

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 3030 St. Joseph Boulevard

Note: This is a draft Summary of the Written and Oral Submissions received in respect of Zoning By-law Amendment – 3030 St. Joseph Boulevard (ACS2020-PIE-PS-0088), 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: 5

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): 34

Primary concerns, by individual

Ken Horne, Concerned Citizens of Queenswood Heights (written and oral submission)

- spoke about the risks of prolonged and intensive construction at this extremely sensitive site, given its composition, specifically the presence of Leda clay
 - ❖ Leda clay’s unique structure can become dangerously unstable and unpredictable when disturbed and adjoining subdivisions and areas further into Orleans would face risk of serious damage as a result of shockwaves during construction and water drainage and removal; as the water drains and is removed, properties will subside and foundations crack – as has happened before to the Crestview homes surrounding the 1970s construction in the Merivale Road area
 - ❖ the developer has never developed or constructed a building over five stories high, let alone one on Leda clay, and in an active earthquake fault zone such as here
 - ❖ numerous multi-story high-rise buildings have been built in the Ottawa area, but not into the face of an escarpment with established

neighbourhoods as proposed here; the Orleans escarpment is like multiple layers of a cake that also has layers of Leda clay and glacial till

- ❖ the very presence of Leda clay that makes it an impossibility for anyone provide assurances that constructing a 16-storey high-rise into this escarpment will not cause damage to the homes that it abuts; even the Paterson Group geotechnical study has caveats on this, noting that vibrations caused by blasting or construction operations could cause detrimental vibrations to the adjoining buildings and structures; this fails to satisfy City requirements requiring that developments will not cause adverse effects or aggravate a hazard either on site or elsewhere
- questioned the suitability of the land for such development as proposed
 - ❖ Covid-19 and the pandemic is now showing to have major impact on the public's view of multistory high-rise condominiums and the lifestyle, itself, and the value of low-density or single homes, and the housing market is reflecting such
 - ❖ the promised retail space will not be attractive to new businesses, as there are already established alternatives across the street at Farm Boy and Place d'Orléans
 - ❖ St. Joseph is not the geographic center of Orléans; 10th Line and Innes is; St. Joseph is not "dead" and does need coordinated business and retail to attract pedestrian traffic to various points
 - ❖ this site does not abut the Place d'Orléans complex and LRT zone; it actually abuts and is part of the escarpment, and Queenswood Heights, and all of the Orléans subdivisions that immediately surround it
 - ❖ in the 1980's, this property was deemed unbuildable by the City of Cumberland, but somehow that was changed

Guy Dacquay, Concerned Citizens of Queenswood Heights (oral and written submission)

- the proposal would bring a significant increase in traffic volume and movement at an already very busy and dangerous intersection, given its topography and the lack of cycling lanes on St. Joseph Blvd
 - ❖ while the City's 2017 Transportation Brief did not identify any major concerns or hazards at the intersection, there have been several serious accidents and at least one fatal crash in the past
 - ❖ the road is slippery hill in winter, difficult for buses and cars to climb

- ❖ pedestrians and cyclists fear crossing the intersection and there are no bike lanes on St. Joseph
- ❖ if the intersection is only at capacity now, it will be over capacity with so many new residents at this development
- ❖ the triangular shape of the building and its proximity to the intersection will significantly obstruct the view of St. Joseph for westbound drivers coming on this street from Duford Drive, which will increase the hazard of crossing this intersection
- ❖ at rush hour, eastbound traffic on St. Joseph, turning right onto Duford, can expect to see more backups & delays due to increased traffic volume and with the addition of tenants and business customers coming into and out of the hi-rise building
- inevitable lane closures during a potential 2-3-year construction period would affect traffic and hamper ease of access for Queenswood Heights residents
 - ❖ the building site is a very small triangular lot located on a steep slope adjacent to another small commercial building on the western property line with adjacent roads on the other two sides; in order to level the ground enough to start construction, the dump trucks being filled with debris from the slope will impede traffic both on the steeply sloping Duford Dr. and the main St Joseph Blvd., and the same will occur with the arrival of other vehicles needed to help construct the building; as there is no level area on the land, there is very little space for heavy construction equipment to be placed, which will inevitably lead to lane and road closures
- there is inadequate infrastructure for walking and cycling in that area, which in turn does not lend itself to decreased vehicle use, and as such, the amount of proposed parking for the development, for tenants as well as visitors and services, is insufficient and will lead to spillover parking on nearby streets
- the proposed variance to the current building height limit of 8 stories should not be approved, or any others involving taller buildings at this location

