

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 78, 84, 86 and 88 Beechwood Avenue and 69, 73, 77, 81, 85, 89 and 93 Barrette Street

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

Number of delegations/submissions

Number of delegations at Committee: 3

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between May 31 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and June 10, 2021 (committee meeting date): 5

Primary concerns, by individual

Chris Greenshields, Vice President, Vanier Community Association (oral submission)

- VCA supports this application but not in its entirety, as they, along with the Beechwood Village Alliance, are disappointed that the recommendations of the UDRP were not fully implemented, especially with respect to heights
- they thank Minto for its engagement with the Vanier community and its efforts to address community concerns about the adjoining heritage property, the design approach on Barrette, the commercial space on Beechwood, together with the setbacks and stepbacks there; the approach along Barrette serves to better integrate the development into this historic R4 residential area of Vanier with the mid-block garage entry and loading dock, the active street entries, the setbacks with front yards, and the stepbacks
- the mid-block pedestrian corridor connecting Beechwood and Barrette, as per the Beechwood Community development Plan, is another welcome step
- they welcome the road modification agreement to extend the cycle track along Beechwood and appreciate the Section 37 investments that will provide additional improvements to the cycle track, as well as traffic calming measures along Barrette and elsewhere in Vanier
- the parks cash-in-lieu is important for Vanier, the community needs more park space and safer spaces, as observed with recent events in the community
- the Beechwood Village Alliance letter addresses the major concern about the

permitted height and shadowing effects, particularly to the north, in Lindenlea; while they recognize that the OPA150 permits mid-rise buildings up to 9 storeys on Traditional Main Streets, this is conditioned on minimizing the shadowing effects and subject to any existing Secondary Plans

- unfortunately, the Beechwood CDP has no statutory effect in the end and such heights would not have permitted had it been a Secondary Plan; this experience, the impact on the character of Beechwood and the resulting shadowing effects illustrate why Vanier and the Beechwood area need a Secondary Plan in addition to the existing Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan, which emerged after amalgamation; the VCA has proposed, with the ward Councillor's support, such a Secondary Plan to build on the Montreal Road District Secondary Plan, to cover all areas of Vanier and all of the community's Traditional Mainstreets

Miklos Horvath (oral and written submission)

- supports the idea of intensification generally and the development of the underutilized properties to enhance the vitality of the mainstreet, this request for the zoning amendment is not in the interest of the residents of Beechwood
- this report is unbalanced and accentuates the developer's proposal, as opposed to providing an objective opinion; the CDP is basically being brushed aside and the UDRP's main suggestion, that of reducing the height of Beechwood and east sides of the development in order to lessen the massing of the building, has been hidden in the annex
- the development lands have recently been assembled and front both 69-93 Barrette and 78-90 Beechwood Ave; while the Barrette side features good setbacks and a progressively stepped back building above the 4th floor to the maximum height of 6 storeys, the Beechwood side (facing north has limited setbacks from the street and limited setbacks as the proposal progresses to 9+ storeys
- primary concerns are around excessive height and massing of the proposal
 - the building will have the largest footprint of any on Beechwood (taller than all except the Cavanagh, at the far eastern side of Beechwood, which is well set back from the street and has a much smaller footprint); the other mid-rise buildings along Beechwood were granted greater heights due to the fact that they occupy corner lots, which allow for greater heights to be requested, but this proposal is not on a corner lot - it is a mid-block development that is 9-storeys and occupies nearly half a city block, where there are no other buildings higher than 3 storeys (the majority being one and two storeys); Beechwood Avenue is a designated Traditional Mainstreet, a narrow winding road which, for much of its

length, carries one traffic lane in each direction (with occasional left-turn lanes squeezed in), with unprotected bike lanes on each side, and the stretch of road in front of the proposed development is only just over 13 metres wide and not at all suitable for a 9+ storey mid-block development

