

## Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

### Zoning By-law Amendment - 30-48 Chamberlain Avenue

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: 8

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between June 28 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and July 8, 2021 (committee meeting date): 27

#### Primary concerns, by individual

##### **The Rosebery Residents as represented by the following four individuals:**

###### ❖ **Rina Cerrato & David Schwartz** (oral and written submissions)

- they support the concept of intensification that is sensitive to the community with thoughtful design that creates inclusive fifteen minute neighbourhoods and a maximum height of 6 storeys, in keeping with the neighbourhood and the Bank Street in the Glebe Height and Character study
- the staff report did not adhere to all of the applicable policies and guidelines for the site when recommending approval of the application, including those that require developments to co-exist without adverse impact and should not impact existing communities and to pay attention to urban design guidelines and minimize impacts on surroundings
  - the proposed building will equate to a 27.6 m lot abutting low rise residential homes with a two level parking lot, when you take into consideration the additional setbacks required for future road modifications and the Chamberlain multi use path; it does not fit
  - the guidelines around transition, setbacks and stepbacks, all of which would allow for transition and minimize some impact on the existing properties, are being ignored or are not mentioned by staff in the report
  - Planning Department staff stated to residents that they will not apply the high-rise guideline requirement of a 45 degree angular plane or the 20 m setback from abutting low-rise residences, but they will apply a 10 m setback from the internal side yard for a potential second tower; the proposal to select

a greater setback for a parking lot, and not for homes, shows a clear bias towards approving developments and disregard of applicable policies and guidelines

- they request a mid-rise development be considered for the site instead and noted they have tried to come to the table with the developer to find a way to address their concerns regarding height and mass

❖ **Andrea Redway** (oral and written submissions)

- there are contradictions between this proposal and the new vision and master framework in the form of the draft OP to guide the city's growth and development for the next 25 years
- the Bank Street and Glebe Height and Character Study was undertaken by the City in late 2018 to ensure a more predictable planning process and to manage intensification and growth; it reviewed the neighbourhood context, lot dimensions, scale and built form, urban design attributes, retail characteristics, development potential, and potential lot consolidations and concluded that the maximum appropriate height for the site is 6 storeys; staff have ignored those recommendations by recommending approval of this application for a 16-storey building, submitted in late 2020; this goes against public engagement and hurts public trust
- the draft OP commits to recognizing the differences in Ottawa neighbourhoods and their own characteristics and states that these neighbourhoods should create a sense of place and character by integrating high quality, human scale urban design; there are already many vibrant 15 minute neighbourhoods with nearby amenities and services and well-integrated greenspace that is embraced by the local community; a 16-storey high rise building towering over neighbouring residents and Central Park West will clearly take the character of the neighbourhood in the opposite direction and will lead to loss of the character of what is now a vibrant, walkable community and friendly residential neighbourhood, and more high rises will follow; this is neither human scale urban design in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood, nor the kind of strategic urban design described in the draft OP, nor does it conform to the OP policies that require that new development fit with, complement and enhance existing communities and not adversely impact them
- the City should showcase better planning processes to create a diverse, vibrant, eco-friendly city that enhances neighbourhoods; high rise buildings squeezed on small lots with non-compliant setbacks only a few metres from residential properties and well used neighbourhood parks do not meet this standard

❖ **Todd Saunders** (oral submission and written submission with **Lesley Kathnelson**)

- this development would impact everyone in the surrounding area but no one more so than those directly behind the tower; five of seven properties affected are owner-occupied homes, including the three properties where the tower will be placed; these are multi-generational homes that have invested significant time, money and effort into their properties
  - affected properties will be adversely affected by shadowing and loss of privacy, something that would not result from a 6-storey building; while the existing tree canopy may help mitigate some impact from the lower towers for five months of the year, in the fall, shadow extends down Rosebery, past Bank Street and into the south east streets like Strathcona; impacts will be felt beyond Rosebery; the proposal does not offer the addition of any landscaping, or evergreen landscape to mitigate the adverse impacts of overlook or screen the new development in any way
  - there is no transition from existing homes to a 16-storey mass, a mere 8 m from their back fences
  - the development will not animate the Rosebery street scape but will loom over it

❖ **Kristi Ross, Kristi M. Ross, Barrister & Solicitor, on behalf of the Rosebery Avenue residents** (oral and written submissions)