Michael Thornber, Concerned Citizens of Queenswood Heights (oral and written submission)

- the proposed variance in height is very inappropriate in relation to the local community in which it is located, being comprised mainly of residential 2 storey buildings
 - ❖ the proposed variance to 16 stories would tower over everything, 48

metres above grade at the top of the Duford hill, and would double the height of the building visible above the top of the hill

- ❖ the structure would be placed about 220 metres away from adjacent residential homes on Duford and it would impose and overwhelm the doorway to this community impose and overwhelm the doorway to this community; across Duford to the east, the closest adjacent home would be just over 70 metres away, and an additional eight storeys to the building would directly intrude on the privacy of the properties
- ❖ the building would infringe on parking of nearby streets and commercial properties, including the neighbouring Farm Boy store; a variance to a building on this small, sloped, corner property, to 16 levels, with two parking levels only underground, is entirely egregious, inappropriate and out of character with the surrounding community
- ❖ approval would set a height precedent in a residential zone; and, would harmonise with nothing in proximity
- ❖ the Urban Design Review Panel felt that even the previous 12 storey proposal would be 'overbuilding' of the site; development on this site should be limited to a maximum height of eight storeys
- this proposal would be more appropriate north of Hwy. 174 adjacent to LRT, where commuters would have easier access to the train, more opportunity for parking and would cause less road congestion on the street

Elise Adams, Concerned Citizens of Queenswood Heights (oral and written submission)

- while there are benefits to the City and the developer if the proposal gets built, there are a number of residents who see great value in open views and preserving their uncluttered neighbourhood
- the Planning Rationale from October 2017 does not justify the proposal for this 16-storey building at this location; OPA 150 states that, subject to a zoning amendment, taller buildings up to a maximum of 12 stories may be considered at the following nodes, if the development provides a community amenity and meets the Official Plan's urban design and compatibility policies, which are: within 400 metres walking distance of a Rapid Transit Station; directly abutting an intersection of the Mainstreet with another Mainstreet or a Transit Priority Corridor; directly abutting a Major Urban Facility
 - ❖ the site is adjacent to the mall with the road in between, not directly abutting

- ❖ as for the community amenity, there was initial discussion of a staircase going through the property, allowing pedestrians to continue using that shortcut, but even if the staircase is built after several years of construction, this will only allow them to take the same path that was there in the first place, so there is no new community amenity being proposed
- ❖ the idea of the site being a 'gateway site' into the community is questionable and the fact that the intersections of arterial and collector roads "can" serve as gateways into communities does not mean they "must"
- this is a unique location with commercial buildings on one side of St. Joseph and almost exclusively low density residential just up the street on the other side; this proposal doesn't fit in; there are locations nearby that would naturally accommodate tall buildings that would not have such impacts
- St. Joseph is on the cusp of revitalization and the residents and business owners deserve full efforts to make Orléans a great place to work and live; .the future LRT, revitalizing Centrum, and upgrading local storefronts are all more worthy projects to keep Orleans relevant and beautiful

Andrew Nicholson (written submission)

- the proposed construction site is the exact location of several Leda clay landslides (October 1965 - February 1966) due to heavy rainfall; as such there is a concern that risk exists for damage to existing structures during the construction phase, either from a landslide, or from vibration from construction equipment during the construction phase
 - ❖ the proposed development builds into the side of the escarpment, not at the bottom of the escarpment, as stated in Executive Summary of the subject report
 - ❖ it is troubling that the property has gone from being zoned 'unbuildable' in the 1960's, 70's and 80's, to be rezoned buildable to 4 to 6 storeys, and is now being considered for construction to a permitted height of 17 storeys; the properties of Leda clay have not changed and are well documented globally, recognized as being an incredibly unstable and unpredictable material when subjected sufficient stress, making it a high risk to work within a community of existing structures
- with 165 residential housing units, there is concern that the added strain on the St. Joseph/Place d'Orleans intersection will be unsafe with the increased

