

## Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

### East Urban Community (EUC) Phase 3 Area: Community Design Plan (CDP), Secondary Plan, Master Servicing Study, Master Transportation Study, Mud Creek Cumulative Impact Study, Area Parks Plan and Official Plan (OP) Amendments

Note: This is a draft Summary of the Written and Oral Submissions received in respect of East Urban Community Phase 3 Area: Community Design Plan, Secondary Plan, Master Servicing Study, Master Transportation Study, Mud Creek Cumulative Impact Study, Area Parks Plan and Official Plan Amendments (ACS2021-PIE-EDP-0002), prior to City Council's consideration of the matter on February 24, 2021.

The final Summary will be presented to Council for approval at its meeting of March 10, 2021, in the report titled 'Summary of Oral and Written Public Submissions for Items Subject to the *Planning Act* 'Explanation Requirements' at the City Council Meeting of February 24, 2021'. Please refer to the 'Bulk Consent' section of the Council Agenda of March 10, 2021 to access this item.

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

#### Number of delegations/submissions

Number of delegations at Committee: 3

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between February 1 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and February 11, 2021 (committee meeting date): 4

#### Primary concerns, by individual

**Heather Buchanan, Bradley Estates Community Organization** (oral submission, slides provided)

- the Association represents Phase 1 and 2 of the East Urban Community and would like to ensure they are considered as part of the interconnected whole with these Phase 3 plans
- concerns about the recommendations from the Master Transportation Study, particularly recommendation 1c
  - it incorrectly states that " it addresses traffic impacts through possible increases to arterial roadway capacity"; this is lofty goal because Phase 1 and 2

recommendations made about this have not actually occurred yet; to date, not one modification has been implemented in Orleans South to alleviate the traffic congestion. Studies show that only 20.5% of workers living in Orléans work in Orléans, while the majority commute to work inside the Greenbelt (71.1%) using arterials which are mostly 2 lanes, including Brian Coburn Boulevard, Innes Road, Navan Road, Orléans Boulevard and Mer Bleue Road and two lane “collector” Renaud Road

- it suggests that dedicated transit lanes on arterials such as Innes Road should be explored to address transportation issues; in that the developments are primarily south of Innes and Coburn, transit priority routes on Innes aren't going to have any benefit to Orleans South residents, and would further add gridlock to Innes Road, funneling more cars onto Renaud Road
- the report states that residents have expressed concern about increased traffic on Innes Road, but public comments from 2014 open houses were about traffic on Navan, Mer Bleue and Renaud Roads, not Innes; Renaud Road is being ignored in these plans and Phase 3 impacts on traffic and current infrastructure are not well addressed in the report; there is also no mention of CDP phase 1 and 2 deficiencies which still have not been addressed, including lack of efficient connectivity to LRT and commercial areas, safe cycling, increases to arterial road capacities, etc.
- traffic concerns are brushed aside in this report, except for Councillor Kitts' comment that Phase 3 will add 5,000 more car-dependent households in an area where the road network is already at capacity; the development of the phase 3 lands has potential to exacerbate capacity issues, so efforts have been made to ensure that traffic flow on Innes Road and Brian Coburn is impacted as little as possible, but Renaud and Navan are the main routes used and are excluded from this report; 8,200 more homes and vehicles will add to gridlock and extra commuters will put pressures on community roads
- much of the traffic is heading to the Walkley employment hub; Phase 3 needs to plan for the extra volume on these roads; current daily traffic on Renaud Road is untenable, with total traffic / community collapse any time there are big snowfalls, accidents, etc.; and the same applies to Innes Road, which, in turn, has created gridlock in Phase 1 and 2 neighbourhoods, with idling vehicles, bumper to bumper traffic, dangerous and illegal passing, speeding, accidents, fatalities
- current traffic patterns indicate that the only EUC lands to date are so far removed from LRT and the main highways that it is a car-centric area by design,

