

Closed Captioning Transcript – City Council 24 May, 2017

>> Mayor Watson: GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. AND WELCOME TO THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 24TH, 2017. IF I COULD HAVE EVERY MEMBER OF COUNCIL TAKE THEIR SEAT, PLEASE. [VOICE OF TRANSLATOR] WE'RE STARTING THE MEETING. >> FOR THOSE WHO ARE ABLE TO, COULD YOU PLEASE RISE FOR A MOMENT OF PERSONAL REFLECTION AND REMAIN STANDING AS WE INTRODUCE OUR SPECIAL GUESTS FOR O CANADA. REMAIN STANDING AND WE'LL ASK COUNCILOR CHIARELLI TO INTRODUCE OUR VERY SPECIAL GUEST. WE'RE GOING TO SING OUR NATIONAL ANTHEM. >> THANK YOU, YOUR WORSHIP. ST. DANIEL SCHOOL CHOIR IS GRADES ONE TO SIX AND SINGS AT ALL SCHOOL ASSEMBLIES, MASSES. AT THE BEGINNING OF THE EIGHTH THEY SANG AT THE OTTAWA CATHOLIC SCHOOL BOARD CHORAL CELEBRATION. THEY'RE WONDERFUL, ENTHUSIASTIC SINGING WAS ENJOYED BY EVERYONE PRESENT. THE CHOIR IS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF CONSTANTINI AND ACCOMPANIED BY JONATHAN HEINZ, THE GRADE SIX TEACHER. ALSO AMONG THEM IS EMILY TRASCH, WHO IS IN THE CHOIR AND WHO IS THE GRANDDAUGHTER TO COUNCILOR JAN HARDER. SO... ST. DANIEL'S CHOIR. \M O CANADA \M \M OUR HOME AND NATIVE LAND \M \M TRUE PATRIOT LOVE \M \M IN ALL THY SONS COMMAND \M [Singing in French]\M GOD, KEEP OUR LAND GLORIOUS AND FREE \M \M O CANADA \M \M WE STAND ON GUARD FOR THEE \M \M O CANADA \M \M WE STAND ON GUARD FOR THEE \M [Applause]>> Mayor Watson: WELL, THANK YOU VERY, VERY MUCH TO THE STUDENTS FROM COUNCILOR CHIARELLI'S WARD FOR THAT BEAUTIFUL RENDITION OF O CANADA. GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. IT'S AN HONOUR TO INVITE THE RIGHT REVEREND FATHER GHATTAS HAJAL TO JOIN US HERE AS THIS MEETING'S CITY BUILDER AWARD, WELCOME. AND I KNOW, FATHER, YOU HAVE MANY FAMILY AND FRIENDS AND GREAT SUPPORTERS OF THE AUDIENCE AND WE WELCOME THEM AS WELL. WELCOME TO OUR COLLEAGUES. FATHER GHATTAS HAS SERVED AT THE ALTAR FOR FORTY YEARS. HE IS RECOGNIZED AS A TRUE CITY BUILDER FOR ENRICHING THE LIFE OF THE CATHEDRAL AND ITS FAITHFUL WITH HIS EXPERIENCE AND LEADERSHIP. IN ADDITION TO ELEVATING THE LIVES OF HIS CONGREGATION THROUGH HIS PASTORAL WORK, FATHER PLAYS A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN THE BROADER COMMUNITY. HE IS AN ACTIVE AND OUTSPOKEN PILLAR OF THE OTTAWA LEBANESE COMMUNITY. HIS PASSION FOR HIS ORTHODOX FAITH AND LEBANESE HERITAGE ARE A BEACON AND A GUIDE AND INSPIRE THE

EXPIRE LEBANESE-CANADIAN COMMUNITY. THE OTTAWA LEBANESE FESTIVAL HAS BECOME A MAJOR AND MUCH ANTICIPATED EVENT FOR EVERYONE IN THE CITY. AND MY FAVOURITE MEMORY OF FATHER GHATTAS IS THE PARADE GOING IN FROM THE HALL TO THE FAIRGROUNDS AND HE WAVING THE LEBANESE AND THE CANADIAN FLAG AND HE'S A GREAT DANCER TOO, SO WE'LL HAVE TO GET YOU ON ONE OF THOSE DANCE SHOWS ON TELEVISION, FATHER. UNDER THE GUIDANCE OF FATHER AND MANY DEDICATED VOLUNTEERS AND ORGANIZERS AND GEORGE HANNAH, THE PRESIDENT OF THE FESTIVAL, IS WITH US HERE TODAY, THE FESTIVAL'S PROVIDED THOUSANDS AND THOUSANDS OF ATTENDEES AN OPPORTUNITY AND EXPERIENCE TO SAVOUR LEBANESE AND MIDDLE EASTERN FOOD, ENTERTAINMENT AND HERITAGE. THE 27TH ANNUAL LEBANESE FESTIVAL TAKES PLACE FROM JULY 19TH TO 23RD AT ST. ELIAS WHERE EVERYONE CAN, AS THEY SAY, LIVE IT, LOVE IT LEBANESE STYLE. FATHER GHATTAS HAS HELPED TO BUILD STRONG COMMUNITY PRIDE AND HIS IMPACT ON THE LEBANESE COMMUNITY AND ALL THAT ENCOUNTER HIM HAVE BEEN EXTREMELY POSITIVE. I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO CONGRATULATE AND THANK FATHER FOR HIS MANY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMUNITY AND TO THE ENTIRE CITY. [VOICE OF TRANSLATOR] I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO THANK FATHER FOR HIS MANY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMUNITY AND THE ENTIRE CITY. >> COUNCILOR BROCKINGTON AND A MEMBER OF YOUR CONGREGATION, COUNCILOR QAQISH, MY PLEASURE TO PRESENT YOU WITH THIS CITY BUILDER AWARD. CONGRATULATIONS. [Applause]>> UNLESS THE LORD BUILDS THE HOUSE, THOSE WHO BUILD IT LABOUR IN VAIN. UNLESS THE LORD GUARD THE CITY, THOSE WHO GUARD IT STAY AWAKE IN VAIN. YOUR WORSHIP, HONORABLE COUNCILORS, DEAR FAMILY AND FRIENDS, OUR LORD HAS CHOSEN SOME OF US TO BUILD COMMUNITIES AND TO TAKE GOOD CARE OF THEM AND HAS CHOSEN SOME OF US TO BUILD CITIES AND GUARD THEM. WE ARE HIS CO-WORKERS AND CAN DO THE JOB SUCCESSFULLY ONLY WITH HIS GUIDANCE. I THANK THE LORD FOR HIS HELP TO BUILD ST. ELIAS COMMUNITY HERE IN OTTAWA AND FOR HIM HELPING YOU, MAYOR AND COUNCILORS, TO BUILD SUCH A BEAUTIFUL CITY AND MAKE IT THE SAFEST AND THE CLEANEST CITY IN CANADA. THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR GRACIOUSLY CONFERRING UPON ME THE MAYOR'S CITY BUILDER AWARD. A SINCERE THANK YOU TO OUR FRIEND LUCY RAHIM WHO KINDLY RECOMMENDED ME FOR SUCH AN HONOUR. THANK YOU ALL. THANK YOU AND GOD BLESS YOU. [Applause]>> Mayor

Watson: THANK YOU, FATHER. >> THANK YOU SO MUCH. THANK YOU. >>

Mayor Watson: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, FATHER. IT IS NOW MY PLEASURE TO INVITE THE CARLETON RAVENS MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM TO COME FORWARD ALONG WITH THEIR COACHING STAFF, THEIR PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS WHO ARE BEING RECOGNIZED AS NATIONAL CHAMPIONS FOR THE THIRTEENTH TIME, SEVENTH YEAR IN A ROW, ALONG WITH DAVID CHERNUSHENKO, THE COUNCILOR FOR CAPITAL WARD, AND OUR SPORTS COMMISSIONER, JODY METIC, IF THEY COULD COME FORWARD UP HERE AND LET'S GIVE THEM A BIG ROUND OF APPLAUSE FOR ANOTHER GREAT VICTORY. CONGRATULATIONS. [Applause] THIS IS WHEN YOU FEEL REALLY SHORT. THIS IS -- AS MEMBERS OF COUNCIL KNOW, WE HAD A SMALL BREAKFAST RECEPTION EARLIER TODAY IN MY BOARDROOM UPSTAIRS, AND IT'S BECOME A TRADITION. WE JUST WEREN'T ABLE TO WORK OUT THE DATES SOON ENOUGH CLOSER TO THE SCHOOL YEAR SO NOT ALL THE TEAM OBVIOUSLY IS HERE. BUT WE DID WANT TO RECOGNIZE DR. ROSANNA RALARENTE, JENNIFER BRENNING, DAVE SMART, HEAD COACH, WINNINGEST HEAD COACH IN CANADIAN HISTORY, BRUCE MARSHAL, MITCH JACKSON, CAM SMYTHE, STANLEY MIAMBO, WILL SPALDING, WILL COLI, GLEN SALMA, CONNOR WOOD. IN MARCH, THE CARLETON RAVENS' MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM ONCE AGAIN DID OUR CITY PROUD BY WINNING THE 2017 U SPORTS MEN FINAL A CHAMPIONSHIP THAT TOOK PLACE IN HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA. THIS IS THE RAVENS' SEVENTH STRAIGHT NATIONAL TITLE AND THEIR THIRTEENTH IN FIFTEEN YEARS. AND THIS IS TRULY AN OUTSTANDING ACCOMPLISHMENT AND IT'S JUST HARD TO PUT INTO WORDS HOW IMPRESSIVE THESE GROUP OF ATHLETES ARE. [VOICE OF TRANSLATOR] IT'S HARD TO PUT INTO WORDS JUST HOW IMPRESSIVE THIS CARLETON BASKETBALL TEAM IS. >> THE RAVENS DEFEATED THE RYERSON RAMS IN THEIR CHAMPIONSHIP GAME 78-69 AND THIS SEVENTH CONSECUTIVE NATIONAL TITLE MATCHES THE VICTORIA VIKES' RECORD OF SEVEN STRAIGHT CHAMPIONSHIPS THAT THEY WON FROM 1980 TO '86. NOW, I WAS TELLING THE GENTLEMEN AND LADIES AT OUR BREAKFAST WE'RE ON A BIT OF A WINNING STREAK IN OTTAWA. IF YOU LOOK BACK OVER THE LAST COUPLE OF DAYS, THE LAST YEAR, WE WON THE GREY CUP FOR THE REDBLACKS. WE WON THE CAN-AM CHAMPIONSHIP FOR OUR OTTAWA BASEBALL TEAM, THE CHAMPIONS. THE SENATORS PULLED OFF AN INCREDIBLE WIN LAST NIGHT. THE FURY DEFEATED TORONTO FC IN FRONT OF 7,000 PEOPLE AT LANSDOWNE. AND THE CARLETON RAVENS ONCE AGAIN

ALMOST MAKE IT LOOK EASY, BUT I KNOW IT'S NOT EASY, BY WINNING THEIR SEVENTH IN A ROW CHAMPIONSHIP ON BEHALF OF CARLETON UNIVERSITY. [Applause]YOUR CLASS AND SPORTSMANSHIP MAKE YOU ALL TREMENDOUS ROLE MODELS FOR NOT ONLY OUR CITIES BUT OUR COUNTRY'S UP AND COMING ATHLETES. [VOICE OF TRANSLATOR] AND YOUR CLASS AND SPORTSMANSHIP MAKE YOU ULTIMATE AS ROLE MODELS FOR NOT ONLY OUR CITIES BUT ALSO OUR COUNTRIES' UP AND COMING ATHLETES. >> YOU MAKE OUR CITY VERY PROUD AND I EXTEND MY CONGRATULATIONS TO TO THE ENTIRE TEAM, PLAYERS, COACHES, TRAINERS AND EVERYONE INVOLVED WITH THE TEAM ON YOUR NATIONAL TITLE. I NOW HAVE THE PLEASURE EVER PRESENTING THE TEAM WITH A PROCLAMATION. I WOULD INVITE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TEAM TO COME FORWARD. AND I WILL GET THE PROCLAMATION. WHO'S GOING TO ACCEPT?HERE WE ARE. ON BEHALF OF THE CITY, IT'S MY PLEASURE TO PROCLAIM MAY 24TH, 2017, CARLETON UNIVERSITY RAVENS MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM DAY IN THE CITY OF OTTAWA. CONGRATULATIONS. [Applause]COME OVER HERE. WE WANT A GROUP SHOT. >> JUST ON BEHALF OF THE TEAM AND ALL THE STAFF AND EVERYONE AT CARLETON, I JUST WANT TO THANK YOU, THE MAYOR, AND IN OTTAWA FOR ALL THE SUPPORT AND RECOGNITION WE'VE RECEIVED. WE REALLY APPRECIATE IT. THANK YOU. GO SENS. [Applause] >> Mayor Watson: NOW WE'LL GO, MADAM DEPUTY CLERK TO -- I JUST WANT TO ASK COUNCILOR TIERNEY HAS SOME GUESTS FROM FEDERATION OF CANADIAN MUNICIPALITIES. >> THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. MAYOR. I WOULD LIKE TO INTRODUCE -- WE HAVE SOME STAFFERS HERE TODAY. THEY ARE IN CHARGE OF PROGRAMMING NOT ONLY DOMESTICALLY BUT INTERNATIONALLY. ALANNA PIERCE HAS BROUGHT THEM OVER FROM FCM TO SEE HOW OUR COUNCIL WORKS AT CITY HALL PLUS THE FEDERATION OF CANADIAN MUNICIPALITIES THAT REPRESENTS MUNICIPAL VOICES ACROSS CANADA WILL BE HERE IN TWO WEEKS WITH OUR AGM SO YOU'LL HAVE 2,000 MAYORS AND POLITICIANS FROM ACROSS THE COUNTRY HERE IN THIS GREAT CITY SPENDING THEIR MONEY, DOING GREAT THINGS, AND IT'S DOING A LOT OF -- EXTRUDING A LOT OF HOT AIR. IF I CAN GET THE FCM STAFF TO PLEASE STAND AND IF WE COULD GIVE THEM A ROUND OF APPLAUSE FOR THE GREAT WORK THEY DO. [Applause]>> Mayor Watson: WE WELCOME OUR COLLEAGUES AND PARTNERS FROM THE FCM AND WE APPRECIATE COUNCILOR TIERNEY'S LEADERSHIP ROLE AS VICE-PRESIDENT FOR ONTARIO. FCM DOES SOME GREAT WORK HELPING US ADVOCATE OUR CITY'S

POSITIONS TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. SO THANK YOU, COUNCILOR, FOR THAT. ROLE CALL, PLEASE. MADAM DEPUTY CLERK. COUNCILOR MITIC. >> HERE. >> COUNCILOR HARDER. >> HERE. >> COUNCILOR WILKINSON. >> PRESENT. >> COUNCILOR EL SHAN AT THISSERRY. >> PRESENT. >> COUNCILOR QADRI. >> PRESIDENT. >> COUNCILOR TAYLOR. >> HERE. >> COUNCILOR CHIARELLI. >> HERE. >> COUNCILOR EGLI. >> HERE. >> COUNCILOR DEANS. COUNCILOR TIERNEY. >> PRESENT. >> COUNCILOR FLUERY. COUNCILOR NUSSBAUM. COUNCILOR McKENNY. >> PRESENT. >> COUNCILOR LEAPER. >> PRESENT. >> COUNCILOR BROCKINGTON. >> HERE. >> COUNCILOR CHERNUSHENKO. >> PRESENT. >> COUNCILOR CLOUTIER. >> PRESENT. >> COUNCILOR BLAIS. >> PRESENT. >> COUNCILOR DE ROOS. >> HERE. >> COUNCILOR MOFFAT. >> HERE. >> COUNCILOR QAQISH. >> PRESENT. >> COUNCILOR HUBLEY. >> HERE. >> MAYOR WATSON. >> HERE. >> YOU HAVE A QUORUM, MR. MAYOR. >> Mayor Watson: CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES. THE REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 10TH, 2017. CARRIED. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST INCLUDING THOSE ORIGINALLY RISING FROM PRIOR MEETINGS. >> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR. I, COUNCILOR ELI EL-CHANTIRY, DECLARE A POTENTIAL DIRECT PROCUREMENT INTEREST ON THE BLAIS, TAYLOR'S MOTION ON MAY 24TH, 2017, WITH RESPECT TO A PROPERTY TAX DEFERRAL PROGRAM FOR RESIDENTS IMPACTED BY THE 2017 FLOOD, AS I OWN A PROPERTY IN THE AREA AFFECTED BY THE MAY FLOODING EVENT. >> Mayor Watson: THANK YOU. ARE THERE ANY OTHERS? COMMUNICATIONS AS PRESENTED, REGRETS. WE HAVE ONE REGRET. COUNCILOR DEANS REGRETS THAT SHE WILL NOT BE HERE TODAY. MOTION, REPORTS. >> THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. MAYOR. AND INTRODUCED BY MYSELF AND SECONDED BY COUNCILOR HUBLEY, THAT THE REPORT FROM THE OTTAWA COMMUNITY LANDS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ENTITLED "OTTAWA COMMUNITY LANDS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION 2016 ANNUAL REPORT", THE REPORT FROM THE CITY CLERK AND SOLICITOR'S OFFICE ENTITLED "STATUS UPDATE COUNCILOR INQUIRIES AND MOTIONS FOR THE PERIOD ENDING MAY 19TH, 2017, COMMUNITY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES REPORT 23, PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT 43B AND 44A AND THE REPORT FROM THE CITY CLERK AND SOLICITOR'S OFFICE ENTITLED "SUMMARY OF ORAL AND WRITTEN PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FOR ITEMS SUBJECT TO BILL 73," EXPLANATION REQUIREMENTS AT THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING ON MAY 10TH, 2017, BE RECEIVED AND CONSIDERED. THAT THE PETITION RESPECTING ACCESS TO MORGENTALER CLINIC LISTED UNDER COMMUNICATIONS BE

RECEIVED. >> Mayor Watson: ON THE MOTION, CARRIED. ADOPTED. REPORTS, OTTAWA COMMUNITY LANDS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION. WE HAVE A PRESENTATION BY COUNCILOR WILKINSON, SO WE'LL COME BACK TO THAT. ITEM NUMBER 2 -- I APOLOGIZE -- ITEM NUMBER 2, STATUS UPDATE, COUNCIL INQUIRIES AND MOTIONS FOR THE PERIOD ENDING MAY 19TH. RECEIVED?COMMITTEE REPORTS. COMMUNITY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES REPORT NUMBER 23. ITEM NUMBER 3, ESSENTIAL HEALTH AND SOCIAL SUPPORTS GRANTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS. CARRIED. ITEM NUMBER 4, OTTAWA FIRE SERVICES 2016 ANNUAL REPORT. IS IT A QUICK HOLD OR IS IT MORE IN DEPTH?MORE IN DEPTH?OKAY. ITEM NUMBER 5, BYLAW REVIEW STRATEGY WORK PLAN STATUS UPDATE. RECEIVED. NOISE BYLAW REVIEW. HOLD. PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT NUMBER 43B. APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION OF NEW CONSTRUCTION OF 270 BUCHAN ROAD. WE GOT A HOLD. DOES ANYONE -- HOLD. OKAY. REPORT NUMBER 44A. BUILDING BETTER, SMARTER SUBURBS AND INFRASTRUCTURE STANDARDS REVIEW UPDATE. CARRIED. ITEM NUMBER 9, DEVELOPMENT CHARGES BYLAW AMENDMENT 2017. CARRIED. ITEM NUMBER 10, SECTION 375, YEAR OF REVIEW. HOLD. WE HAVE A MOTION. HOLD THAT. ARE THERE ANY REQUESTS TO REMOVE ANYTHING FROM THE BULK CONSENT AGENDATHAT'S BEFORE YOU?ON THE BULK CONSENT AGENDA AS PRESENTED, CARRIED. OKAY. SO WE'LL GO BACK TO OUR FIRST ITEM THAT WAS HELD. WE HAVE COUNCILOR WILKINSON PROVIDING A BRIEF UPDATE ON THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OTTAWA COMMITTEE LANDS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION. GORD MCNAIR IS THERE AS STAFF, AND AS YOU KNOW, COUNCILOR WILKINSON IS THE CHAIR OF THAT COMMITTEE. AND I BELIEVE YOU HAVE A POWER POINT PRESENTATION. THE FLOOR IS YOURS. >> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR. >> ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, IT'S MY PLEASURE TO SHARE WITH YOU THE ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2016. THIS CORPORATION WAS ESTABLISHED TO TAKE PARCELS OF CITY OWNED LAND THAT HAD DEVELOPED POTENTIAL AND OUR OBJECTIVE OF PROVIDING A FINANCIAL RETURN TO THE CITY WHILE MEETING THE SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL NEEDS OF COMMUNITIES. THE CORPORATION EXISTS OF A BOARD AND STAFF IS SHOWN ON THE SLIDE. JUST THERE. -- AS SHOWN ON THE SLIDE. YOU CAN READ IT. AND THE JOINED HERE BY GORD MCNAIR WHO IS THE SECRETARY AND CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER FOR THE CORPORATION. AS CHAIR I'M VERY PROUD OF OUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS TO DATE AND I AM PLEASED TO PRESENT THE