congestion from traffic flow from the proposed building

- 165 additional residential housing units will put an increased burden on the water and drainage system that will be detrimental to the neighbourhood
- the towering height of the proposed building will be unsightly and not blend in with the beautification and historic objectives with respect to St. Joseph Blvd.
- with all of the proposed parking spaces committed for use by the residential units, there is concern regarding the clients of the retail/commercial area of the building parking on neighbouring streets, in the adjacent shopping centre, etc.

Betti-Jo Ruston (written submission)

- a 17 story development is more appropriate for a downtown core and will be an eyesore and a devastation for the neighbourhood, which is an older, quite community of single family homes with views of the Gatineau Hills
- while there are individuals that believe that this is a great step forward for Orleans, and while St. Joseph would benefit from modernization, the size of the proposal is simply too large for this area - a smaller building (up to six stories) would be welcome; the light rail system is the driving force behind the location of this development, but area homes should not be sacrificed for political goals and development aspirations, especially as there are many locations around Ottawa that are appropriate for larger high rise buildings to meet the needs of seniors and others who do not wish to own homes, while homeowners on St. Joseph have sustained opposition to the proposal
- not all areas need to provide high intensity development; Orléans should simply concede that it is a suburb and that families are looking for single family/town/garden homes
- concerns have been raised regarding the soil and overall safety of a large construction, which have seemingly been 'addressed'
- the development would bring higher traffic volumes and add to commute time

Christine Dacquay (written submission)

- the 17 story development is being proposed solely for developer profit, not because it is suitable to the location or a good idea
- once built, the residents in the houses along the ridge will have to live with 13 rows of windows looking onto their back yards; with the hill, at least some of the tower's windows are below the residents' homes
- the residents of Queenswood Heights will have to live with 2 years of

construction blocking the entrance road into Queenswood Heights, with a risk of having a landslide because of the Leda clay in the hill

- this building should not be built on this tiny piece of land next to single-family homes; there are many empty and more suitable sites where a 17 story tower could be built in Orleans near the future train station; this type of building should be planned by the City in areas that are not encroaching onto low rise single family homes; on the surface, this development might conveniently fit the City's plans for intensification but in reality it will have a negative impact on the residents of Orleans and could cause multiple problems for the City of Ottawa

Chris Haut (written submission)

- the proposed site for this building would create a very congested area, as there is already a lot of traffic here with limited parking available; just to the north of this proposed site at Petrie Island there has been and continues to be construction for affordable housing, estimated to encompass 10,000 people in the near future
- the proposal is out of character with the surrounding area and will create challenges due to the lack of parking space available along with a great influx of people in an already busy location; the City should seriously consider the negative impact this building will have upon the Orleans area and plan accordingly

Darlene Brenner (written submission)

- change and a revitalization of the area is a good thing but height of the building means it would tower and overshadow the neighbouring homes; this change in zoning would not be in the best interest of the neighbourhood

Donna Nicholson (written submission)

- a variance to permit 17 storeys in height in this area would:
 - ❖ greatly increase traffic flow at this already very busy corner
 - ❖ increase the risk of accident and/or death as a result of the increased traffic flow
 - ❖ congest the surrounding streets with parked cars since the building planning has not adequately allowed for the increased commercial and residential occupancy
 - ❖ place at increased risk the unstable ground upon which the structure will be built

- ❖ destroy the “village-like” skyline of the historic Orléans main street
- ❖ not be in keeping with surveys that have indicated (warned about) the instability of the ground upon which this proposed structure will be built

France Bidal (written submission)

