

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions: Zoning By-Law Amendment, Part of 3285 Borrisokane Road

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

Number of delegations/submissions

Number of delegations at Planning Committee: 0

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee and Council between April 15 and May 8, 2019 : 1

Primary concerns, by individual Faith Blacquiere (written submission)

- recommended refusal of the Zoning By-law amendment, or alternately, the implementation of a holding zone, noting that this development and the policies being implemented are contrary to provincial policy and the Official Plan; also noted that the recent flood damage along the Ottawa River, which is being attributed to climate change, should also be a concern, as this will be impacting all watercourses
- raised concerns about development in the floodplain, suggesting this proposal is premature and should wait for the updated floodplain mapping results from the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA), which may or may not result in the amount of developable area envisioned by the developer
- expressed concern that proponent is being given preferential treatment, as their floodplain reclamation from the floodway far exceeds floodplain reclamation in Kanata West, and this extreme volume of floodplain reclamation from the floodway, which is managed using the one-zone concept, is prohibited in the PPS and Official Plan
- the one-zone concept, which includes the entire area within the Regulatory Flood Line, is the floodway, and the Regulatory Flood Line will determine the developable area when the new mapping is completed
- the developer's OPA 212 Planning Justification Report refers to a future zoning application, but the zoning and Draft Plan of Subdivision for the lands should have been implemented before individual parts of the total holdings are implemented so that these, and the supporting reports, can

serve as a master plan; the 3285 Borrisokane applications have made changes to that plan that impact servicing

- the 3285 Borrisokane application does not request removal of the floodplain overlay and needs to have holding conditions to ensure that the land claimed to be developable does not conflict with the existing or updated mapping
- if the updated mapping identifies more developable land, this would also impact the lands all along the Jock River corridor, and, as such, all development applications would be impacted and would need to be coordinated, as removal of land for any one parcel may adversely impact flows and plans of the others, unless there is an overall implementation plan and related policies
- there are problems with the 17 October 2018 Draft Conditions with respect to: park size; open space designation; development in advance of the Kennedy Burnett SMF Sediment Management Area location determination; watermain connections, *Drainage Act* implications; these problems indicate the subdivision is premature
- there are problems with the 30 August 2018 Draft Cut and Fill Memo prepared for the 3285 Borrisokane applications with respect to: the location of the large cut area on top of future townhouse blocks and on the Chapman Mills Drive/BRT ROW as well as on the future north/south Chapman Mills Drive extension does not account for additional land that may need to be cut after the mapping is updated; the location of the small cut area may impact the Kennedy-Burnett SMF outlet and a future STM outlet from southeast lands to the Fraser Clarke Municipal Drain; the cut areas far exceed the 20 m³ and 50 m³ permitted for additions to buildings in the February 2018 RVCA Regulation Policies and raising the lands is not included in the RVCA Regulation Policies Section 1.4 as a floodproofing measure; inaccurate elevation and fill levels; the use of sump pumps for all of the dwellings, as indicated in the Geotechnical Report, transfers the risk to homeowners, who are required by the Draft Conditions to be responsible for the installation and maintenance of these devices

Primary reasons for support, by individual

none provided

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The committee carried this item on consent, without discussion

Vote: The committee carried the report as presented, without change to the report recommendations.

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all written and oral submissions in making its decision and CARRIED this item as presented, without change to the report recommendations.