- the proposal does have some positive elements that are consistent with the CDP and the Urban Design Guidelines for Traditional Mainstreets; for example, the Barrette side of the development is not overbearing and is in fact human in scale, at 6 storeys or approx. 20m in height, with relatively large setbacks of 8.5 m on the 6th floor, 7.2 on the west side of the building, and the setbacks and heights of the Barrette side allow for the 45 degree angular plane, which is a planning tool used to assist the appropriate height transition between the proposed and existing low-rise buildings; these positives on the Barrette side do not translate into the Beechwood side and in fact are not consistent at all with the CDP, which calls for lower level buildings of up to four storeys, more significant setbacks for higher floors, as well as the breaking up of the facades to provide more of a village feel
- the Beechwood side is proposed at 9 storeys or approximately 30m, not including the mechanical buildings, which would bring the total height to above 34m, making it the tallest building directly facing Beechwood; the setbacks on this much higher section of the building range from 1.1 to 4.2m at the 9th floor, a far cry from 8.5m on the 6th floor on the Barrette side; it is unclear why the Barrette side is consistent with the intent or the provision of the Guidelines but the Beechwood side is not
- the planner has used the planning tool for the 45 degree angular plane to assist the appropriate height transition between the proposed and the existing low-rise buildings but not on the north side
- throughout this report the development is referred to being 'generally consistent with the guidelines with ample setbacks and setbacks being provided to create human scale and reduce shadowing impacts', which is not true for the Beechwood side; the shadowing piece on the Beechwood side indicates that the shadows would disappear in the winter by 11 AM, which is factually incorrect and further evidences that the report is inaccurate and downplays the reality; it also has no mention of the fact that the sidewalk on the north side of Beechwood will be in shadow until 1 PM in mid-winter; the shadowing goes further than 50% of the as-of-right shadowing that is allowed
- shadowing will have irreparable damage on the community from the loss of natural sunlight during the darkest and coldest months of the year – thus

impacting the solar-gain that occurs currently; this will undoubtedly increase the cost of heating of homes and businesses in the neighbourhood; the height will also throw the sidewalk and businesses (and their patios) on the north side of Beechwood into shadow for much of the year, thus creating an uninviting experience for residents who frequent those businesses; this is contrary to the Traditional Mainstreet concept

- this proposal is not suitable for this community or generally compliant with a low-rise community; it would be better suited to St. Laurent, Merivale, Innes or Strandherd, with curb to curb measurements that match the current right-of-way, not a winding mainstreet that is approximately 13m across in a low-rise established community; some residents in the community have characterized the impacts of having this development on their main street as being a container ship or a cruise ship dropped in the middle of the community
- the proponent's context analysis relating to Mid-Rise buildings along Beechwood, put forward as precedent to support their proposal, does not provide a true picture, which was remarked on by the UDRP
 - 10 Vaughan, while an 8sStorey building, is built upon a much smaller footprint, thus creating a much smaller shadow impact on the surrounding community, and it is also a corner development, so would have been allowed to rise a few more storeys given its location at an intersection
 - The structures at 411 and 420 Mackay St. are at intersections, allowing for slightly greater height, and the portion of 420 Mackay facing Beechwood is only 2-storeys in height, and much less intrusive than the Minto proposal
 - the proponents omitted the Indian High Commission building from their presentation, which is at the key intersection of Beechwood and Springfield and is a 4-storey building that fits well into the character of the community, and is in-line with the desire of the residents using Beechwood as well as the Beechwood CDP approved by Council
 - while Beechwood is deemed a Transit Priority corridor (with isolated measures) on schedule D in the current and draft OPs, there are in fact absolutely no priority measures on any section of Beechwood – be it the two lane or four lane sections – and given the narrowness of the street, none could be implemented, so there is no justification for increased height based on “Transit Priority”
 - while the “potential” development site at 41-57 Beechwood and the approved development at 89-97 Beechwood, are at a height that will impact the community through the potential massing, they are both at intersections and are on the north side of Beechwood, thus not impacting the street itself