- the City should base its decision on the homeowners and developer’s best interest and keep in mind that homeowners have to live with the changes that occur in the neighborhood
- there are some benefits to the application, being:
 - ❖ intensification in this area means less spreading to the south or east
 - ❖ apartments or condos provide an excellent alternative for older couples looking to downsize, young couples without children or in this location, anyone who prefers to travel via transit
 - ❖ multi-dwelling buildings would help revitalize St-Joseph and Place d'Orléans
 - ❖ the redesign looks much better and the bottom "platform" does help it blend into the cityscape
- there are also concerns, being:
 - ❖ building height: the tallest buildings in Orléans stand at 12 or 13 stories, but they are away from other residential neighborhoods and the impact, other than the sight line, appears minimal; new buildings or redesigns on St-Joseph over the years are all below 6 stories and blend in well; up to 8 stories would be acceptable.
 - ❖ parking: the allocated number of parking spaces will be lower than the number of units, and while not everyone living in those units will have cars, if there is some retail space, those employees and customers will need somewhere to park, as will visitors; if they cannot park underground, they will park at Place d'Orléans, at the dental office, or up the hill, which will negatively transform the neighborhood

G & A Farmer (written submission)

- with the construction in the area, rats are coming into people’s backyards, and this will likely worsen once construction starts on this proposed

Gerald & Claire Borris (written submission)

- the location by itself poses big concerns about the flow of traffic taking place at this already busy intersection

- concerns around access and parking for first responder vehicles, such as police, fire and ambulances
- concerns about safe operations of large service vehicles, such as moving vans, delivery trucks, garbage trucks and school buses, entering and exiting the site
- the entrance and the exit locations pose a safety issue for both vehicles and pedestrians, resulting in unnecessary accidents and the possibility of loss of life
- the proposed site is mainly made of Leda Clay and there are concerns about stability, as there have been two landslides that have damaged buildings and roads in the location in the last 50 years
- the ridge is one of the major fault lines in Eastern Canada and has incurred tremors that resulted in minor damages to foundations of homes in the area, and there are concerns the blasting of bedrock will cause the same type of damage to homes in the area

George Anstey (written submission)

- the development is on a scale totally out of sync with all of Orleans in terms of scale, height and size
- it will cause traffic congestion at a key access point for Queenswood Heights and will force more traffic onto Prestone Drive, which already has a problem with speeders that has resulted in major property damage in one case and a fatality in another
- the amount of parking provided is inadequate for a development with both residential and retail/commercial properties and will result in the unauthorized use of parking at Place d'Orleans and cause customers of the shopping center to look for parking further away
- the previous Councillor for this area was opposed to the development and his opinion should be considered
- if approved, this development will set precedent for further out of scale development along St. Joseph Blvd.

Brian Wideman (written submission)

- many years ago, another development was proposed at this location but the property was deemed not suitable for development; in 1963 the South side of the Duford Hill collapsed twice within a couple of weeks

- vehicles exiting this building are supposed to turn right and drive down to Trim Road to get on to highway 174 but instead they will cross 3 lanes of traffic to turn left at Place D'Orleans or come up the Duford Hill and make a U-turn, which is dangerous
- parking spots for 70 vehicles from 165 apartments and 15 spots for visitors is not workable; people will be parking up on Chartrand Ave., Kennedy Lane and Major Rd. and in the dental/business building two doors down
- many of the residences around this area are seniors and the noise of construction, the parking on local streets, and the noise from the proposed ground floor patio would be very upsetting to many of them

Sylvia Barrett (written submission)

- land use:
 - ❖ the site has a Leda clay base, on which there were two landslides in 1965, requiring stabilization measures, and there is concern the vibration from all the excavation for this project may trigger some terrible event, particularly if the unpredictable Leda clay is exposed to unusual precipitation events, which have occurred in our region in the last few years
 - ❖ the lengthy construction process itself for such a large building, and the need to secure the hillside, would impede free access in and out of our neighbourhood, blocking Duford, diverting bus routes, causing unbearable noise, disturbing sleep, and adding to the already stressful conditions caused by Covid 19
- effect on the existing neighbourhood:
 - ❖ this tall building would block existing views of St-Joseph Blvd, Place d'Orléans, and the mountains beyond the Ottawa River and would invade the privacy of neighbours with overlook into the adjacent back yards
 - ❖ the project does not fit in the neighbourhood's feel of open space; a shorter building would blend into the slope of the hill and would be less invasive and keep the hilltop open for all to enjoy
- traffic:
 - ❖ the intersection in question was subjected to a traffic study at a quiet time in July; a new traffic study at rush hour during the school year would reveal much more activity on this corner, now that schools and businesses are open again; a traffic camera was installed at this

intersection a few years ago, in itself a sign of existing impatience at the corner