FINANCIALS IN THE LDC ANNUAL REPORT AND AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS TO COUNCIL TODAY. SO OUR HIGHLIGHTS IN 2016. IN 2016, WE HAD MARKETED FIVE PROPERTIES FOR SALE. A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF TIME WAS INVOLVED IN PREPARING A NUMBER OF PROJECTS TO BE READY FOR MARKET. AND IN SPITE OF THE MARKET CONDITIONS, WE SECURED TWO AGREEMENTS FOR 3071 RIVERSIDE DRIVE AND 1435 RANDAL AVENUE WHICH RECENTLY CLOSED IN 2017. WE'RE CURRENTLY NEGOTIATING ON 2140 BASELINE. THE 3007 RIVERSIDE DRIVE PROPERTY WAS A SURFACE SCHOOL SIDE ACQUIRED BY THE CITY IN 2008. THIS FRONTAGE ALONG RIVERSIDE DRIVE. IT'S APPROXIMATELY 4.29 HECTARES. 1435 RANDAL WAS CLEANED UP FORMER WATERMAIN TOWER SITE THAT HAS BEEN DECOMMISSIONED AND DISMANTLED. THE SITE IS SURROUNDED BY ALTA VISTA FIRE STATION AND SINGLE DETACHED DWELLINGS IN SOUTH AND WEST OF ELMWOOD, NONPROFIT DEVELOPMENT. 2140 BASELINE IS A FORMER ROAD ALLOWANCE THAT WAS ORIGINALLY A NONVIABLE PARCEL. MADE VIABLE THROUGH ROAD CLOSINGS INCLUDING REMOVAL AND RELOCATION OF UTILITIES. SO THEY ALSO HAVE PART OF LONGFIELDS PROJECT, THE BLOCK OF LAND THAT WAS TRANSFERRED CITY'S AFFORDABLE HOUSING BRANCH WAS UNDER DEVELOPMENT THIS YEAR. THE BRANCH PARTNERED WITH MULTI-FAITH HOUSING INITIATIVE AND BEGAN CONSTRUCTION AT THE HAVEN IN 2015 WHICH CONTINUED INTO 2016 AND IS ANTICIPATED TO BE COMPLETED IN 2017. THE HAVEN WILL PROVIDE 98 UNITS AND ASSIST IN MEETING THE CITY'S AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDS. MR. MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL, WE'RE COMMITTED TO PROMOTING COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CITY OF OTTAWA. IT'S NOT BASED NOT ONLY ON THE FINANCIAL REWARDS BUT TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL NEEDS OF COMMUNITIES. HENCE WE'RE COMMITTED ON THE SALE OF SURPLUS PROPERTIES TO ACHIEVING OPTIMAL VALUE AND FINANCIAL AND NONFINANCIAL COMMUNITY VALUES. AND THAT'S WHERE THE HAVEN COMES INTO THIS ONE. THIS YEAR, WE HAVE CLOSED ON TWO AGREEMENTS AND SECURED IN 2016 TO NEGOTIATE ONE CLOSED LATER THIS YEAR. IT CLOSED ON 3071 RIVERSIDE DRIVE IN MARCH AND 1435 AVENUE IN MAY WITH A TOTAL GROSS SALES THIS YEAR ARE 17.4 MILLION. WE'RE CONTINUING TO MOVE FORWARD ON OTHER PROPERTIES TO SUPPORT THE CITY OF OTTAWA. THE 2016 AMOUNT OF MONEY INTENDED TO RAISE IN 2016 ACTUALLY WAS -- DIDN'T COME IN UNTIL 2017 AND WE JUST WORKED WITH THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT SO THAT IT'S TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT AS A RECEIVABLE SO

THAT THE OBJECTIVE WE HAD IN RECENT RAISING FUNDS FOR THE CITY HAS -
- WERE ACTUALLY SURPASSING WHERE WE INTENDED TO BE AT THIS POINT
IN TIME. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS? MYSELF OR GORD MCNAIR IS HAPPY
TO ANSWER THEM AS WELL. >> Mayor Watson: THANK YOU FOR THE
PRESENTATION, THE GOOD WORK. COUNCILOR BROCKINGTON, I BELIEVE,
HAS A QUESTION. >> THANK YOU, YOUR WORSHIP, AND GOOD MORNING TO
MEMBERS OF COUNCIL. FIRST OF ALL, TO THE OCLDC, TO THE BOARD OF
DIRECTORS, THANK YOU FOR YOUR SERVICE AND TO THE STAFF, THANK YOU
FOR THE WORK THAT YOU DO. CERTAINLY MY KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THIS
CORPORATION HAS INCREASED OVER THE LAST YEAR AND THE LAST COUPLE
OF YEARS WITH THE PROPERTY ON RIVERSIDE DRIVE, WHICH IS IN RIVER
WARD AND NOW THAT THE PROPERTY HAS BEEN SOLD WORKING WITH THE
NEW PROPONENT, CERTAINLY MADE MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY MORE
AWARE OF WHAT THE CORPORATION DOES AND IT'S ALSO HIGHLIGHTED
SOME ISSUES WITH THE CORPORATION THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED.
THAT'S CERTAINLY NOT FOR TODAY. BUT I DID HAVE SOME QUESTIONS. I'M
JUST TRYING TO FIND HERE IN MY BOOKLET HERE, THE -- HERE IT IS, YOUR
PRESENTATION. FIRST OF ALL, I DON'T EXPECT ANSWERS TODAY, BUT I
WOULD LIKE TO PUT MY QUESTIONS ON THE RECORD AND IF I COULD GET A
REPLY BACK IN THE NEXT MONTH OR SO, THAT WOULD BE GREAT. I'VE READ
YOUR REPORT IN FULL, THE ANNUAL REPORT, AND YOU TALK ABOUT THE
STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS OR YOUR OBJECTIVES AS A CORPORATION. THERE'S
ABOUT TEN OF THEM ON PAGE 4 THAT ARE LISTED. AND WHEN I CONSIDER
THE PROPERTY AT 3071 RIVERSIDE DRIVE WHICH HAS GONE THROUGH A
VERY LENGTHY PROCESS AND HAS, IN ITSELF, RAISED A NUMBER OF
QUESTIONS IN THE COMMUNITY, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW -- YOU TALK ABOUT
MAXIMIZING FINANCIAL, SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL
SUSTAINABILITY. I KNOW THAT THE FINANCIAL COMPONENT HAS BEEN
REALIZED BUT I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW FOR THE RIVERSIDE DRIVE PROPERTY
HOW YOU'VE MAXIMIZED THE SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL
SUSTAINABILITY OF THAT PROPERTY. ONE OF YOUR OTHER OBJECTIVES IS
TO ENGAGE IN COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND A MAJOR CRITICISM OF THIS
PROPERTY DISPOSAL IN MY WARD IS THE LACK OF COMMUNITY
CONSULTATION, PARTICULARLY DRIVEN BY THIS CORPORATION. SO I WOULD
LIKE TO KNOW HOW THAT OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ADDRESSED AND THE THIRD
BULLET THAT I WOULD LIKE AN ANSWER TO IT IS AS ONE OF YOUR STATED
OBJECTIVES IS, QUOTE, "BUILD ON COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES." AS YOU KNOW,

A DECADE AGO, A CONCEPT PLAN WAS COMMUNITY LED. COUNCIL APPROVED. AND SOME CHANGES TO THAT CONCEPT PLAN WERE INCORPORATED AND SORT OF GO AGAINST THE OVERALL COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES OR THE COMMUNITY-LED PLAN THAT WAS APPROVED A DECADE AGO. SO I DON'T WANT TO PUT YOU ON THE SPOT TODAY AND ASK HOW THOSE POINTS HAVE BEEN MET BUT I WANT TO GET THOSE QUESTIONS ON THE RECORD AND HAVE AN ANSWER SO I CAN GO BACK TO MY COMMUNITY WHICH HAS RAISED SOME SIGNIFICANT QUESTIONS THROUGH THIS PROCESS. THANK YOU. >> COULD I JUST ASK YOU SEND US THOSE IN WRITING ASK WE WILL GET BACK TO YOU ON THEM. >> I WILL. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. >> Mayor Watson: IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE?NO?COUNCILOR BROCKINGTON. THANK YOU FOR THE PRESENTATION. THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS. SO ON THE REPORT, CARRIED. OUR NEXT ITEM THAT'S BEEN HELD IS THE OTTAWA FIRE SERVICES 2016 ANNUAL REPORT. COUNCILOR BROCKINGTON, I BELIEVE YOU HELD THIS. >> YES, YOUR WORSHIP, THANK YOU. I REALIZE THIS WAS -- WENT THROUGH COMMITTEE LAST WEEK. I WAS AT A CONFERENCE AND NOT ABLE TO ATTEND AND ASK QUESTIONS, SO I'LL TRY TO BE BRIEF AND FOLLOW UP WITH STAFF ON OTHER QUESTIONS. FIRST -- >> Mayor Watson: WHO DO WE HAVE MR. DEMONTE ANSWER?>> I CAN TAKE THOSE QUESTIONS. >> THE FIRST QUESTION IS JUST REGARDING SERVICE CALLS THAT ARE OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION OF THE CITY OF OTTAWA, WHETHER THOSE TAKE PLACE, AND WHEN WE DO REPLY TO SERVICE CALLS OUTSIDE, HOW THOSE COSTS ARE THEN REIMBURSED BACK TO THE CITY. >> MAYOR, WITH REGARDS TO OUR MUNICIPALITIES THAT SURROUND US, WE HAVE A MUTUAL AID AGREEMENT OR FORMAL AGREEMENT SIGNED. OFTEN OTTAWA FIRE'S RESPONDS BECAUSE OUR SPECIALTIES, PARTICULARLY HAZMAT AND RESCUE CAPABILITIES OF AN URBAN CENTRE LIKE OTTAWA, AND THOSE COSTS ARE RECOVERED AS PART OF THE MUTUAL AID AGREEMENT. >> IS THAT BY THE PROVINCE OR THOSE OTHER MUNICIPALITIES?>> BETWEEN THE OTHER MUNICIPALITIES AND US. >> OKAY. AND ON PAGE 5, STAFF HAD PROVIDED A VERY HELPFUL TABLE ILLUSTRATING CALLS COMPARING 2015 OVER 2016. THERE IS A FEW POINTS HERE THAT CERTAINLY DREW MY ATTENTION AND I WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS. ONE IS REGARDING THE VOLUME OF FALSE ALARMS, WHICH I THINK IS SIGNIFICANT IN 2016. THERE WERE 8721 FALSE ALARMS THAT THE OFS RESPONDED TO. FOR CHRONIC ADDRESSES THAT HAVE FALSE ALARMS, WHAT TYPE OF STEPS DOES THE OTTAWA FIRE

SERVICE TAKE TO EDUCATE OR EVEN CHARGE THESE ADDRESSES FOR THESE CHRONIC FALSE ALARMS?>> MAYOR, THERE IS FOLLOW-UP ON THOSE AND WE'LL FOLLOW UP MORE SPECIFICALLY WITH YOU AND THE FIRE CHIEF COUNCILOR, BUT WE DO HAVE A PROCESS BY WHICH OUR -- WE ANALYZE THOSE CALLS. THERE IS FOLLOW-UP WITH OUR PREVENTION OFFICERS, BECAUSE THAT IS AN IMPORTANT COMPONENT, AS YOU'RE RIGHT. THERE ARE NUMEROUS FALSE ALARMS. ONE HAS TO REMEMBER IT'S A FINE BALANCE AND THE FIRE CHIEF HAS STATED IT SEVERAL TIMES PUBLICLY, WHEN ONE SMELLS HEAT OR SMOKE, ET CETERA, WE WANT TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO CALL. OFTEN THOSE AFTERWARDS ARE CLASSIFIED AS FALSE ALARMS. IT COULD BE A MINOR PROBLEM. SO A BUCKET OF THOSE CALLS OR THAT TYPE OF CALL BUT FOR THE OTHER ONES AS YOU INDICATED, THE MORE CHRONIC ONES, THERE IS FOLLOW-UP DONE WITH OUR PREVENTION TEAM BUT I'LL ASK THE CHIEF TO FOLLOW UP MORE SPECIFICALLY IN MORE DETAIL WITH YOU. >> THANK YOU. AND THE OTHER STAT THAT CAUGHT MY ATTENTION WAS THE NUMBER OF INCIDENTS RESPONDED TO FOR MEDICAL NEEDS. 19% YEAR AREA-YEAR INCREASE, 3492 IN 2015, 4,101 INCIDENTS IN 2016. CAN YOU SPEAK TO WHY THAT NUMBER IS SO HIGH. >> MAYOR, THIS IS DIRECTLY RELATED. WE HAVE A TIERED RESPONSE AGREEMENT AND THE MEDICAL CALLS OBVIOUSLY THE PARAMEDIC SERVICES, THE PRIME AGENCY, BUT WE ALSO TIERED POLICE AND FIRE ON SPECIFIC CATEGORIES OF CALLS WHERE THEIR SKILLS CAN BE BROUGHT TO BEAR AND ASSIST US IN SAVING A LIFE. THIS ATTRACTS SIMILAR TO WHAT WE'RE SEEING IN THE PARAMEDIC REPORT, I BELIEVE, COMING TO OUR NEXT COMMITTEE, YOU'LL SEE THAT THEY'VE HAD YEAR-OVER-YEAR INCREASES SIMILAR SO THERE'S NOTHING SPECIFIC HERE THAT IS MORE OUTSTANDING. IT'S A TREND THAT WE'RE SEEING ACROSS THE BOARD WITH REGARDS TO MEDICAL CALLS. AND IT'S A CONTINUATION OF WHAT WE'RE SEEING IN THE PARAMEDIC SERVICE. YOU'RE SEEING HERE ON THE CATEGORIES OF CALLS OF FIRES SENT TO, NAMELY UNCONSCIOUS AND VITAL SIGNS ABSENCE CALLS. >> OKAY. I APPRECIATE THE MENTION OF CAMP FIT, WHICH IS THE FEMALE FIREFIGHTERS IN TRAINING. I ATTENDED LAST SUMMER A DAY -- >> Mayor Watson: DID YOU PASS?>> PARDON ME?>> Mayor Watson: DID YOU PASS THE TEST?>> NO. BUT I'M CERTAINLY GOING TO ENCOURAGE MY DAUGHTERS, IF THEY ARE INTERESTED IN A CAREER IN EMERGENCY SERVICES, TO CONSIDER THIS WHEN THEY COME OF AGE. CERTAINLY A PROGRAM FOR GIRLS, YOUNG WOMEN 15 TO 19 YEARS OF AGE. ANYWAY, IT'S A GREAT

PROGRAM. IT REALLY IS A GREAT PROGRAM. AND I WOULD JUST LIKE TO ENCOURAGE NOT MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE BUT ALL OF COUNCIL, IF YOU CAN GET AWAY THIS SUMMER AND ATTEND HERE WITHIN OTTAWA TO DO THAT. MY QUESTION, THOUGH, IS REGARDING THE NUMBER OF WOMEN IN THE OTTAWA FIRE SERVICE. 16 NEW RECRUITS WERE HIRED AND BEGAN TRAINING IN THE SPRING OF APRIL OF 2017. HOW IS THE OTTAWA FIRE SERVICE DOING IN RECRUITING AND RETAINING FEMALE FIREFIGHTERS?>> MAYOR, IT IS THE PRIORITY OF THIS FIRE CHIEF -- HE'S NAMED IT PUBLICLY -- THAT RECRUITMENT OF WOMEN AND INCREASING THE DIVERSITY OF THE SERVICE AS WELL AS MENTAL HEALTH ARE HIS TWO PRIORITIES. ON THIS ONE IN PARTICULAR, THE FIRE SERVICE IN OTTAWA HAS BEEN FINDING MULTIPLE OPPORTUNITIES TO TRY TO ENCOURAGE AND BRING WOMEN INTO THE FIRE SERVICE. CERTAINLY IT'S A CHALLENGE. WE RECRUIT BASED ON PEOPLE LEAVING US, ET CETERA, SO THE NUMBERS YEARLY AS WE INCREASE, IT IS A CHALLENGE ACROSS THE COUNTRY, BUT IT'S SOMETHING THAT WE'RE FOCUSED ON. CAMP FIT IS ONLY BUT ONE EXAMPLE. WE DO MULTIPLE OUTREACH PROGRAMS. SO I JUST WANT TO REASSURE YOU THAT THIS IS THE FIRE CHIEF'S PRIORITY. >> THANK YOU. I'LL JUST NOTE MY FINAL COMMENT IS WE HAVE HAD SOME GRADUATES FROM THIS CAMP WHO HAVE GONE ON TO BECOME FIREFIGHTERS, NOT JUST IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS BUT HERE IN OTTAWA WHICH IS A GREAT THING. YOUR WORSHIP, THANK YOU FOR THAT OPPORTUNITY. AGAIN, THANK YOU TO THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE OTTAWA FIRE SERVICE WHO SERVE THIS GREAT CITY. THANK YOU.