- the St. Charles Market development has a very small portion that touches Beechwood, just east of the Church, and will have a much less shadowing impact north of Beechwood (more than the existing heritage former church building) due to the fact that the building is actually facing Barrette and is again at an intersection, not only mid-block; it also has maintained a very large park at the corner of Beechwood and St. Charles St, which is more considerate of the Village feel
- the location of the Kavanagh at 7 Marquette, while 4-10 storeys, is built between two intersections (Marquette/Beechwood and Jolliet/Beechwood) would have been a case for its height
- the current proposal is a mid-block development that does not interact with any intersections (no justification for increased height), situated within a low-rise neighbourhood; it does not conform to Official Plan Amendment # 150 in respect of intensification and building height
 - the proposal does not meet policy as the abutting right-of-way is much less than the height proposed, the setbacks on the Beechwood side are minimal at best, and the proposed plan does not demonstrate how the project would minimize the impact on the surrounding community north of the property, yet this is demonstrated on the Barrette side
 - the proposal would result in a density of 537 units per hectare, which is completely inappropriate for the community, and there is no evidence that the community has the facilities – parks, recreation etc., to accommodate this increase – especially given the other developments of recent years; this proposal also does not include any large dwellings (three-bedrooms or larger) for families, so is not in keeping with the city’s policy intent and the needs of the community
- the proposed development does not appropriately take into account the registered heritage building at 94 Beechwood and the heritage property will be trapped in perpetual shade if all proposed and potential developments are approved; the heritage landmark will not only be dwarfed by the proponent's development, but may well not survive the massive excavation and blasting required to incorporate parking into the development
- this zoning amendment should be limited to 6 storeys on both the Barrette and Beechwood sides, in line with other development sites on the north side of Beechwood that have had zoning amendments approved in the past several years (such as 89-97 Beechwood); if built as proposed, it will change the surrounding communities forever and provide precedent for more of the same type of

development with heights that suffocate the residents of Beechwood Village, and convert the mainstreet to a dark wind-swept canyon

Tony Stikeman, Beechwood Village Alliance (BVA) (written submission)

- Minto has been respectful, accessible and engaged with the result that many design changes reflect input from BVA members, but the BVA continues to have concerns about the massing and height along the Beechwood frontage and supports the comment by Councillor Rawlson King to oppose the planned height of Minto's project (78-90 Beechwood and 69-93 Barrette)
- recognizes that the Official Plan as amended by OPA 150 permits mid-rise buildings of up to 9 storeys on traditional mainstreets, but there is a requirement to avoid shadowing on adjacent properties; continues to have reservations about the general massing of the proposal which does not fit the context and character of the Beechwood streetscape under the Beechwood Community Design Plan, specifically, the 9-storey façade on Beechwood
- the City should apply OP Guidelines that indicate mid-rise buildings shall include sufficient setbacks and step backs to avoid a street canyon effect and minimize micro-climate impacts, as well as the Urban Design Guidelines, to the fullest extent for both the Zoning Amendment and the Site Plan Control applications; if applied, a building of a more modest height would emerge with minimal disruption due to reduced massing and shadowing
- urges the Committee to consider the recommendations from the UDRP (in respect of reduced massing façade treatment) and to include them, as applicable, as part of the subsequent Site Plan control review; the BVA welcomes the lower height, step backs and setback on Barrette St consistent with its existing R4 zoning
- Minto's own shadow study concludes that a number of homes would have no morning sun during the winter months, and pedestrians on a 100 meter stretch on the north side of Beechwood would have sunrise delayed until about 11:00 AM on June 21- the longest day of the year – and even less sun during the rest of the year; some homes in Lindenlea would be in increasing shadow from September to January during winter months – precisely when sunshine is needed
- the BVA welcomes the setbacks and stepbacks related to the adjacent heritage building
- the inclusion of the Beechwood CDP provisions for a pedestrian route through the development is positive
- BVA supports the rezoning provisions to accommodate the patio space along Beechwood, as well as provide relief to enable greater residential use on the ground