- The Residents of Rosebery take the position that the development should be mid-rise (not high-rise); it should have a larger setback between the development and the existing backyards; that a setback of 8 m between a 16 storey tower and a backyard is inadequate, and does not meet the transition policies in the Official Plan; and, that the Subject Lands are too shallow to support a high-rise without resulting in undue adverse impact (contrary to policies 2.5.1 and 4.11 of the Official Plan and), in the form of shadowing, overlook and loss of privacy
- the staff report over emphasizes the Official Plan policies that “may support taller buildings” on arterial roads and transit priority (which is only “isolated measures”), while ignoring the Official Plan policies that speak to creating adequate transitions to existing low-rise neighbourhoods and respecting the character and built form of these neighbourhoods; read together, these policies could support a taller mid-rise building; however, the sensitive context of Rosebery, the depth of the site and the High-rise guidelines do not support a high-rise at the site

- the staff report applies the Official Plan policies and High Rise guidelines in a selective manner to ensure that the tower is setback at least 10 m from the side yard (so that a future companion tower can be built) but ignores the Official Plan Policies and High-rise Guidelines that require a larger setback than 8 m from the existing low-rise lot lines on Rosebery, which is problematic
- the Rosebery Residents have indicated a willingness to discuss and negotiate with the applicant to achieve intensification that is more compatible with the existing community and while there have been a number of meetings and discussions between the applicant, the City and the Rosebery Residents, there has been little interest in further modifying the proposal to respond to the residents' concerns with respect to the lack of set-back and transition to their properties, height and shadow impacts or to move the project towards conformity with the policy direction in the Bank Street Height and Character Study; the Residents' would support a true allocation in density of the GFA permitted in a 6 storey building into a different mass (rather than a bar building) but they do not support the degree of densification resulting from a high-rise building.
- the application for rezoning to 16 stories should be refused for the following reasons (rationale to support each reason outlined in detailed submission):
  - the proposed high-rise development does not comply with the Policy Direction in the Bank Street Height and Character Study, which will form the Secondary Plan for the area
  - the Planning Report suggests that a 3 storey podium with a 16 storey tower is less impactful than a mid-rise building, and that this built form impacts fewer homes than a mid-rise design would, but the Residents of Rosebery disagree; they feel that a mid-rise building is more compatible with their street character and represents a more reasonable transition, results in minimal shadows and represents a more sustainable policy direction for the community; the shadowing impacts are considerable and place some homes on Rosebery (front and back yards) in complete darkness at certain times of the day and the shadowing extends to Bank Street and even as far as Strathcona Street; Chamberlain Avenue will likely become a street of high-rises and this will change the nature of the Community, and be inconsistent with direction in the future Secondary Plan (the Bank Street Height and character study)
  - the density of the proposal is approximately 30% larger than what would be permitted in a 6 storey built form, and approximately 35% larger than the as-

of-right-zoning; the podium and point tower design is not a “reallocation of density” in a different form, but a significant increase in density; the Official Plan permits increases in density, but only if this increase does not result in undue adverse impacts and if the development is compatible with the existing development, represents an adequate transition and complies with the policies of 4.11; the development does not meet these compatibility policies

- while intensification in a mid-rise built form can be supported at the site, a high-rise building does not comply with numerous Official Plan policies, the overall guidance for intensification in the Official Plan and the High-rise Guidelines; the proposal does not comply with the Official Plan Policies with respect to character, transition, overlook, privacy, undue adverse impacts; significantly, the policies in the Official Plan cannot support a high-rise level of intensification at the site: intensification should be in a mid-rise form.
- Key sections of the City’s Urban Design Guidelines for High-rise Buildings (the “High-Rise Guidelines”) have not been applied to the Subject Lands as required by the Official Plan, and does not comply with the Official Plan policies on intensification, high-rise development and compatibility, character, compatibility, transition and will result in undue adverse impacts

**Carolyn Mackenzie** (oral submission)

- while the Height and Character Study has no standing in the Official Plan, it is an important context and this committee supported the study, on which two significant projects (that are now currently being built) were considered; the key idea was to have policy discussion with all stakeholders out in the open, to set the rules and avoid debates that are time consuming and divisive, and to allow development to move forward, but this hasn’t happened; after two years, draft study recommendations were presented that included the maximum 6-storey height and the Glebe Community Association supported the recommendations; they are not against intensification that follows Official Plan policies, especially policies related to context and compatibility
- the staff report notes this proposal does not currently meet the City’s High-Rise Guidelines regarding tower separation and transition and also lists detailed feedback and significant concerns about the massing and transition of the building, but no significant changes have been made to address transition and massing; massing and transition are key elements to the Guidelines and this application doesn’t come close
- the report states that these Guidelines can provide guidance in addressing compatibility, which indicates the City has the option to ignore the guidelines and that doesn’t seem consistent with policies in the Official Plan; this raises questions about

what confidence anyone should have in this or the next compatibility issues if they can be so easily ignored

