

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment – 1335 and 1339 Bank 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 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): 8

Primary concerns, by individual

James Russell (oral submission)

- cautioned the committee against approving projects with short-term interests or benefits and suggested that long-term goals and impacts must first be considered when making decisions that will shape the city
 - pandemic times are chaotic, divisive and risky; people are uncertain and they want basic jobs done by people who care; good government is a job that really matters and is what leads us forward and keeps us together in these times, so doing it well counts; the Committee's job is to shape the city for the long-term interest of its people; not make short-term decisions for short-term interest; long-term plans for long term possibilities are being foreclosed here in favour of immediate decisions on short term interests

Garry Lindberg, Chair, Alta Vista Community Association Planning Committee (AVCA) (oral and written submission)

- recommended the decision on this matter be deferred until major changes have been made to the proposal, or resolved, in respect of the proposed height and massing, in keeping with the recommendations of the Urban Design Review Panel
 - the submission includes AVCA's earlier expressions of concern and the planning department responses but these responses have never been discussed with AVCA and they feel their concerns have not been fully addressed, which include height allowances, rights of way, the proposed lay by and how the proposal fits(or does to fit) with the current detailed design for Bank Street now underway

- the Urban Design Review Panel recommends major changes to the proposal, including to scale and density, but none of these seem to have been addressed and they are major enough that they shouldn't be dealt with at site plan
- they recognize that there must be intensification and greater heights, especially near Billings Bridge; they participated in the Bank Street Community Design Plan and these needs were thoroughly examined in that plan and the subsequently Secondary Plan, and, as a result of those considerations, a maximum 16-story height was deemed appropriate for node 1 (that includes the proposal) and AVCA accepted this; nothing has changed since then in terms of planning for the Billings Bridge area, yet this seeks to build 26 stories and it's not clear how they can square those concerns
- they have concerns about the Bank Street redesign process, which this proposal changes significantly; there have been no reasonable discussions about how wide the road has to be, how tall the podium should be, how close to the road it should be; etc.

Nijyar Shemdin (written submission)

- this 26-storey building would obstruct current views enjoyed by neighbourhood residents
- the two buildings already constructed on the property are eyesores but are much lower in height
- the proposal will add to congestion, traffic, and risks with unsafe pedestrian crossing
- the Rideau River fronts, corniches, and paths need protection from such projects

Richard Slowikowski, President, Old Ottawa South Community Association (written submission)

- OSCA appreciates that the proposal adds needed density and rental opportunities at a gateway location, but continues to have concerns regarding this particular development on this particular site, the proposal's compatibility with the Bank Street Secondary Plan and concerns regarding the combined impact that this development and the proposed development across the street will have on this portion of Bank Street at the Rideau River
- although high-rise buildings may be permitted subject to a Zoning By-law amendment and where a building is within 400 metres walking distance of a Rapid Transit Station, this site is subject to a Secondary Plan that identifies a maximum height of 50 metres (approximately 16-storeys), for this site, and the proposed 26-storey tower exceeds the Secondary Plan height by 10 storeys; the community is

concerned about the appropriateness of a 26-storey tower form on this narrow site and suggests that the height limit established by the Secondary Plan, which is less than 10 years old and will be brought forward into the new Official Plan, is more in keeping with the limitations of this particular site

- the combined impact of future developments contemplated for this area is a continuing concern; this proposal is for 391 units and across the street, two high-rise towers will provide an additional 537 dwelling units; the density created by 928 dwelling units, which include 65 hotel units, will have tremendous vehicular, cycling and pedestrian impacts, and the cumulative traffic effects of the proposed high-rise developments on either side of Bank Street will exacerbate problems at these historically accident-prone intersections
- the proposed public realm layby on Bank Street continues to be an area of particular concern; the layby has been reduced by one car, but the only option for vehicles leaving the layby is to continue north over Billings Bridge. Vehicles needing to travel south on Bank or east or west along Riverside must continue travelling north and then find a suitable place to turn around once they have crossed Billings Bridge and entered Old Ottawa South, where there are no proximal opportunities for effecting such a turn; a drop-off location at the rear of the property, away from the public realm, and as recommended in Section 3.15 of the City's Urban Design Guidelines for High-Rise Buildings, would allow for better traffic flows using the existing arterial loop system and likely reduce the potential for accidents

Michel Haddad (written submission)

- objects to the two applications on the grounds that they do not comply with the current Secondary Plan nor applicable zoning for the two properties, 1335 and 1339 Bank Street, and agrees with the recommendations of the Urban Review Design Panel (URDP) (as appended to his submission)
 - the corners of Bank St. and Riverside Dr. west and east comprise a very complex and challenging intersection with high volumes of traffic and the applicants have proposed a dense structure that is not only imposing and out of place, but will add to the traffic problems of this intersection
 - the applicants have submitted a proposal of a 26-story tower that exceeds the allowable height by approximately 76%; they have argued that the building proposed in this application is of similar density and a more attractive structure than their "as-of-right" ability to build other structures, but this does not justify the applicants rearranging structures within a site in order to exceed the zoning and Secondary Plan requirements