>> Mayor Watson: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?THE REPORT RECEIVED. THE NEXT ITEM THAT'S BEEN HELD IS NOISE BYLAW REVIEW. I BELIEVE COUNCILOR BROCKINGTON HELD THAT AS WELL. >> THANK YOU, YOUR WORSHIP. I'M GETTING MY MONEY'S WORTH HERE THIS MORNING. SO FOR THE -- AGAIN FOR THIS REVIEW, WHICH I APPRECIATE OTTAWA BYLAW SERVICES, WHICH LED THIS OVER THE LAST COUPLE OF MONTHS, AND THE SIGNIFICANT PARTICIPATION THAT MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PROVIDED, NOT JUST AT PUBLIC SESSIONS THAT WERE HOSTED BUT ALSO BY THE ON-LINE SURVEY WHICH COLLECTED A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF FEEDBACK. NOISE, LIKE MANY OTHER WORDS, IS A SIGNIFICANT ISSUE IN MY WARD. WE HAVE A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF SPECIAL EVENTS AND FESTIVALS IN RIVER WARD, THE MOST FESTIVALS AND SPECIAL EVENTS OF ANY WARD OUTSIDE THE DOWNTOWN CORE. WE HAPPILY EMBRACE FESTIVALS AND SPECIAL EVENTS AND WE HAVE MANY YEARS OF WORKING WITH THEM COLLABORATIVELY TO

ADDRESS VARIOUS SOLUTIONS. THE SURVEY THAT OTTAWA BYLAW CONDUCTED TALKED ABOUT THE BASE NOISE WHICH HAS BEEN A PROBLEM FOR YEARS, EMANATING FROM SOME FESTIVALS AND SPECIAL EVENTS, AND IS CERTAINLY ONE THAT IS AN ISSUE IN RIVER WARD AND SO I'M HAPPY THAT IT IS ADDRESSED IN THIS REPORT AND WILL BE ADDRESSED GOING FORWARD. I KNOW IT'S NOT AN EASY COMPONENT OF NOISE TO MEASURE, BUT I'M TRYING TO WRAP MY HEAD AROUND WITHIN THE REPORT HOW THIS IS GOING TO BE DONE GOING FORWARD, HOW WILL YOU MEASURE AND ENFORCE THE BASE NOISE COMPONENT? BECAUSE WHEN I HAVE READ THE DRAFT BYLAW THAT IS PROPOSED HERE, WHICH IS ATTACHED AS DOCUMENT ONE, IT SAYS, "NO PERSON SHALL CAUSE OR PERMIT ANY BASE NOISE, UNUSUAL NOISE OR NOISE LIKELY TO DISTURB THE INHABITANTS OF THE CITY." I THINK WE HAVE TO EXPECT THAT THERE WILL BE SOME BASE NOISE BUT I'M CERTAINLY LOOKING FOR THOSE EXTREME CASES THAT CAUSE SIGNIFICANT UNREST AND DISTURBANCE TO RESIDENTS WHO LIVE BESIDE THESE FESTIVALS. SO I SEE THE CHIEF OF BYLAW IS HERE. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT THE PLAN IS TO MEASURE AND ENFORCE BASE NOISE GOING FORWARD. >> THROUGH YOU, MAYOR, CURRENTLY THE PROVISION OF THE BYLAW THAT WE USE TO ENFORCE BASE NOISE IS SECTION 2 OF THE BYLAW. IT'S A GENERAL NOISE PROVISION. THE PROBLEM THAT WE'VE HAD RECENTLY WHEN WE'RE BEFORE THE COURTS IS THAT WE'VE BEEN CHALLENGED TO WHETHER BASE NOISE, BECAUSE IT'S NOT SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSED IN THE PROVISION, IS -- WE HAVEN'T BEEN SUCCESSFUL WITH OUR CHARGES. WHAT WE'RE RECOMMENDING HERE IS THAT WE AMEND THE SECTION 2 TO SPECIFICALLY INCLUDE BASE NOISE AND CLEARLY DEFINE BASE NOISE AS BEING LOW FREQUENCY NOISE AS WELL AS VIBRATION. SO WHEN WE GET COMPLAINTS ABOUT BASE NOISE OR NOISE IN GENERAL, WHEN WE GO INTO PEOPLE'S UNITS OR, YOU KNOW, FROM THE POINT OF RECEPTION, TAKING THE METRE READINGS, OFTEN BASE NOISE DOESN'T SHOW UP ON OUR METRE, SO THEY SHOW AS NO VIOLATION SO LESS THAN 65 DECIBELS HAVE BEEN EXEMPTION -- IF AN EXEMPTION'S IN PLACE SO "B" BUT IT'S OBVIOUS WHEN WE GO INTO THE UNIT THAT PICTURES ARE VIBRATING ON WALL OR THINGS ARE VIBRATING ON THE TABLE, THINGS LIKE THAT, SO IT'S OBVIOUS TO US THAT THERE IS A VIOLATION, THERE IS A DISTURBANCE TO THE NEIGHBOUR, SO AT THAT POINT, WE CAN NOW ISSUE A CHARGE IF POSSIBLE, BUT I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO MENTION THAT, YOU KNOW, PREVIOUS CALLS THAT WE'VE HAD INVOLVING FESTIVALS AND EVENT

ORGANIZERS, WE'VE HAD GREAT COLLABORATION WITH THEM AND IT'S -- THEY'VE BEEN VERY RESPONSIVE TO OUR CONCERNS ABOUT BASE NOISE IN THE COMMUNITIES AND I'VE DONE EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO TRY AND REDUCE BASE NOISE WHERE POSSIBLE. SO WE'LL CONTINUE THOSE EFFORTS WITH THOSE ORGANIZERS, BUT IN EXTREME CASES WHERE WE'RE NOT GETTING COMPLIANCE, AT LEAST NOW IT'S CLEAR IT'S SPECIFIC IN THE PROVISION AND WE CAN GO AHEAD AND ISSUE THE CHARGE. >> THANK YOU. YOU KNOW FULL WELL THE SPECIAL EVENTS AND FESTIVALS THAT TAKE PLACE IN RIVER WARD AND WE'VE HAD MANY, MANY CONVERSATIONS, SO I'VE APPRECIATED YOUR COMMITMENT OVER THE YEARS TO ADDRESS ISSUES FROM MY RESIDENTS. THE OTHER QUESTION I WANTED TO RAISE WAS NOT REGARDING BASE NOISE BUT SNOW CLEARING OPERATORS AND AGAIN, I UNDERSTAND THE NEED TO ALLOW THIS SERVICE TO BE CONDUCTED IN THE EVENINGS AND THROUGH THE NIGHT. WE WANT TO MAKE SURE OUR ROADS AND PARKING LOTS ON PRIVATE PROPERTY ARE CLEARED. BUT FOR RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES THAT NEIGHBOUR GOVERNMENT COMPLEXES, SHOPPING STRIP MALLS, THAT CAN'T BE CLEARED DURING THE DAY, BECAUSE THEY HAVE STAFF OR PATRONS THERE WHO HAVE TO CLEAR AT NIGHT, THERE HAS BEEN ONGOING CONCERNS IN CERTAIN SECTIONS OF MY NOISE -- MY WARD ABOUT THE OPERATORS WHO OPERATE AT NIGHT. IS THERE ANY WAY THAT WE CAN WORK TOGETHER AFTER TODAY TO LOOK AT SOLUTIONS WHERE WE DON'T GIVE A 24-HOUR CARTE BLANCHE AUTHORITY TO THESE OPERATORS BUT TRY AND STREAMLINE WHETHER THEY DO IT BETWEEN 6 P.M. AND MIDNIGHT OR EVEN 6 P.M. AND ONE, BUT THROUGH THE NIGHT, THESE ONGOING CHALLENGES, PARTICULARLY IN WINTERS WHERE WE HAVE A LOT OF SNOW AND THE IMPACT IT HAS ON RESIDENTS, IS THERE ANYTHING THAT YOU CAN SUGGEST -- I KNOW YOU'RE NOT ADDRESSING IT IN THIS BYLAW REVIEW -- BUT IS THERE ANYTHING YOU CAN SUGGEST GOING FORWARD THAT MAY HAVE BEEN WORKED IN OTHER SITUATIONS OR OTHER WARDS?>> YES, MAYOR, SO WE DID CONSIDER SEVERAL OPTIONS REGULATING SNOW CLEARING AND SNOW REMOVAL NOISE IN THE WEE HOURS OF THE NIGHT. IN REVIEWING PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH THAT WE DID, AS WELL AS THE ON-LINE SURVEY THAT WE DID, IT WAS CLEAR THAT RESIDENTS ALTHOUGH HAD COMMENTS ABOUT DIFFERENT NOISE CREATED FROM THE SNOW CLEARING OPERATIONS, SPECIFICALLY THE BACKUP BEEPERS, WE FELT THAT WE HAD A CLEAR MESSAGE FROM THE RESIDENTS OF OTTAWA THAT IT WAS MORE

IMPORTANT TO HAVE THESE STREETS AND PUBLIC -- THE PARKING LOTS AND THINGS PLOWED THROUGH THE NIGHT TO ENSURE SAFETY AND MOBILITY FOR THE RESIDENTS IN THE MORNING. BUT WE DID DISCOVER WHAT'S CALLED A BROAD BAND BACKUP BEEPER SO WE ARE DOING SOME FURTHER RESEARCH ON THAT AND ACTUALLY WE HAVE A COMMITTEE DIRECTIVE TO EXPLORE THAT OPTION FURTHER, SO WE'RE HOPING THAT WE'LL BE ABLE TO COME FORWARD EARLY NEXT YEAR WITH THE SOLUTION THAT MAY WORK.

>> I APPRECIATE IT. I CERTAINLY WORK WITH PROPERTY MANAGERS AND OTHER PEOPLE WHO ARE IN CHARGE OF SNOW CLEARING TO WORK OUT SOME SORT OF POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS, BUT WHEN YOU HAVE A BYLAW IN PLACE THAT GIVES THEM 24-HOUR ACCESS, SOME OF THESE CHALLENGES DO COME UP SO I WANTED TO RAISE THAT AND MAYBE I CAN WORK WITH YOU OFF-LINE AGAIN ON THAT MATTER. BUT AGAIN, I WANTED TO THANK OTTAWA BYLAW STAFF FOR CONDUCTING THIS REVIEW. I THINK IT WAS CERTAINLY NECESSARY AND CERTAINLY A LOT OF COMMENTS HAVE COME IN AND WE'RE GOING TO MAKE SOME CHANGES HERE WHICH I WILL BE SUPPORTING.

THANKS VERY MUCH. >> Mayor Watson: THANK YOU. COUNCILOR McKENNY, PLEASE. >> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR. I WAS AT COMMITTEE FOR ALL OF THE DISCUSSION THAT HAPPENED AROUND THE NOISE BYLAW AND WHILE I HAD ASKED STAFF TO LOOK AT A 9 A.M. TIME FOR CONSTRUCTION STARTS ON SATURDAY, THAT WASN'T SUCCESSFUL. THE MOTION DIDN'T GET THROUGH COMMITTEE. BUT I DO -- I THINK THAT -- I FEEL LIKE I DO NEED TO POINT OUT THAT NOISE HAPPENS MORE IN AREAS AND NOISE COMPLAINTS ARE GENERATED IN AREAS WHERE PEOPLE, YOU KNOW, LIVE CLOSER TOGETHER, OBVIOUSLY, AND IF YOU JUST LOOK AT THE FIRST QUARTER RESULTS FROM BYLAW FOR 2017, AS AN EXAMPLE -- AND THIS IS ALL NOISE -- THIS IS NOT JUST CONSTRUCTION NOISE -- BUT I THINK YOU CAN EXTRAPOLATE FROM THESE NUMBERS -- SORRY. I'VE NEVER BEEN ACCUSED OF NOT SPEAKING LOUD ENOUGH. THAT'S ODD FOR ME. HERE I GO. SO, YOU KNOW, FOR WARD 12, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE WERE 307 NOISE COMPLAINTS. FOR MY WARD, 263. AND THAT -- THAT COMPARES WITH FIVE FOR SOME, EIGHT, THREE IS, I THINK, THE LOWEST. I THINK -- AND I DON'T -- YOU KNOW, WE CAN'T BLAME THIS ON FESTIVALS. I GET VERY FEW COMPLAINTS ABOUT BLUES FEST ANYMORE. I GET NONE ABOUT GLOW FAIR. SO THIS IS, YOU KNOW, GENERAL NOISE. SO IN MY OFFICE ALONE, I GET PEOPLE, RESIDENTS, CALLING ME ANY TIME THERE'S CONSTRUCTION HAPPENING IN THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD ALMOST DAILY. AND SO IT WOULD HAVE BEEN NICE TO GIVE PEOPLE A 9 A.M. START

ON SATURDAY. I THOUGHT THAT TWO HOURS A WEEK TO LET PEOPLE REST WASN'T ASKING FOR TOO MUCH. BUT I THINK THAT GOING FORWARD, I WOULD LIKE TO -- I DO HAVE AN INQUIRY WHICH I WILL READ OUT AT THE END OF COUNCIL MEETING WHEN WE GO THROUGH INQUIRIES. BUT ESSENTIALLY -- AND I WORKED WITH STAFF ON THIS -- LOOKING FOR OTHER MEASURES THAT WE CAN PUT IN PLACE TO MITIGATE PRIVATE CONSTRUCTION NOISE. AND LOOK AT WHAT OPPORTUNITIES COULD BE DEVELOPED TO REDUCE NOISE DISRUPTION. YOU KNOW, WHEN I'M WORKING WITH THE LIGHT RAIL OFFICE, FOR EXAMPLE, AND THEY COME TO ME FOR EXPECTATIONS, I GET ASKED FOR EXEMPTIONS MAYBE NOT DAILY BUT CLOSE FROM SOMEONE. AND I THINK THAT THE CHIEF OF BYLAW SERVICES CAN VOUCH FOR ME THAT I'M ACTUALLY PRETTY DARN GOOD AT GIVING THOSE EXEMPTIONS. AND -- BUT WHAT THAT ALLOWS ME TO DO IS WORK WITH WHO'S ASKING FOR THEM TO SAY, YOU KNOW, IF, IN FACT, IT IS TOO LOUD, WHAT ARE SOME OF THE MEASURES THAT WE CAN PUT IN PLACE? AND THAT'S IMPORTANT. I THINK IT'S -- YOU KNOW, JUST HAVING THAT FLEXIBILITY, HAVING THAT LEVERAGE WITH WHOEVER THE DEVELOPERS, THE BUILDER IS, THE CONTRACTOR IS, IT ALLOWS ME TO WORK ON BEHALF OF MY RESIDENTS, US TO WORK ON BEHALF OF OUR RESIDENTS, TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY'RE ABLE TO LIVE WITH, YOU KNOW, SOME MITIGATION FROM WHAT CAN BE VERY LOUD NOISE. YOU KNOW, WHEN JACK HAMMERING HAPPENS FROM 11 P.M. 'TIL 6 A.M., WHICH HAPPENED ALL LAST SUMMER, PEOPLE CALL MY OFFICE ACTUALLY CRYING. THEY ARE PHYSICALLY DISTURBED BY IT. SO I WILL DO THE INQUIRY. I WILL WORK WITH STAFF TO LOOK AT OTHER OPPORTUNITIES TO MITIGATE NOISE THAT, YOU KNOW -- IT'S EASY ENOUGH TO DO IT WITH OUR STAFF, BUT TO LOOK AT THOSE OPPORTUNITIES FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPERS. THANK YOU. >> Mayor Watson: THANK YOU, COUNCILOR McKENNY. COUNCILOR QADRI, PLEASE, ON THE ISSUE. >> THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. MAYOR. AND ON THIS NOISE BYLAW, MR. MAYOR, I DO HAVE CONCERNS AS ONE OF THE BUSIEST AREAS FOR CONSTRUCTION THAT IS HAPPENING IN THE CITY OF OTTAWA IN TERMS OF STITTSVILLE, AND BASED ON THAT, I HAD A REQUESTED FROM STAFF TO MAYBE MOVE THE SATURDAY MORNING START TIME FROM 7 A.M. TO 8 A.M., AND AGAIN, PEOPLE WERE WONDERING, WHY WOULD ONE HOUR MAKE SUCH A DIFFERENCE? IT'S A WEEKEND. WE'VE GOT A LOT OF YOUNG FAMILIES THAT HAVE KIDS SLEEPING ON THE WEEKENDS. SO BASED ON THAT, MR. MAYOR, AND BASED ON REQUEST FROM MY COMMUNITY, I'M GOING TO DISSENT ON THE REPORT, ALTHOUGH I

THINK THE REPORT OVERALL IS NOT A BAD REPORT. IT'S JUST THE CONSTRUCTION NOISE BECOMES A HICCUP IN THIS PARTICULAR PROCESS, AND ESPECIALLY ON THE WEEKENDS. SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. MAYOR. >> Mayor Watson: OKAY. SO ON THE REPORT AS PRESENTED, CARRIED? COUNCILOR QADRI DISSENTS. McKENNY, NUSSBAUM AND FLUERY. OKAY. ON THE -- THE NEXT ITEM THAT WAS HELD IS REPORT -- PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT NUMBER 43B. APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION AT 270 BUCHAN ROAD, PROPERTY DESIGNATED UNDER PART 5 OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT AND LOCATED IN THE ROCK CLIFF PARK HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT. COUNCILOR NUSSBAUM, PLEASE. >> THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. MAYOR. I JUST WANTED TO PROVIDE JUST A FEW REMARKS OF CONTEXT FOR THIS ITEM. I THINK AS COLLEAGUES KNOW, THIS ITEM ORIGINALLY CAME TO THE BUILD HERITAGE SUBCOMMITTEE WITH A RECOMMENDATION FROM STAFF THAT THE APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION BE REFUSED. THAT WAS UPHeld AT THE BUILD HERITAGE SUBCOMMITTEE AND WENT TO PLANNING COMMITTEE, WHICH THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION MOTION LOST ON A TIE, AND THAT LED TO THE REPLACEMENT MOTION WHICH IS BEFORE US TODAY. I WILL BE OPPOSING THE REPLACEMENT MOTION AND SHOULD IT FAIL PUTTING FORWARD A MOTION BY ME SECONDED BY THE MAYOR WITH THE ORIGINAL STAFF RECOMMENDATION BACK ON THE TABLE, BUT I RECOGNIZE THAT WHAT'S BEFORE US RIGHT NOW IS THE REPLACEMENT MOTION FROM PLANNING. I THOUGHT IT MIGHT BE USEFUL JUST TO PROVIDE A VERY BRIEF -- JUST THREE BRIEF COMMENTS ON THIS FILE BECAUSE I KNOW THAT MANY COLLEAGUES HAVE NOT HAD A BENEFIT OF HEARING THE DISCUSSION THAT HAPPENED EITHER AT BUILD HERITAGE OR AT PLANNING. AND I THINK WHAT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE IS THAT THE ROCK CLIFF PARK HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT, WHICH WAS ESTABLISHED BACK IN 1997, ALSO HAD GUIDELINES WHICH WERE CREATED THE FOLLOWING YEAR WHICH ESSENTIALLY SET OUT RULES FOR PROPERTIES, WHETHER IT'S ADDITIONS OR WHETHER IT'S FACADES OR APPEARANCES OR MASSING OR SCALE, DEMOLITION, ET CETERA, THERE WAS A FAIRLY COMPREHENSIVE SET OF GUIDELINES THAT SERVED THE COMMUNITY WELL BUT WHEN AMENDMENTS TO THE HERITAGE -- THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT CAME IN THE MID-2000s, THERE WAS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS TO ESSENTIALLY HAVE GREATER TEETH AND THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT PROVIDED THAT PLANS COULD BE ESTABLISHED IN ALL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS.