- another fundamental problem with the staff support is on page 13, regarding building transition and massing, the report states that a mid-rise building would pose negative planning consequences to residents on Roseberry; starting from that observation, staff looked at potential proximity of mass and compared different scenarios for redistribution, which is a critical point; if a mid-rise has negative consequences that are so significant, it is questionable how the Committee can explain the reversal of significant concerns
- the dynamics that have unfolded on this application are troubling, including a more intense lobby effort by the developer than she has seen during her work on planning files for 8 years

**Andrea Chandler** (oral submission)

- lives in the Greystone development and Lansdowne Park, both of which showed room for improvement in terms of consultation with the community; many people and businesses have fallen on hard times during the pandemic so now it's an important moment for planning in the city to be for all the people, including the unhoused, and to be safe and sustainable for all modes of transportation
- Chamberlain Ave. is located in the Glebe, near parks and schools, and this road is a scary place for cyclists; adding a high-rise is not going to help the safety of cyclists and pedestrians; the proposed development includes car parking and it's unclear what measures will be taken to ensure that cyclists and pedestrians are not cut off by residents entering or exiting the building - providing funds for traffic calming doesn't guarantee that such measures will be able to keep up with increased traffic
- It's unclear how this proposal would promote affordable housing since the car parking plan suggests a fairly affluent set of residents
- it's not just about safer bike lanes but also about what kind of culture we are creating and whether there is a culture of respectable co-existence for people with diverse ways of life; planning must consider affordable housing, sustainability, and safety to be just as important as building more buildings

**Carla & Mike McCloskey** (written submission)

- objects to ignoring the Bank Street Height and Character Study guidelines for construction to allow the developer to erect a 16-storey building where the Study has proposed a 6-storey for this site

- ten extra floors of residents will increase the traffic on Chamberlain Ave., causing traffic congestion and cut-through traffic, impacting safety for children on the street and directly affecting quality of life for existing residents of the area
- the project will increase construction time and noise, dust and grime
- not objecting to construction or intensification, but to no more than 6 storeys

**Janine & Jason Anderson** (written submission)

- a 6-storey building, which was proposed by the Bank St Height and Character Study, seems much more appropriate for the neighbourhood and would be a better fit
- questioned why all of the work that went into the Bank St Height and Character Study is being ignored
- the increased traffic on Chamberlain Ave, because of all of the people living and working in that 16-storey building, would negatively impact their family

**Laurin Williams** (written submission)

- the developer has requested a change to the original plan of a 6-floor condo, to instead build a 16+ story condo, a much larger proposal that directly disregards the current Bank Street Height and Character study
- aside from the noise associated with major construction, it will create permanent increased traffic, noise pollution and potential real safety concerns for neighbourhood children
- during construction, there will be noise, traffic and traffic delays along Chamberlain and Glendale, five or six days a week along Chamberlain Ave., Percy & the north side of Glendale Avenue, as the 10 extra floors of workers and/or residents travel to work and to home; this would limit the enjoyment of the neighbourhood and outdoor spaces for existing residents, and act to create noise disturbances daily, especially for those with homes on the north side of Glendale
- once traffic starts backing up because of lane closures or construction vehicles, impatient drivers will seek faster routes home and there is a real possibility of cut through traffic on Percy as well as on Glendale throughout the day and especially during morning and evening rush hour; there are 22 children under the age of 16 on Glendale and already drivers are careless with speed so this proposal poses a real and serious threat to the safety of the neighbourhood children who live, walk, ride their bikes, scooter and play on the street
- requested that the developer and the City honour the Bank Street Height and Character study for the neighbourhood and that this development be limited to no

more than 6 floors, and that traffic be calmed on Glendale to prevent impatient drivers from carelessly speeding down Glendale in an effort to bypass the construction zone and in doing so, putting children's lives at risk daily

