGHT TO ASK FOR A ZONING CHANGE OF THE CITY. [END OF TRANSLATION] >> SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY AND COUNCILLOR FLEURY MENTIONED A COUPLE. WE HAVE NOT MICROMANAGED THEIR INVITE SELECTION THROUGH THE PLANNING APPROVAL PROCESS. LIKE CORNER STONE HOUSING FOR WOMEN IN THE SOMERSET WARD. AND THE OAK CENTRE AND THE SHEPHERDS OF GOOD HOPE. THE COMMITTEE'S DECISION HAS TO BE BASED ON PLANNING -- HOW THIS FACILITY MAY BE FUNDED IN THE FUTURE. >> Voice of Translator: THE DECISION HAS TO BE MADE ONLY ACCORDING TO PLANNING PRINCIPLES. [END OF TRANSLATION] >> THE BUILDING IS DESIGNED IN A WAY THAT'S FLEXIBLE AND CAN BE

CHANGED.THERE ARE STEPS BEFORE THE SALVATION ARMY COULD START CONSTRUCTION.APPEALS PERIOD, SITE PLAN APPROVAL, OPERATION REQUIREMENTS AND MANY ONGOING CONSULTATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY.THESE ARE ALSO AGREE TO FORM AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE.MOST MEMBERS OF COUNCIL SUPPORTED THAT MOTION EARLIER TODAY.THEY ARE AGREED TO INTRODUCE AMBASSADOR PROGRAM TO BUILD RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY.I LISTENED TO THE DISCUSSIONS AND SUPPORT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON PLANNING PRINCIPLE.>> Voice of Translator: >> I LISTENED TO THE DISCUSSIONS AND I SUPPORT STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON PLANNING PRINCIPLES.[END OF TRANSLATION] >> IT'S A SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT OVER THE MOTEL THAT SITS THERE THAT PROVIDES 14 ROOMS AS OVER FLOWED CAPACITY.I FEEL THE LOCATION -- MITIGATE THE TRAFFIC IMPACTS ON THE COMMUNITY, THE FOCUS WILL BE FINDING PERMANENT HOUSING FOR CLIENTS RATHER THAN EMERGENCY BEDS. >> Voice of Translator: OUR FOCUS FOR THESE VULNERABLE CITIZENS WOULD BE TO FIND A STABLE AND SUSTAINABLE HOUSING AND NOT JUST A BED FOR THE NIGHT.[END OF TRANSLATION] >> FEELINGS OF FEAR AND I WANT TO QUOTE INNER CITY HEALTH.I HAVE BEEN AFRAID FOR THE MEN THAT WE SERVE BUT I HAVE NEVER BEEN AFRAID OF THEM.I ENCOURAGE THE COMMUNITY TO ENGAGE IN THE PLAN.THIS TYPE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL IN THE PAST.I HOPE THIS APPLICATION IS APPROVED AND WE WOULD WORK WHERE ALL NEIGHBOURS SO EVERYONE'S NEEDS ARE ACCOMMODATED.I DON'T SUPPORT THE DELAYING OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO MAKE A DECISION ON THE APPLICATION TO SOME DATE FAR IN THE FUTURE, 100 DAYS OR SO.ON DECEMBER 13, 2017.IF COUNCIL DOES NOT MAKE A DECISION, THE APPLICANT HAS AN AUTOMATIC RIGHT OF APPEAL TO GO TO THE OMB.TO DEFER OUR DECISION IS EVADING OUR RESPONSIBILITY AS ELECTED OFFICIALS.>> Voice of Translator: I DO NOT SUPPORT THE DECISION TO OR THE PROPOSAL TO PUT IT OFF TO ANOTHER DATE.THIS WAY WE WOULD NOT BE RESPONSIBLE AS ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES. [END OF TRANSLATION] >> WE MUST CONSIDER THIS ON PLANNING PRINCIPLES AND PLANNING POLICY AND LAW.WE HEARD LOTS AFTER PROPERTY VIETNAMS AND STORES THINKING OF LEAVING.I EMPATHIZE THEY ARE NOT VALID LAND USE PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS.THE CURRENT SALVATION ARMY WAS AN OLD SCHOOL NEVER DESIGNED TO BE A SHELTER.>> Voice of Translator: THE FORMER