- cyclist and pedestrian safety:
 - ❖ the proposed entrance/exit of the building parking lot would be too close to the intersection where so many cars would want to cross over all lanes in order to turn left towards Hwy 174; drivers and cyclists in both east and west directions on St-Joseph, as well as pedestrians crossing north-south on Duford would be exposed to unnecessary danger; at the very least, a pedestrian crossing should be constructed underground, leading from the building to an exit emerging near the Farm Boy, allowing access to the south entrance of Place D'Orleans by foot
- insufficient parking:
 - ❖ there are other places where a high-rise tower could be built near the future LRT station, where more space would exist around the building, and more parking could be planned for future residents and sufficient "visitor" spaces could be provided; the relatively small triangular lot in question would be more than crowded;
 - ❖ the idea that all these new tenants would use public transportation for all their needs is not realistic, and since there is no parking possible on the 2 adjacent streets, the residents, business patrons and visitors will grudgingly creep up Duford, turn on Chartrand, and end up parking on the small surrounding streets; the only way to avoid this would be to construct the parking garage in such a way that it tunnels under St-Joseph boulevard into the underground parking at Place d'Orléans, leading the cars to exit on the north side of Place, close to the 174

Frank Barrett (written submission)

- the proposed build is so ill conceived that he assumed all along it would eventually be stopped; it makes no sense for the City to allow such a tall building in such a small space, in a neighborhood where zoning bylaws do not allow buildings of over 3 stories; the location proposed is not at all suitable for a tall structure, both from a safety and aesthetics standpoint

Email sender 'Joe Paialunga' (submission otherwise unsigned) (written submission)

- there is need for growth in the area but growth that is not well thought through is not welcome; the area does not need such a high rise - 4-5 stories should be the maximum; the proposed development would look more appropriately

situated on the old RBC location on Centrum or across from the YMCA, equally in proximity of transit and services

- property owners nearby, who have paid taxes for decades to be in this quiet area of Orléans, will be directly affected
- Orléans should be developed in a smart way, not a desperate way

J. P. Unger (written submission)

- this represents bad intensification; a 6-8 storey building should be the maximum permitted at this location;
- safety impacts:
 - ❖ at 16-stories, this building would be an extremely heavy structure with high gravity centre in an area peppered with unstable soil'; given there has already been slope failure in the immediate area, and the site is on a steep slope in an area where Leda clay is common, there is no guarantee that issues will not occur, despite the language to the contrary in the staff report and geotechnical study; in this case, there are no views of the land use maps, such as those that the City of Ottawa inherited from the City of Gloucester, which show soil types and hazards, nor historic references to things like the Great Orléans Landslide that happened not far from the area
 - ❖ no building should be taller than the highest-reaching fire ladder, for obvious reasons
- privacy impacts:
 - ❖ even without a telescope or binoculars, many of the residents of a 16-story tower would be naturally peering over people's homes and backyards below, year-round, day and night
- legal precedent:
 - ❖ allowing the proposed zoning amendment without challenge or modification by the City will open the floodgates to any other interest pushing beyond the limits in this and similar areas of the City
 - ❖ the Official Plan argument being used in the report (in favour of the proposed amendment) to state that a high-rise building here would be suitable because it abuts a Major Urban Facility, such as the Place d'Orléans Shopping Centre located across the street, is simply not true because it does not abut - it sits well over 70 metres from the actual mall building, across a widened portion of an arterial road from the mall

building, which happens to be only two stories high, and is in fact an additional distance farther, past an open parking area; to have such a clearly inaccurate statement followed by the sweeping assertion of reassurances that the development also conforms with other policies related to intensification, urban design and compatibility and is consistent with the relevant design guidelines, without specifics, renders those assurances suspect; such lack of specifics, particularly after a clearly inaccurate assertion, is unacceptable for a report influencing to effectively alter irreversibly a key area of the city; even worse, soon after that unsupported claim of wide "conformity", the report then states that the proposed zoning amendment would "amend various provisions" including the area's established height limits