**Wendy Denley & Isabelle Roy** (written submission)

- they are neighbouring homeowners that will be directly impacted by this development; while not opposed to the site being developed, they oppose a 16-storey high rise development that is not adhering to existing zoning, the Bank Street Height and Character Study, the High Rise Guidelines or the new Official Plan
  - this specific site is part of the City's own Bank Street Height and Character Study, which proposes in the section for "Maximum Building Heights in the North Gateway - Chamberlain Ave" a 6 storey maximum, due to depth of the lots and proximity to the homes on Rosebery Avenue, yet staff are recommending approval of this 16-storey building in an area that is not appropriate for a high-rise and literally backs onto residential yards, completely ignoring the required setback
  - according to the OP, this site should be limited to a development which would ensure compatibility with the adjacent low-rise backyards and properties on Rosebery, but a 16-storey high rise will be enormously imposing and negatively impactful (lack of privacy, shadowing, noise, traffic, to name a few)
- this application will be precedent setting, not only for the Glebe but for every neighbourhood in Ottawa, and will specifically set a precedent for multiple high-rises to occur alongside the proposed high-rise
- this family-oriented, residential neighbourhood (and others like it) should be preserved and high rises should be built only where appropriate to their surroundings, not where it is expedient and lucrative for a developer

**Bev & Jack MacRae** (written submission)

- object to the proposed tower on 30-48 Chamberlain Avenue being 16 storeys instead of the originally proposed six storeys

**Brien Whalen** (written submission)

- objects to the proposal for a high rise building in the Glebe
- the Bank/Glebe height and character study was a major influence in his decision to purchase a home in this neighborhood and it is concerning that recommendations to keep any structure at six stories, to preserve the character of the neighbourhood, are now being ignored



- it is also concerning that a developer is being granted such extreme exemptions from the zoning rules and high-rise guidelines, which is irresponsible behaviour by the City of Ottawa planning department and raises questions about precedents being set, and further degradation of the neighbourhood where he pays property tax

**Natasha Jamieson** (written submission)

- not opposed to construction or intensification, only to the changes the developer is requesting, from a proposed 6 storey to a requested 16 storey, which is not in line with the Bank Street Height and Character study
- concerns about increased traffic on Chamberlain, overflow traffic during rush hour, and construction delays onto Glendale Avenue which could put the safety of resident children at risk

**Linda Butcher & Wayne Cole** (written submission)

- concerned that staff recommend approval of a 16 storey building on a 30 metre wide lot when 6 storeys was originally approved; the requirements of the High Rise Guidelines say the setback should be 20 metres from nearby residential housing back yards but the City's Planning Department is approving 8 metres, which is significantly different and will have a much greater negative impact on their neighbourhood with regards to noise and traffic
- the Bank Street Height and Character study was put in place to review and update planning policy and zoning by-laws in order to better manage future growth in the ward and address concerns of residents; it approved a 6-storey building as appropriate to the lot context
- the original 6 storey building, with 20 meters from adjacent properties, meets the city's aim of intensification while respecting the Official Plan and the neighbourhood's character; the new proposal merely abuses the City's intensification goals by ignoring zoning rules, High rise guidelines, and the proposed plan and vision for the neighbourhood; it would be in the City's best interests to apply the Official Plan appropriately and follow the recommendations of the Bank Street Height and Character study to deny the developer's new and excessive proposal

**Judy Wilson** (written submission)

- objects to allowing a development on the site higher than the 6 storeys allowed under the Bank Street Height and Character Study, a study that should carry weight and speak for the locals
- intensification is necessary but there are limits in place

**Kalapi Roy (and on behalf of Chitra Roy)** (written submission)

- co-owner of a property directly south the proposed tower
- supports goals to increase urban density but disagrees with the addition of housing and services in the form of a 16 storey tower at the site when the alternate proposal, offering a similar number of housing units in a six storey building, would allow the proper implementation of building guidelines, the recommendations for Chamberlain Avenue in the Bank Street Height and Character Study, and the City plan
- disagrees with the conclusions drawn by staff that a tower is preferred to a midrise building on counts of transition and mass, privacy, and sun and sky view as their foundational reasoning rests on the argument that the two properties directly behind the proposed tower would get relief from mature trees on counts of transition and mass, privacy, and allowance of sun and sky view; staff neglect to note in its report that the trees are maples, leafed less than six months of the year, and three or four tall maples give minimal mitigation to a 52 metre, 16 storey tower, and even less when the trees are bare branched in the winter
- the proposed tower is incompatible with the character of the neighbourhood, obstructing of light, obstructing of privacy, delivering a negative wind impact on Rosebery, and looming and encroaching, without respecting the scale, proportion and character of the adjacent streets
- the site-specific exception proposed of a minimum rear yard setback for a tower at 8 metres, and replacing the 20 metre setback in the Urban Design Guidelines for High Rise Buildings, is shocking and` begs the question on the legislative requirement of the Planning Committee and Council to comply with the guidelines
- without a doubt, the zoning application for 30-48 Chamberlain causes undue adverse impact on Rosebery Avenue and should be rejected in favour of an alternate proposal for a six storey building