not by choice

- the road pattern shown on the Gloucester Concept Plan does not meet current OP objectives; it creates cut through traffic on Renaud Road as it enters the Greenbelt; Renaud Road is a farm road, even though it is designated as a collector and being used as an arterial, with 18,000 vehicles using it as a cut-through of the Greenbelt (crossing Mud Creek three times
- the Phase 3 CDP report does not adequately address OP objectives in that it does not Identify any network modifications or other measures required to mitigate impacts on network performance (including improvements to the road, transit, and active transportation networks, as well as transit and TDM measures to encourage the shift to sustainable modes), and it does not assess the impact of development trips on the performance of the transportation network both within the development and within adjacent communities, including any downstream transit or road capacity deficiencies triggered or made worse by the new development
- the report neglects to address the deficiencies and failures of the Phase 1 and 2 CDPs and fails to recommend the preferred Option 7 of the Brian Coburn Extension to Anderson and ultimately to the Hunt Club extensions be explored as a primary solution to the traffic concerns, despite being endorsed by the public since the 2014 consultations and significantly supported by all four East end Councillors, Mayor Watson, and many local community groups, including Friends of Mer Bleue; this essential traffic corridor must be prioritized and included in the Phase 3 report

**Murray Chown, Ryan Poulton, Novatech, representing the landowner of 2127 Mer Bleue Road** (oral and written submissions)

- the property is located immediately north of the bus rapid transit route and the BRT station at Mer Bleue Road and the lands, on the current OP, are designated Urban Employment, which significantly limits the mix and scale of development that would be permitted in close proximity to that BRT station
- they raised these concerns with staff at the time of the adoption of the OP Amendment 180, an appeal was filed on behalf of their clients, and that appeal was withdrawn once they received written commitment from former City staff, on behalf of the City, indicating the City's desire to develop a mix of uses at relatively higher densities in close proximity to BRT stations, and pledging to work with the client on these issues in 2019 and beyond
- the draft OP report that was released in showed the property would be designated as

a hub in the new OP, which would allow for a mix of uses at a higher density than the current designation; the frontage of the property is on Mer Bleue Road, which is identified as a minor corridor, which would also permit a mix of uses at a higher density than the current designation in the OP but in this Phase 3 EUC report, it's shown as being designated employment area in the Secondary Plan

- policies and designations in a Secondary Plan always trump the policies and designations in the parent OP designations, so the approval of this Secondary Plan, designating these lands Employment, could have the effect, following adoption of the new OP, that despite the proposal in the draft OP to allow for a mix of uses at a higher density, development of these lands would be limited by the policies of the Secondary Plan, which only allow for employment uses at a reduced scale on these lands
- (indicated during oral submission) discussions with the Chair and staff prior to this meeting (following his written submission) had provided him some assurance that when the new Official Plan report is brought forward in the fall, the Secondary Plan would be amended and these lands would be removed from the Employment hub designation, so that the designation and policies of the new Official Plan would be in full force and effect (rather than those of the Secondary Plan)

**Pat Teolis, Chateaufneuf Community Association** (written submission)

- the Association represents the geographical area adjacent to the EUC area, with residents reside within Innes on the south, Mer Bleue/Jeanne d'Arc to the east, Boyer to the west, and St. Joseph to the north, an established community of over 40 years; in consideration of an additional 5200 residences in this area, they request the City to:
  - ensure appropriate affordable housing, as per the City's recent plan
  - ensure less sprawl by including some taller residence buildings (6 to 10 storeys); higher buildings should have appropriate transitioning to the two-storey residences nearby, which will allow for more greenspace/parkland to be shared by all residents
  - ensure that most of the traffic as a result of the newly created roads is channeled on the wide collector/arterial streets, such as Innes Rd., Jeanne d'Arc/Mer Bleue, Orleans Blvd. and Brian Coburn; as a serious and valid concern has continuously been the cut-through traffic on small, established residential streets where all those homes face the roads, resulting in high risk to pedestrians and cyclists
  - ensure that the Brian Coburn Rd. extension is in line with the National Capital

Commission's (NCC) mandate and the City's Transportation Branch's studies on this subject, as the administrators of federal lands in Ottawa, the NCC has an important mandate, a significant priority being the safeguarding of the development and conservation of the Greenbelt; the NCC must ensure the least negative impact on the environment while allowing for the provision of much needed transportation and transit requirements and it works closely with the City of Ottawa to determine best options for all shared priorities; the NCC's rationale and position must be respected