ESTABLISHMENT IS OLD SCHOOL AND WAS NEVER BUILT FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES. [END OF TRANSLATION]>> -- ON THE STREETS THIS SITE IS THE FIRST PURPOSE BUILT SHELTER OF ITS KIND IN OTTAWA.IT WILL HAVE AN INTERIOR COURTYARD.TODAY I'M ASKING COUNCIL TO SUPPORT THE SALVATION ARMY'S PLAN, A PLAN THAT PROVIDES BETTER HOUSING OPTIONS FOR OUR MOST VULNERABLE RESIDENTS.A PLAN DEVELOPED BY A NOT FOR PROFIT ORGANIZATION THAT HAS BEEN HELPING THE LESS FORTUNATE FOR OVER A HUNDRED YEARS.I'M ASKING COUNCIL TO SUPPORT THIS SALVATION ARMY PLAN AND THAT WILL HELP OUR VULNERABLE CITIZENS.FOR YEARS IN THE 1990S.I VOLUNTEERED AT THE SOUP KITCHEN.ON TUESDAY I WOULD SEE AN ENDLESS LINE OF MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN COMING IN FOR A WARM MEAL IN THE PROSPEROUS CITY LIKE OURS.I THOUGHT TO MYSELF, WHAT IS WORSE?STARTING THEIR LIFE AS A CHILD IN A SOUP KITCHEN OR COMING TO ONE AT THE END OF LIFE.I REALIZED NEITHER IS ACCEPTABLE.THIS IS NOT AN EASY ISSUE.I APPRECIATED THE EMOTIONAL ATTACHMENT TO OUR NEIGHBOURHOODS AND APPRECIATIVE OF THE DELEGATIONS THAT EXPRESSED THEIR POINT OF VIEW.LOST ARE THE MEN, YOUNG AND OLD, WHO NEED OUR HELP AND UNDERSTANDING.KNOW WITH THE VOTE TODAY, THE DISCUSSION DOES NOT STOP.WE WILL CONTINUE THE IMPORTANT DIALOGUE WITH THE COMMITTEE IN THE NEW YEAR AND I HOPE YOU STAY INVOLVED IN THE PLAN THAT BY WORKING TOGETHER WE CAN FIND A SOLUTION. >> THIS IS NOT AN ISSUE FOR ANYONE AND I APPRECIATE EVERYBODY'S CONTRIBUTION ALL OF THOSE WHO CAME TO EXPRESS THEIR VOICES. >> FOR THEIR WORK AND CHAIR HARDER WHO HANDLED THE MEETING WITH GREAT SKILL, COMPASSION AND THOUGHTFULNESS.THE DEPUTY CLERK, THE ROLL CALL, PLEASE.COUNCILLOR FLEURY. >> NO. >> COUNCILLOR DAROUZE. >> COUNCILLOR -- >> NO.COUNCILLOR WILKINSON. >> YES. >> COUNCILLOR CLOUTIER. COUNCILLOR McKENNEY.>> NO. >> COUNCILLOR MONETTE. >> YES. >> COUNCILLOR MITIC. >> YES. >> COUNCILLOR QAQISH. >> YES. >> COUNCILLOR CHERNUSHENKO. >> NO. >> COUNCILLOR HUBLEY. >> YES. >> COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM. >> NO. >> COUNCILLOR TIERNEY. >> YES. >> COUNCILLOR LEIPER. >> NO. >> MAYOR WATSON. >> YES.>> 16 YES 6 NAYS >> Mayor Jim Watson: COUNCILLOR -- I BELIEVE COUNCILLOR HUBLEY HAD A POINT.COUNCILLOR HUBLEY HAS THE FLOOR, PLEASE. >> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.JUST WANT TO THANK OUR AUDITOR-GENERAL MR. HUGHES AND THEIR WORK ON THIS REPORT. >> Mayor Jim Watson: I BELIEVE COUNCILLOR CHIARELLI HAD QUESTION BUT IT WAS

ANSWERED.NEXT IS NUMB NUMBER 5.CITY OF OTTAWA PARTICIPATION IN THE CAPITAL COMMISSIONS.YES.THAT WAS RECEIVED.I BELIEVE COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM HAD A QUESTION.THE LAST ITEM JUST FOR CLARIFICATION FOR THE AUDITOR-GENERAL THAT WAS RECEIVED, AGREED.COUNCILLOR NUSSBAUM, THE FLOOR IS YOURS.FOR REFERENCE I'M LOOKING AT PAGE 21 OF THE STAFF REPORT.UNDER PRINCIPLE 2.CITY TAXPAYERS MUST BE PROTECTED AS PART OF ANY AGREEMENT IN PRINCIPLE.WHICH IS THE PRINCIPLE THAT I COMPLETELY AGREE WITH AND I WANTED FOR CLARIFICATION TO ASK A FEW QUESTIONS OF STAFF.SO IN THE FIRST PART OF THIS SECTION, STAFF OUTLINE THE FACT THE CITY HAS A LIMITED FINANCIAL TIMES AVAILABLE TO ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING THE BROWN FIELDS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, DEVELOPMENT CHARGE EXEMPTION AND LEVIES.ARE THERE ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL TOOLS THAT STAFF WOULD ADD TO THAT LIST THEY THINK WOULD BE PART OF ANY DISCUSSION WITH THE CITY AND THE PROPONENT?>> THERE ARE NO TOOLS THAT WOULD ADD TO THIS LIST AT THIS POINT IN TIME.THE CONSTRAINING FACTOR IS THE MUNICIPAL ACT WHICH DOES NOT ALLOW BONUSING. >> DOES STAFF CONSIDER THAT A FORM OF FINANCIAL TOOL?>> IT IS A FORM -- A FORM OF FINANCIAL AID BUT IT HAS -- CAN ONLY BE GIVEN UNDER LIMITED CIRCUMSTANCES.WE ARE NOT AWARE OF WHAT THE CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD BE AT THIS TIME, IT WAS JUST IDENTIFIED, BUT AS YOU KNOW, WE ARE NOT ALLOWED TO PROVIDE LOANS TO COMMERCIAL ORGANIZATIONS.WE ARE IN THE BUSINESS OF PROVIDING FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR MUNICIPAL SERVICES. >> THANK YOU.THE FINAL SENTENCE IN THIS SECTION AGAIN IS ONE THAT I THINK IS THE RIGHT ONE.IT SAYS IT'S FURTHER UNDERSTOOD OBLIGATIONS THAT THE CITY MAY AGREE TO TAKE ON WOULD BE SECURED BY ASSETS OR A MECHANISM TO RECOVER THE COST FROM THE BENEFITTING AREA.JUST A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS.A SPECIAL AREA LEVY IS ULTIMATELY PAID FOR BY TAXPAYERS.IS THAT -- AM I TO READ THAT LAST SENTENCE TO SAY IF THERE WAS A SPECIAL AREA LEVY WHICH WAS PART OF AGREEMENT IN PRINCIPLE THAT ANY PROCEEDS FROM THE ESSENTIAL AREA LEVY WOULD BE SUBJECT TO THAT FINAL SENTENCE?>> UNDER THE COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PLAN YOU CAN HAVE A SPECIAL AREA LEVY WHICH SAYS IF YOU BUILD SOMETHING OF A MUNICIPAL PURPOSE THAT THE TAXES THAT YOU RECEIVE GO TO PAY FOR IT.THAT WOULD BE THE CONSTRUCT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HERE.>> SO YOU WOULDN'T INTERPRET THAT TO MEAN THAT THAT TYPE OF CONTRIBUTION WOULD NEED TO BE