**Justin** (email sender 'Justin Tang') (written submission)

- concerned about the disregard regarding the proposal's 52m height as compared to the zoning's 14m height, which is inappropriate for this location
- the disregard for existing plans is disturbing, as it sets a precedent for them to continue to be ignored
- urged the city to listen to the community and heed the work that went into creating the existing official plans and character studies

**Carrie Alyman & Allen Carpenter** (written submission)

- understand that some development is inevitable but feel very strongly that a mid-rise build would be more appropriate for this location than the proposed 16-story development
- the City has just invested significant money for the Bank Street Height and Character Study so it is shocking that it would consider approval of this development proposal, which is clearly in conflict with the guidelines provided by the study; in that study, the area that would include the permanent structure is being revised from a four-storey maximum building to a six-story maximum building height zoning, as staff had indicated during the Bank Street Character and Height Study community meeting that the site does not support buildings of greater height due to depth of the lots and proximity to the homes on Rosebery Ave
- the impact to the residents of Rosebery Ave. is significant; shadows will be cast on the lots for both sides of the street; the visual landscape will be a catastrophe for this residential street; the proximity to the lots on the north side of Rosebery will be a huge infringement on privacy; all of this in addition to the fact the area has been subject to so much noise over the past many years due to the Kent Street overpass construction and then the storm water containment tunnel that all took place on Chamberlain Street
- the City should respect the residents of Rosebery, approve development that is appropriate to the site and the neighborhood, respect the Height and Character Study, respect the Official Plan and the zoning laws

**Arnold Polentz** (written submission)

- objects to the change from a 6-story building to higher as it will give others the right to ask for the same in the future and will set a precedent
- it seems under-handed that they did not ask for this from the start and now at the last moment are asking for a huge change

**Leslie McDermott** (written submission)

- asked that the developers of the former Imperial Electric property located on Chamberlain not be granted rezoning to higher than the current zoned height of 14 metres

**Avra Gibbs Lamey** (written submission)

- 16 storeys is far too tall in relation to the residential neighborhood streets to the south; the development plan established with the community should be respected

**Dan Moloughney** (written submission)

- disappointed to see that planning has so grotesquely altered their previous position on the proposed development and questioned how a city can grow intelligently when decisions seem to be made with little thought and considerations for plans made previously or studies about to be accepted
- the lot in question is currently zoned for up to 4 story and the Glebe Height and Character Study suggests up to six storeys mixed-use going forward, but this proposal is for 16-stories; the argument is that by lowering the full width of the building by one storey and adding a 16-storey tower, the city and neighbourhood will be better served
- they also proposed moving the tower 10 meters west of the original design just in case another tower is allowed adjacent (to the east); questioned why the planning for another tower “just in case” when the tower being proposed does not fit in to any of the previously agreed upon uses for the land, nor for any of the uses expected to be agreed upon going forward
- so many adjustments are being made for the current proposal it makes one wonder for whom the Planning Committee and Councillors owe their allegiance; questioned if there is any justification to drastically increase the height of building within 10 meters of single-family homes
- the zoning on Rosebery allows for triplexes, and there are several, but the street is very residential with a very strong front-porch, neighbour-centric feel, where street parties are common, children play on the street and tools and snow-blowers are shared; they have all chosen to live in an urban environment and understand that space is a premium
- the plans shown by the developer suggest that each building on Rosebery is a big three-story block; the homes are mostly original 1900's character 2.5 storeys with original rooflines, front porches and generally a much lower mass than suggested on the design; Chamberlain west of Bank is not the same as Isabella (east of bank), the lots are less deep
- they all want to help increase density but they have been told that the exchange of a high tower and lower base of the building would benefit the homes not directly adjacent to the proposed development and it unlikely any owner or tenant that lives on Rosebery would agree with that statement