THAT LED TO A VERY ROBUST PROCESS WITHIN ROCK CLIFF PARK OF FIRST EVALUATING ALL 800 PROPERTIES WHICH WAS DONE BOTH BY CITY HERITAGE STAFF AND BY MEMBERS OF THE ROCK CLIFF PARK RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION HERITAGE COMMITTEE AND THEN THAT STARTED IN ABOUT 2012 AND THEN TWO YEARS OF WORK ON THE ACTUAL PLAN, WHICH STARTED, I THINK, BACK IN 2014, WHICH CULMINATED IN THE PLAN BEING FINALIZED AND BROUGHT TO COUNCIL LAST YEAR, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY THIS YEAR AT COUNCIL AND THE COMMUNITY CELEBRATED THAT BECAUSE IT WAS AN OPPORTUNITY, AS I SAID, TO BOTH STRENGTHEN AND TO PROVIDE TEETH TO THOSE ORIGINAL GUIDELINES TO MODERNIZE IT, AND ALSO TO MAKE SURE THAT THERE WAS GREATER CERTAINTY IN TERMS OF HOW TO MANAGE GROWTH IN THE VILLAGE MOVING FORWARD. ONE THING THAT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE IS THAT THE DRAFT PLAN WAS SUBJECT TO A LOT OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION, A LOT OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION. WE HAD A PUBLIC MEETING PRIOR TO THE PLAN COMING TO COUNCIL WHICH ALMOST A HUNDRED RESIDENTS CAME, AND INTERESTINGLY AND IMPORTANTLY, THERE WAS NEAR UNANIMOUS SUPPORT FOR THE PLAN. PEOPLE RECOGNIZED AND SAW THAT IT WAS IMPORTANT THAT THE UNIQUE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE WAS PRESERVED AND FOR THAT REASON, THERE WAS STRONG PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR IT. IMPORTANTLY, THOUGH, THE PLAN IS NOT A FREEZING OF ROCK CLIFF PARK. IT IS A MANAGEMENT PLAN. IT SETS VERY CLEAR RULES FOR SITUATIONS OF, AGAIN -- OF ADDITIONS AND MASSING AND SCALE. BUT IT ALSO ENSURES THAT IN MANY CASES, IF PEOPLE WANT TO DEMOLISH THEIR PROPERTIES, THERE IS A PROCESS FOR THAT, AND, IN FACT, SINCE COUNCIL PASSED THE PLAN A YEAR AGO, STAFF HAVE RECOMMENDED THAT THREE HOUSES BE DEMOLISHED. THEY ARE SO-CALLED GRADE TWO HOUSES. THEY HAVE A SCORE OF A HUNDRED OF LESS THAN 50. BUT IN THE MATTER AT HAND, WE'RE DEALING WITH A PROPERTY THAT WAS SCORED ORIGINALLY IN 80 OUT OF A HUNDRED, AND THEN REVISED TO A 69, BUT WELL OVER THE 50 THRESHOLD. AND I REALLY THINK IT'S IMPORTANT FOR COLLEAGUES TO RECOGNIZE THAT GIVEN THAT THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THAT STAFF HAVE RECOMMENDED REFUSAL AND THE FIRST TIME THAT THE PLAN IN SOME WAYS HAS BEEN PUT TO THE TEST, THERE IS A REAL FEELING THAT IN ORDER FOR THE PLAN TO HAVE MEANING, IT NEEDS TO BE UPHELD BY US, BY THE GROUP THAT PASSED IT LAST YEAR. AND IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE AS WELL THAT BECAUSE THE PLAN IS UNDER APPEAL, HERITAGE STAFF HERE IN THE CITY EVALUATED THE PROPERTY BOTH UNDER

THE ORIGINAL 1998 GUIDELINES AND UNDER THE 2016 PLAN AND WERE VERY CLEAR IN THEIR RECOMMENDATION THAT THE APPLICATION FAILED UNDER BOTH BODIES. SO THAT'S JUST SOME IMPORTANT CONTEXT. I THINK WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY HERE TO DEMONSTRATE THAT WE SUPPORT THE PLAN WHICH WE PASSED LAST YEAR. THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR. >> Mayor Watson: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS?IT'S ALL IN ONE -- COUNCILOR TIERNEY. >> GREAT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. MAYOR. AND I DO APPRECIATE THE CHAIR OF HERITAGE WITH THOSE POINTS. I DID WANT TO HIGHLIGHT SOMETHING. WE SPENT QUITE A BIT OF TIME DISCUSSING AS A PLANNING COMMITTEE, AND I REALLY WISH THIS WAS ABOUT HERITAGE. UNFORTUNATELY, THAT'S NOT THE CASE. WE DEALT WITH THE FACT THAT WE HAVE TO BE ABLE TO DEFEND WHAT WE DO TO THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD, AND BASED ON THE INFORMATION THAT WAS PROVIDED AT THAT PLANNING COMMITTEE, THERE'S MANY HOLES, WHETHER IT'S THE FACT THERE WAS CLAIMS OF MR. SELDOM LIVING IN THE HOUSE THAT WERE FICTITIOUS, THAT NEVER HAPPENED. EVEN A DIFFERENT SCORING THAN WHAT WAS ORIGINALLY PRESENTED. WHETHER IT WAS THE FACT THERE WAS CLAIMS OF VEGETATION ON THE PROPERTY AND TREES. IF YOU'VE EVER WALKED THE PROPERTY, THERE'S NOTHING. COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT YESTERDAY, AT PLANNING COMMITTEE, WE HAD TO HOLD AN ITEM THAT WAS RELATED TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT. BUT IT WAS NOTED WHEN WE PULLED THE ITEM AND WE SPOKE FOR IT OVER AN HOUR, THAT THERE WAS NO DEMOLITION PERMIT. SO I ASKED THE SAME QUESTIONS, WOULD THEY HAVE HAD TO GO THROUGH THE SAME MATRIX, THE SAME SCORING, AS THIS PROPERTY WE'RE DEALING WITH TODAY?THE ANSWER WAS YES. BUT WE WERE STILL GOING TO GO AHEAD AND ISSUE A BUILDING PERMIT. BASICALLY TELLING PEOPLE, TEAR DOWN YOUR HOUSES. GO AHEAD AND BUILD. THAT'S NOT WHAT THE PURPOSE OF THIS HERITAGE DESIGN PLAN IS. IF WE REALLY WANT TO MAKE THIS EFFECTIVE AND WE DON'T WANT THIS TO GO TO THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD AT THE END OF THE YEAR AND HAVE AN "I TOLD YOU SO" MOMENT WHERE IT LOSES AND POKES HOLES LIKE SWISS CHEESE IN A PLAN THAT IS MEANT TO PROTECT A COMMUNITY, WE HAVE TO ALLOW THIS TO TAKE PLACE TODAY. I DO HAVE A FEW QUESTIONS -- ACTUALLY OF MR. MARK. GREAT. ONE OF MY QUESTIONS THAT I HAVE IS RELATED TO IF WE MAKE A DECISION TODAY FOR DEMOLITION, WOULD THIS HELP SAVE YOUR ROTHWELL HERITAGE DESIGN PLAN?ROCK CLIFF, FORGIVE ME. ROCKWELL'S MINE. >> MR. MAYOR, THE

ROCK CLIFF HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN IS UNDER APPEAL TO ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD. AND I CAN SAY NOTHING FURTHER IN OPEN SESSION. >> SO ON THAT, I'VE BEEN LOOKING AT WHAT OUR LEVEL OF SUCCESS IS AND FORGIVE ME FOR ASKING MANY OF THE SAME QUESTIONS THAT TOOK PLACE AT PLANNING. UNFORTUNATELY MY COUNCIL MEMBERS WEREN'T PART OF THAT LONG DISCUSSION. WHAT'S OUR CHANCES OF SUCCESS BASED ON WHAT YOU SEE IN FRONT OF YOU TODAY? ESPECIALLY WITH THE FACT THAT THE ORIGINAL SCORING IN 2010 VERSUS 2017, RATHER THAN THE TWO CATEGORIES WHERE IT WAS IDENTIFIED BY INDIVIDUALS AND THERE WAS NO VEGETATION, THEY CHANGED ALL THE CATEGORIES AND ALL THE SCORING. WILL THIS HAVE AN IMPACT AT THE OMB?>> MR. MAYOR, I'M UNDERSTANDING THE COUNCILOR'S QUESTIONS FOCUSED SOLELY ON THE MATTER OF 270 BUCHAN AND IF THE COUNCILOR WANTS ME TO EXPRESS AN OPINION ON THE HERITAGE DISTRICT CONSERVATION PLAN, I WOULD BE PLEASED TO DO SO. WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION, I HAVE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY SINCE COMMITTEE TO REACH THE -- READ THE CULTURAL HERITAGE DISTRICT STUDY, IMPACT STUDY, AND I WAS STRUCK WHEN I READ IT, MR. MAYOR, BY THE FACT THAT THE STUDY IS REALLY FOCUSED ON COMMENDING THE NEW BUILDING. THAT IS WHERE THE AUTHOR DECIDED TO DIRECT HER EFFORTS. I DID NOT FIND THERE TO BE MUCH ON THE QUESTION OF THE DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURE. AND I HAVE TO SAY, MR. MAYOR, THAT THAT STRUCK ME BECAUSE, OF COURSE, THE FIRST STEP TO BE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE WOULD WOULD HAVE TO BE THE DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING BUILDING. SO I'M LOATHE, IN LIGHT OF PAST EXPERIENCE TO, GIVE A PERCENTAGE, MR. MAYOR. WHAT I WILL SAY IS I THINK THE CITY'S CHANCES ARE SLIGHTLY BETTER THAN 50/50. I THINK WE HAVE ON BALANCE AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE SUCCESSFUL AT THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD WITH RESPECT TO THE APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION AND CONSTRUCTION AT 270 BUCHAN. [Please Stand By] THIS IS THE ONLY APPLICATION THAT WE HAVE RECEIVED FOR THE DEMOLITION OF A GRADE 1 BUILDING THAT WAS SCORED ACCORDING TO THE NEW SCORING SYSTEM THAT WAS ADOPTED AS PART OF THE RENEWAL OF THE HERITAGE PLAN.>> SO, IT WAS BROUGHT TO MY ATTENTION THAT THERE'S A PROPERTY THAT WAS LISTED GRADE 1. WAS ABOVE THE 50, AND IT WAS TORN DOWN WITHIN THE LAST TWO YEARS. DO YOU CARE TO COMMENT ON THAT?>> MR. MAYOR, THE APPLICATION FOR THAT PARTICULAR PROPERTY AT 265 ACACIA WAS RECEIVED PRIOR TO THE ADOPTION OF THE

HERITAGE CONSERVATION PLAN BY CITY COUNCIL IN 2016.IT WAS DEMOLISHED IN 2015.IN ADDITION, AT THE TIME, THERE WAS ANOTHER TEST THAT THE CITY USED.WHETHER IT WAS INCLUDED ON THE FORMER HERITAGE INVENTORY OF ROCKCLIFFE PARK, AND THAT BUILDING WAS NOT.IN THE CASE OF 270 BUCHAN, THE BUILDING RECEIVED A SCORE OF 69.WHEREAS THE SCORE OF 285 ACACIA WAS 56.>> CORRECT.SO, YES, THERE HAS BEEN A -- SOMETHING THAT HAS SCORED OVER THE 50 THAT HAS BEEN TORN DOWN.>> MR. MAYOR, NOT SINCE THE ADOPTION OF THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION STRICT PLAN IN 2016.>> SO I HAVE A FEW MORE QUESTIONS RELATED TO -- YESTERDAY WE WERE PRESENTED WITH SOME INFORMATION BY COURT.THANK YOU FOR THAT.I BELIEVE COUNCILOR HUBLEY ASKED FOR THAT INFORMATION QUITE A WHILE AGO AND WHICH ONLY IT IT IN FRONT OF US LAST NIGHT.ORIGINALLY, WE HAD THE 2010, FOR THE SAME PROPERTY, WITH THE SCORING.AND THIS WHEN IT WAS HIGHLIGHTED THAT MR. SOUTHERLAND NEVER LIVED THERE.THERE'S NO VEGETATION ON THE PROPERTY.RATHER THAN JUST CHANGING THE TWO CATEGORIES, IT APPEARS THE WHOLE SCORING SYSTEM WAS COMPLETELY CHANGED.THEN THERE WAS ATTACHED A 2016 VERSION, WHICH DOESN'T CORRELATE AT ALL.THERE'S -- IT'S NOT THE SAME NUMBER.IT'S -- IT SHOWS 08 AND THE OTHER ONE SHOWS 80.65.IT NOW SHOWS A NUMBER OF 69.ALL THESE CHANGES IN THREE VERSIONS OF DOCUMENTS...IS THERE NO STANDARD TEMPLATE THAT'S TO BE USED ACROSS THE BOARD?BECAUSE I -- EVEN YESTERDAY, I WAS LOOKING AT THE SCORING.THE NUMBERS THAT IT WAS OUT OF DIDN'T MATCH, AND I JUST THINK THIS ADDS MORE FUEL TO A CASE THAT AT THE OMD AGAINST YOU.>> MAYOR, I CAN ADVISE THIS IS THE SAME SCORING THAT WE'VE USED IN ALL THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION PLANS.AS THE VICE-CHAIR POINTED OUT, THE APPLICANT DID BRING NEW INFORMATION TO US.ONCE THEY FILED THEIR APPLICATION.WITH RESPECT TO THE SOUTHAMS, THE AMOUNT OF TIME THAT THEY LIVED IN THE REPORT AND CAN CHANGES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE TO THE PROPERTY SINCE WE'VE DONE OUR INITIAL SCORING BACK IN 2016.SO, AS WE'VE INDICATED, THE PLANS ARE FLEXIBLE, AND WE RE-EVALUATED THE HOUSE IN THOSE TWO CATEGORIES, WHICH BROUGHT THE SCORING DOWN FROM 80, WHICH WAS ASSIGNED IN 2016, TO 69 IN 2017.>> AND WHEN I LOOK AT A SITUATION LIKE BACK WHEN IT WAS THE ACADIA HOUSE, FOR EXAMPLE.THERE WAS SO MANY POINTS SET ASIDE BECAUSE THE ROCKCLIFFE MAYOR LIVED IN THIS HOUSE.BUT YET THEY STILL HAD 10 IN THAT CATEGORY.I'M HAVING A HARD

TIME WITH HOW THAT -- WITH WHAT THE RATIONAL IS.AND THAT'S WHAT THIS IS ABOUT, IS ABOUT RATIONALE AND DEFENDING RATIONALE.CAN YOU JUST COMMENT ON THAT?>> MR. MAYOR, WHEN THE FACT WAS REVEALED THAT MR. SOUTHAM HAD NOT LIVED THERE FOR AS LONG AS WITH THE THOUGHT AND WE WERE WILLING TO CORRECT THE RECORD AS SOON AS WE RECEIVED THAT INFORMATION.WE DROPPED IT DOWN FROM A -- TO A FAIR.AND THE FAIR SCORE WAS GIVEN TO -- IN SIMILAR HOUSES AND WE EVALUATED OVER 800 HOUSES IN ROCKCLIFFE PARK, AND IF A HOUSE HAD BEEN INHABITED BY SOMEONE WHO WAS ACTIVE IN THE COMMUNITY AND OWNED FOR A LONG TIME BY THE SAME PERSON.IN THIS CASE, 45 YEARS.SO A WELL-KNOWN PERSON IN COMMUNITY AND A MEMBER OF A WELL-KNOWN LUMBERING FAMILY.SO ALL THE OTHER HOUSES THAT WERE SIMILAR -- THAT IS LIVED IN BY THE SAME PERSON FOR A LONG TIME AND ASSOCIATED WITH SOME ASPECT OF OTTAWA'S HISTORY -- THEY WERE ALL GIVEN A FAIR.SO THIS RECEIVED A FAIR.THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE SCORING THAT WAS UNDERTAKEN AND ARRIVED AT THROUGH CONSENSUS WITH CITY STAFF AND MEMBERS OF THE ROCKCLIFFE COMMUNITY.SO THAT'S WHY WHEN WE DISCOVERED THE ERROR, WE KNEW THE SCORE TO DROP IT TO TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE OTHER 800 FORMS THAT WE HAD UNDERTAKEN IN THE EVALUATION PERIOD.>> I'LL GO BACK TO THE...>> YOU ONLY GET ONE ONCE.THIS IS YOUR FIVE MINUTES.>> WELL, CAN I AT LEAST -- I HAVE MORE QUESTIONS.>> YEAH, UNFORTUNATELY, THAT'S THE RULES UNDER THE PROCEDURE BYLAW.>> CAN I AT LEAST WRAP UP?>> WELL, I'LL GIVE YOU 30 SECONDS, IF YOU WANT TO WRAP UP.>> THANK YOU FOR THE 30 SECONDS.I DO APPRECIATE THAT.FIRST OF ALL, HOPING SOMEBODY ELSE ASKS A COUPLE OF QUICK QUESTIONS IN REGARDS TO THE LUMBERING FAMILY.I LOOKED AT THE REPORT THAT WAS CIRCULATED LAST NIGHT.THERE WAS TO MENTION OF THIS.THIS IS NEWS TO ME, ABOUT THE DETAIL BEHIND IT, WHERE OTHER REPORTS HAVE IT.THAT BEING SAID, I -- I WANT TO REALLY ILLUSTRATE THE FACT, I'M NOT AGAINST HERITAGE.THIS IS NOT A HERITAGE SITUATION.ROTHWELL.I PUT A HERITAGE DECISION NATION ON THREE STREETS THIS MY WARD LAST TERM.I SUPPORTED MY FRIEND JEFF LEIPER ON BROADVIEW PUBLIC SCHOOL BE A HERITAGE DESIGNATION.THAT'S NOT WHAT THIS IS ALL.THIS IS ABOUT RATIONALE AND WHAT'S GOING TO HOLD UP IN FRONT OF OUR TRUE TEST.WE HAVE TO BE STRONGER IN WHAT WE DO.THANK YOU.>> THANK YOU, COUNCILOR.COUNCILOR MCKENNEY, PLEASE.>> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.SO, I WON'T BE SUPPORTING THE

REPLACEMENT MOTION.I WILL BE SUPPORTING THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION, OF COURSE.SO JUST -- JUST TO CLARIFY:THIS -- THIS IS -- THIS GRADE 1 PROPERTY, THIS -- THERE HAS NOT BEEN DEMOLITION SINCE THIS PLAN WAS ADOPTED MONTHS AGO FOR ANOTHER GRADE 1 PROPERTY IN THIS PLAN.IS THAT CORRECT?>> THAT'S CORRECT., MR. MAYOR.>> AND HOW MANY OTHERS -- SO YOU STAND BY YOUR -- YOUR EVALUATION, OBVIOUSLY.HOW MANY OTHER PROPERTIES IN THIS NEW ROCKCLIFFE PARK HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN DO YOU -- YOU HAVE AN ESTIMATE OF HOW MANY OTHER PROPERTIES COULD COME TO US WITH THIS SCORE AND BE ASKED TO BE DEMOLISHED?>> MR. MAYOR, THERE ARE IN THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT.312 GRADE 1 BUILDINGS AND 406 OR SOMETHING GRADE 2 BUILDINGS.SO, THERE -- THAT IS 312 BUILDINGS THAT THE GUIDELINES INDICATE WE WOULD NOT -- WOULD -- THAT DEMOLITION WOULD NOT BE RECOMMENDED.I CAN'T SPECULATE ON HOW MANY APPLICATIONS WE WILL RECEIVE.>> FAIR ENOUGH, BUT IT'S SAFE TO SAY, THEN, THAT WE COULD GET DOZENS OF OTHERS THAT ARE AROUND 69, 70, OUT OF A HUNDRED, AND THIS WOULD SET A PRECEDENTS FOR THOSE, IF, IN FACT, WE AGREED TO ALLOW IT TO BE DEMOLISHED.>> MR. MAYOR, IN PREPARATION FOR THIS MEETING, I -- I LOOKED AT THE NUMBERS THAT WERE CATEGORY 1 AND CATEGORY 2, BUT I DIDN'T LOOK AT HOW MANY WERE 70 AND UP OR 50 TO 70.SO I CAN'T ACTUALLY SUPPLY THAT ANSWER.>> FOR, MR. MARK, JUST BACK TO THE APPEAL, THE 067 MB APPEAL.DO WE KNOW, WHO IS APPEALING THE PLAN?>> THE QUESTION WAS WHO IS APPEALING THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION...>> WHO IS APPEALING THE HERITAGE PLAN?>> YES, MR. MAYOR.IT'S THE APPLICANT IN THIS CASE.RICHCRAFT.>> SO IT'S RICHCRAFT WHO'S APPEALING THE PLAN AND ALSO ASKING FOR THE DEMOLITION AT THE SAME TIME?>> MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT IT IS AN INDIVIDUAL APPLICANT FOR THE DEMOLITION AND NEW CONSTRUCTION AND IT IS THAT APPLICANT AND RICHCRAFT WHO ARE THE APPELLANTS OF THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN.>> THANK YOU.I HAVE NO OTHER QUESTIONS.>> THANK YOU.COUNCILOR WILKINSON, PLEASE.QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS?>> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.ONE OF THE THINGS THAT I THINK WAS ASKED -- I WAS ON THE COMMITTEE, SO I KNOW WE SPENT A LOT OF TIME ON THIS, AND I HAD DIFFICULTY IN UNDERSTANDING THE -- ALL OF THE HERITAGE THINGS, BECAUSE IT -- RETURNING TO MORE STATISTICIAN THAN ACTUALLY REAL HERITAGE THINGS, AND I FIND THAT'S TYPICAL OF THIS CITY WITH A LOT OF