SECURED BY ASSETS SO OUR MECHANISM TO RECOVER THE COST?>> AS THE ASSET THAT IT WOULD BE PAYING FOR WOULD BE A MUNICIPAL ASSET, IT WOULD NEED TO BE SECURED IN THAT WAY, BUT IF THERE WAS ANY OTHER REQUESTS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN ANY WAY IT WOULD HAVE TO BE SECURED WITH AN ASSET. >> IN TERMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT CHARGE EXCEPTIONS WHICH IS LISTED AS A POSSIBLE OF -- IF THERE ARE EXEMPTIONS TO DEVELOPMENT CHARGES I PRESUME THEY CREATE A LIABILITY FOR THE CITY, THAT THEY WOULD BE SUBJECT TO THE PRINCIPLE EXPRESSED IN THE FINAL SENTENCE, CORRECT?[PLEASE STAND BY]To the minister and had some discussions about, you know, some of the things that we want to make sure that we see as we're moving forward on LeBreton flats. But I do -- you know, I guess my struggle here is two things. Just back to the development charge exemptions and what that could mean for the surrounding community, umm, if we -- if we in the end decide that we're going to exempt on development charges, those impacts for the surrounding -- the immediate community and, you know, the broader city, can be profound. I mean, we've got, I don't know, storm water systems. We've got needs for transportation infrastructure, we've got certainly needs for recreational facilities, and up until now all I've ever seen is some recreational facilities that would be provided by the private sector, but certainly there's a lot of public infrastructure that we're going to need to see as a result of redevelopment of LeBreton flats. I just worry a little bit about the possibility of development charge exemption, and it's the part of the report that really prevents me from supporting it in terms of one of the principles that we will provide to at this point the mayor and the NCC to look at going forward.>> So, councillor, let me provide you with some comfort around that, because right now, if you provide any exemption for that, for the development there, the city has to step in and make up those development charges, which means the program of growth that is supported by development charges is not diminished as a result of that exemption. What you're doing is you're substituting development charges with taxpayer dollars, but at the end of the day you still are raising the same amount of development charges that supports your growth program. So nothing -- and this -- Mr. Willis can talk about, when you accept the planning -- an area for planning and all the infrastructure has to be built with it, we don't allow a subdivision to come up and not have roads and not have sewers and not have water and not have storm water. All of those things go with it. So the fact that you would exempt it does not actually delay any of the growth program that is supported by development charges. What delays your growth program for development charges is when growth doesn't happen. It's because we aren't receiving the DCs, not because you are getting exemptions but because growth overall has been down, from what we had

forecast. So I want to assure you, giving an exemption is not going to actually impact on the growth program because the city steps in and makes up the difference.>> So becoming a subsidy from private to public, essentially?>> that is what exemptions are, yes.>> Yep. And then on the principle, like, of the borrowing authority, I understand that we're not necessarily going to be offering a borrowing authority for better interest rates, but if we do, is there some way that we could ensure that at the very least we're doing green bonds again? this is an area of the city where we should be showing that we want to build the most sustainable and environmentally sustainable community in the city.>> So depending on what the borrowing is for will determine whether, in fact, you can use a green bond or not. If it is for investment in light rail or for state-of-the-art storm water facilities, those are all things that would qualify for most likely a green bond, but if we're using it to build roads, chances are it won't qualify.>> Well, hopefully we're not going to be putting forward any -- you know, providing any borrowing authority for roads at this place. So I have concerns with the report in terms of the scope in what we're allowing the conversation to happen in behind closed doors.>> We don't -- councillor, this is just a broad brush report sort of looking at all of the things that could potentially be available. We don't know what they're going to be asking for at this point in time, but we don't want to have to come back to you if something gets raised that we haven't put in the report and don't have any direction on. So there will be full reporting once the negotiations have started and we come to a point where we think we may have a deal. We have to come back to and get your full endorsement on it anyway. This doesn't limit your ability to reject or approve in the future what we would come forward with.>> Councillor, anything else?>> no. >> Okay, councillor leaper, please.>> Thanks, chair, and I think you will hear some tentativeness around that previous reply. By the time something is agreed to in principle behind closed doors bringing it back to city council it's going to be very difficult to push back at that. I do want to get some precision and clarity around something that both councillors NUS balm and McKenny have raised. On the matter of development charge exemptions, if we were to extend those, is it your intention or not to ensure that there is a cost recovery mechanism so that they do not become a subsidy to the developer?>> at this point in time I haven't figured out a way to do that. Right now you have built into your budget an allocation of \$6 million a year, which is what you typically provide for exemptions in a year. So if you were to do more exemptions, but you wanted them recovered, I'd be hard pressed to find a way that you would recover it, other than through incremental taxes, which at the end of the day is the same thing as having it in your budget.>> And forgive me, take me through that. Are you suggesting that they are entitled, then, to certain development charge exemptions?>> at this point in time, no, they're not.>> But do we have discretion as to