floor

- the BVA also welcomes the ground floor commercial space and its configuration to reflect the Beechwood CDP
- the BVA acknowledges that under Section 37 Community Benefits agreement, the City permits greater heights than allowed by the current zoning; implementation of the UDRP recommendations on lower height and reduced massing would similarly trigger such a requirement
- the BVA supports the efforts to ensure the bike tracks on Beechwood extend along Minto's property and the adjacent properties, supported through the Section 37 Community Benefits payment together with the necessary road modification agreement; similarly, the safety improvements along Barrette and other measures to improve pedestrian and cycling safety and traffic calming in Vanier are welcomed
- the BVA supports the Parks Cash-in-Lieu agreement; Vanier continues to be desperately short of park space, particularly in the face of current intensification trends and the VCA favours the use of these and other funds to purchase additional park space in the immediate vicinity
- overall, the experience of this project suggests a failure of the OPA 150 to take into account different traditional main streets in Ottawa and in this case to reflect key elements of the Beechwood Community Design Plan; it would not have been possible under the OPA 150 if the CDP had been a secondary plan; tis example supports the argument by the VCA and other members of the BVA that a secondary plan for Vanier and Beechwood is necessary just as the Montreal Road District Secondary Plan is intended to ensure compatible development in the limited areas which the plan covers

George Phemister (written submission)

- the Beechwood Community Design Plan calls for a maximum of six floors and Zoning By-Law 2008-250 sets height limits at 11 and 15M; this proposal calls for a nine-storey, 33M building; in spite of the proposed concessions by the developer that would step back the upper floors, and use of different facades, at the end of the day it is still nine floors and 33M, in an area of mostly two-storey buildings that is supposed to be in a "village"; questioned the point of having approved Plans, By-Laws and Policies when they are regularly ignored to favour developers over residents
- the Report suggests that this project will not create a concrete canyon, like Richmond Road in Westboro; perhaps not with this one oversized building alone, but the de facto bar will have been raised, opening the door for other developers to do the same along Beechwood and then on the neighbouring streets; the next request will be for

15 floors; perhaps not across the street, but nearby, and that's how the concrete condo canyon starts, and the village ends

- the goals of intensification can be achieved without destroying the fabric of established neighbourhoods such as Westboro, the Glebe and New Edinburgh

Dr. Ian K. Crain (written submission)

- this request for rezoning of a large land assembly will have a major irrevocable impact on the surrounding neighbourhoods, and deserves careful consideration by the Planning Committee
- the forward-looking Beechwood Community Design Plan (BCDP), widely supported by the community, and formally approved by Council, provided confidence that development would take place in the community on a human scale that would enhance the neighbourhood's vitality as a modern family-oriented community; the requested zoning change would enable an out-of-proportion building that detracts and damages the community, and is contrary to established OP Urban Design Guidelines, as well as the Beechwood Community Design Plan
- serious concerns were raised by multiple community associations during the consultation period, as well as by respected architects and urban planners who happen to live in the area, and by numerous residents from all walks of life; although there are other issues, the principal concerns are for the height and massive nature of the proposed project, and hence for the shadowing, "canyoning", and significant incompatibility with the current streetscape and surrounding low-rise (but high density) residential neighbourhoods; the UDRP echoed the concerns about "massing" and also recommended a lower height limit, as did the Councillor for the abutting Rideau-Rockcliffe Ward; it is disappointing to note that while the Planning Rationale commends the proponents for accepting some of the UDRP recommendations, there is no mention of the rather important ones that have not been implemented
- PIED City staff have surprisingly recommended approval using justifications that appear to be at odds with City policy and are also logically flawed; the Planning Rationale does not support the conclusions stated in the Executive Summary; this proposal does not complement the existing pattern and scale of development and planned function of the area, does not align with the vision set out by the [Beechwood] community design plan, is not sensitive to or respectful of the community's established characteristics and does not protect against undue adverse impact on surrounding properties
 - Beechwood Avenue is a very "busy" road, often very clogged; it is not a

transportation “corridor” or “artery”