- traffic impact:
 - ❖ the fact that it is directly abutting a quite busy and complex intersection makes a high-rise's large resident and visitor parking demands an actual traffic congestion and collision hazard; the nature of the intersection and the fact that underground parking in such a tight area will demand deft maneuvering, makes this a recipe for trouble—in fact, a likely safety hazard for other vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, particularly pronounced in winter
 - ❖ while the report asserts that the priority for site development at locations such as this is to encourage alternative transportation modes such as walking, cycling or taking transit, the nature of the particular intersection next to this site, with its steep slopes and sidewalks, roads intersecting at irregular angles and busy traffic crossing, would actually increase risks and discourage such alternative transportation modes
- environmental impacts:
 - ❖ by the staff's own admission, a building of the height proposed will deny summer sunlight hours, including sunsets, to many homes; this should be a very important consideration for rejecting the proposal, as sunlight is not only known to have a bearing on mental and physical health, but it's also an energy source that is only beginning to be tapped by households and which such a highrise would deny for decades to come; should the proposal be approved, it is unclear if the builder would provide any compensation to the residents to whom it will block that source of energy and health
 - ❖ the report, other than an unsupported general assurance about wind

impact, is silent on the impacts that residents can expect, including a wind tunnel effect against cyclists and particularly pedestrians walking along the slopes and next to fast-moving traffic below

- ❖ the City appears not to have taken any serious consideration for the lives of animals when deciding to approve or reject a particular building proposal; high-rises are a known hazard for birds, both resident and particularly for the many species of migrating birds that are known to fly through the area –particularly low-flying migrating birds as they approach or leave the nearby areas along the river
- better options available
 - ❖ housing: the area already has several mid-rise buildings nearby, along the same Street (St. Joseph Blvd., east and south of Centrum Boulevard), whose inconspicuousness speaks to the correctness of their height; they successfully provide quality and fairly affordable housing, including exactly the same variety (studio, 1 & 2 bedroom apartments) the proposal at hand would provide; allowing a medium height (i.e., 6, 7 or 8 story-high) building would no doubt provide profitably the type of housing being proposed and for which we can expect ongoing demand
 - ❖ retail: such medium height could also house the ground-level retail that the proposal suggests, even though there are now many vacant retail business locations along St. Joseph and in the mall, with no real prospect of on-site retail making a major comeback anytime soon, if ever, so the suggestion of more ground-level retail space for the area seems ill-advised
- impact on the community:
 - ❖ a clear majority of resident representations from the "open house" meetings were in opposition of the proposal; if approved, the current proposal would not only trump their legal provisions, it would also trample residents' concerns, to effectively enable maximizing of profits for an out-of-city business interest; private and for-profit development is supportable but it does not have to go against established principles, provisions and residents in order to make a good profit; the fact that the area's Secondary Plan is currently being developed suggests that a decision that would bring about a very significant change and precedent in the existing principles and stated preferences of the community would be, at best, premature; the proponent should be asked to consider submitting a

development proposal that respects existing parameters, community's preferences and concerns

Luc Tetrault (written submission)

- the proposed building does not belong there, is ugly, does not blend with Queenswood Heights settings, is located at a busy intersection, and will add congestion on Duford and St-joseph; it should be moved further east along the river where it will not interfere with Queenswood Heights' traffic and it should be camouflaged with trees

Marc Bourgeois (written submission)

- nothing has been made available in regards to plans to make the commercial space successful; the mall barely has customers, even pre-COVID
- would have liked to see a design more appropriate due to the woodsy-feel on Duford and because it is the entry point to a residential area; the design looks like the ones at Blair, it is grim in colour, too symmetrical, and clashes with the natural slopes of the surrounding area

Email sender 'Melanie' (submission otherwise unsigned) (written submission)

- this is not an ideal location for a 17 storey building
- there is already a ton of traffic and crossing the road is already dangerous
- concern about the building process and how it will affect her own home's structure
- the building will not fit into the current neighbourhood; there isn't a single building over 8 stories in Orléans
- this will make the area busy and change the feel of her home and environment completely
- the residents of the building will park on adjacent streets, which already have parking issues, because there isn't enough parking
- there have been 4 sink holes in the Orleans area in the last few months and unsettling the earth will affect the land surrounding it
- Councillor Luloff previously said he did not support the proposal but now does; his voice does not reflect what the residents want