whether or not to extend it to any particular developer?>> yes, you do.>> And is it -- what am I hearing then, that there is open mindedness on the part of the city's negotiating team to extending development charge exemptions as it's negotiating with the preferred bidder and NCC on this property?>> no, we're not. But there may be -- >> You are not open minded for it?>> we're not offering it. >> So if they ask what is our preliminary approach?>> we would have to do an analysis of the value of what they're asking for and the benefits to the city and the trade-offs. At this point in time I can't tell you whether we would say this is a good deal or it's not a good deal. It's all part of a package of things, and I can't commit to you that we would be in favour of it. We would need to look at the impact overall.>> But that doesn't seem to be the case, for example, with respect to brownfields or borrowing authorities. You've already signalled your approach on that. Why are you not signalling your approach on DC exemptions?>> at this point in time they haven't asked for DC exemption.>> At this point in time have they asked for brown field?>> we know they are aware of the program, and we would expect them to ask.>> So do we expect them to ask for DC exemptions?>> I can't speak on their behalf.>> Okay, so it sounds -- forgive me, it sounds a little bit cagey. I'm not sure why when we're talking about our preferred approach on brown fields, our preferred approach on borrowing authorities we would very specifically set it out at the beginning that we would only contemplate those on a cost recovery basis but we're not willing to do to on a DC bylaw that sounds a lot like we're making sure the door is open to extend DC exemptions to them. I'm sorry, Mr. Wiltsy? you wanted to jump in?>> Mr. Mayor, it's not cagey at all. You need to look at all the components of the deal. It's a very complex deal. It's been compared to Lansdowne. I think it will be more complex than Lansdowne. There are a lot of moving pieces and a lot of requests financially and otherwise that have to be dealt with, and as the GM of corporate service at treasury just said, the whole thing has to be looked at in entirety. When they bring us a proposal, what's best for the city keeping within these principles. So we have a principle on No. 2 which effectively says the city tax base must be protected as part of any agreement. There may be parts of it that we are giving and some taking, but ultimately to protect the taxpayers. To answer a question about a specific component right now is actually impossible until we see what exactly they are going to come with in terms of putting together what works for them in terms of their financial proposal to make sense from a business case and then we'll respond based on what works for our taxpayers to keep to this principle and ensure we can bring something back to council that we believe council will accept.>> Forgive me, just one more time, it seems inconsistent with our very clear signalling in this document about how we're going to treat certain types of requests.>> Mr. Mayor, I'm sorry, but I have to disagree with that. It's not

inconsistent. We have principles here that we can live within, we can negotiate with, that gives us enough room to bring a proposal, and as we said, we won't be making any final agreement. It has to come back to council for approval, and to me, no door is open here to give away the farm. Let's see what they bring back and we have a duty to protect our taxpayers. We're committed to that.>> Shifting gears, the role of the local ward councillor, and I include myself tangentially there since I border right on the property, this development will have a significant impact on the neighbourhoods of centre town, Dalhousie, Hintonburg, mechanicsville. It's going to transform those neighbourhoods. Now I absolutely understand that no one particular councillor should be at the table with veto, with any further influence than others, but in the wake of let's call it some off-line discussion on this point recently, it looks to me like the local ward councillor is deliberately being kept out of the loop. I'm looking for some assurance here that there will be a flow of information to the local ward councillor on issues of concern to the ward.>> Mr. Mayor, the ward councillor, respectfully, is not deliberately being left out of the discussion. In fact, the outcome of the committee was that the mayor and myself would be keeping the ward councillor informed of progress as it moves into the planning component. Mr. Willis also made a commitment at the end of fedko that he would keep the ward councillor and councillors who are impacted informed as we move away from the land settlement and the federal government negotiations that are happening with the proponent, as we look at the financial model that we'll move into as part of these principles, we'll quickly be moving after that gets settled as to how does this unfold as a planning effort, and at that point Mr. Willis has made a commitment that the ward councillors and whoever is affected will be kept informed as per our normal process of development.>> So Mr. Mayor, if I may add to that, the types of impacts that the councillor is referring to, the sorts of things we would think about in any major development, built form, transportation, circulation, other mobility systems, the public open space system, access to public amenities and facilities and community facilities throughout the site are all in the purview of the land use planning process under the governance of the planning committee, so there will become a point at which this will transition from a council-wide decision related to a broader deal related to a land use planning application and the like and that would then trigger us back to our usual processes where there's a considerable amount of involvement with the councillors. As the city manager committed, I have also committed to councillor McKenny and I'll commit to you as well, if there's meaningful information on those things as we go through the earlier stage, I will make sure you're briefed.>> Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. Mayor? thank you very much, Mr. Mayor.>> Councillor Wilkinson, please.>> Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Actually, Mr. Mayor, I have questions for you.>> Okay, go

