

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment – 2740 Cedarview Road, 4190, 4200, 4210 and 4236 Fallowfield Road

Note: This is a draft Summary of the Written and Oral Submissions received in respect of Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment – 2740 Cedarview Road, 4190, 4200, 4210 and 4236 Fallowfield Road (ACS2020-PIE-PS-0068), prior to City Council's consideration of the matter on September 23, 2020.

The final Summary will be presented to Council for approval at its meeting of October 14, 2020, in the report titled 'Summary of Oral and Written Public Submissions for Items Subject to the *Planning Act* 'Explanation Requirements' at the City Council Meeting of September 23, 2020'. Please refer to the 'Bulk Consent' section of the Council Agenda of October 14, 2020 to access this item.

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

Number of delegations/submissions

Number of delegations at Committee: 2

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between August 31 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and September 10, 2020 (committee meeting date): 1

Primary concerns, by individual

Adam Ferrone (oral and written submission)

- he and his wife have made their life decisions to stay in their rural residential home, adjacent to the proposed development site, based on the information in the Secondary Plan for this area; specifically that there would be an Institutional / Institutional Office area at the location in question to provide employment to the area while amalgamating three different communities, and given that there would be no widening of Fallowfield Road until post 2031
- the applicant's proposal to build a 188-unit apartment building and some other townhomes on segregated land, 26 metres adjacent to their home, is contrary to the Secondary Plan, contrary to Official Plan guidelines, and contrary to the Provincial Policy Statement

- ❖ to put residential on this land would mean they have no access to the existing residential community, which means, according to the City's measurements for walking distance to parks, it would be a 10-minute walk just to enter the community; allowing a segregated residential subdivision to exist on the subject site would absolutely limit the elderly and persons with disabilities from participating in society
- ❖ all residential developments within areas 9&10 have been built according to the density instructions the Secondary Plan, with high density residential sitting on the western edge, lowest densities on the eastern edge, and the northwestern edge is high density and moving east transitions to medium, followed by the lowest; next to this sits the subject site, bound by fences and roadways, isolated from the residential context; the applicant is proposing to now have a transition of high to medium to low then to the very highest in the area on the subject site, which does not conform to existing policy
- ❖ of all thirteen South Nepean Secondary expansion areas, the subject site was the only area to be given the designation of Institutional and Office /institutional, a rare and coveted designation because it offers a calming effect on communities and provides very specific institutional and office employment that cannot be replicated in a business park; the approval of these applications means these specific uses can never be replaced nor can the calming effect it will provide when it helps amalgamate the existing communities
- ❖ if the requested height change is permitted, from 10.7 meters to over 15 meters the proposed 3.5 storey apartments will be almost 2.5 times higher than their rural home, and as their properties are only 26 meters apart, it will effectively destroy their rural identity and character
- ❖ it is impossible through design to blend 45-foot-tall 4 story apartment buildings, 26 meters away from a 1950s, 19-foot-tall rural home; according to the Official Plan, the size and scale of the applicant's proposal belongs closer to the Town Center where Rapid Transit already exists or where it is planned
- ❖ no justification has been provided for the proposal and the question of whether the lands can be redesignated to residential has not been answered
- ❖ Areas 9 and 10 are already over residential goals with much more to come South of Strandherd Drive, where adequate public infrastructure,

including future rapid transit, are planned; the Secondary Plan and Provincial Policy Statement have preserved and protected the subject site from residential intensification to help provide a complete community

- ❖ the City continually surpasses its minimum targets for intensification and redevelopment within built-up areas, targets that have never applied to a sub area's approximate goal
- ❖ the applicant has incorrectly referred to the area as Ottawa's Regional Market Area on order to apply Provincial Policy to justify the proposal for apartments; South Nepean already has an influx of affordable housing starts with an abundance of low-rise apartments options located exactly where the Official Plan has dictated
- ❖ the South Nepean Secondary Plan for areas 9 and 10 encompass all policies and direction in respect of growth patterns and managing growth and dictates exactly where residential development will occur, where high densities are allowed and how existing communities will blend with the new, with which this application is completely inconsistent
- ❖ the Applicant believes that because Schedule B in the Official Plan identifies this entire area as "General Urban Area", and that residential development is allowed in a General Urban Area, and because R4 zoning is listed as one of many options for residential developments, this means they can completely disregard the Secondary Plan in respect of urban design and compatibility
- ❖ the proposal doesn't follow the 2017 Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) guidelines and would force the early widening of Fallowfield by inserting traffic into an arterial roadway, uncontrolled (no lights); as intended in the Secondary Plan, with Institutional / Institutional Office use, the traffic to and from the site would have complemented existing area traffic and not conflicted with it; if the plan proceeds and Fallowfield gets widened, their home would be expropriated

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Greg Winters, Novatech (applicant) (oral submission)

- disagreed with Mr. Ferrone's assertions about compliance with the Official Plan (OP) and Secondary Plan, as the Secondary Plan is outdated and wouldn't stand the test today under the Provincial Policy Statement or current

City strategy under the new OP

- more development must be encouraged with moderate density increases in the urban area if the desire intensification targets are to be achieved
- allowing some development to occur in this neighbourhood, which is largely largely comprised of town houses and single detached houses and very few apartments, where people could actually walk to work, is good planning
- the Secondary Plan had proposed for higher densities along Strandherd Drive to accompany the Business Park developing across the street, but that never happened; the Institutional Office has never materialized as it was envisioned 20 years ago; this is one of the last opportunities to introduce some moderate level of density and to allow for some other forms of housing to occur in this community
- the study did follow the TIA guidelines and met the level of service requirements; this proposal is not triggering a widening to Fallowfield Road, but rather development in the entire west end of the city and south end of Barrhaven is creating that need for transportation improvements

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 9 minutes in consideration of the report.

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 September 10 (Planning Committee consideration date) and September 23, 2020 (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.