**Christine McCuaig, Q9 Planning + Design, on behalf of Smart Centres (Innes Shopping Centres Limited, 'ISCL')** (written submission)

- ISCL is a landowner within the EUC CDP area and subsequent Secondary Plan being considered to implement the CDP; its lands are located south east of the intersection of Innes Road and Mer Bleue Road, identified as 4200 Innes Road, situated in the north-east section of the CDP study area
- they wish to draw attention to the fact that portions of the ISCL lands have already been developed and that the ISCL lands have already been the subject of necessary studies and plans; infrastructure works have already been put into place in accordance with those studies, both studies and works paid for by ISCL, including on adjoining lands also developed by ISCL, but fall outside of the CDP plan area; the ISCL lands are not affected by the infrastructure issues referenced in the various reports forming part of the CDP
- ISCL is not opposed to Recommendation 1. (f) to implement the Official Plan Amendment, which comprises the new Secondary Plan identified as Document 6, but should any discussion at Planning Committee result in a change to Document 6, ISCL reserves the right to appeal or revisit its position, as may be applicable dependent on the changes

**Primary reasons for support, by individual**

The primary landowner/project developer, Richcraft Homes, as represented by the following persons, was present in support and to answer questions: **Julie Carrara, Senior Planner, Fotenn Consultants; Fairouz Wahab, Manager Land Development, Richcraft; Arthur Gordon, Principal, Castleglenn Consultants; Laura Maxell, Client Project Manager, David Schaeffer Engineering Limited; Kelly Roberts, Principal & Senior Environmental Planner, Morrison Hershfield**

**Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision:** Debate: The Committee spent 1 hour and 29 minutes in consideration of the item.

Vote: The committee considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations with an amendment to Document 6 of the report, as follows:

THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that Planning Committee approve that:

1) In Document 6, on page 14 of the Official Plan Amendment and Secondary Plan, Section 4.0, Policy 11:

a. the following be deleted:

“The City will require the execution of the Funding Agreement by each landowner and the execution of the Cost Sharing Agreement by each participating and affected landowner prior to the approval of any application by the landowner for rezoning, draft plan of subdivision or condominium, conditional approval of a severance, or approval under site plan control. The City shall include as a condition of approval for all plans of subdivision and condominium, site plan and severance applications in the secondary plan area a condition requiring notification from the Trustee of the EUC Phase 3 Area Landowners Group that the owners are party to the relevant agreement(s) and have paid their share of any costs pursuant to the agreement(s).”; and

b. be replaced by:

“The City will require each owner to demonstrate that it has executed the Funding Agreement and any applicable Cost Sharing Agreement, or the other owner’s consent to the owner proceeding in advance of the Cost Sharing Agreement being executed, as a condition of approval for all draft plan of subdivision and condominium, site plan and severance applications in the secondary plan area. A development condition shall require notification from the Administrator of the EUC Phase 3 Area Landowners Group that the owner is party to the relevant agreement(s) and has paid their share of any costs pursuant to the agreement(s) prior to registration.”

2) In Document 6, on page 19 of the Official Plan Amendment and Secondary Plan, Section 6.0, Policy 3:

a. The following be deleted:

“Consistent with Official Plan Section 5.3.5 Cost Sharing Agreements, the City will require the execution of the Funding Agreement by each

landowner and the execution of the Cost Sharing Agreement by each participating and affected landowner prior to the approval of any application by the landowner for draft plan of subdivision or condominium, conditional approval of a severance, or approval under site plan control. The City shall include as a condition of approval for all plans of subdivision and condominium, site plan and severance applications in the EUC Phase 3 Area requiring notification from the Trustee of the EUC Phase 3 Area Landowners Group that the owners are party to the relevant agreement(s) and have paid their share, if applicable, of any costs pursuant to the agreement(s).”; and

b. be replaced by:

“Consistent with Official Plan Section 5.3.5 Cost Sharing Agreements, the City will require each owner to demonstrate that it has executed the Funding Agreement, and any applicable Cost Sharing Agreement, or the other owner’s consent to the owner proceeding in advance of the Cost Sharing Agreement being executed, as a condition of approval for all draft plan of subdivision and condominium, site plan and severance applications in the secondary plan area. A development condition shall require notification from the Administrator of the EUC Phase 3 Area Landowners Group that the owner is party to the relevant agreement(s) and has paid their share of any costs pursuant to the agreement(s) prior to registration.”