ahead.>> I heard you say in the past that you are not in favour of paying for the brown fields on this site, that the NCC, since they own the land, should be selling it clean, as we would do with our own lands. Have you made any progress on that?>> well, I raised the issue yesterday with the NCC chair and president and reiterated the position that was going forward as part of this series of recommendations to give the city manager and myself a mandate to negotiate, that we truly -- I hope you will agree with me, that the federal government made an historic decision in the 1950s to demolish that part of the city, and it's been sitting vacant and has contaminations on the site, and because the federal government is the owner of the site, they should take responsibility for the cleanup of the site and not the city's brown fields. I very much believe that. I have discussed it with a number of federal officials, and they have not rejected that claim because it is their land and we believe that they should be responsible for their land before it's developed.>> I take it there's no legislation that says that a person knows their land is contaminated does not have a right to sell it with its contamination.>> I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.>> Is there any legislation either provincially or nationally that will say if you have contaminated land that you then pass on or sell to somebody else that you are actually responsible for cleaning it up first?>> I don't believe so because, in fact, there have been pieces of land I believe over the years for LRT that we have purchased from the federal government and it's been our responsibility to clean them up, but there's nothing that says that it has to be done by the federal government, but as you know, our brown field rehabilitation fund is relatively small portions of dollars that have been handed out in the past to kick start the projects I think of west hunt club road, but I truly believe that the federal government is going to sell or lease the land as part of this redevelopment and revitalization, it should be taken care of before it's passed over to the new owners.>> I absolutely agree with you, and I think that the -- this would be very much more expensive than what we've been doing now. The other one is I know you have said many times that you do not want this to cause any cost to the city, and that they should follow all the rules -- >> Sorry, councillor, the noise out there, if you could just speak into your mic a little more, it's very hard to hear.>> You said that you don't want this to cause cost to the city, this development, and that they should follow the normal rules. To my mind, I would think dedicating any land for parks, we wouldn't be buying it. That they would pay for the construction of new roads within the development as other developers have to, and sewers, et cetera, except for the oversizing, which we have obviously a policy on that type of thing. And that development charges will be used for paying for those things like oversizing, et cetera, as we do in the other parts of the city when there's new development. This basically is almost like a green field development, just because they -- the land is completely open and cleared off. It's not as

if it's a redevelopment in the normal sense between two different buildings or anything. I just wanted to -- I know you're going to have a lot of discussions on this, and I completely support the report in going forward in that way, but I just wanted to know that you and the staff will be doing everything possible to make sure that they follow the same rules, the same regulations, carry the same costs as anybody else would, and that we wouldn't burden a city with additional costs, which I don't think at this point in time we can actually carry. >> I think in fairness, though, councillor, this gives us a bargaining mandate to go forward. I don't think it's appropriate we get into what we're going to agree to or not agree to even before the mandate has been approved or we have had a sit-down meetings with the proponents in the NCC. Certainly it's very clear that one of my objectives, as stated in the document, is to protect the Ottawa taxpayers, and that will be a principle that I will continue to hold throughout the negotiations, and my hope is that we're able to find a amicable agreement, primarily between the NCC and LeBreton to revitalize that particular part of the downtown core. As you know, we have a significant transit investment with two stations, the LRT, and it's in our collective interest that those stations be busy with activities throughout the site, not just the arena, but the affordable housing component and other components that will bring more people to the western edge of the downtown core. So I think you can appreciate the fact that I don't think it's appropriate we start the negotiations here, showing our hand, if you will, because I think it's important that we have an initial sit-down meeting with the proponent to determine what their looking for and to let them know what we're prepared to do to protect taxpayers and at the same time revitalize -- >> I recognize you're going to be doing things, but I think the principle is that it is a new development and it shouldn't matter where in the city a new development is going, the rules should be roughly the same. There may be occasionally a few special things that come up. Even in the case of Lansdowne, I know that we have foregone a lot of tax revenue to get that development in place. That was one of the things that was negotiated, and I was involved with the financial negotiations on that particular one, and it was a concern of mine from day one that we -- it's fine to say they won't have to -- it will be paid for by the tax revenues of the new development, but that new development also has costs that we have to carry for a lot of things, like security and roads, et cetera, and if you do that with everything, then a few taxpayers will pay for everything. So I'll leave it in your hands. I know you have the right objectives in this and that you're going to do the best you can for the taxpayers. I think it would be helpful if we got some periodic reports back to us on how things are going, possibly in a confidential briefing, even, so that it doesn't at the end come as a big surprise. >> Yeah, this is a -- you know, it's not a couple of months process. This is sort of a year and a half. There's a lot to deal with, and we have to first and foremost