Nicole & Brian Gauthier (written submission)

- this is not the appropriate location for this type of project; it will increase traffic at that intersection, which is already busy because of the shopping centre, and

there will not be sufficient parking, which will cause people to park on the side roads in Queenswood Heights

- this project can cause serious damage to their home during blasting for the underground parking; questioned whether the City will assure the residents that no damage would occur and take responsibility for the damages if there is

Patricia Cocker (written submission)

- increased traffic to and from the building on an already busy street is not a wise move (even with 8 stories there would be an increased amount of traffic), and the property exit should not be on Duford Street as there is a steep hill heading south
- questioned whether there will be enough parking for retail customers of the property, the small strip mall immediately to the west of this property does not have enough safe parking
- questioned where tenants will park, as vehicles are necessary in this area given that OC Transpo fails to provide timely service
- the rent should be considered 'affordable', not subsidized; the monthly rent for many rental properties, and especially those in Orleans, are beyond those of a great many people

Ron & Diane Mabee (written submission)

- concerns for the physical safety of the people that currently live around the proposed site and the people who will be living in the proposed building:
 - ❖ permission to build on this site has been refused by previous area planning groups twice in the last 50 years because the whole ridge is mainly Leda clay and has had two landslides that has damaged buildings and roads in Orleans; the ridge is also one of the major fault lines in eastern Canada and has had two well reported tremors that caused minor damage to foundations of homes in the area on the ridge running above St Joseph Blvd; these occurred without any physical cause like blasting of bedrock to create the footing to support a 17 story building
 - ❖ the site is small for the size of the building and number of units and the entrance and exit of the site for both vehicles and pedestrians are close to a very busy intersection and could cause accidents and possibly loss of life; there are also issues regarding parking for police, fire, ambulance to access and exit the site, as well as service vehicles like large moving vans, delivery trucks, garbage trucks and school buses

- ❖ Torgan Group, the owners and developer of the project, have, according to all public records never completed a project of this size; questioned whether the City has considered the possibility of any resulting class action legal battle, or that the Torgan Group will have to greatly change their plans as they have in the past in three major projects

Robin Maloney (written submission)

- if the new building is too high it will overlook others' back yards and impede on privacy
- there is not enough parking allocated at the building so tenants or guests will find parking on already crowded neighbouring streets, and trucks will be coming up Duford hill, even though it's prohibited
- the new building would block views and cause shadowing
- if the lights remain constantly on during construction, it will cause light pollution in neighbouring homes
- the development would increase noise and impact the tranquility and quality of life for neighbouring properties
- the proposed building is out of context for the surrounding area
- the building would be on a small lot and there will be no room for pedestrians walking down or up the hill, which is used by many pedestrians and residents of Queenswood Heights, and construction might actually cause the road to be closed

Richard McNamee (written submission)

- if read precisely, the construction consideration sentence, "not expected" with "will not have"; means it will have a negative impact on overall slope stability, which means the City of Ottawa would be liable for death or damage, due to accepting the applicant's amendment

Sharon Parisien & Kenneth Wood (written submission)

- this 17 story monstrosity does not belong in Queenswood Heights, as indicated in their original submission in 2018 (concerns included negative impacts to neighbouring properties in respect of views; shadowing; privacy; soil instability; parking, traffic congestion and pedestrian safety; neighbourhood character)
- the majority of residents work and it is wrong for the City to hold at an hour that most can't be present

Sarah Thornber (written submission)

- while the logic behind building higher density residential areas in the suburbs is understandable, as is the developer wanting to make a profit from his property, this is a truly terrible location for such a large building
- many large apartment buildings have been built in Orleans, farther away from small homes, such as the ones that were built close to the highway by the Police Station further down St Joseph, and that is a great place for them; tall apartment buildings belong somewhere with a little distance between them and houses, further along the outskirts of the community
- will be deeply dismayed if this plan goes through and concerned about the mental health of the nearby residents