THE PLANNING THINGS.WE DO IT BY FIGURES AND NUMBERS AND THINGS LIKE THAT, AND NOT LOOKING AT WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO END UP WITH.IS THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF THIS NOT TO BE THAT WE KEEP THE CHARACTER OF ROCKCLIFFE THE SAME AS IT IS NOW?AS THE OBJECTIVE.I THINK WE HAVE TO KNOW WHAT THE OVERALL OBJECTIVE IS.>> MR. MAYOR, THE OBJECTIVE OF ANY HAIR HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT IS TO PRESERVE THE CULTURAL VALUE THE DESIGNATED PLACE ASK TO MANAGE CHANGE WITHIN THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT.SO, WHAT -- WHAT WE DO IS BALANCE -- BALANCE CHANGES TO BUILDINGS AND LANDSCAPES AGAINST THE -- TO -- AGAINST THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT AND TO MAKE SURE THAT ALL CHANGE REFLECTS THE DEFINED HERITAGE CHARACTER AND ATTRIBUTES AS LAID OUT IN THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN.>> THANKS.BUT WHEN YOU GET A PLAN FOR A NEW BUILDING -- FOR EXAMPLE, IF THAT NEW BUILDING GOING IN SOMEWHERE.LET'S SAY IT'S NOT EVEN THIS LOCATION. IF THAT NEW BUILDING PLAN FITS IN AND WOULD BE ADAPTABLE TO THE CHARACTER AND FIT INTO THE CHARACTER OF THAT COMMUNITY, WOULD YOU THEN APPROVE IT?>> MR. MAYOR, WE MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL, BUT IN THAT PARTICULAR INSTANCE, WE WOULD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF A BUILDING IF IT MET THE GUIDELINES THAT ARE IN THE HAIR HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN.>> IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, IF THIS BUILDING DIDN'T EXIST AND THEY PUT FORWARD THE PLAN THAT THEY HAVE ALREADY SUBMITTED TO SHOW YOU WHAT WOULD GO THERE, WOULD WHAT THEY'VE DESIGNED AS REPLACEMENT, IN YOUR OPINION, FIT INTO THAT CHARACTER?>> MR. MAYOR, THE APPLICANT PRESENTED THE DRAWINGS AND THEN, IN THE LAST LITTLE WHILE, HAS MADE SOME CHANGES TO THEM AT THE REQUEST OF HERITAGE STAFF.SO, THERE ARE MAY 5TH DRAWINGS OF THE BUILDING THAT, IF -- THAT STAFF HAS NO OBJECTION TO.>> OKAY.SO THAT, WHAT'S THE PROBLEM HERE IS THAT NOT TAKING DOWN A BUILDING TO REPLACE IT WITH A BUILDING THAT WOULD FIT IN IS WHAT THE REAL ISSUE IS HERE, THEN?AM I CLEAR ON THAT?>> TO BE CLEAR, THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION, MAYOR, IS TO RECOMMEND AGAINST DEMOLITION OF THE PROPERTY.WE WERE DIRECTED AT PLANNING COMMITTEE TO WORK WITH THE APPLICANT ON REVISED ELEVATIONS THAT WOULD MEET THE SPIRIT OF THE GUIDELINES OF THE ROCKCLIFFE PARK HERITAGE CONSERVATION STRICT.SO IT'S A SEPARATE STREAM, IF YOU WILL, AND THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT WE'VE DONE.WE'VE WORKED WITH THEM ON ARRIVING AT A SET OF ELEVATION THAT IS ARE

ACCEPT TO STAFF SHOULD DEMOLITION PROCEED.>> SO WE HAVE A SITUATION WHERE A REPLACEMENT WOULD FIT IN, BUT YOU DON'T WANT THEM TO REPLACE IT. YOU WANT TO KEEP WHAT'S THERE. IS THAT ROUGHLY WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT?>> THAT IS ABSOLUTELY CORRECT. PART OF THE THING ABOUT A HOUSE IS THAT PEOPLE LIVE IN THEM AND IT'S THEIR LIVING AREA, AND THE INTERIOR OF ANY LIVING AREA IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR HOW A FAMILY LIVES. THIS PARTICULAR FAMILY HAS FOUND THAT THE WAY THAT THAT HOUSE IS SORT OF BROKEN UP INSIDE, ET CETERA, IT'S NOT VERY COMPATIBLE TO THEIR FAMILY STRUCTURE. SO, WHAT YOU'RE SAYING IS WE'RE ACTUALLY GOING TO CONTROL HOW PEOPLE CAN LIVE BECAUSE IT - - RATHER THAN LETTING THEM PUT SOMETHING THAT FITS OUR GUIDELINES IN THE END THAT WOULD BE ONE WHERE THEY WOULD HAVE A HOUSE INTERIOR THAT THEY'D LIKE TO? THAT'S WHERE I AM -- THAT'S THE PROBLEM I'VE HAD ALL ALONG WITH THIS ONE.>> MR. MAYOR, IF I MAY RESPOND TO THAT QUESTION... THIS GOES BACK TO MS. COUTTS' REPLY ON THE PURPOSE OF HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS IN THE FIRST PLACE, THAT THE INCIDENT OF HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS IS TO IDENTIFY AREAS WITHIN THE CITY WHERE THEY HAVE SIGNIFICANT CULTURAL HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES EITHER THROUGH A COMBINATION OF INDIVIDUAL BUILDINGS OR BY A COMBINATION AS BUILDINGS AND CULTURAL LANDSCAPE CHARACTER. THE INTENT OF HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS IS TO MAINTAIN INTO THE FUTURE THOSE ASPECTS OF -- WORTHY OF HERITAGE VALUE TO CONTINUE INTO FUTURE. WE DON'T TAKE POSITIONS ONE WAY OR THE OTHER ON THE INTERNAL CONFIGURATIONS OF HOUSES AND LOT. IN FACT, OUR POLICIES AND GUIDELINES DO ALLOW FOR MODIFICATIONS OF BUILDINGS, AND HAD AN APPLICATION BEEN FILED FOR A MODIFICATION OF THE BUILDINGS THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION AND BROUGHT TO COUNCIL. I'M -- TO ADDRESS YOUR QUESTION, THERE IS FLEXIBILITY TO MODIFY BUILDINGS IN DISTRICTS WITH RESPECT TO THE GUIDELINES IN THE MANAGEMENT PLANS.>> OKAY. BUT YOU'RE NOT ALLOWING THEM A TAKE A BUILDING, REMOVE IT AND PUT A NEW BUILDING IN WHICH MEETS THE GUIDELINES. THAT'S REALLY WHAT THE ISSUE IS HERE.>> MR. MAYOR, STAFF'S POSITION THAT WE DON'T SUPPORT THE REMOVAL OF THE BUILDING. IT HAS HERITAGE VALUE. WE DON'T -- WE DON'T SUPPORT IT. HOWEVER, BASED ON COMMITTEE'S DIRECTION, WE REVIEWED INDEPENDENTLY THE NEW PROPOSAL AND FEEL THAT THE NEW PROPOSAL WOULD MEET THE INTENT OF THE GUIDELINES, IF COUNCIL CHOOSES TO

APPROVE IT.>> ALL RIGHT.>> THIS IS THE ISSUE THAT I'VE HAD WITH THIS ALL THE WAY ALONG, IS THAT IT REALLY -- I THOUGHT THAT THE NEW BUILDING WAS ACTUALLY -- THE LANDSCAPING THEY WANTED TO PUT ON IT AND EVERYTHING ELSE WAS BETTER.I WAS REALLY SURPRISED AT HOW HIGH THEY -- THE LANDSCAPING ON THIS BUILDING, BECAUSE THEY ERECT IT A LOT HIGHER THAN ANOTHER BUILDING IN ROCKCLIFFE PARK THAT HAS FAR IMPROVED LANDSCAPING OVER THIS ONE.SO IT'S A VERY SUBJECTIVE GRADING.YOU KNOW, IT'S REALLY IS ONE THAT IS IN THE EYES OF THE BEHOLDER AND EVERY PERSON LOOKS AT THINGS DIFFERENTLY.AND THAT GAVE ME A LOT OF DIFFICULTY, TOO.EXCHANGING IN THE NUMBERS IN VARIOUS OTHER THINGS.SO I ACTUALLY SUPPORT THE REVISED POSITION THAT WAS DONE BY PLANNING STAFF, BECAUSE I -- THE QUESTION I HAD AT THE TIME WAS WOULD THE NEW BUILDING FIT IN.NOW THAT WE KNOW IT DOES, AND ACTUALLY DID NOT DETER FROM THE WHOLE CULTURAL VALUE OF THE VILLAGE, WHICH IS IMPORTANT...THEN I DON'T SEE WHY WE'RE STANDING IN PEOPLES' WAY.WE KEEP TALKING ABOUT IN HERITAGE BUILDINGS THAT REUSING THEM TO MAKE THEM SO THAT THEY MEET MODERN NEEDS.AND AS THEY PUT FRONTAGES ON THEM SO THEY MEET MODERN NEEDS.THE STYLE OF THIS BUILDING IS ALMOST THE SAME AS THE OTHER ONE.IT'S JUST GOT A DIFFERENT WAY OF ARRANGING THE ROOMS AND WINDOWS AND THINGS.I'M A GREAT SUPPORTER OF THEM.I HAD THE FIRST HERITAGE BUILDING EVER IN KANATA.I PUSHED FORWARD TO GET DONE AND I'VE DONE A NUMBER OF OTHER BUILDINGS, AND I'VE HELPED PEOPLE TO DO MODIFICATIONS TO THEM THAT FIT IN.THIS ONE, TO MY MIND, JUST DOESN'T FIT INTO THAT CATEGORY.IT IS A FAMILY HOME.IT'S GOING TO BE REPLACED BY A FAMILY HOME THAT MEETS THE GUIDELINES AND I REALLY HAVE A REAL PROBLEM IN SHUTTERING PEOPLES' ABILITY TO USE THEIR PROPERTIES BECAUSE OF THAT, AND WE NOW KNOW -- YESTERDAY, WE DEALT WITH SOMEONE THAT WHERE SOMEBODY ILLEGALLY TOOK THE BUILDING DOWN AND THEN YOU VERY CALMLY SAID, YES, YOU CAN HAVE A BUILDING PERMIT.THEY LEAVE IT EMPTY AND THE VAGABONDS DO IT FOR THEM.IT'S A REALLY ONE OF THESE -- WE'VE HAD AN EMPTY HERITAGE PROGRAMS BEFORE THAT CAUSED US LOTS AND LOTS OF PROBLEMS.IT'S MUCH BETTER IF THEY'RE OCCUPIED AND THEY'RE BEING USED IN SOME WAY.AND THEY HAVE A TENANT IN THERE NOW, BUT THEY COULD NOT HAVE TO KEEP THAT THERE.I JUST THINK THIS IS ONE WHERE WE SHOULD SAY THIS ONE WILL WORK.I WOULDN'T DO THIS FOR EVERY PROPERTY, BUT THIS

PARTICULAR ONE SEEMS -- I JUST DON'T SEE HOW WE COULD TAKE ANY OTHER OBJECTIVE VIEW OF IT AND FETTER PEOPLES' USE OF THEIR OWN PROPERTIES.THERE ARE STILL A FEW PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THIS COUNTRY, I THOUGHT.>> OKAY.THANK YOU.SO JUST FOR CLARIFICATION ON COUNCILOR WILKINSON'S POINT...INTERIOR RENOVATIONS ARE PERMITTED.IS THAT CORRECT?>> CORRECT, MAYOR.>> THANK YOU.COUNCILOR HUBLEY, PLEASE.>> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.I'M REALLY HAPPY TO HEAR THAT STAFF HAVE REVIEWED THE APPLICATION AND, IF WE APPROVE DEMOLITION TODAY, THAT THEY WILL BE WORKING WITH THE APPLICANT TO MAKE SURE THAT -- THAT THE NEW PROPERTY DOES FIT THE GOALS OF THE HERITAGE PLAN.ALONG WITH COUNCILOR TIERNEY AND COUNCILOR WILKINSON'S COMMENTS, I HAD A LOT OF DIFFICULTY WITH THIS AT COMMITTEE ON THE SCORING SIDE OF IT.I READ THE SCORING SHEETS.I JUST SAW IMPORTANT IT WAS THAT THIS ROBERT SOUTHAM HAD LIVED IN THE HOUSE AND THAT, YOU KNOW, THE MATURE TREES ON THE PROPERTY ADDED TO THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD.AND I UNDERSTOOD WHAT -- WHERE THEY WERE GOING.UNTIL I FOUND OUT THAT THIS GUY NEVER LIVED THERE AND SO THE 30 POINTS THAT WENT DOWN IN THE REPORT FOR SOMEBODY IMPORTANT LIVING THERE DIDN'T HAVE ANOTHER NAME TO REPLACE IT.THE TREES THAT THEY WERE ADDING VALUE TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND GIVING -- NOT JUST 30 POINTS, BUT IT'S ACTUALLY A WEIGHTED SCORE, MR. MAYOR, SO I THINK IT'S SOMETHING LIKE 45% OF THE WEIGHT OF THE SCORE GOES TO THE ENVIRONMENT.BUT THESE TREES WEREN'T EVEN ON THEIR PROPERTY.THESE TREES WERE ON THE NEXT PROPERTY OVER.SO, THEY'RE NOT BEING TOUCHED BY THIS PLAN AT ALL.SO, IF THAT'S WHERE THE SCORES WERE ARRIVED AT...THEN I THINK, TO BE FAIR TO ANY APPLICANT, WE SHOULD BE REVISING THOSE SCORES AND EITHER COMING UP WITH SOMETHING ELSE THAT GENERATES THE SCORE REMAINING OR RECOGNIZE THAT THIS IS NOT A GRADE 1 PROPERTY.IT WAS MADE A GRADE 1 BECAUSE OF ERRORS IN THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED.SO I FIND THAT TROUBLING.IT WAS REALLY COMPOUNDED YESTERDAY AT PLANNING WHEN WE HAD A CASE WHERE SAME NEIGHBOURHOOD.WHAT SOMEONE'S DONE IS JUST DEMOLISHED AND THEN CAME IN.AND WHAT'S BEING RECOMMENDED IS THAT WE REWARD THE DEMO AND GIVE THEM A FAST-TRACK.THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN WALKING OUT WITH A PERMIT YESTERDAY IF WE HAD AGREED TO THIS, WHERE SOMEONE THAT'S FOLLOWING ALL THE RULES AND TRYING TO RESPECT THE PLAN -- THESE

VERY IMPORTANT PLANS THAT THE COMMUNITY WANTS TO KEEP IN PLACE, SOMEONE THAT'S TRYING TO FOLLOW ALL THOSE RULES, WE'RE GOING TO PUNISH THEM AND SAY "NO"?GO SPEND A WHOLE BUNCH MORE MONEY TO GO A THE OMB.SHOW THEM HOW WE MESSED UP THE SCORING HERE AND HOW WE'RE NOW REVISING TO TRY TO MATCH UP TO OUR NUMBERS, AND GOOD LUCK.SOMETIMES THE THINGS WE GIVE MR. MARK TO DEFEND FOR US AT THE OMB.I DON'T THINK WE PAY HIM ENOUGH TO DEFEND US FOR DOING THINGS LIKE.THIS I'M DISAPPOINTED IN IT.I THINK WE'RE SENDING THE WRONG MESSAGE BY SAYING, NO, NO, WE HAVE TO BLANKETLY REFUSE THIS BECAUSE IS IT DOESN'T MATCH UP TO THE PLAN.I THINK IT'S VERY, VERY IMPORTANT TO BE HONEST IN OUR SCORING AND BE ABLE TO JUSTIFY THOSE SCORES FOR PEOPLE.SO, MR. MAYOR, I FIND IN THIS CASE HERE AND ESPECIALLY WITH THE NEWS TODAY THAT STAFF HAVE COME TO A GOOD COMPROMISE WITH THE APPLICANT.I AM EXCITED TO TO HEAR THAT, SO I'LL BE SUPPORTING THE PARTIAL DEMO OF THIS BUILDING SO THAT WE CAN GET ON WITH BUILDING WHAT LOOKS LIKE A GOOD HOUSE.I WANT TO ADD ONE MORE POINT TO IT THAT GOES TO THE INFORMATION PROVIDED.MANY OF YOU MAY HAVE SAW SOME OF THE REPORTS IN THE MEDIA.I THINK IT WAS A "METROLAND" EDITORIAL, THAT TALKED ABOUT THIS BEING A MONSTER HOUSE INSERTED INTO THE NEIGHBOURHOOD.WHERE, IN FACT, WHAT WE LEARNED AT PLANNING IS THAT THE NEW HOUSE IS OF THE SAME SIZE AS THE NEIGHBOUR'S AROUND IT, AND JUST LAST YEAR, THE HOUSE -- ONE OR TWO LOTS OVER WAS DEMOED AND REBUILT.SO IT'S NOT LIKE THIS IS THE FIRST HOUSE THAT'S GOING TO BE MODERNIZED AND REINSTATED SO THAT IT WILL BE THERE FOR MANY YEARS TO COME.BUT IT IS A HOUSE THAT SOMEONE HAS TAKEN AN INTEREST IN AND WANTS TO MAKE AN INVESTMENT IN.AND I THINK WE SHOULD BE SUPPORTING THAT.AND REWARDING THE FACT THAT THEY JUST DIDN'T DEMO IN AND COME IN AND ASK FOR A REBUILD PERMIT.SO THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.>> THANK YOU.COUNCILOR CLOUTIER, PLEASE.(SPEAKING FRENCH)>> JUST TO -- COUNCILOR WILKINSON AND COUNCILOR HUBLEY HAVE SAID THAT STAFF NOW HAVE REACHED A COMPROMISE WITH THE PROPONENT.CAN -- I HAVEN'T SEEN DOCUMENTS ON THAT, MS. COUTTS OR MR. CURRY.CAN YOU COMMENT ON THAT?DOES STAFF STILL -- THE ORIGINAL REPORT TO PLANNING COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDED REFUSAL, AND I RECOGNIZE THAT PLANNING COMMITTEE HAD TWO VOTES ON THE ISSUE.CAN YOU UPDATE ME ON PAST DECISIONS?>> SO, COUNCILOR, I DRAW YOUR ATTENTION TO THE MEMO I REQUIRED YESTERDAY EARLY

AFTERNOON.IT REFLECTS THE CONVERSATIONS THAT WE'VE HAD WITH THE APPLICANT SINCE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON APRIL 25TH FOR THE MOTION MOVED BY THE VICE-CHAIR TO WORK THE APPLICANT ON DETERMINING WHETHER WE CAN ARRIVE AT A SET OF ELEVATIONS THAT RESPECT THE ROCKCLIFFE PARK HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT GUIDELINES.SO THERE WERE FIVE AREAS THAT WE WORKED WITH THE APPLICANT ON, AND IN ALL CASES, THE APPLICANT WAS AMENABLE TO MAKING CHANGES SUCH THAT THEIR APPLICATION WOULD COMPLY WITH THE GUIDELINES.>> OVERALL, DOES STAFF STILL SUPPORT REFUSING THE DEMOLITION OF 270 BUCHAN ROAD?>> ABSOLUTELY, COUNCILOR.AS MS. COUTTS HAS INDICATED.IT'S A GRADE 1 BUILDING OF THE HIGHEST CALIBER IN THIS PLAN APPROVED BY COUNCIL LAST YEAR, SO WE WERE CARRYING OUT THE WORK DIRECTED BY US BY COMMITTEE, PLEASE WE HAD THE OUTCOME, BUT, NEVERTHELESS, OUR POSITION MUST REMAIN THE SAME.>> DO -- FURTHER TO COUNCILOR TIERNEY'S COMMENTS ABOUT WHO LIVED THERE.MR. SOUTHAM, AND HOW LONG, AND LANDSCAPING.DO YOU ANTICIPATE RECEIVING ANY NEW INFORMATION THAT WOULD REDUCE THE SCORE?>> MR. MAYOR, NO.THE -- THE ISSUES THAT WERE BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION, THAT -- REGARDING THE ORIGINAL INHABITANT AND THE LANDSCAPE THAT WAS CHANGED BETWEEN THE TIME THE BUILDING WAS ORIGINALLY EVALUATED AND TODAY, WE DON'T ANTICIPATE ANYTHING FURTHER.BUT, AGAIN, WE WERE WILLING TO DO THE ANALYSIS AND CHANGE THE SCORE BECAUSE THERE WERE REASONABLE -- REASONABLE REQUESTS RAISED REGARDING THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION AND THE LANDSCAPE AND WE THOUGHT THAT IT WAS APPROPRIATE TO RESPOND TO THESE PARTICULAR REQUESTS AND LOOK AT THE EVALUATION OF THE BUILDING.>> THE ORIGINAL SCORE WAS 80 AND THE NEW SCORE IS 69?IS THAT CORRECT?>> THAT'S CORRECT.>> AND ALL THE ELEMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT FORTH BY MY COLLEAGUES ARE FACTORED INTO THAT 69 SCORE?>> YES.>> THE RESIDENT AND LANDSCAPING?>> THAT'S CORRECT.>> AND THE 69 SCORE IS A -- MAKES THIS A GRADE 1 HOUSE?>> YES.50 AND ABOVE IS A GRADE 1 HOUSE, MR. MAYOR.>> OKAY.IF WE REFUSE THE DEMOLITION OF THIS PROPERTY, THE PROPONENT -- THE OWNERS ARE STILL ABLE TO CHANGE THE INSIDE OF THE HOUSE AS THEY SEE FIT A MAKE IT MORE LIVABLE?>> YES.THE INTERIORS ARE NOT REGULATED UNDER -- IN BUILDINGS THAT ARE DESIGNATE THE UNDER PART 5 OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT, COUNCILOR.>> THE PROPONENTS ARE ABLE TO LANDSCAPE