have the NCC and rendezvous LeBreton reach some kind of agreement. There's no sense in us starting to negotiate until they have an agreement in principle with respect to the land, and then the ball falls in our court to start working on it. So I appreciate that input, and we will update council on a confidential basis as the process unfolds.>> Thank you very much.>> Thank you, councillor. Councillor Kadri, please.>> Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor, and thank you for the update that you just provided to councillor Wilkinson. My concern, Mr. Mayor, is and has been that through this whole process, I agree with you it's a lot different than Lansdowne park because there is another piece to this process. The other piece being in the west end as to what happens over in the west end once they move. I mean, up until now we have been talking about what happens at LeBreton flats when they move out to LeBreton flats, but one thing I do want to caution everybody on, is not to forget the west end, the Kanata, Stittsville area. Because the impacts of them moving are going to be there, and I want to make sure that any funding that is provided through the city, if any, to them is also rip-ro-Kated in reverse for the Kanata-Stittsville area. There will be effects in that area, both economically, as well as needing some of that funding to replenish what we're losing. I want to keep that on the back of your table to make sure that that as a negotiation goes forward that that issue is discussed also.>> Yes, I think -- thank you, councillor, for that, and I certainly give credit to you and your colleagues, because that is a big economic generator in the west end, and we certainly have raised it -- at least I've raised it on two occasions with Eugene Melynk and with the senators group, and rendezvous LeBreton. Because while it's not part of a LeBreton proposal, it has direct implications if the arena moves downtown. I certainly kept that very much in mind, and we need to find what is going to fill that very significant void if the arena is constructed downtown. So thank you for that.>> Councillor Kadri, please?>> thank you again, Mr. Mayor, for that, and you know, I agree with you that it's good to have it in the discussion, but for me, the comment that you just made about it not being part of the LeBreton discussion, I think the whole piece is one piece. You can't separate the two. LeBreton is a different discussion versus the west end, to me is another discussion that should be part of that process.>> Yeah, you know, from a broad perspective, I agree, but the information before us or the recommendation before us that the NCC have made is really only the LeBreton rendezvous agreement, but I -- as I said, I've raised on two occasions with Mr. Melynk and the senators group at your behest the fact that we've got to come up with a solution for what will be a big economic loss for the west end. So I certainly -- you know, it won't be in the formal negotiations, but it will be, in essence, an ancillary item that we have to continue to pursue because that is an important part of the economy and job creation in the west end. So you know, I hear you loud and clear. You have been very persistent with me, and

keep prodding me, but I want to find a solution for that as well. It may be in a parallel process that we operate with, but it's not part of the NCC agreement that they're trying to reach.>> Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor.>> Thank you. [Speaking French]. Any other questions or comments? [End of Translation]. Why don't we have yeas and nays, then. Yeas and nays, please? 20 yeas, two nays.>> Okay, thank you. The next item that was held, smart city 2.0, I believe councillor Leiper had a question.>> I did. Thank you very much, chair. This is a subject that I'm very, very interested in. A couple of quick questions for staff on this one. I think some of it more philosophical. Bear with me while I pull up my notes. So I am looking at a couple of items in here -- sorry, bear with me. Open data, open city, digital by default, open by default. There is some really interesting principles, I think it's on page 327 of the version of the report that I have, there are two key themes, one of which is that a smart city is analytics driven with operations and the second one of which speaks to intelligent infrastructure. And underneath key theme two, it speaks about having an open data catalogue that is free for use. I'm looking for some comfort from staff that if we're going to truly be a smart city that we are looking at making sure that everything that we do is digital by default and that it is open by default. Because when I take a look at how the data that's created by various sensors or the various things that we have is going to be used, I'm looking in key theme three at a number of sort of prepackaged products. We're going to take the data and we're going to create interfaces for it that citizens will then be able to use, which is interesting, but it's not a smart city. A smart city puts that data in the hands of residents in as raw a form as possible, machine readable data that they can manipulate themselves. When it comes to open data, to what extent are you thinking about making sure that it is everything that we do? Steve is pointing.>> Yep.>> Mr. Mayor, so the open data is a core piece of the smart city strategy, and absolutely, councillor, we're totally in agreement in terms of the approach that we need to do moving forward. So much so that when we went through the organizational transformation, we recognized that for us to really move forward in a digital and a mobile and a smart city, we had to invest in data analytics capability, data capability, and develop some expertise in the organization around how we pull all that data together and make that both available to the market, to develop solutions for us, but also to develop it in a way that individual residents can use it as we move forward. So in the transformation, we created an entire group that is building capability and data analysis expertise to be able to guide us in that. And they started to do that this year with the introduction of, again, another number of data sets. But they're moving beyond just the data sets to look at what do we need to do into the broader organization from both a policy capability and tool perspective as well. Because we've got some work to do in terms of just even the development of our

data that goes beyond just back into our back-in systems that create and capture the data. I'm going to pass it to our director of service transformation to talk about who owns now that in his department to talk about the plan moving forward on the data and strategy.>> We've done a number of things over the course of the last I'd say six months around the open data. As you may be aware, we are moving forward with releasing another 15 data sets this year, and that will bring our total up to close to 165 data sets available. We're also pursuing the open data -- open 311-API, which is releasing a number of service requests. We just went live with another 70 service requests today totalling 90 service requests, which makes up over I think 90% of our on-line volume now that's completely open, again, to try to spur innovation out in the community around the open data 311-API, so allowing two-way communications to happen now directly into our environment. And we're also completing a data analytics strategy that also covers things like a data policy, to accelerate data sets moving forward and being able to offer more and more data sets publicly. In 2018 we're going to have visualization tools in our data sets, similar to what you may have seen with Edmonton or with municipalities like Boston that are really at the forefront of open data. So we're aggressively pursuing that in 2018 as well.>> Okay. And I'm interested in hearing more on the policy side. It strikes me as councillors that we are too often having to go to Mr. O'Connor to say there is information that residents want, and when we seek it, we are being told no by staff because I think bureaucrats, and I was one, and I know exactly how they feel, tend to want to control information. They tend to worry about the ramifications of having information get out into the wild. What are we doing to ensure that our open data policy is supported by a culture of open by default?>> Mr. Mayor, the policy, you're right, councillor, will be one piece, and we'll be looking at that policy and also the release plans that we will be developing in terms of the data sets that we're going to release out into the community. So we plan to do that on a progressive matter, where we are looking at what the community want and being responsive in terms of how we enable that in the development to move forward. As part of the entire digital strategy, we are looking at how do we not just focus on just the open data but how are we building that culture of innovation and data and information across the organization. You'll see that as a key piece of the strategy when we come forward in the new year. And it will start with us as our leadership has made a commitment in terms of our digital strategy. For that to be a key piece that we start to look at in order for us to be able to really develop solutions that are going to meet the needs of residents. So it really will be a three-pronged approach that will be a key component of the strategy in the new year, when that comes forward.>> Okay, that's going to be coming forward to council?>> yes, that is correct.>> Fantastic. There is another piece in the smart city