- the proposed building encroaches on the City's protected Right-of-Way (ROW) by 5 metres and 3.5 metres along the east length of Bank Street between Riverside Dr. west and Riverside Dr. east; the City's protected ROW is 37.5 metres of road allowance or 18.75 metres from centre line of Bank St., so this is a significant reduction in Ottawa's protected ROW and there is no justification nor benefit to the City for it; given the reconstruction and renovation of Bank St, it is necessary for the City to retain the full amount of its protected ROW; it should not give up its public infrastructure for the short-term benefit of private developments; keeping the protected ROW will enhance the pedestrian and cycling environment around a very difficult intersection, will enable a better alignment of the Bank St. cycle track with proposals to improve a cycle crossing across the Rideau River, will allow a more welcoming and attractive "Gateway" to the neighbourhood, allow street trees and benches, which are currently minimal in the development design, and more closely align the proposed development plan with that on the West side of Bank and Riverside
- the imposition of a lay-by along Bank St. for delivery vehicles will present a conflict and safety hazard for bicycles and pedestrians from delivery vehicles, given the proximity of this lay-by to the cycle track and sidewalk; from a safety perspective, this lay-by must be removed from the design
- the building will require a vehicular entrance from Riverside Dr. east and an exit to Riverside Dr. west, which are additional to the existing entrance and exit for 2197 Riverside Dr., adjacent to the east of the subject property; this will add a significant complexity to the Bank and Riverside intersections; the applicants should seek to combine the access and egress with the adjacent property in order to have only one entrance and exit
- the podium is very imposing as currently designed; the height of the tower should be reduced accordingly
- the "setbacks" proposed by the applicants are completely and utterly inappropriate for the proposed building; without sufficient space between the building and the street, the structure is monolithic and threatening rather than open and welcoming, the antithesis of the Gateway concept for the neighbourhood; while the applicants argue that their proposed setbacks are less than the current ones, those setbacks are many decades old and may have been appropriate for very low density single uses, but are completely inadequate for a 26-story tower with an eight-story podium covering the whole block; the contrast between the former property and the proposed structure is startlingly enormous

- the applicants should seek partnership with adjacent property owners to the east at 2197 Riverside Dr. in order to propose a more appropriate development that would integrate all the land within the parcel in a more cohesive and suitable development proposal

Larry Orton & Barbara Jensen (written submission)

- they prepared a submission to the City in October 2020 (appended to their comments for this Planning Committee meeting) in response to the proposal to construct a 26-story tower at 1335-1339 Bank St.; although individual comments were submitted to the City, the consolidation was not submitted, in part because the proposal needed to be considered along with another proposal that was expected for the opposite (west) side of Bank St.; that second proposal has now been posted at the development site and it is for even taller towers, one for a 34-story apartment tower and another for a 31-story mixed-use tower and it raises the same concerns that individuals in the community raised about the first proposal; taken together, the intense development represented by the three towers surely make it necessary for the City to insist that the developers back off and to make other concessions, and up its own game to deal with the health and safety issues that will result
- not one of the three proposed towers respect the development plan for the Bank Street Secondary Plan that was developed less than ten years ago and that is now part of Ottawa's Official Plan; questioned how people can plan their lives and the substantial investment that comes with purchasing a home if official plans are not being respected
- there has been no allowance for the inevitable increase in traffic and pressure on the natural environment or for any playgrounds for children; the intersection of Bank and Riverside is already dangerous and has seen an unusual number of accidents, an uncountable number of close calls, and even death; Bank Street is already choked with traffic and Riverside has become a speedway with no attempts being made to calm the traffic; the intense development being proposed will only increase these concerns with health and safety and the plans available to the public make clear that instead of proposing solutions the developers are proposing to add to the health and safety concerns; the City has not made public any plans, either by requiring the developers to modify their plans or by countering with their own proposals, whether for playgrounds, a tram running up Bank Street, changes to Riverside traffic flow, or arranging for adjacent property to be used to improve access and egress to the proposed development; all of these concerns have been stated repeatedly and are well known and they will only increase, both from the population growth that will result from these developments and our society's increasing use of services such as Amazon and Uber Eats

- they do not see what benefit or positive impacts these developments provide to the neighbourhood, residents of Alta vista and old Ottawa south, and to the city generally; there is no necessary subsidized housing for families in these structures nor give back to the communities
- attached (2020) comments from the Billings Estate Community indicated concerns about: inappropriate height and density; failure to respect existing policy/plans; failure to provide affordable housing; traffic and safety; parking; failure to consider other approved/pending development in the area; greenspace and environmental impacts

Chris Harback (written submission)