AS THEY SEE FIT, OR ARE THERE RESTRICTIONS?>> THERE ARE NO RESTRICTIONS.THERE'S A PROCESS.WE WORK WITH ANY OWNER WHO IS ANTICIPATING CHANGES TO THEIR PROPERTY AND ISSUE PERMITS ACCORDINGLY.LANDSCAPE CHANGES ARE USUALLY ISSUED THROUGH DELEGATED AUTHORITIES, SO THAT'S THROUGH STAFF.IT'S A RAPID PROCESS.>> THANK YOU.(SPEAKING FRENCH)>> COUNCILOR FLEURY?>> QUESTION TO MR. WILLIS.I'M SORRY, MR. WILLIS.I WASN'T AT COMMITTEE YESTERDAY.I DID HEAR ABOUT IT AND DID READ THE ERROR.JUST TO CLARIFY THAT THE PROPERTY THAT WAS ILLEGALLY DEMOLISHED.NOT THE ONE NETS AT THAT HITS IN FRONT OF US TODAY.WHETHER A GRADE WAS THAT PROPERTY?IT WASN'T A GRADE 2 PROPERTY THE.IS THAT CORRECT IN.>> IT WAS A GRADE 2 PROPERTY.>> THERE ARE LEGAL PROCEEDINGS FOR THAT PROPERTY?>> MAYOR, I'M NOT GOING TO COMMENT ON AT LENGTH ON MATTERS THAT WILL BE BEFORE LEGAL PROCEEDINGS.BUT JUST TO CLARIFY, THERE ARE TWO DISTINCT ISSUES IN THE OTHER FILE.ONE SMART OF DEMOLITION AND THE OTHER IS THE APPLICATION THAT WE ARE REQUIRED TO PROCESS UNDER THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT FOR A REPLACEMENT BUILDING, SO THOSE ARE TWO DISTINCT ITEMS, AND JUST FOR CLARIFYING THE FACTS IN THE CASE.>> THANK YOU, MR. WILLIS.>> THANK YOU:>> I ALSO DON'T SIT ON THE PLANNING COMMITTEE.I WANT TO START OFF BY THANKING BOTH -- BOTH THE APPLICANT AND THE REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE ROCKCLIFFE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION AS WELL AS STAFF, BECAUSE I'VE HAD A LOT OF QUESTIONS OVER THE LAST COUPLE OF DAYS.AND WHETHER ON A VOLUNTEER BASIS OR ON A PROFESSIONAL BASIS, PEOPLE HAVE TAKEN THE TIME TO EXPLAIN THEIR POSITIONS AND TO ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS.SO I WANT TO THANK ALL INVOLVED FOR THIS.THOUGH I STILL HAVE A COUPLE -- A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS.SO, THE 10% THAT'S AWARDED, IF I UNDERSTAND THE EXPLANATION, IT'S AWARDED BECAUSE THE HOUSE WAS SIMPLY INHABITED FOR 60 YEARS?DOESN'T REALLY MATTER ALL THAT MUCH WHO INHABITED IT, BUT SOMEBODY LIVED IN THE HOUSE FOR 60 YEARS ON A CONTINUOUS BASIS?>> MR. MAYOR, CAN I ANSWER THIS FIRST, AND MS. COUTTS CAN CORRECT ME, IF I'M WRONG.THE REFERENCE TO MR. SOUTHAM DID GET ADDRESSED THROUGH THE CORRECTION IN THE SCORING, BUT THERE WAS ANOTHER PERSON WHO INHABITED THAT HOUSE OF LOCAL SIGNIFICANCE, WHICH IS A BARNETT MCLAREN, WHO IS THE MCLAREN FAMILY LIVED IF THAT HOUSE FOR MANY, MANY YEARS, AND THE MCLAREN FAMILY IS STRONGLY ASSOCIATE WE HAD THE HISTORY OF THE

ROCKCLIFFE PARK COMMUNITY, SO I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT FACT IS ON THE RECORD, THAT THE REMAINING SCORE THAT EXISTS AFTER THE RESCORING HAS A LOT TO DO WITH THE MCLAREN FAMILY, NOT THE SOUTHAM FAMILY.>> NO.AND I APPRECIATE THAT CLARIFICATION.THAT'S -- THAT'S NOT IN THE REPORT, AS I UNDERSTAND IT.AND IT WASN'T IN FRONT OF THE -- IN WASN'T IN FRONT OF COMMITTEE WHEN THEY HAD THAT DISCUSSION.>> MR. MAYOR, THE REFERENCE TO THE MCLAREN IS IN THE 2017 SCORING SHEET EVALUATION, WHICH WERE SUBMITTED.THAT IS PART OF THE REEVALUATION PROCESS.IT WAS ACTUALLY INCLUDED.>> SO, AGAIN, MR. WILLIS, JUST FOR CLARIFICATION:SO THAT FACTOR WAS IN FRONT OF PLANNING COMMITTEE?>> MR. MAYOR, IF YOU'LL ALLOW ME TO CONFER WITH STAFF.>> YES.THE HERITAGE SURVEY AND EVALUATION FORM THAT WAS PREPARED BY -- BY CITY STAFF AND THEN EVALUATED BY THE ROCKCLIFFE COMMITTEE THAT WAS INCLUDED IN THE REPORT TO COUNCIL MENTIONS MR. MCLAREN.>> SORRY.COUNCILOR EGLI?>> ARE WE GOING TO DEAL WITH THE POINT OF ORDER?I'M NOT SURE IF I SHOULD GO.>> I'M NOT QUITE SURE WHAT YOUR POINT OF ORDER IS.>> IT DOESN'T MENTION THE OTHER FAMILY.IT ONLY MENTIONS SOUTHAM.AND THIS IS THE REPORT THEY JUST SENT US.>> ALL RIGHT.SO MR. MARK, CAN YOU ANSWER THAT, PLEASE?CLARIFY.>> YES.YES, MR. MAYOR.IT IS ON -- IT'S MENTIONED ON PAGE 6 IN BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT.DESIGNED BY HAZEL GROVE AND MILLS IN 19450 FOR ROBERT SOUTHAM.IT WAS SOON SOLD TO.A BARNETT MCLAREN, WHOSE FAMILY LIVED THERE UNTIL 1995.>> OKAY.THANKS FOR THAT CLARIFICATION.>> THANK YOU.>> NOW, CAN YOU SHARE WITH US HOW MANY HOMES ARE ON THE -- I BELIEVE THE ENTIRE LIST IS 200 PROPERTIES.OF THE 200 PROPERTIES, ARE THERE ANY OTHER PROPERTIES ON THAT LIST THAT ARE DESIGNED BY THE SAME ARCHITECT, MR. HAZELWOOD?>> MR. MAYOR, YESTERDAY, I -- ANTICIPATING THIS QUESTION, WE HAVE ALL THAT INFORMATION IN PLACE, AND I HAD OUR SUMMER STUDENT COUNT HOW MANY BUILDINGS THAT MR. HAZELGROVE WAS INVOLVED WITH THE DESIGN OF.HE HAD A NUMBER OF FIRMS WITH DIFFERENT NAMES, SO OUT OF THE 316 BUILDINGS THAT ARE CATEGORY 1 BUILDINGS, HE DESIGNED -- OR WAS INVOLVED IN THE DESIGN OF 31.>> SO 10% OF THE TOTAL LIST WERE DESIGNED BY THE SAME INDIVIDUAL OR FIRMS HE WAS AFFILIATED WITH.>> THAT'S CORRECT.>> OKAY.THANKS FOR THAT CLARIFICATION.THE OTHER QUESTION IS -- AND I WANT TO THANK COURT FOR EXPLAINING THIS TO ME YESTERDAY.BECAUSE IT IS A BIT NUANCED.THE PROPOSED NEW BUILDING, IF

IT WAS ANYWHERE ELSE BUT ROCKCLIFFE, WOULD MEET THE EXISTING ZONING AND THE PEOPLE WOULD BE ALLOWED TO BUILD AS OF RIGHT? BY PROPOSED IN THE ORIGINAL DESIGN. NOT THE ONE THAT YOU NOW HAVE, BUT THE ORIGINAL DESIGN WOULD HAVE BEEN -- WOULD HAVE MET OUR ZONING LAWS AND REQUIREMENTS AND WOULD HAVE BEEN ALLOWED TO BE BUILT? >> SO, MAYOR, MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THIS APPLICATION WOULD REQUIRE NO FURTHER -- BESIDES THE HERITAGE PERMIT OR A BUILDING PERMIT, THERE ARE MONTREAL COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENT OR REZONING IMPLICATIONS REQUIRED. SHOULD THEY WISH TO REBUILD THE NEW PROPERTY. >> OKAY. AND -- BUT IN ROCKCLIFFE, THERE'S AN OVERLAY. THERE'S A SET OF GUIDELINES THAT EVEN IF YOU MEET ZONING, THAT MAY NOT GET YOU THROUGH THE DOOR. THERE'S OTHER THINGS YOU MIGHT HAVE TO DO. IS THAT NOT CORRECT? >> YES, COUNCILOR, BECAUSE THERE'S A HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT, HERITAGE PERMIT IS REQUIRED IN THIS CASE, SO IN EFFECT, IT OPERATES AS AN OVERLAY. >> SO IN THIS PARTICULAR SET, THE SECOND SET OF DESIGNS THAT CAME FORWARD FROM THE APPLICANT, STAFF HAS REVIEWED THAT AND FEELS THAT IT MEETS BOTH THE ZONING RULES AND THE CONDITIONS OF THE OVERLAY? >> THAT WOULD BE CORRECT. IT MEETS THE CONDITIONS OF THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN. >> OKAY. AND IF IT WAS TO BE BUILT IN MY WARD OR COUNCILOR WILKINSON'S WARD, THE ZONING WOULD HAVE BEEN ENOUGH TO GET IT BUILT. YOU WOULDN'T HAVE HAD GONE TO HAVE THAT SECOND LEVEL OF AN OVERLAY. CORRECT? >> CORRECT, MAYOR. IF THIS WAS A HOUSE BEING BUILT IN AN R1 ZONING AND THE LOT WAS OF SIZE THAT CAN BE ADJUSTMENT APPLICATIONS WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED, IT WOULD BE PERMISSIBLE. >> IS THERE ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE CITY WHERE THIS HOUSE -- THE ORIGINAL DESIGN OF THE HOUSE WOULD NOT COULD NOT HAVE BEEN BUILT. AS LONG AS IT HAD R1 ZONING? >> MR. MAYOR, I'LL START OFF AND THEN MR. CURRY OR MS. COUTTS MAY WISH TO STEP IN. THERE ARE, OF COURSE, MANY OTHER AREAS OF THE CITY WHERE THERE ARE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS IN PLACE, AND SOME HAVE DISTRICT PLANS. SOME JUST HAVE GUIDELINES, BUT A HERITAGE ANALYSIS WOULD HAVE TO TAKE PLACE, MR. MAYOR. >> OKAY. I APPRECIATE THAT CLARIFICATION. THANK YOU FOR THAT. SO AT THE END. DAY, AND AGAIN, I DO THANK EVERYBODY WHO'S PROVIDED INFORMATION, BECAUSE IT HAS BEEN VERY, VERY HELPFUL. BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY, I -- I FIND A LOT OF SENSE IN THE ARGUMENT OF COUNCILOR WILKINSON, IN THAT WE DON'T

WANT YOU TO DEMOLISH.BUT IF YOU DID DEMOLISH, WE'RE QUITE FINE WITH WHAT YOU WANT TO REPLACE IT WITH.AND IT'S ALMOST MONTY PYTHONNIST IN THAT APPROACH.SO, YOU MEET THE RULES.YOU CAN BUILD.BUT WE DON'T WANT YOU TO BUILD.AND YET, YESTERDAY, AND AGAIN, I WASN'T THERE, WE HAVE AN APPLICANT THAT IGNORED THE RULES AND IS BEING REWARDED, AND THIS QUESTION IS TO -- TO YOU, MR. MARK.IS THERE ANY WAY THE CITY COULD STOP THE INDIVIDUAL FROM YESTERDAY -- THE APPLICANT FROM YESTERDAY, FROM BUILDING WHATEVER THEY WANT TO BUILD?>> MR. MAYOR, THE APPLICANT -- 3 PROPERTY NEEDS A HERITAGE PERMIT AND IF THAT PERMIT WAS REFUSED, THEN SUBJECT TO AN APPEAL TO THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD, THEY COULD NOT PROCEED WITH NEW CONSTRUCTION.>> SORRY.I DIDN'T HEAR.WHAT KIND OF A PERMIT?>> THE PROPERTY AT 83 PASSELL ALSO REQUIRES A HERITAGE PERMIT UNDER THE ROCKCLIFFE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN, AND IF THAT PERMIT WERE REFUSED, THEY ALSO COULD NOT PROCEED WITH NEW CONSTRUCTION.>> HOW DOES THE 90-DAY RULE APPLY, THOUGH, IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE?>> MR. MAYOR, IF AN APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT, BE IT FOR DEMOLITION OR NEW CONSTRUCTION, IS SUBMITTED TO THE CITY AND IT IS NOT CONSIDERED WITHIN 90 DAYS, IT IS DEEMED APPROVED.>> SO IS THAT WHAT HAPPENED IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE?GOING BACK TO MY FIRST QUESTION.SO THE APPLICANT FROM YESTERDAY CAN GO AHEAD AND BUILD, CORRECT?>> MR. MAYOR, THE 90 DAYS ARE NOT UP YET, SO I CAN'T ANSWER THAT QUESTION.>> BUT WE DIDN'T APPROVE YESTERDAY.IS THERE ANY WAY FOR US TO APPROVE BETWEEN NOW AND WHEN THE 90 DAYS RUNS ITS COURSE?OR PROCEED -- OR ESSENTIALLY HAS THAT SHIPPED SAILED.>> THE RULES OF PROCEDURE PROVIDE THAT A COUNCILOR COULD INTRODUCE A MOTION TO COUNCIL TODAY AND SEEK TO HAVE THE ITEM DEALT WITH AT THE NEXT MEETING OF COUNCIL.>> OKAY.THANK YOU FOR THAT.SO, AGAIN, THE LOGIC THAT COUNCILOR WILKINSON PUT FORWARD THIS MORNING I FIND VERY PERVASIVE, AND FOR THAT REASON, I'LL BE FOLLOWING HER LEAD ON THIS AND TAKING THE SAME POSITION THAT SHE DOES ON THE VOTE.>> COUNCILOR?JUST TO FOLLOW UP ON A POINT THE COUNCILOR RAISED.WE KEEP RAISING THIS ISSUE OF THE OTHER CASE FROM YESTERDAY.WAS THAT DEMOLISHED ILLEGALLY, THAT PROPERTY?WITH NO DEMOLITION PERMIT?>> MR. MAYOR, IF I MAY, AT THIS STAGE OF THE SAME GAME, WITH THE INVESTIGATIONS CONTINUING AND THE FACTS BEING ASSEMBLED, I DON'T ACTUALLY USE THE SPECIFIC TERM.IT IS A MATTER

UNDER INVESTIGATION BY THE CHIEF BUILDING OFFICIAL AS WELL AS OUR CITY LEGAL WITH RESPECT TO BOTH THE ONTARIO BUILDING CODE ACT AND THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT.>> OKAY, THANK YOU.>> I'M QUITE SURPRISED, FRANKLY.IT'S, IN FACT, THE LOGIC THAT I HAVE TO CALL INTO QUESTION HERE, THAT BECAUSE THE REPLACEMENT MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE, WE WOULD THEREFORE BE IN FAVOUR OF ELIMINATING WHAT CURRENTLY EXISTS.BY THAT SAME LOGIC, THAT BEAUTIFUL MATURE TREE ON THE YARD IN OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD THAT EVERYONE WANTS PROTECTED BUT BECAUSE STAFF ARE OKAY WITH A MAPLE BEING PLANTED TO REPLACE IT, IF SOMEBODY ILLEGALLY CUT IT DOWN,...THEREFORE IT'S OKAY TO CUT IT DOWN.THAT'S THE EXACT SAME LOGIC THAT I'M FINDING HERE, AND ALTHOUGH OUR STAFF, WHO ARE INSTRUCTED TO WORK WITH THE APPLICANT TO FIND WAYS TO MAKE THEIR PROPOSAL MORE COMPATIBLE WITH THE HERITAGE DISTRICT GUIDELINES, THAT'S NOT THE SAME THING AS SAYING OR IMPLYING THAT OUR STAFF ARE NOW IN FAVOUR OF IT.IN FACT, THEY'VE SAID ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS THAT THEY'RE NOT.AND I CANNOT FOLLOW THE LOGIC THAT, BECAUSE IT WOULD BE A BEAUTIFUL HOUSE THAT WOULD REPLACE IT, THAT WOULD OTHERWISE MEET THE GUIDELINES, AND YET IT'S VERY CLEAR THE HOUSE SHOULDN'T BE DEMOLISHED, THAT THEY CAN THEREFORE VOTE IN FAVOUR OF DEMOLISHING.SO...ON THAT ALONE, I CANNOT SUPPORT THE DEMOLITION AND WILL CONTINUE A SUPPORT STAFF'S POSITION ON THIS.THANK YOU.>> THANK YOU.DOES ANYONE ELSE WISH TO SPEAK ON THE MATTER?NO?WELL, LET ME OFFER A COUPLE OF COMMENTS ON THIS.THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT'S RECEIVED A GREAT DEAL OF LOBBYING AND ATTENTION AND FOCUS BY BOTH -- BOTH SIDES OF THE ISSUE.BUT I'M ASKING MEMBERS OF COUNCIL TO SUPPORT OUR HERITAGE DISTRICT PLAN AND VOTE AGAINST DEMOLISHING THIS BUILDING.NOW, JUST TO PUT IT IN PERSPECTIVE:EVEN BEFORE THE CITIES WERE AMALGAMATED, ROCKCLIFFE WAS ACTUALLY AHEAD OF ITS TIME IN GOING FORWARD.I THINK THEY PROBABLY FIGURED OUT AMALGAMATION WAS COMING DOWN THE PIPE AND, IN FACT, IT DID, IN THEIR TERM OF COUNCIL IN '97 TO 2000 AND THEY WENT AHEAD AND DESIGNATED THE ROCKCLIFFE PARK HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT.WHETHER AMALGAMATION TOOK PLACE MANY YEARS LATER, THE CITY AND THIS COUNCIL, AND I REMIND EVERYONE WE ALL VOTED FOR THE ROCKCLIFFE PARK HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT AND WE ALL KNEW WHAT WE WERE VOTING FOR.IN PREPARATION OF THE PLAN, EVERY BUILDING IN THE DISTRICT REDUCE RESEARCHED AND ANALYZED,