strategy which I'm very, very interested in, which is options for low-cost broadband, explore broadband as a utility. That is probably the most interesting statement, a couple of words in the entire piece. Can you talk more about what you're thinking on that front? >> yes, Mr. Mayor. It's interesting, we had a discussion with our long-named right-of-way heritage urban design group the other day about what the role of a right-of-way in the city, and that's the land between what's privately owned on either side of the road and occupied, and we believe our philosophy is the right-of-way represents the space used for traditional utility, water, sewer, storm water. It's used for mobility, which we now view as multi-modal. It's used for energy now, our energy evolution project, and it's for data movement as well. That's the role of the right-of-way, and on top of that we have the public realm that the public sees. We're broadening how we understand the right-of-way to function, and part of the strategy involves ensuring that we are getting out of the way where we can to ensure that we enable it, as long as there are no conflicts between the other purposes of the right-of-way, and also as a department we're going to be measuring the level of rollout of availability of broadband across the city, and one of the proposals in the new year is we'll establish a group who will advise us on a minimum standard we should be targeting as a community for that. >> One of the -- some of the language that I did not see in the report, though, is that as we're looking at broadband as a utility and exploiting our right-of-ways is competitive neutrality. Earlier in this term of council, this council chose not to support our small ISPs. Thankfully federal cabinet made the right decision on that one. What is your view on competitive neutrality as we taking a look at the crowded right-of-ways, whether it's on conduits or on poles? >> I think it's not a short answer, so it's something I'd like to talk further off-line to get a better understanding of what you mean by competitive neutrality, but I know by the way the CRTC regulations work today, the way other federal regulations work, we have to be effectively neutral in terms of our offering of the right-of-way, provided there are no conflicts with other utilities and functions within the right-of-way. So if I'm not answering the question right, perhaps I need to spend more time to understand what you mean. >> Yeah, it's well worth an off-line conversation. Congratulations on coming up with this strategy. I'm looking forward to engaging with it further down the road. Thank you, chair. >> Thank you. Councillor Fleury? [Speaking French]. >> Thank you very much. [End of Translation]. On the importance of investments in technology and in smart city. I think the more data we have, the better it is. The more decisions -- the better decisions are made, and also after that the better our response can be as a city. So to me it's a win-win-win. I just want to speak to a matter that too often we hold on to legacy programs in the various departments, which to me are continued waste of these strategies. I want to highlight also different levels of behaviour, and I'll highlight two very

measured ones. One which is -- I'll use the pothole example. Pothole comes into 311, makes its way through to Kevin's group, who makes -- who then prints the copy, assigns it to the office -- to whoever's going to fill that pothole and it ends up being a physical copy. I want to applaud the work of Ottawa community housing on that front where there was a very predominant issue at community housing, and we were able to close that loop by removing the paper trail. Everyone had the technology tools they needed on site, where they needed it, so that it wasn't a manager who was closing a file. It was actually the person who had done the work. So that to me is one. The other one that I know Mr. Man conie is struggling with is technology is evolving. Technology is evolving around this. People with the data that we provide, they -- they invent apps and so on. It's great. Let's keep that up, and let's make sure the information we provide is accurate. The big gap in my mind is we're stuck with the old legacy. We're printing the sheet of the buses at the bus stop and things continue to evolve. We also have to be front facing in that challenge with technology so that we can make a cohesive shift. So again, I applaud the strategy. I just wanted to highlight two very -- you know, two gaps that we have that I think reflect a bigger challenge that we have internally. Thanks.>> Good, thank you. Councillor Hubley, please.>> Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor. I would just say I want to echo my colleagues and thank Mr. Willis and Ms. Grey for their work on the strategy, along with councillor Harder and councillor Tierney. It's been quite an occasional journey to learn where -- educational journey to learn where we're going with this. It's also very exciting to see how much the city is already doing in this area with a number of great initiatives on how to save taxpayers' money, yet provide better services. So I want to express my support publicly for your efforts today, and -- carry through. Thank you for seeing the wisdom and the potential savings and embracing smart cities so we can move towards making this a term of priority for council.>> Thank you, councillor Hubley. Other questions on the item? on the report? carried? council will now resolve in camera to consider a number of collective bargaining matters. Councillor KAKace, seconded by councillor Taylor, please introduce the motion to resolve in camera.>> Procedure be suspended to permit the deputy solicitor and staff to brief council and receive direction in respect to collective bargaining mandates for the following bargaining units, ATU local 279 Para Transpo local ATU and Ottawa professional firefighters association and be it further resolved that council resolve in camera pursuant to procedure bylaw 216-377-13(1) (d) and others, the receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose with respect to the above-noted collective bargaining matters.>> On the motion? carried. We'll take a five-minute recess before moving in camera. I ask that the room be cleared and that staff who do not need to be present please leave the room as

well, and please remember to bring all of your belongings with you as you exit. I believe commissioner crew is here on behalf of -- and Hartman as well. So if they could take a seat, and we're recessed for five minutes.

