

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 1 and 9 Canfield Road and 13, 15 and 17 Parkmount Crescent

In addition to those outlined in the Consultation Details section of the report, the following outlines the written and oral submissions received between the publication of the report and prior to City Council's consideration:

Number of delegations/submissions

Number of delegations at Committee: 11

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between June 29 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and July 9, 2020 (committee meeting date): 4

Primary concerns, by individual

Devon Harris (oral submission)

- residential development should not be demolished for the sake of creating parking space; there is a housing shortage in Ottawa and people would like to live in this community
- there are better uses for the property that would benefit the community more than parking spaces
- and worried about the impact it would have on the community and its character
- Demolition of the property will result in a loss of character in the neighbourhood

Tom Kurdyla (oral submission)

- expressed concern about how the neighbourhood would be impacted by this and future development
- suggested that participation and collaboration on a vision that will do justice for all parties is needed

Clarke Cross (oral submission)

- opposed to the demolition of homes to create parking and felt that it was not necessary with the availability of existing parking in the area
- the plan is not compatible with the area, nor with Official Plan policies
- the development remove mature trees and it will tower over neighbouring properties and should be scaled back

- not opposed to smart development and want the Church to thrive but not at the expense of the neighbourhood
- the applicant had not been willing to dialogue or engage with the community on the plan; the application should be deferred so the applicant and neighbours could discuss a compromise, or failing that, the plan should be rejected

Christy Allen and Shawn Doherty (oral and written submission)

- there was a lack of consultation and accommodation by the applicant
- their concerns were not considered or included in the report
- their property will be impacted due to the development massing and setback, fencing and property maintenance
- they will be surrounded and shadowed by the property and worry this is creating an impetus for them to sell their property to the Church
- requested their concerns be addressed with respect to: the need for a sun/shade study prior to building height approval; the need for the setback to be increased from the shared property line; the need for a proper perimeter fence to be installed along the entire shared property line; the need for the property to properly kept and maintained

Trevor Poole (oral submission)

- reiterated previous speakers' comments about lack of dialogue and community engagement, concerns about removing homes for parking, impacts on the neighbourhood and suitability of the plan
- supported deferral of the report for further consultation

Kristi M. Ross, Barrister and Solicitor, on behalf of the Trend Arlington Residents for Smart Development Inc. (the Residents' Group) (oral and written submission)

- lack of consultation by the applicant
- the development is not compatible with the site or the neighbourhood
- deintensification for the sake of unnecessary parking – there are other parking spaces nearby and alternative parking options, such as underground parking; with such alternative options, the community center could be built
- potential sterilization of the site for future intensification
- supported the proposed deferral motion to allow exploration of planning alternatives and compromise, but failing deferral, recommended rejection of the application

James O’Grady (oral submission)

- the site is not adequate to hold the size of facility that will be required to accommodate considerable anticipated growth in the community
- supported deferral to allow for further negotiation in hopes that the community could be preserved

Nancy Moynihan (also speaking on behalf of her husband, Scott) (oral submission and slides)

- the development is too large for the quiet, mature neighbourhood; it will have a detrimental impact on trees and streetscape, and neighbourhood character
- nearby properties will be impacted by light pollution and loss of greenspace

Sean Devine, President, Trend Arlington Community Association (oral and written submission)

- supported deferral as a means to allow opportunity to find a mutually acceptable solution that would mitigate damaged relations between the Church and the community
- noted community concerns that the development will have insufficient parking, which will exacerbate existing issues with parking, traffic and safety
- the consequences of this application will cause a permanent adverse impact on the surrounding community when there are alternative options that have not been fully considered

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Nancy Meloshe, Stantec (oral submission)

- provided background, noting the changes that have occurred between the 2018 proposal, which included a new Church and Community Center, and the current (2019) scaled back proposal for just a Community Centre
- spoke to the prior consultation that had occurred
- this development is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and the Official Plan; it is the expansion of an existing and established Church (for 30 years) development proposed would be appropriately located at a collector road/artery
- impacts on the residential area are mitigated through landscape design

Bishoy Alfy Samy (oral submission)

- spoke to the Church's integration and involvement within the community and suggested the Church has compromised with the community and acted in good faith to serve and build a community center that will be an asset and benefit to all

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 2 hours and 50 minutes on this item

Vote: The committee considered all written submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations the report recommendations as presented.

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between June 25 (Planning Committee consideration date) and July 15, 2020 (Council consideration date): 0

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all written submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations without amendment.