EVALUATED WITH A SCORE, AND YES, THERE WERE CHANGES TO THE SCORE BECAUSE NEW INFORMATION CAME FORWARD SINCE THE ORIGINAL SCORING. I THINK THAT WOULD BE ONLY SENSIBLE FOR OUR STAFF TO COME FORWARD IF THEY DISCOVERED THAT THAT TREE OR THAT SHRUB WAS NOT ON THE PROPERTY, TO MAKE AN ALTERATION, BUT EVEN WITH AN ALTERATION, IT STILL REMAINED THE HIGHEST GRADE, GRADE 1 BUILDING, IN THE HERITAGE DISTRICT CONSERVATION AREA. AND I GUESS I MENTION THE ISSUE OF, YOU KNOW -- PEOPLE HAVE SAID, WELL, YOU KNOW, THE BUILDING IS NOT IN GOOD SHAPE. WELL, THERE'S SOMEONE LIVING THERE. AND IT MEETS ALL THE STANDARDS OF THE CITY OF OTTAWA, THE BUILDING CODE. AND GRADE 1 BUILDINGS CANNOT BE DEMOLISHED EXCEPT IN EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES, AND THOSE EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES ARE THINGS LIKE FIRE OR FLOOD DAMAGE AND SO ON. AND IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT ALTHOUGH COUNCIL APPROVED THE ROCKCLIFFE PLAN ONLY IN 2016, THE HOUSE LOCATED AT 270 BUCHAN ROAD IS ONE OF THE ORIGINAL 200 BUILDINGS THAT RECEIVED THE HIGHEST DESIGNATION BY THE PREVIOUS MUNICIPALITY OF ROCKCLIFFE IN 1997. SO I THINK WHAT WE HAVE BEFORE US IS A KEY OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO SUPPORT WHAT WE ALL SUPPORTED UNANIMOUSLY IN THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT VOTE IN 2016. AND IT WOULD SEEM RATHER STRANGE, LITERALLY. THE INK ISN'T DRIED ON THE DOCUMENT AND WE'RE ALREADY -- THE FIRST APPLICATION THROUGH THE DOOR, WE'RE READY TO THROW OUT THE ENTIRE HERITAGE DISTRICT CONSERVATION AREA. THIS DOES SET A PRECEDENT. IF SOMEBODY SEES THIS HAPPENING, WHY NOT OPEN THE FLOODGATES? WELL, IT DEFEATS THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION CONCEPT, THAT WE WANT THESE AREAS TO REMAIN AS PART OF OUR BUILT HERITAGE AND WE ALL HAVE AREAS IN OUR COMMUNITIES. I THINK I WAS TELLING COUNCILOR QADRI, YOU KNOW, IN STITTSVILLE MAIN STREET, WHICH HAS THE BEAUTIFUL OLD MS. BUILDINGS ON IT, YOU WANT TO PRESERVE MAINTAIN THAT CHARACTERISTIC. YOU DON'T WANT TO HAVE, YOU KNOW, A GIGANTIC WALMART ON THE PART OF THE AREA THAT YOU'VE PRESERVED. AND I THINK WE ALL HAVE AREAS. MAYBE NOT AS OLD OBVIOUSLY AS ROCKCLIFFE IN SOME OF THE NEWER SUBURBS. OBVIOUSLY YOU DON'T HAVE HOMES THAT ARE 7 -- 50 OR 75 OR 100 YEARS OLD, BUT I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WE ACTUALLY SUPPORT WHAT WE SUPPORTED, AND WE NOT SIMPLY GO DOWN THE PATH SIMPLY BECAUSE SOME PERSON WANTS TO DEMOLISH A HOME. YOU KNOW, THE REALITY IS ANYONE BUYING IN A NEIGHBOURHOOD

THAT HAS A HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT KNOWS THAT, OR THEY SHOULD KNOW IT OR THEY SHOULD HAVE A GOOD REAL ESTATE AGENT OR LAWYER TO TELL THEM, SO THAT THEY'RE NOT SURPRISED AND FEEL HARD DONE BY BY THE CITY THAT DOESN'T WANT TO BEND ITS YEARS THAT WE JUST VOTED IN A SCANT YEAR AGO.SO THE MOTION THAT IS BEFORE SUGGESTION BEFORE THE MANNING COMMITTEE?AND IF YOU WANT TO DEMOLISH THE PROPERTY, YOU VOTE "YES," AND IF YOU DO NOT WANT TO DEMOLISH THE PROPERTY, YOU VOTE "NO."SO YEAS AND NAYS, MADAM DEPUTY CLERK, PLEASE.(CALLING OF RECORDED VOTE)(CALLING OF RECORDED VOTE)>> TEN YEAS.13 NAYS.>> OKAY, SO THAT MOTION IS DEFEATED.COUNCILOR NUSSBAUM, I BELIEVE, HAS A REPLACEMENT MOTION.>> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.YES, I HAVE A MOTION BEFORE ME.BE IT RESOLVED THAT COUNCIL REFUSE THE APPLICATION TO DEMOLISH 270 BUCHAN ROAD, DESIGNATED UNDER PART 5 OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT AND REFUSE THE APPLICATION TO CONSTRUCT A NEW BUILDING ON THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 270 BUCHAN ROAD, ET CETERA.>> SO WE PUT THE SAME VOTES THAT WE DON'T HAVE TO GO THROUGH YEAS AND NAYS?AGREED ON THAT?SO THAT CARRIES.SORRY.I APOLOGIZE.THE SAME VOTES IN REVERSE.JUST SO WE'RE CLEAR, MADAM DEPUTY CLERK.OKAY.THANK YOU VERY MUCH, EVERYONE.OUR NEXT ITEM THAT HAS BEEN HELD IS ON PAGE 10.SECTION 37.FIVE-YEAR REVIEW.(SPEAKING FRENCH)COUNCILORS LEIPER AND HARDER HAVE A MOTION.COUNCILOR LEIPER, IF YOU'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE THE MOTION, AND THEN WE'LL GET TO QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS.>> THANK YOU, CHAIR.ONE OF THE PROVISIONS IN THE GUIDELINES WAS THAT, IF MONEY IS ALLOCATED THROUGH A SECTION 37 AGREEMENT TO ONE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT OR USE AND IT WAS PROPOSED TO BE MOVED TO ANOTHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING USE, THAT THAT COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED WITH STAFF'S DELEGATED AUTHORITY.THIS MOTION WOULD INTRODUCE COUNCILOR CONCURRENCE IN THAT FORMULA SUCH THAT THE COUNCILOR CONCURRENCE WOULD BE REQUIRED IN ORDER TO SWITCH BETWEEN AFFORDABLE HOUSING ENVELOPES WITHIN SECTION 37.MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THIS ENJOYS STAFF SUPPORT.WHEREAS REPORT ACS, ET CETERA, WHICH RECOMMENDS COUNCIL APPROVE THE SECTION 37 GUIDELINES 2017 WAS APPROVED BY PLANNING COMMITTEE ON MAY 9 AND THIS WHEREAS PLANNING COMMITTEE REQUESTED THAT ADDITIONAL WORDING TO GUIDELINES 77 AFFORDABLE HOUSING OF THE SECTION 37 GUIDELINES 2017.THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT GUIDELINE

77 AFFORDABLE HOUSING OF DOCUMENT 1 BE AMENDED BY DELETING AND REPLACING THE LAST SENTENCE WITH "THE USE OF ANY CASH PAYMENTS TOWARDS AFFORDABLE HOUSING WILL BE DETERMINED UNDER THE DISCRETION OF THE GENERAL MANAGER OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL SERVICES IN CONSULTATION WITH THE WARD COUNCILOR.">> OKAY.SO IT'S JUST ADDING THE CONSULTATION WITH THE WARD COUNSELOR?DOES ANYONE HAVE ANY COMMENTS ON THIS MOTION?ON THE MAIN MOTION.NOT THIS ONE.ON THE AMENDMENT?THE MAIN MOTION OR THE AMENDMENT?OKAY.GO AHEAD.>> SO, COUNCILOR, HOW DOES OCH FIT INTO THIS DISCUSSION?>> I'M NOT ENTIRELY SURE, BECAUSE TO DATE, I HAVEN'T SEEN SECTION 37 FUNDS USED TOWARD OCH.GENERALLY, WHAT WE'VE SEEN IN THE WARDS WHERE THERE HAS BEEN MONEY ALLOCATED THROUGH SECTION 37, IS THAT IT'S BEING HELD IN A FUND.THAT WOULD BE THE REASON FOR THIS MOTION IS TO ENSURE THAT THE COUNCILOR HAS SOME CONTROL OVER THAT SO THAT IT IS WARD-SPECIFIC.PRESUMABLY, IF A -- IF THERE'S MONEY IN A WARD AFFORDABLE HOUSING FUND AND IT WAS DETERMINED THAT ONE OF THE BEST USES OF THAT WOULD BE TO GO INTO AN OTTAWA COMMUNITY HOUSING PROPOSAL, IT WOULD REQUIRE THE WARD -- THE WARD COUNCILOR'S CONCURRENCE WORKING WITH THE GENERAL MANAGER OF HOUSING.>> YEAH, AND I HAVE NO QUARREL WITH THE WARD COUNCILOR'S INVOLVEMENT.I THINK THAT'S QUITE APPROPRIATE.BUT IT JUST SEEMS TO ME THAT WE HAVE A VERY SEASONED AND KNOWLEDGEABLE STAKEHOLDER IN THE CITY. I'M JUST WONDERING WHY THEY'RE NOT PART OF THE DISCUSSION?>> SO I'M LOOKING AT -->> COUNCILOR LEIPER, IS THAT SOMETHING THAT COULD BE CONSIDERED AS SOMETHING OF A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO YOUR MOTION, THAT THEY BE CONSULTED?IS IT JUST SEEMS TO ME THEY HAVE THE EXPERTISE TO ASSIST IN THAT SORT OF DISCUSSION AND MAKE SURE THE MONEY'S SPENT IN THE BEST POSSIBLE WAY.>> MR. WILLIS?>> MR. MAYOR, ON BEHALF OF MYSELF AND THE GENERAL MANAGER...GENERALLY SPEAK, OTTAWA COMMUNITY HOUSING ISN'T THE ONLY POTENTIAL PROVIDER OF HOUSING DEPENDING ON THE GEOGRAPHY OF WHERE THE ACTUAL APPLICATION IS AND WHERE THE FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE.SO, COUNCILOR EGLI'S POINT WELL-TAKEN, THAT THEY ARE -- OTTAWA COMMUNITY HOUSING IS A GOOD GROUP TO CONSULT, AND WE WOULD DO THAT ON A STAFF LEVEL.BUT IN NOT ALL CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD OTTAWA COMMUNITY HOUSING BE NECESSARILY A PARTICIPANT IN THE DISCUSSION, DEPENDING ON WHICH WARD WE'RE

TALKING ABOUT.SO MY ADVICE IS THAT WE TAKE THAT BACK UNDER STAFF DIRECTION, RATHER THAN THROUGH THE MOTION.>> TO CONSULT, AS NECESSARY.I'M LOOKING AT COUNCILOR FLEURY AS CHAIR, I THINK HE'S NODDING HIS HEAD AS WELL.SO AS LONG AS THERE'S PUBLIC COMMITMENT TO DO THAT AND TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE EXPERTISE WE HAVE ON THE GROUND AS NECESSARY, I'M FINE WITH THAT.IS THAT ACCEPTABLE, COUNCILOR?>> OKAY.SO, COUNCILOR FLEURY HAS A QUESTION ON THE MAIN ITEM BEFORE WE VOTE ON THE MOTION.>> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.I WON'T BE LONG, AND THANK YOU FOR MY COLLEAGUE FOR BRINGING THIS UP.I'M CERTAINLY IN FAVOUR TO THIS.MY QUESTION IS CERTAINLY I -- THE REPORT IS WELL-WRITTEN AND IT PROVIDES BETTER DIRECTION IN TERMS OF WHAT WE HAD BEFORE, BUT I'D LIKE TO HEAR STAFF ON THE ISSUES OF DRAWBACK.BECAUSE WHAT'S HAPPENED IN THE PAST IS PROPERTY WOULD COME IN.WE'D IDENTIFY IT.THE SECTION 37 FEE OR AMOUNTS SOMETIMES IN THE RANGE OF 2 MILLION, FOR EXAMPLE, AND I DON'T WANT TO RAISE A SPECIFIC PROPERTY AND THEN THERE'S JUST SO MANY DRAWBACKS THAT BY THE END, THE ACTUAL COMMUNITY BENEFIT PORTION GETS DOWN TO 200,000.SO IT'S NOT CLEAR TO ME IN THIS REPORT HOW THAT WILL BE CORRECTED, BECAUSE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WHAT IS FACTORED AS A DRAWBACK AND THE VALUE OF THE DRAWBACK, IT'S -- IT REMAINS VAGUE AS PART OF THIS REPORT.>> MR. MAYOR, WE'RE GETTING OUR EXPERIENCE WITH SECTION 37 IN THIS CITY, AND WE'RE RELATIVELY FEW YEARS INTO IT IN COMPARISON TO OTHER MUNICIPALITIES.I THINK THE -- WE TAKE THAT BACK AS A COMMITMENT OF AN ISSUE TO CONTINUE TO MONITOR AND TRY TO PROVIDE OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES THAT OFFER GREATER CLARITY AND THEN WHEN WE BRING FORWARD REPORTS TO COMMITTEES AND COUNCIL, WE'LL EXPLAIN THOSE FACTORS WITH MORE ADDITIONAL DETAIL, AND IF MR. SMITH HAS ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO ADD ON TOP OF THAT, I WILL LET HIM.>> MR. MAYOR, I THINK THE KEY WITH SECTION 37, IT'S A NEGOTIATION PROCESS, AND THERE'S BEEN EXPERIENCE IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS, PRIMARILY IN TORONTO, WHERE IF YOU START ARTICULATING AND DESIGNING PRECISELY AND PRECLUDE THE WHOLE NOTION OF NEGOTIATION, THE WHOLE SECTION 37 PROCESS TENDS TO BE LOOKED AT AS ANOTHER FORM OF TAXATION, WHICH IS NOT ALLOWED UNDER THE SECTION 37 PROVISIONS OF PLANNING ACT.THAT'S PART OF THE REASON WHY IT'S STRUCTURED IN WAY WHERE, IN FACT, WE DO PROVIDE FOR THE DRAWDOWN, AND IN FACT, THERE IS A LOT OF NEGOTIATION.WE

CLARIFY THE TYPES OF THINGS THAT WOULD BE ELIGIBLE CONSIDERATIONS FOR DETERMINING A DRAWDOWN.WE DON'T INDICATE THAT THERE'S A PERCENTAGE AMOUNT THAT WOULD BE ASSOCIATED WITH COMPILING OF THESE DRAWDOWNS, BUT THERE ARE GENERAL PARAMETERS.AND I THINK TO MR. WILLIS' POINT...WE UNDERSTAND THAT THERE'S SOME CONCERN ABOUT HOW WE COME UP WITH THESE DETERMINATIONS, AND IT'S SOMETHING THAT CLEARLY WE'LL HAVE TO CONTINUE TO WORK THROUGH AND WORK WITH, BUT THE IMPORTANT THING THAT WE CAN'T LOSE SIGHT OF IS THE CONCEPT OF NEGOTIATION.>> THANKS FOR THAT.THE FRENCH IN ME SAID DRAWBACK.BUT IT IS DRAWDOWN.I APOLOGIZE FOR THAT.JUST TO CLARIFY...WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE, BECAUSE THERE'S ALWAYS A NUMBER THAT'S ESTABLISHED THAT THE FILE LEAD IN THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT IDENTIFIES THAT NUMBER AND THEN WE SORT OF AS A COUNCILOR'S OFFICE ONLY GETS TO THE LAST NUMBER, AND WE DON'T SEE, YOU KNOW, WHERE IT STARTED AND WHICH COMPONENTS ARE OF COMMUNITY BENEFITS.CAN THAT BE A LITTLE MORE TIGHTLY-MANAGED SO THAT LOCAL OFFICES CAN KNOW OF THE START POINT AND WHAT IS ACTUALLY CONSIDERED A DRAWBACK AS PART OF AN APPLICATION?>> MR. MAYOR -->> A DRAWDOWN.>> MR. MAYOR, I THINK WHAT IS REASONABLE IS WHEN WE DO OUR STAFF REPORTS ON SECTION 37, WE CAN INDICATE IN THE STAFF REPORTS FACTORS THAT AFFECT THE DRAWDOWN, AND SHOULD COUNCILORS HAVE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR REQUESTS, WE CAN DEAL WITH THEM ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS.IT'S NOT ADVISABLE TO INCLUDE THE NUMBERS BECAUSE, AS MR. SMITH SAID, THIS IS A NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT.I THINK IT'S REASONABLE FOR US TO INDICATE THE FACTORS CONSIDERED AND SHOULD COUNCILORS HAVE QUESTIONS, WE WILL FOLLOW UP.>> THANK YOU.>> THANK YOU.COUNCILOR LEIPER, PLEASE?>> THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.JUST FOR THE BENEFIT OF COLLEAGUES, THIS WAS A SIGNIFICANT LINE OF QUESTIONING ALONG WHAT COUNCILOR FLEURY WAS ASKING.SOME GREATER TRANSPARENCY AROUND THE VALUE OF THOSE DRAWDOWNS.INDIVIDUAL A VERY GOOD CONVERSATION WITH MR. JAMES AND ANOTHER, AND I AM SATISFY WE HAD THEIR COMMITMENT TO TRY TO PROVIDE SIGNIFICANT NEW TRANSPARENCY IN STAFF REPORTS MOVING FORWARD WITH RESPECT TO HOW THOSE DRAWDOWNS HAVE INFLUENCED THE VERY FIRST NUMBER.SO, WE'LL LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING THOSE AS WE MOVE FORWARD.THANKS.AND THANK YOU TO YOUR STAFF FOR HAVING THAT CONVERSATION.BECAUSE I AM ALSO CONVINCED NOW BY THE NEED

NOT TO GET TOO DEEP INTO THE EXACT NUMBERS, BECAUSE WE DON'T WANT TO GIVE BARGAINING LEVERAGE AWAY TO THE DEVELOPERS.WE WANT THAT FINAL NUMBER TO LOOK AS HIGH AS WE CAN POSSIBLY GET IT.SO THANK YOU TO YOUR STAFF.>> OKAY.SO WE HAVE COUNCILORS LEIPER AND HARDER'S MOTION.CARRIED.AND THE MAIN REPORT AS AMENDED?CARRIED.THANK YOU VERY MUCH.MOTION TO ADOPT REPORTS.(SPEAKING FRENCH)>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. MAYOR.THAT THE REPORTS FROM THE OTTAWA COMMUNITY LANDS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ENTITLED OTTAWA COMMUNITY LANDS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION 2016 ANNUAL REPORT, THE REPORT FROM CITY CLERK AND SOLICITOR'S OFFICE ENTITLED STATUS UPDATE, COUNCIL INQUIRIES AND MOTIONS FOR THE PERIOD ENDING MAY 19, 2017.COMMUNITY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE COMMUNITY 23.PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT 43 B AND 44 A AND THE REPORT FROM THE CITY CLERK AND SOLICITOR'S OFFICE ENTITLED SUMMARY OF ORAL AND WRITTEN PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS FOR ITEMS SUBJECT TO BILL 73, EXPLANATION REQUIREMENTS AT THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 10TH, 2017 BE RECEIVED AND ADOPTED AS AMENDED.>> ON THE RECOMMENDATION...?CARRIED?MOTIONS REQUIRING SUSPENSION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE.THE FIRST ONE, COUNCILOR WILL LEAVE THE TABLE.I HATE DOING THAT, ELEY, BECAUSE YOU'VE WORKED SO HARD, AS YOUR OTHER COLLEAGUES HAVE.BUT WE KNOW.WE APPRECIATE YOU REFERENCING THE CONFLICT.SO THIS IS ON THE TAX DEFERRAL PROGRAM THAT I REFERENCED AT OUR LAST MEETING THAT THE RULES OF PROCEDURE BE APPROVED.CARRIED.ON THE REPORT, COUNCILOR BLAIS.SECONDED BY COUNCILOR TAYLOR.COUNCILOR BLAIS, IF YOU'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE THE MOTION, PLEASE.>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. MAYOR.I'LL GO TO THE OPERATIVE CLAUSES AT THE END.THERE ARE BE IT RESOLVED THAT COUNCIL APPROVE THE EXTENSION OF THE DUE DATE FOR PAYMENT OF 2017 FINAL TAXES TO DECEMBER 7TH, 2017 FOR THOSE PROPERTIES IDENTIFIED BY THE CITY TREASURER IN CONSULTATION WITH THE MANAGER.BETTER TO CREATE A CONTROLLED WAY OF PUTTING SMOKE INTO THE STADIUM -- NOT ALLOWED UNDER OUR BYLAWS, MY UNDERSTANDING IN CONVERSATION WITH STAFF THEY HAVE COME UP WITH A PROPOSAL FOR A FIVE-GAME PILOT.MY SENSE SHOULD IT BE UNPOPULAR FOR THE FANS WHO MAY NOT WANT SMOKE, WE WOULD HEAR FROM THEM AND FIND OUT WHAT'S BEST FOR THEIR OWN FAN BASE.THE PREAMBLE TO THE CITY PROHIBITS THE USE OF SMOKE ADVICES, WOULD LIKE TO PILOT THE

