

## Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

### Zoning By-law Amendment –191 Norice Street

Note: This is a draft Summary of the Written and Oral Submissions received in respect of Zoning By-law Amendment –191 Norice Street (ACS2021-PIE-PS-0025), 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: 0

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): 1

#### Primary concerns, by individual

**Giancarlo Ciambella** (written submission)

- there is no compatibility with other houses on Norice and they are not adequately set back from adjacent properties - the buildings are twice the height, at half the distance from the sidewalk of the existing single bungalow, and the proposed design fills the maximum available open-space, contrary to the open-space concept of adjacent properties
- despite the claim that this building serves as a transition, the future apartment building to the west is another ill-conceived idea of inserting a high-density over-sized construction, lacking back-yard and parking spaces, on an established residential area consisting of single-family homes on generous lots
- despite the claim that a single entrance has the benefit of providing ample space for landscaping in the front yards, front landscaping would be greatly reduced; the distance from the buildings to the sidewalk would be half the distance of the present bungalow and these proposed buildings would be the only ones so close to the sidewalk

- transportation will be an issue; the term ‘multi-use path’ is an embellishment describing a main artery with a bicycle lane, a sidewalk and a bus stop; four of the eight of the dwellings have no garage and four have a single garage, with no provision for visitor parking, which illustrates how saturated the construction on the lot is
- despite the claim that the existing watermain system is capable of supplying water to meet demand while meeting minimum required pressures and that that fire flow demands can be supplied through existing hydrants, “minimum required” in a description of any service, especially when fire flow is mentioned, is not acceptable; municipal water use is a paid service; there should be no extra load on the existing system to render it “minimum requirement”; this would only profit the City and the investors of the project, to the detriment of the residents
- the staff statements in respect of the proposed zoning details are arguable
  - the definition of a semi-detached dwelling is “two houses that share one common wall”, but this proposal is not about semi-detached dwellings, it is about four garages, two of which are semi-detached and each attached to a separate house, where every house is a double dwelling
  - all this congestion happens on an average size Norice lot, where the majority of the lots hold a single house and a few have been sub-divided to hold two houses with their own garage and driveway
  - there is no compatibility in introducing high-density residences in a low-density residential area consisting of single-family houses, not units
  - the site is not underutilized; it is an opportunity for someone who appreciates the opportunity to live in a property with a house, space for a possible vegetable garden, swimming pool, flower beds, open space for children to play safely or just space to barbecue and relax
  - there are other better-suited areas where high-density oversized dwellings would fit without need for re-zoning
- the staff responses in respect of public feedback (Document 3) are arguable
  - the low-rise neighbourhood is stable and re-zoning would de-stabilize it by changing its character; mention of a future apartment building is more de-stabilizing for the environmental character of the area; this appears to be social re-engineering of established neighbourhoods by external factions, who are not part of the local community
  - the scale of the development is not small, when compared to the surrounding

properties, and doesn't reflect the characteristics of the neighbourhood; each property or house on Norice has a garage, single or double, driveway space for the inhabitants' vehicles and space for visitor parking

- a mature tree was removed on the front lawn a few years ago and, on the plan, the buildings seem to reach the spot where the tree was; the front lawn appears to be half the size it presently is; there is no mention of features benefitting a family with children
  - it is unclear whether there is a registered community association for this area who may have been notified as suggested, but if they are in the community, they too must be living in a house with a decent front lawn, garage and driveway for themselves and visitors and they should expect the same type of living for others in their community
- there is no need to remove the rare opportunities that remain in Ottawa, inside the Greenbelt, for those who wish to have such a lifestyle
  - there are existing R2D zoning areas in Ottawa, better suited and with appropriate living amenities nearby that correspond to high-density living and minimal transportation requirements

## Primary reasons for support, by individual

None provided.

**Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision:** Debate: The Committee carried the report recommendations on consent (without discussion).

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

## **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): 0

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

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