- this middle of the block project will occupy a consolidated land parcel of 0.416 hectares, with frontage on Beechwood of 71 metres, about 45% of the block face; it will have a larger footprint than any other building on Beechwood, and will be taller than all but one; immediately adjacent buildings are a one-storey strip mall, and a 2-storey (plus cupola) heritage registered house; there are currently no buildings higher than 3 storeys in the block
- the sun-shadow analysis indicates that expansion of shadows beyond the “as-of-right” extend by about 50; they will be most dramatic during the morning and especially in winter months, when sunshine is needed most, it also shows that sunrise will be delayed to as late as 11:00 AM on June 21 – that longest day when the sun angle is highest, but there also will be less sunlight on every other day of the year and very, very little in the winter months; a large number of residences north of Beechwood will have no morning sunlight all through the winter months; these are not “minor” impacts
- the proposed setbacks and stepbacks on Beechwood are not ample, as indicated by staff and the ratio of height to corridor is not consistent with the Guidelines, as asserted
- the target for intensification in areas like this has been set at 80-120 units per hectare; with 227 units, this development will have over 500 units per hectare, a startling contrast; there are currently no buildings of more than 4 storeys on the south side of Beechwood with the exception of the Cavanaugh development at the far eastern end of the street, and on the north side the only comparable building is the earlier Minto building of 8 stories; most along the north side are 2-6 stories, many being former residential buildings, now with ground floor commercial
- the UDRP observed that none of the comparables presented as justification by Minto were truly comparable – having more generous setbacks, corner locations, smaller footprints, and so on – and one was non-existent; in the Planning Rationale no mention is made of positive examples of typical existing mid-rise buildings along the street
- the design incorporates very few of the architectural elements that characterize the street, except perhaps the use of brick on the lower level; although there is great variety, there are a number of common elements in the current streetscape – such as diagonal corner setbacks and entrances, pitched roofs and dormer windows, and other features reminiscent of village houses (as some of them are), but the proposed project is aggressively box-like, with only straight lines

and 90 degree angles, described by the UDRP as having “too commercial an expression”; the Beechwood CDP calls for large buildings to be articulated in ways the look more like separate structures, specifically calls for a 6-storey limit on the south side to protect the sunlight, and for lower heights mid-block with taller buildings at selected “hubs” at intersections; the proposed project is the exact antithesis of the BCDP vision

- the project as proposed will require deep excavation of the entire assembled property and this, combined with the impact of blasting, is highly likely to destabilize the adjacent “El Meson” building only a few metres away; there are no adequate plans to mitigate this risk and the developer declined the suggestion of the UDRP to back further away from this heritage registered property, and has merely indicated that the situation will be “monitored”
- other issues raised during the consultative period include the environmental impact, traffic congestion, bird kills, and so on, all of which were dismissed as unfounded in the Planning Rationale, except for the environmental concerns, which were, strangely, not mentioned at all; the consolidation of these 11 lots will obliterate all of the natural open space mandated in each lot by the current zoning (side yards, front setbacks, rear yards, etc.) amounting to perhaps to 800 square metres; every tree, shrub, blade of grass and dandelion will be removed along with the soil, while, at the same time, the proposal is requesting relief from a long list of setbacks, projections and landscaping requirements; most of the proposed landscaping consists of small trees and bushes growing in planters or through small openings in pavement; concerning bird kills, of note, it is curious they have included in the landscaping a number of service-berry bushes, aka Saskatoon berry, which are extremely attractive to birds
- it is a source of immense frustration that it would seem that a little bit of creativity and vision could have ensured a building (or buildings) on this site that would meet intensification goals and be an attractive and vitalizing asset to the neighbourhood, but the proponents seem very determined to squeeze every possible dwelling unit into the space

Primary reasons for support, by individual

The applicant/owner, as represented by Paul Black, FoTenn, and Kevin Harper, Minto Communities (oral submission and slides)

- Minto has engaged extensively with the community over the course of this application, with the community associations as well as the Beechwood Village Alliance, with the public through public meetings, the UDRP, City staff and local