**Connie Boynton** (written submission)

- the development would be directly in front of their house and would greatly impact their use and enjoyment of their home and street

- dismayed that the City is not following the Bank St. Height and Character Study, the Official Plan nor the High Rise Guidelines; the proposed development is unsuitable when considering these guidelines, which are in place to prevent unsuitable construction in unsuitable locations
- a high-rise tower across the street will block out a large section of sky from their view, replaced with the view of a massive building, up close; downtown Ottawa is getting filled with taller buildings and it changes the feel of the neighbourhoods, blocking the sun and sky (the reason they chose to live in this section of downtown); trees are some of the tallest structures which enhance the livability of the area
- in planning cities, the idea of human scale has been discussed, the idea that certain ways of building support human health and needs and create optimal living spaces; low scale buildings are part of that design premise and people who live in properly designed neighbourhoods feel happy and healthy because this design fosters a sense of community in neighbourhoods; Rosebery currently has that sense of community; the true cost benefit must be weighed when deciding to completely disregard all zoning recommendations and go ahead and allow outsized development
- their home sits in front of a heritage designated park where most area dog owners and families walk several times a day; building a large tower beside the park will change the nature and feel of time spent in the park, which is a welcomed respite from the downtown streets, with its slightly wild feel with many trees and open green spaces; the view of a large building will ruin this feeling as well as cast shadows across wide areas of the park
- the Planning Committee needs to follow the zoning/guidelines already in place when making a decision on this development; allowing the development to go ahead will not only ruin the street but will begin a process of eroding the entire character of the Glebe neighbourhood

**Marcello Cianciaruso & Carla Bonora** (written submission)

- the project would have adverse impacts on his home on Lyon Street
- not opposed to this site being developed but is against a 16-story tower on a 30-meter wide lot; the property is currently zoned for 14 m and the developer is asking for 52 m when the Bank St. Height and Character Study proposed 6 storeys for this site
- several of the requested zoning amendments go against the Official Plan, in recommending approval of the application, the City is not applying the Official Plan and High Rise Guideline appropriately, nor complying with the requirements of the High Rise Guidelines, most importantly the requirement to be 20 meters from

adjacent properties (the tower will only be 8 meters from the yard of another property); the site is only slightly more than 30 meters wide, making a high-rise too big for this site

- approval would set a precedent that would be set by allowing this project to proceed.
- a mid-rise built form is more appropriate

## Primary reasons for support, by individual

### **Ian Charlebois** (oral and written submissions)

- supported the proposal and suggested it is in keeping with the City's goals on intensification and housing, is a good design and is in an area that can support it
- the Height and Character Study mentioned by others is for Bank Street and Chamberlain isn't on Bank street, but abuts it and crosses over into Isabella; developers on the corners of Bank St. near the highway reference 23 stories or more and yet Chamberlain is limited to 6 stories (according to the Study)
  - if it goes to 6 stories and has this idea of reallocation of density, it would become like a warehouse
  - cities around the world, abutting or facing highways, have striking buildings with heights over ten to fourteen feet
  - residents are not in line with what is happening on Isabella
  - we are trying to become a vibrant city with 15-minute neighbourhoods, and the Glebe is one such neighbourhood, but this is a city without rentals; the City anticipates that approximately 90 percent of its expected growth on the next 20 years will be accommodated within the urban area and much of the demand for new housing is anticipated to be in the form of smaller units, such as apartments or condominiums; this site is a prime opportunity to contribute to those objectives, being located within the downtown urban core on the edge of a low-rise residential neighbourhood where the development would provide residential intensification on an under-utilized site that is currently dominated by surface parking; the proposed building form and mass serves to enhance and complement the existing character of the street while not impacting the general nature of the Bank Street "mainstreet" character that is the subject of the Height & Character study
  - if it is to be based on the OP and tax money put into it, it should co-exist in the future in the next 30 years
- the proposed development is not a long building mass of 6 or 9 storeys tall that forms

an overbearing wall but rather a 3 storey podium that is pedestrian in scale and a light 13 storey tower at the more easterly end of the podium that provides views in all directions, not just north and south; the tower of the building steps back from the base to allow the base to be the primary visual element for the site and not have a dominating effect on the streetscape, and has been oriented and shaped to minimize any shadow impact on the adjacent neighbours that does not already exist with the large trees along the back of Roseberry; the overall massing reduces the impact on the neighbourhood and is well suited for the site, and the site plan as developed incorporates drop off zones, visitor parking and move-in considerations