Walter Palaganiuk (written submission)

- the builder hasn't updated the information on the site since the sign installation; the project has been changed significantly and the Queenswood community has not been informed about the latest update in a proper way

Wylda Thornber (written submission)

- the size of the building is inappropriate and is completely out of harmony with the surrounding community; it will have a shocking, chaotic effect and, in a time when people are under stress and depression is common, communities need to be a place of calmness and safety; the site has been approved for 8 stories, which would be more suitable
- the large building would be at the gateway entrance to Queenswood Heights and would not be a very welcoming sight
- this property previously had a severe landslide and at one time it was deemed unbuildable; the instability of this land and the effects the constructing of this building could have on neighbouring homes is concerning
- there is much community opposition to the proposed 16 story building and some feel the City does not care about them and will do whatever they want

Yvon Fredette

- many accidents have occurred on that intersection and the entrance for that building will be on St Joseph, where there's already lots of traffic
- there are many vacant commercial lots on St. Joseph and in Place d'Orléans
- that corner is known for landslides and there are residences on top of the hill

Primary reasons for support, by individual

The Applicant, as represented by Julie Carrara, Senior Planner, Fotenn Consultants; Roderick Lahey, Architect, RLA Architecture; Miguel Tremblay, Partner, Fotenn Consultants (oral submission and slides)

- provided site context and a high-level overview of the proposal, indicating changes that have occurred from the previous proposal
 - ❖ the subject site is located across the street from the Place d'Orléans Shopping Centre, which means it is walking distance to key amenities
 - ❖ it is located just over 400m from a rapid transit station, with the Highway 174 station pending for 2024
 - ❖ existing units on the rear lot line have rear yards so separation between buildings is an even greater distance
 - ❖ there are concerns with the steps originally proposed for a pedestrian passage through the site, including winter functionality, accessibility, and exit onto an area that could make for dangerous pedestrian crossings, so the passage has been removed from the current proposal in favour of a publicly accessible plaza at the intersection of St. Joseph and Duford, which widens the sidewalk by moving the building back for the plaza
 - ❖ Arterial Main Street designation permits a wide range of residential and non-residential uses and encourages mixed use development, as proposed, and the Official Plan supports intensification of these areas
 - ❖ no parking, other than for visitors, is required in this area because of proximity to higher order transit, but five times the required number of visitor parking spaces is being provided
 - ❖ increased side yard setbacks and added greenspace;
 - ❖ extensive geotechnical studies have been done on Leda clay and any remaining issues flagged in the study will be addressed
 - ❖ concerns raised by the Urban Design Review Panel about the original proposal are now irrelevant and were considered in the development of the current proposal; the Panel is supportive of the current proposal
 - ❖ the proposal conforms to the Official Plan and Highrise Design Guidelines
 - ❖ the character of the area is changing; this is an appropriate building of transitional height that fits with fit with the developing area

Robert A. Paiment (written submission)

- intensification of this type is important for this corridor and the future of Orléans in general
- would like added that a minimum of 10 units be managed as affordable housing units by the proponents of this application

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 57 minutes in discussion of the report

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Planning Committee recommend to Council that

1. That Document 2 – Details of the Recommended Zoning 3(a) be amended to change the language from:
 - (a) Minimum required yard setbacks, building setbacks, and maximum permitted building heights as per Schedule ‘YYY’.

To:

- (a) Minimum and maximum required yard setbacks, building setbacks, and maximum permitted building heights as per Schedule ‘YYY’.
- and that the legend on Schedule ‘YYY’ be modified accordingly.
2. The recommended Floor Space Index be a maximum of 4.25 metres to avoid a FSI deficiency; and
 3. That Document 2 - Details of the Recommended Zoning Amend Section 239, by adding a new exception [xxxx] with provisions similar in effect to the following,
 - a) In Column II, add the text “(AM3 [XXXX])”
 - b) In addition to those provisions already recommended to be added to Column V, add the following provision be added:

The maximum permitted Floor Space Index is 4.25

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that pursuant to the *Planning Act*, subsection 34(17), no further notice be given.

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 with the amendment put forward by the Planning Committee.