Councillors, and this resulted in significant changes to the building since its original inception

- the proposed is highly articulated and contextually sensitive, is appropriate for the site and will provide a significant intensification along a target area for intensification; the site is a mid-block site but it is along a corridor that is experiencing significant change;
- the OP recognize the area as supporting mid-rise building heights of 5 to 9 storeys, and it calls for developments to be compact, mixed-use and pedestrian-oriented
- the property is also subject to the Beechwood CDP and is within the Village mixed-use area, and the CDP speaks to buildings generally being within 4-6 storeys but does recognize that greater intensification will be considered in certain conditions (which were outlined in the staff report) and include things like access to sunlight being maintained, complementing the character of the village, as well as vertical distinctions within the building
- the Beechwood Avenue frontage of the building is highly articulated with setbacks above the third storey, sixth storey and the eighth storey, setting the ninth storey of the building back a total of 9m from the property line; the ground floor of the building also features a 4.5m setback to accommodate a cycle track and wide pedestrian sidewalk to create an excellent public realm along the frontage, with retail spaces animating the sidewalk, specifically a retail space at the corner of the building, adjacent to the heritage building at 98 Beechwood, and the proposed mid-block connection through to Barrette Street
- shadow impacts have been examined with a fair bit of detail, specifically for the properties along Commanda Way and Douglas Avenue; in the fall and spring those properties are out of shadow by 10 AM, and in the winter they are out by noon approximately; the sidewalk on the north side of Beechwood Avenue will be out of shadow completely by 1 PM in the spring and fall, and by 2 PM in winter; during the summer months the yards would be completely out of shadow
- infill development is complicated because it means change - change in the urban fabric, change in the built form and change in the community; it's also expensive and time-consuming for a lot of reasons; it demands strong commitment to community engagement, significant contribution to the public realm, quality architectural design and materials, and an appropriate transition to the surrounding streets and buildings, which they feel they have achieved in this proposal, but they acknowledge that not everyone will agree

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 42 minutes in consideration of the item.

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Details of Recommended Zoning in Document 2, be amended to add item 3.b.ix. as follows:

“ix. Clause 198(8)(d) does not apply. Residential uses within a building which faces Barrette Street are permitted to occupy a maximum of 80% of the ground floor area.”

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

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between June 10, 2021 (Planning Committee consideration date) and June 23, 2021 (Council consideration date): 6

Primary concerns, by individual

Miklos Horvath

- reiterated submission to Planning Committee
- asked that Council not approve the zoning amendment request, but agree to a maximum height of 6-storeys for the Beechwood side of the site, as proposed for the Barrette side, with similar setbacks as on Barrette

Marilyn Hanley

- the proposed project is not what is needed on Beechwood and will change it forever; once built, there will be no going back
- at the Planning Committee meeting last week, Miklos Horvath disagreed with the statement that the first Minto building was accepted by the community; he was correct, as the community ended up with what is there after massive consultations that pretty well ignored the community's wishes; City Hall did not listen, and is doing the same thing again; there is now a very large high rise looming over Beechwood, a coffee shop with hardly any room for outside seating, an LCBO and a very large empty retail space
- the scale of the proposed development is wrong and does not fit; when the mechanicals are added, the height is over 10 stories

- with virtually no setback on Beechwood, there will be one big tunnel on a very, very busy street with unacceptable shadowing for residents to the north; a third floor setback like the one on New Edinburgh Square would help remediate the problem and allow a little blending in with the old El Meson
- the Beechwood side is not consistent with the Community Design Plan, which calls for lower level buildings of up to four floors as well as the breaking up of façades to provide more of a village feel.
- had the feeling that very few of the councillors on the Planning Committee were familiar with the area being discussed
- does not live in lower Lindenlea so does not have a vested interest in the shadowing problem