- in keeping with Barry Hobin's designs the podium will likely have carefully crafted details to achieve visual interest along the pedestrian streetscape
- overall, the proposed development offers an efficient, cost-effective pattern of growth, intensifying an underutilized property within an existing community that is well suited to accommodate the proposal

**Taylor Hunter, Senior Vice President, Inside Edge Properties, Authorized Representative of Your Credit Union** (written submission)

- registered property owner directly east of the properties being considered
- the proposal is well-designed and represents an important opportunity for re-investment on the street, which will benefit the neighbourhood
- understand that amendments to the Ottawa Zoning By-law relating to height, rear setback, and parking are required to allow the proposed re-development and have no concerns regarding the applications; the new building will fit well within this specific part the community and will offer affordable, family-sized units that will allow more people to live near the Bank Street corridor and will also represent a much-needed investment in this portion of Chamberlain Avenue
- as long-term members of the community, they do not believe the latest development recommendations from the ongoing Bank Street in the Glebe Height and Character Study have adequately considered the different character and context between Bank Street and Chamberlain Avenue and consequently has arrived at overly restrictive conclusions regarding appropriate building height for the street; they believe further consultation is necessary to fully realize the potential for Chamberlain Avenue

**The applicant, as represented by Kersten Nitsche, FoTenn, and Barry Hobin, Hobin Architecture** (oral submission and slides)

- provided site context, an overview of the proposed development and its design and mitigation measures for identified issues; identified how it conforms to existing

policies and contended that a 16-storey would be less intrusive on the neighbouring properties than a mid-rise tower

- the site is at the north end of the Glebe, abutting highway 417 to the North and is largely a surface parking lot, as well as a two and half storey medical building and a two-storey office building, with residential development to the south
- Chamberlain Ave. is an edge condition and serves as an entrance into the Glebe coming from the west; it has the potential for intensification and redevelopment to support the Official Plan and moving forward with growth in the urban area
- the proposed development is a 16-storey building, three of those stories being a podium; it will have ground floor commercial space; 150 dwelling units (of which 10% will be 3-bedroom units, including 2 walk-out units on the ground); bike parking at a 1:1 ratio; a total of 70 parking spaces to acknowledge the walkability of neighbourhood
- this process has been underway for three years and the property owner has been engaged in consultation, including participation in the Glebe Height and Character Study, meetings with staff, the ward Councillor, community association and the Urban Design Review Panel (informal)
- the site is in the General Urban area, which permits a range of housing choices and uses; it's on an arterial road, in which the General Urban area also permits high-rises; the Official Plan does not distinguish between isolated measures or not
- there are impacts on the community whether the development is a six-story or 20-story building; Chamberlain Ave is a very busy street; Chamberlain at some point was a double-sided street, and over time it was basically decimated by cars, buildings were removed, and we're at a current situation where we have a mix of parking lots and open spaces; it's fair to say that there will be an impact to Rosebery (a mix of low-rise buildings with some singles and some multi-unit dwelling) but they are immediately behind the site and there are no backyards as most are currently used for cars
- from a design perspective, a mid-rise building does not serve as well; there would be a substantial sky-plane impact, there would be a greater shadow impact, contrary to what other delegations have said, and it would create a strong overlook impression because in a mid-rise building, the tendency is to look down and not at the distance
- they looked at reallocating the mass of a mid-rise building, and keeping a low podium for protection; this way, the footprint of the building is quite small; in the



process of keeping that mid-rise mass in a high-rise, they are protecting the low-rise neighbours

- the articulation of the building will be minimized to the south in terms of impact
- all site parking, visitor parking, and access to the basement is contained on the site; it will be clear as you move along Chamberlain that you will have easy access to the site and can see where you come and go; the low podium is intended to repopulate Chamberlain in a way that's friendly to the public

**Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision:** Debate: The Committee spent two hours and 13 minutes in consideration of the item.