>> Mayor Jim Watson: FOR THOSE
1PRESENT I WOULD
LIKE TO ADVISE THAT COUNCIL MET IN CAMERA TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE FROM
STAFF REGARDING THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING MANDATES FOR
THE FOLLOWING THREE BARGAINING UNITS: AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNIT
LOCAL 279, PARATRANSPO AND OTTAWA PROFESSIONAL
FIREFIGHTERS ASSOCIATION. THESE MATTERS WILL NOT BE REPORTED OUT
AS THEY RELATE TO LABOUR RELATIONS OR EMPLOYEE NEGOTIATIONS AND
ADVICE THAT IS SUBJECT TO SOLICITOR/CLIENT PRIVILEGE DURING THE IN
CAMERA SESSION. NO VOTES WERE TAKEN, OTHER THAN TO GIVE DIRECTIONS
TO STAFF TO DEAL WITH PROCEDURAL MATTERS. SO, MOTION TO ADOPT
REPORTS (SPEAKING FRENCH) COUNCILLOR -->> REPORT FROM THE
COMMISSIONER ENTITLED INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER 2017 ANNUAL REPORT,
THE REPORT FROM THE OTTAWA BOARD OF HEALTH ENTITLED ONTARIO'S
HEALTH SYSTEM, RESPONSE TO THE MINISTER'S EXPERT PANEL
REPORT, AUDIT COSMETIC REPORT 13, FINANCE AND ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT 29, PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORTS 54
AND 54A, TRANSIT COMMISSION REPORT 15 AND THE REPORT FROM THE CITY
CLERK AND SOLICITORS OFFICE ENTITLED SUMMARY OF ORAL AND
WRITTEN PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FOR ITEM SUBJECT TO BILL 73. EXPLANATION
REQUIREMENT AT THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF NOVEMBER 9th, 2017 BE
RECEIVED AND ADOPTED AS AMENDED. >> Mayor Jim Watson: ON THE MOTION
CARRIED? ARE THERE ANY MOTIONS REQUIRING SUSPENSION OF THE RULES
OF PROCEDURE? (SPEAKING FRENCH) NO?

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR
SUBSEQUENT MEETING. (SPEAKING FRENCH) >> COUNCILLOR HARDER. >>
THANK YOU, IT'S ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RESPONSE GROUP FOR OUR STUDY
MOVED BY MYSELF WHERE AS THE PURPOSE OF THE R4 STUDY REVIEW THE
LAND USE PLANNING POLICIES ASSOCIATED WITH LOW RISE SINGLE
DETACHED AND MULTI-UNIT DWELLINGS FOR THE PURPOSES OF ASSESSING
THE LAND USE PLANNING IMPACT OF SUCH DWELLINGS WHERE THEY
CONTAIN MORE THAN 4 BEDROOMS TO ESTABLISH FURTHER
ZONING STANDARDS TO HELP ENSURE THE COMPATIBILITY AND
STAFF REQUESTED A SPONSORS GROUP OF COUNCILLORS BE FORMED TO
HELP INFORM AND GUIDE THE R4 STUDY AND WHEREAS SUCH SPONSORS
GROUP SHOULD BE COMPRIMISED OF WARD COUNCILLORS, WHOSE WARDS
ARE MOST IMPACTED BY THE STUDY THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT
COUNCIL APPROVE A SPONSORS GROUP FOR THE R4 STUDY COMPRIMISED
OF COUNCILLORS... IT'S A NOTICE OF MOTION. >> Mayor Jim Watson: WE'LL DEAL
WITH THAT AND ANY OTHER NOTICE OF MOTION FOR FUTURE MEETING? NO,
NOTICE OF INTENT (SPEAKING FRENCH) THAT THE CITY AUDITOR GENERAL TO
TABLE THE ANNUAL REPORT AT THE NOVEMBER 30, 2017 MEETING OF THE
AUDIT COMMITTEE. MOTION ENTERED AS BYLAWS (SPEAKING FRENCH). >>
THAT THE BYLAWS LISTED ON THE -- UNDER MOTION TO INTRODUCE BYLAWS
THREE READINGS READ AND PASSED. >> Mayor Jim Watson: ON THE MOTION
CARRIED. DO WE HAVE ANY WRITTEN INQUIRIES

MADAM DEPUTY CLERK?

3ADJOURNMENT,

ADJOURNMENTCOUNCILLOR QAQISH SECONDED BY --CONFIRMATION BYLAW
COUNCILLORQAQISH.>> FOLLOWING BYLAW READ ANDPASSED CONFIRM
THAT PROCEEDINGSOFTHE COUNCIL MEETING OFNOVEMBER 22, 2017.>>

Mayor Jim Watson: CARRIED.COUNCILLOR QAQISH FOLLOWED BYCOUNCILLOR
TAYLOR.>> MEETING OF NOVEMBER 22, 2017BE ADJOURNED.>> Mayor Jim
Watson: MEETINGADJOURNED THANK YOU VERY MUCH,CARRIED.