Dr. Ian K. Crain

- reiterated previous concerns (in written submission to Planning Committee) about height and massing on the Beechwood side of the development and suggested the benefits of the project, including a significant Section 37 agreement, accrue to Vanier while all the adverse effects of “canyoning” and sun-blocking fall on the communities north of Beechwood
- reiterated previous concerns about inadequate consultation/consideration of community concerns

Anne Wood

- community concerns have thus far been dismissed and the fact that Council is at this same meeting reviewing a report critical of Planning Committee-developer relationships does not inspire any confidence that mere Ottawans' concerns will be considered; this amendment/project makes a mockery of community consultation (see Beechwood CDP) and defies any reasonable definition of “traditional mainstreets”
- the amendment will permit a 31 metre behemoth that is anything but compatible with the surrounding buildings and planned function of the area
- the heritage building next door (El Meson, 94 Beechwood) will be dwarfed; its historical significance and physical beauty diminished if not obliterated
- sun-shadow depictions are quite simply distorted and manipulated to understate the impact of this building; to claim the impact is minor is quite frankly wrong; the impact will be most dramatic during the morning and winter months - key times when sun is needed

- understands that one justification to approve this is that other applications for tall buildings will be received, but, if anything, this merely means that Ottawa City Council needs to take a stand today
- Beechwood is already being decimated by developers such as Minto; an earlier Minto condo building on Beechwood, between Crichton and MacKay, is an overbearing eyesore; misleading promotional material again overstated setbacks and misstated shade implications; the pedestrian experience (walkability) and receptivity to local enterprises has been severely and negatively impacted (commercial space lay vacant for years, and all that could afford the rents was eventually an LCBO); delivery trucks and aerial work platforms (“cherry pickers”) obstruct the bike paths and sidewalks, all begging the question of why the City invested in such improvements; there is not a blade of grass anywhere
- supports rational development and compatible infill and well-designed community-driven plans; Beechwood Avenue does not need this 9-storey building

Andrea (email sender ‘Andrea Stewart’)

- it should be the duly-elected representatives of the City and City staff driving what Ottawa is to become, not for-profit developers; she and her neighbours, as well as citizens across the city, have spent countless hours trying to help guide the new OP so it works for people, not plans, and yet, what the City proves time and time again is that they do not even bother to follow their own rules and guidelines — not when developers, who clearly fill the coffers of many Councillors, want to have their way; the relationship between Councillors and developers is entirely altogether too cozy
- this (Beechwood) development contravenes the Beechwood Design Plan or Urban Development Plans in mass, height, sun-shading or compatibility with the neighbourhood, but apparently, it is sure to pass; every councillor who is considering voting for this proposal should be made to answer why time and money is spent developing these plans when they summarily ignore them; it should be simple – if the development proposal does not conform with the Design Plans and all the City’s thoughtful guidance on development it should be rejected; it is wasting taxpayer time and money by even having a planning department if the City doesn’t even follow its own rules and guidance.

George Phemister

- reiterated previous concerns (in written submission to Planning Committee) about mass, height and precedent

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations with the amendment approved at Planning Committee. Council also approved the following motion in respect of this property:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council approve demolition control for the existing buildings on the property subject to the following conditions;

1. The landscaping of the property shall be finalized in accordance with conditions established by the General Manager of Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development;
2. The registered Owner agrees that, to the discretion of the General Manager, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department, a replacement building must be substantially completed within five years from the date of this approval and in default thereof, the City Clerk shall enter on the collector's roll the sum of \$5,000 for each of the two residential dwellings to be demolished;
3. The registered Owner shall enter into an Agreement with the City of Ottawa to include the foregoing conditions and pay all costs associated with the registration of said Agreement. At such time as a building permit is issued to redevelop the site and the replacement building is in place, the Agreement will become null and void and will be released upon request of the Owner. The Owner shall pay all costs associated with the release of the Agreement;
4. The registered Owner agrees that a demolition permit will not be issued and the buildings cannot be demolished until such time that the Agreement referenced herein has been executed and registered on title;
5. This approval is considered null and void if the Agreement is not executed within one month of Council's approval.