USE OF SMOKE FOR FIVE GAMES.BE RESOLVED THAT THE CITY GRANT AN COMPENSATION TO BYLAW 203 TO OTTAWA SPORTS ENTERTAINMENT FOR FURY GAME MAY 24th FOR FIVE GAMES AND GRANTING AN EXEMPTION WHICH REQUIRES A EXEMPTION FIVE -- REQUIREMENTS OF THE BYLAW INCLUDING SECTION 18 TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE FIRE CHIEF.>> MAYOR WATSON: DOES ANYONE WANT TO SPEAK ON THIS ISSUE?I DON'T BELIEVE IT WILL BE GOING INTO RIVER WARD.COUNCIL BROCKLINGTON. >> WE HEAR THE NOISE FROM LANDSDOWNE THAT'S A DIFFERENT CONCERN FOR ANOTHER DAY.I'M CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT THE SMOKE IS.IT'S NOT ACTUAL, SMOKE CAN I GET A COMMENT ON WHAT THE ACTUAL GAS IS AND THE POTENTIAL IF ANY OF THE HEALTH OF POTENTIAL FOR PEOPLE SITTING NEAR THESE DEVICES.[LAUGHING]>> MAYOR WATSON: THIS COULD GO WAY OFF TRACK IF WE ALLOW IT.>> THE ISSUE IS SMOKE DEVICES.I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT'S BEING EMITTED.WE PUT RESTRICTIONS AROUND INHABITANTS.>> MAYOR WATSON: THEY HAVE TO BE APPROVED BY THE FIRE SERVICE.>> THE FIRE CHIEF AND THE SERVICE LOOKED AT THE PUBLIC SAFETY AND THE MSDS SAYS THERE WAS NO HEALTH RISK.THAT SAID, WE COULD FOLLOW UP WITH PUBLIC HEALTH.I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE PRODUCT IS.THE ONE YOU WILL SEE AT ROCK CONCERTS, THAT TYPE OF SMOKE. >> I HAVE SEEN ALL TYPES OF -- FROM FLARES IN EUROPEAN STANDS TO ACTUAL SMOKE TO SMOKE MACHINES TO ALL OTHER TYPE OF SUBSTANCES.I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT'S BEING RELEASED AND WHETHER IT'S IN THE STANDS WHERE PEOPLE ARE SITTING OR ON THE PERIPHERY ON THE STADIUM.THAT INFORMATION IS NOT GOING TO BE.PEOPLE WHO ARE GOING TO THE GAME WITH ALLERGIES OR SENSITIVITIES SHOULD KNOW THAT BEFORE WE DEAL WITH THIS REQUEST.THERE IS NO INFORMATION ABOUT THE SUBSTANCE IN THIS MOTION.>> MAYOR WATSON: THANK YOU.COUNCILLOR MOFFATT.>> CAN I GET INFORMATION FROM STAFF WILL BE PROVIDING THE INFORMATION -- IN A TIMELY MANNER.>> I DIDN'T HEAR THAT?>> I WANT CONFIRMATION THAT I WILL GET RESPONSES IN A TIMELY MANNER. >> WE CAN PROVIDE THAT. >> MAYOR WATSON: COUNCILLOR MOFFATT.>> WOULD HOOLIGANISM BE AN OPTION?I THOUGHT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT EUROPEAN SOCCER AND NOBODY LAUGHTED. >> MAYOR WATSON: THERE MUST BE A WRITER'S STRIKE IN YOUR OFFICE.Mr. QADRI..>> I WANT TO ADD CONFIRMATION THAT OTTAWA PUBLIC HEALTHY BE CONSULTED ON THIS ITEM.Mr. DIMONTE.>> WE CAN DO THAT.>> MAYOR WATSON: OKAY.THANK YOU.COUNCIL ALSANTRI.>> THE

DEVICES WILL BE SHSHI. ONLY ALLOW THE STUFF OUR PRIME MINISTER WILL AGREE TO SOON.>> MAYOR WATSON: I KNEW YOU WERE GOING TO SAY THAT. ON THE MOTION AS PRESENTED?>> CARRIED.>> MAYOR WATSON: A MOTION BY MYSELF WITH RESPECT TO ROAD ASK PATH WAY REPAIR. CARRIED. AS MANY MEMBERS OF COUNCIL KNOW, THIS ISSUE OF THE CALCULATE OF -- QUALITY ROADS AFTER ONE OF THE WORSE WINTERS WITH THE FREEZE THAW AND THE NUMBER OF POTHOLES FILLED, I HEAR FROM A LOT OF RESIDENTS ON A REGULAR BASIS WHEN I'M OUT AND ABOUT THAT WE NEED TO INVEST MORE IN OUR ROAD AND PATH WAY SYSTEM. PARTICULARLY, I SEE THE CONDITION OF ROAD ALONG THE SHOULDERS IN ROUGH SHAPE. THAT'S BAD FOR MOTORISTS AND PSYCHOLIVES AT THE SAME TIME. SO WORKING WITH STAFF, I WAS ABLE TO SECURE 2.5 MILLION DOLLAR IN FUNDS BEING RETURNED AS PART OF CAPITAL CLOSE EXERCISE AND FUNDS THE ONE-TIME AND UNFORESEEN INCLUDING 400,000 BE ADDED TO THE UNSCHEDULED ROADS, PATHWAYS REPAIRS PROGRAM, WHICH IS IN ESSENCE FIXING THE POTHOLES. I WOULD ASK FOR YOUR SUPPORT. WE'RE NOT UNIQUE. YOU GO TO OTHER CITIES WITH THE SAME TEMPERATURE, CLIMATES. WE HAD 70 FREEZE, THAW CYCLES. WE KNOW THE GOOD WORK OUR PUBLIC WORKS DOES, THE WATER FREEZES AND THAWS AND THE POTHOLE IS CREATE. I APPRECIATE THE CHALLENGE Mr. WILEY HIS TEAM HAVE FACED. THEY HAVE FILLED I BELIEVE Mr. WILEY OVER 200,000 DIFFERENT POTHOLES. WE KNOW WE HAVE A SIGNIFICANTLY LONG LIST OF STREETS THAT NEED ASPHALT OVER LAY. SOMEONE WHO TRAVELS IN EVERY WARD IN THE CITY OVER THE COURSE OF A WEEK OR SO, WE HAVE STREET INSIDE GREAT SHAPE. WE HAVE STREETS IN ADEQUATE SHAPE AND SOME STREETS THAT ARE IN POOR SHAPE THAT NEED THAT OVERLAY FOR PEDESTRIANS WHERE THERE ARE NO SIDEWALK. CYCLISTS WHO USE THE SIDES OR THE MAIN ROADS OR MOTORISTS. I WOULD ASK MEMBERS COUNCIL FOR THEIR SUPPORT. THIS ALLOW US TO DO A LITTLE BIT MORE THAN WE WERE GOING TO DO. AND THE REASON I HAVE ASKED FOR THE RULES TO BE SUSPENDED WE HAVE A SHORT CONSTRUCTION SEASON. WE WANT TO BE ABLE TO GET OUT AND FIX AS MANY ROADS AND AS MANY POTHOLES AS WE CAN. QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS.>> TO I HAVE A QUESTION MAYBE I JUST WANT TO BRING A COMMENT ON THE POTHOLES. I DID SPEAK WITH KEVIN NOT TOO LONG AGO, I KNOW WE USED TO HOT PATCH ASK WE STOPPED. AND NOW WE'RE USING COLD PATCHES AND IT'S NOT WORKING OUT. MAYBE IN YOUR EXPERIENCE E WOULD LOOK TO REUSING THE HOT PATCHES BECAUSE

ARE THEY -- IS THE REASON THEY'RE NOT WORK BECAUSE WE'RE NOT APPLYING THEM RIGHT OR MAYBE TRAINING TO BE DOING? I KNOW THE COLD PATCHES ARE WORKING THE WEATHER WE'RE HAVING YOU PUT THE COLD PATCHES THEN OUR SNOWPLOW HIT THEM AND THEY GO AWAY. THEY'RE NOT CATCHING UP TO THE ROAD PROPERLY. MAYBE WE LOOK AT AND COME BACK TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE WHEN YOU BRING YOUR REPORT IN TIME FOR THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE ON THAT? >> WE'RE CONTINUALLY LOOKING AT NEW PRODUCTS TO DO A BETTER MORE PERMANENT FIX. WE'RE VAULTING A COLD PATCH THAT'S SUPPOSED TO PERFORM BETTER. I CAN COME BOOK TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE WITH THE RESULT OF THAT TEST. >> MAYOR WATSON: THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR. COUNCILLOR BROCKINGTON? >> THANK YOU, YOUR WORK SHIP. I WILL BEEN WORKING ON A PUBLIC INQUIRY, I WILL BE MOVING AT THE END OF THIS MATTER, I SUPPORT ADDITIONAL RESOURCES BEING PUT INTO THIS. THE CONDITION OF ROADS IN MY WARD AND ACROSS THE CITY ARE IN A VERY POOR CONDITION. ASK THIS IS PART OF MY PUBLIC INQUIRY. I'M GOING TO ASK THIS NOW, I DON'T BELIEVE THAT THE FREEZE THAW CYCLE IS THE ONLY CONTRIBUTING FACTOR TO THE QUALITY OF OUR ROADS. I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THROUGH THE SOLICITOR OR GM, WHAT TYPE OF PERFORMANCE AUDITS ARE BEING WHERE THE ROADS HAVE BEEN DETERIORATING FASTER. I BELIEVE IN SOME AREAS IN MY WARD THE QUALITY OF ASPHALT IS AT PLAY. I SUPPORT THE MOTION. WHAT TYPE OF AUDITING ARE WE DOING ON THE QUALITY OF THE JOBS BEING PERFORMED. >> FIRST OF ALL ON THE QUESTION OF THE QUALITY OF THE ASH FAULT, WE HAVE AN ASSURANCE PROGRAM DURING THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ROAD PROJECTS. WHEN NEW ROADS ARE BUILT THAT WE HAVE NEW SPECIFICATIONS AND WE DO TAKE SAMPLES AND ARE TESTED AND ON-SITE CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISION. MANY OF THE HAVE YOU ISSUES ARE ON ROADS THAT ARE OLDER. ME HAVE PREDATE THE CERTAIN, MAY HAVE HIGHER LEVELS OR MAY BE DUE TO THE AGE OF THE ROAD STRUCTURE AS WELL. WHERE WE'RE IN A SITUATIONS WHERE WE'RE REPAIRING A ROAD RATHER THAN RECONSTRUCTING WE'RE DEALING WITH AN UNDER LINING BASE THAT MAY NOT BE AS STRONG. WE WILL BE BRINGING A REPORT ON THE COMPREHENSIVE ASSET PLAN. WE WILL PRESENT MORE INFORMATION AT THAT TIME AND WELCOME MORE QUESTIONS TO STAFF WHEN WE HAVE THE EXPERT INSIDE THE ROOM. >> MAYOR WATSON: THANK YOU. YOU'LL HAVE THAT INQUIRY COUNCILLOR AT THE END. COUNCILLOR LEIPER ON THE MOTION PLEASE? >> JUST A QUESTION

IN TERM OF THE DIFFERENCE IT WILL MAKE.IT LOOKS TO BE SIGNIFICANT.MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THE ROAD RESURFACING BUDGET IS 33.\$6 MILLION, ADDING AN ADDITIONAL 2.5, YOU'RE GETTING 7 AND A HALF PERCENT MORE CAPITAL MONEY INTO THIS, IS THAT ROUGHLY -->> THAT'S CORRECT.>> ON THE OPERATING SIDE, HOW MUCH IS THAT 400 AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE BUDGET?>> FLITS THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF 15 PERCENT.>> OKAY.FAIRLY SIGNIFICANT.IS IT ENOUGH?WHAT KIND OF DIFFERENCE WILL RESIDENTS SEE AS A RESULT OF INJECTING THESE FUNDS INTO THESE TWO ACCOUNTS?>> FOR THE POTHOLES WE WILL CONCENTRATE ON THOSE AREAS WHERE THERE'S CLUSTERS OF POTHOLES AND CHRONIC AREAS WHERE WE'RE CONTINUALLY GOING BACK.WE WILL HIRE CONTRACTORS TO GO IN AND GRIND IT OUT.IT WILL STOP CREWS TO CONTINUALLY GO BACK AND REPAIR THOSE AREA.>> WONDERFUL.DO YOU NEED MORE THAN THAT, SO IF WE'RE TAKING A LOOK AT THE BUDGET IN 2018, WHAT IMPLICATIONS CAN WE DRAW FROM THIS ADDITION OF FUNDS?>>>> Mr. MAYOR, AS YOU POINTED OUT, IT'S A BAD YEAR.I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S INDICATIVE OF THE YEARS GOING FORWARD.>> YOU'RE SATISFIED ITS ONE-TIME FUNDING AS OPPOSED TO AN ADDITIONAL ONGOING REQUIREMENT.>> Mr. MAYOR, YES.>> MAYOR WATSON: COUNCILLOR CHIRELLI PLEASE.SORRY -->> THERE.Mr. MAYOR.I WANT TO ECHO WHAT YOU HAVE TO SAY.IT'S BEEN A MEMORABLE YEAR ASK NOT IN A GOOD ONE.ONE STATISTIC WE SHOULD BE AWARE OF BECAUSE THERE ARE A LOT OF CONCERNS AND COMPLAINTS OUT THERE ABOUT WHAT'S THE CITY DOING?>> AS OF YESTERDAY, I CHECKED WITH Mr. WILEY, CITY CREWS HAVE FILLED 148,000 POTHOLES THIS SEASON.SO THE CREWS ARE OUT THERE.THEY'RE DOING WHAT THEY CAN WITH WHAT THEY HAVE.I THINK THIS WILL BE A VERY WELCOME ADDITION TO THEIR TOOL BOX AND THE APPROACH THAT Mr. WILEY HAS SET OUT TO TARGET THOSE AREAS WHERE THE CLUSTERS ARE WHERE WE'RE GETTING THE REPEATED COMPLAINTS.THIS MONEY WILL ALLOW THEM TO TACKLE THEM IN A REAL WAY.I WANT TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO THANK STAFF FOR BEING OUT THERE IN ALL KINDS OF WEATHER AND DEALING THE POTHOLES UNDER VERY ADVERSE CONDITIONS WHETHER IT'S RAIN, COLD OR DAMP.I WANT TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO REMIND THE PUBLIC ONE OF THE WAYS WE KNOW ABOUT THESE POTHOLES WHEN YOU TELL US.IT'S NOT A BOTHER WHEN YOU CALL YOUR COUNCILLOR AND SAY THERE'S A POTHOLE OR CALL 311 TO SAY THERE'S A POTHOLES IT'S SOMETHING WE ENCOURAGE.THE PUBLIC ARE EYES ON THE ROAD.WE WANT TO HEAR ABOUT IT.SO THAT KEVIN CAN SEND

OUT HIS CREW TO ADDRESS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT AREAS.I WOULD URGE EVERYONE TO SUPPORT THIS MOTION.I THINK IT WILL GO A LONG WAY TO A MEMORABLE YEAR, BUT NOT IN A GOOD WAY.>> MAYOR WATSON: ON THE MOTION?CARRY.THE NEXT MOTION THAT REQUIRES SUSPENSION OF THE RULES BY HUBLY AND TIERNEY.ON SUSPENSION, CARRIED.COUNCILLOR HUBLEY.>> I WILL GO TO THE THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED.I THINK EVERYONE HAS HAVE SEEN THE RESULT OF THE INQUIRY.THAT STAFF DIRECTED TO REPORT BACK TO THE APPROPRIATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROACTIVE MONITORING AND BAITING PROGRAM AS PART OF THE LONGER COMPREHENSIVE FOR DETERMINING RODENT AND FUNDING SOURCES IN ADVANCE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2018 BUDGET.WHAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR IS WHAT CITY STAFF DO IS THEY ONLY BAIT THE SEWERS WHEN SOMEONE -- A RESIDENT COMPLAINS.WHAT THIS MOTION WILL DO IS ENCOURAGE STAFF TO BAIT THE SEWERS AROUND THE CITY TO MANAGE THE RODENT POPULATION BETTER.THANK YOU Mr. MAYOR.>> MAYOR WATSON: ANYONE ELSE?CARRIED.MERCI.NOTES OF MOTION FOR SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS.TO HOLD THE GENERAL OF THE SHAREHOLDER AT THE COUNCIL SCHEDULED FOR JUNE 14TH, 2017.MOTION TO INTRODUCE BYLAWS?>> COUNCILLOR QADRI FOLLOWED BY MOTION HUBLEY.>> THAT THE MOTION THREE READINGS BE READ AND PASSED.>> MAYOR WATSON: CARRIED?CONFIRMATION BYLAW, PLEASE.COUNCIL QADRI.>> MOVE BY MYSELF AND SECONDED BY COUNCIL HUBLEY THAT THE FOLLOWING BYLAW BE RED AND PASS.TO CONVERGE THE PROCEEDINGS OF MAY 24th, 2017.>> MAYOR WATSON: CARRIED?INQUIRIES?COUNCILLOR BROCKLINGTON WITH RESPECT TO POTHOLES.>> ITS TWO PARTER.FIRST, GIVE THAT THE QUANTITY AND SEVERITY OF POTHOLES AND OVERALL ROD CONDITIONS IN RIVER WARD WHAT IS THE CITY OF TWO TO INVESTIGATE NEW TECHNOLOGIES TO MAXIMIZE THE LONGEVITY.MY SECOND -- PERFORMANCE AUDITS OF ROADS WHERE THE CONDITION DETERIORATED AT A MUCH FASTER WAY THE AIRPORT ROAD AND ON AND OFF.>> MAYOR WATSON: THE NEXT WRITTEN INQUIRY FROM COUNCILLOR CHERNSKO.>> IT'S A REFERRING TO THE FACT THAT IN I DON'T WANT TO SEE DEMOLITION IN THIS MEETING, IN THE DEMOLITION OF HOMES THERE IS FREQUENTLY A LOT OF DUST AND UNKNOWN HAZARDOUS MATERIAL.IT HAS COME MORE TO MORE TO MY ATTENTION, THE MUST HAVE LABOUR HAS LEGISLATION INTENDED TO PROTECT WORKER.THERE SEEMS TO BE A GAP ARSON NOTIFICATION OF NEIGHBOURS.MY INQUIRY I WILL SKIP TO THE END, CAN THE CITY CLERK AND

SOLICITOR PROVIDE OPTIONS TO ENSURE THAT BUILDERS FOLLOW APPROPRIATE ABATEMENT PRIOR TO DEMOLITION OR A SUPPLEMENTARY BYLAW BE ADDED THAT INCLUDING PROOF AND DOCUMENTATION FROM THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR BE PROVIDED, ARE THERE ANY ONTARIO MUNICIPALITIES WHO HAVE IMPLEMENTED SUCH REGULATION.>> MAYOR WATSON: THAT WILL BE ANSWERED BY STAFF.OUR FINAL WRITTEN INQUIRY FROM COUNCILLOR McKENNY.>> THIS ONE IS DIRECTED AT CHIEF DIMONTE WITH EMERGENCIES AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES.CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS CAN GENERATE NOISE ESPECIALLY ON WEEKEND.WILL THE CITY HAVE TO ACCOUNTABILITY ON THEIR PROJECT, CAN STAFF INVESTIGATE FOR NOISE AND WHAT CAN BE DONE TO DONE TO REDUCE NOISE.>> MAYOR WATSON: I WILL COUNCIL QADRI THE SENATORS HAVE BEEN IN A PLAYOFF SERIES WITH THE PENGUIN.LAST NIGHT OBVIOUSLY WAS A MUST WIN.THEY DID.AND COUNCILLOR QADRI HAS THE HONOUR OF HOSTING THE CTC.COMMENTS ON WISH THE SENS OUR BEST.>> AS YOU POINTED THE SENATORS ENJOYED SOME VERY GOOD SUCCESS SO FAR THIS YEAR.LET'S HOPE AND SEND OUR BEST AS COUNCIL AND AS A CITY TO BRING THE FINALS BACK.WE'RE ALL IN SUPPORTING THEM.GO SENS GO.[APPLAUSE]>> MAYOR WATSON: HERE, HERE.AND WE'RE NOT GOING TO ALLOW COUNCIL CHRELLI TO TALK PARADE.ONE GAME AT A TIME.WE WISH THE SENATORS THE BEST.THEY BROUGHT A LOT OF EXCITEMENT AND PRIDE TO OUR CITY.WE KNOW IT'S BEEN TOUGH, BOY, HAVE THEY BEEN PLAYING WELL IN THE LAST MONTH OR SO.>> I WAS GOING TO SAY WE'RE THANKFUL THAT COUNCIL CHRELLI WAS QUIET SO WE DON'T GET THE CHRELLI JINX. >> MAYOR WATSON: COUNCILLOR QADRI ON THE ADJOURNMENT? >> THAT THE PROCEEDINGS OF MAY 24th 2017 BE ADJOURNED.[111]