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

## **Ottawa City Council**

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between July 8 (Planning Committee consideration date) and July 21, 2021 (Council consideration date): 2

### **Primary concerns / opposition, by individual**

#### **Rina Cerrato**

- Rosebery residents and the community would like to see 30-48 Chamberlain be developed in a way that is strategic to the urban development of the City - just not to the size that is being proposed
- current zoning allows for 14m and the applicant has requested a change to allow 52 meters, quadruple the height allowance, and argues it should be allowed here when it is allowed for Minto on Isabella, but the impacts are very different
- the applicant's architect has gone as far as to say their backyards are "not pristine" and therefore, they do not deserve to have their privacy and the character of the neighbourhood protected, but the worthiness of their back yards is not for him to judge
- the OP states that in the absence of a secondary plan, a proposal must be assessed against approved design guidelines (Section 4.11 policy 10), considering the Bank Street in the Glebe Height and Character Study has been stalled, which would have been the secondary plan, the high-rise guidelines must be followed; in this case, the urban design guidelines for high-rise apply, and the OP policy directs that the City will assess the appropriateness of the proposal" based on these Guidelines; City planning staff recommend a 16 storey "narrow tower" for approval as the best way forward but it was stated in the meeting that

the City has no mid-rise guidelines, and therefore allowing a 16 storey building will enable the application of the high-rise guidelines to ensure minimal impact; however, the most applicable High-rise Guidelines are ignored

- the Guidelines require a 45 degree angular plane to ensure that there is an appropriate transition between a low-rise neighborhood and taller buildings; a 45° angular plane, in this location, would allow a mid-rise building, not the proposed high-rise
- the Guidelines also suggest a 3 m step-back from the base of a tower and minimum of 1.5 m; only a 0.5 m step-back is being proposed
- the City applied a 10 m side yard setback to allow for a possible tower in the future; the City appears to have “cherry picked” the policies that apply, with the effect of applying policies from the Guidelines to protect future replica towers on Chamberlain, but not applying the policies that require transition to existing homes; questioned if the Bank Street study does not apply because it is not current policy, why the planning staff are allowed to protect future replica towers and what the true reason is to allow four times the height
- the proposed development is in a GM4 zone, where general zoning provisions under Table 187 state a maximum height of 18m, however, table 188A takes special consideration of the adjacent zones to further state and single out properties between Lyon and Bank must have a limited height of 14m, no doubt due to the fact that it is adjacent to a residential zone
- questioned why constituents come second to developers and why the City would allow this design that goes against the Official Plan, against the future vision of the City (New Official Plan and Bank Street Height and Character Study) to move forward; the proposal is not appropriate for this site and, if approved, such a blatant disregard for policy cannot be undone and has serious, damaging consequences to the communities
- following the Planning Committee’s decision, Rosebery residents on the north end received solicitation from another developer to buy their properties to build adjacent to 48 Chamberlain; the Central Park, a heritage park, will be in the shadow of a high rise and likely more high rises to come; it will change the character of the park, a treasured greenspace in this central neighbourhood
- if this proposal is approved as is, then Rosebery residents are prepared to appeal it and take it to the Ontario Land Tribunal

### **Andrea Redway**

- echoed Rina Cerrato’s (her neighbour) concerns

- the application does not conform to the current Official Plan, the current zoning laws and policies or the vision that the City of Ottawa's Policy Department put forth in the draft Bank Street Height and Character Study
- there were concerns by some Members of the Planning Committee, as evidenced by three opposing votes, but the push and drive for intensification at all costs seems to win the day almost every time
- there should be a bigger, broader vision for our existing neighbourhoods and the City as a whole; there is a grand vision presented in the new draft Official Plan, but approving this application is again quite contrary to the values and goals expressed in the draft Official Plan about reserving the character of existing neighbourhoods, sky views, green spaces, etc.
- there is still so much untapped potential for high rise buildings north of the 417 so it is not clear why we are encroaching on existing, central, heritage neighbourhoods with these high rises, when they are much better placed and in keeping with the downtown core
- this is not neighbourhood appropriate intensification; heritage neighbourhoods, which are already vibrant, 15-minute neighbourhoods, with many amenities and services and well-integrated green space that is embraced by the local community, need to be protected in favour of a diverse, vibrant, eco-friendly city; planning decisions should set a standard to preserve and enhance existing neighbourhoods that make the city what it is today and the city that it wants to be in the future; planning decisions should allow intensification to co-exist with communities while minimizing impact; high rise buildings squeezed onto small lots with non-compliant setbacks only a few metres from residential properties and well-used neighbourhood parks, do not meet this standard

### **Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:**

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations without amendment.