## **Ottawa City Council**

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between February 11 (Planning Committee consideration date) and February 24, 2021 (Council consideration date): 1

### **Primary concerns, by individual**

#### **Heather Buchanan, Bradley Estates Community Organization**

- provided further reflection and comments in support of their presentation and request to Planning Committee that Option 7 of the Brian Coburn Extension be implemented
  - as evidenced from the nods and comments made (at Planning Committee), clearly Option 7 of the Brian Coburn Extension has support and is favoured by the majority but for the NCC which seems to be an infinite loop going nowhere fast; staff seem resigned to the fact that yet more discussion and negotiations are needed with NCC but they detected no energy or

indication of momentum any time soon; they ask that direct conversations with the NCC CEO, Tobi Nussbaum, be aggressively pursued so that we might see the extension before the community is fully built

- both Councillors Kitts and Dudas had a good understanding of and agreed on the community plan being basically a good thing for south Orleans but most importantly that the transportation plan and ongoing traffic infrastructure issues surrounding and supporting the plan need to be prioritized and actively improved upon sooner than later, and Councillor Tierney echoed the same opinion; each ward presents its share of traffic woes, but even the City transportation report indicates the shortfalls particular to this area
- staff commented that the new plan took into account the street grid for the neighbourhoods, allowing people easy access north-south for their “daily needs” (i.e. commercial shopping along Innes) but they took no account for the overwhelming demand of commuter traffic of people needing to move west-east at peak periods; seemingly, the belief is that the LRT will solve all the issues when, in fact, as the map on the slide show indicated, they are far removed from the LRT stations and connected by inefficient and unreliable bus service, directly linked to the gridlock that exists on Innes and Renaud; even the Phase 1 CDP stated, "the road pattern shown on the Gloucester Concept Plan does not meet current OP objectives and creates cut through traffic on Renaud Road as it enters the Greenbelt."; the phase 2 CDP states, "The East Urban Community is currently not well serviced by public transit....it is expected that as the community grows with development, transit services will increase to meet the demand and provide improved connectivity.", but this has yet to happen as Phase 3 will add another 5200 units to the mix
- staff does not seem to appreciate the full impact of the closure of Page or the non-development of the Frank Bender/Fern Casey extension to Innes Rd, indicating that "People will not mind taking a few seconds" to take Brian Coburn to Mer Bleue and then onto Innes, but anyone who lives in this community knows it is more than a few seconds and this dismissal of the need for a direct N-S link via Fern Casey is discouraging to say the least; there was no appreciation for moving commuter traffic west-east or the already persistent congestion or the vast numbers of homeowners who must use cars to drive for every errand given the closest commercial is a 55 minute walk away; staff also stated that expectations that as LRT Line 1 comes on line, more people will choose to travel north-south, lessening the



west-east pressure, but they failed to note that there are no direct routes north-south, much less are there any parking facilities at either Montreal or Jeanne d'Arc stations, so it's unlikely to see the LRT will provide any traffic relief to the south Orleans communities

- concerns about unfinished projects from the earlier phases 1 and 2 are still not acknowledged, despite the direct link to phase 3; when recommendations made in the CDP 1 and CDP 2 are ignored, or interminably delayed beyond 2032, it is hard to accept that recommendations made in Phase 3 will occur in a timely fashion; in order for all three phases to have efficient and safe multi-use links to each other, let alone to employment and shopping hubs, these should be prioritized; Option 7 must be rigorously pursued, sidewalks must be built, transit must be improved, BRT must be fast tracked, the Fern Casey extension is needed now, OC Transpo stops must be safer, and commercial development vs residential is needed as soon as possible, particularly for earlier phase area

#### **Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:**

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations with the amendment to Document 6, as recommended by Planning Committee.