- questioned why the towers are exempted from normal height restrictions, particularly when there is no stated concession/benefits to the community and no stated commitment to include affordable housing units
- concerned about the reality of parking for residents and visitors and fear this will entail spillover into nearby areas like Pleasant Park, Neil Way, Chalmers Road
- this corner is already terrible for traffic, cyclists and pedestrians and feared this will only exacerbate matters

Jessica Fullerton (written submission)

- while the Bank-Riverside development is not directly within her neighbourhood, she felt a growing need to speak up given what appears to be the unregulated development that has occurred in and around their neighbourhoods
- the Glebe (her neighbourhood) is a vibrant, walk-able, human-scaled, green neighbourhood that has seen countless development projects; she fully supports and is thankful for the hard work of those that developed the Bank Street Secondary Plan and Height and Character Study and also fully agrees with Carolyn Mackenzie's (oral) comments (previously raised at this Planning Committee meeting) on the Chamberlain project and is shocked by the stance of the developer there
- if we truly want a City of Neighbourhoods then we need to plan main streets and buildings that make people want to spend time there, supporting small businesses and allowing for community engagement; the high-rise buildings planned for Bank and Riverside do not fit the bill, particularly the proposed locations, density and traffic concerns associated with them; she also is of the understanding these buildings will not provide affordable housing
- it seems developers are driving the plan for our communities and not in a positive way so it is questionable why we bother with City by-laws at all; in her neighbourhood, they have had to endure noise pollution, idling construction trucks,

blocked streets, traffic impediments, dangerous conditions for cyclists and pedestrians - particularly children while walking to school, garbage, foul language, smoking; if this was all for a value-add to the community then the annoyances are well worth it, but another building that defies main street by-laws or ignores Secondary Plans is a tough pill to swallow

- these types of streets need to be preserved and expanded to other areas, such as Bank and Riverside, to make these attractive places to live and work; the plan for development at Bank and Riverside seems to be an example of prioritizing developers' interest over city residents, and reflect the wants and needs of private developers and their political affiliations, not the community

Primary reasons for support, by individual

The applicant, as represented by Kevin McMahon, Park River Properties, and Christine McQuaig, Q9 Planning & Design, as well as Barry Hobin and Doug van den Ham, Hobin Architecture, responding to questions (oral submission and slides)

- presented an overview of the requested Zoning and OP amendments and details on the proposal, its vision and objectives, and the community benefits it would provide
 - the attraction to the site was transit, walkable amenities, and the long-term vision for the community
 - the concept is to create a gateway building that can be a catalyst for change in the community
 - the proposal is 5% below the density approved in Secondary Plan; it was presented many times to the community, Councillors and staff and the only response received is that the density is permitted
 - their focus on the property is to create something that leverages quality architecture to create a strong ROW and pedestrian presence, to meet and improve the functional design that is in the Bank Street renewal project and focus on creating an active Bank Street by having mixed uses all along that corridor that's engaging with pedestrians
 - the project has 326 residential units ranging from studio to 3-bedroom, 65 short term boutique hotel units, a ground floor café, gym and a coworking space
 - they are seeking to increase height from 16 to 26 stories, regulate step backs and built form through the zoning schedule, and identify where that height is being requested on the site and seeking a reduction in the required parking for the residential units from 0.5 to 0.3 units
 - access to the site is done through rear corridor, a major reason for acquiring the

adjacent property to handle garbage and more technical challenges that exist

- the road widenings being proposed on Bank and Riverside account for 11% of the total land area provided to the city for streetscape and infrastructure improvements
- the proposed site plan currently, along with the streetscape being proposed, has the ground floor facing Bank Street, which will have active frontage; this redevelopment will help improve the public realm by removing all the Bank Street accesses that are currently there and incorporating a small lay-by, widening the sidewalks over what's currently there, incorporating the cycle track proposed, providing a bus shelter, a total of 9 street trees and bike lockups along this stretch, plus planters, small parkettes, and a patio at north that would be provided with the café use; the design aims to improve the functional requirements of a multi-mobile lifestyle and to provide quality urban design
- the podium will be broken into three distinct design palettes with the proposed high-rise positioned towards the north
- this project offers a range of rental options and an improved and desirable main street experience
- what's being proposed is less density than what's currently permitted; by proposing one taller high-rise building instead of two, there's less shadowing, an improved micro-climate pedestrian experience, along with more efficient building design; it also allows for a more dynamic relationship with built form with the proposed development across the street; the high-rise forms are staggered, which will open up the node while still allowing for density needed to support a rapid transit station; the proposal does require a lay-by for way-winding purposes, facilitating less reliance on owning a vehicle and is a key component to the proposed design
- they will continue to work hard on the lay-by and continue to refine it through the site plan process


Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent one hour and seven minutes in consideration of the item.

Vote: The committee considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as presented with a technical amendment to replace the Zoning Schedule (Document 4), as follows:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Document 4 – Zoning Schedule be replaced with the following revised Document 4 – Zoning Schedule (Revised); and

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

Document 4 – Zoning Schedule (Revised)



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): 0

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

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