

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment – 19 CentrepoinTE Drive

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: 6

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): 25

Primary concerns, by individual

James Kuang (oral submission)

- it is a 3-5 minute wait at this intersection now to get on Centerpointe Drive; it is already a dense area and two 20-floor highrises will make it worse
- this building isn't blending into the lowrise area
- we have a very narrow-minded small city mentality
- traffic was not considered

Brian Grant, CentrepoinTE Community Association (oral and written submission)

- raised concerns about height, density, parking, traffic and community impacts
 - the application for towers of 22 or 24 storeys is double what was asked for 10 years ago and is so high that people standing on the sidewalk beside it won't be able to see the top, just the podium and then the building will grow into the sky; the neighbours across the street will need to live with this view for the next 50 years. Your own urban design guidelines for high rise buildings
 - the Urban Design Guidelines for High-rise Buildings abutting a residential neighbourhood call for a height transition of 45 degrees, but in this case that angle appears to be at 60 degrees, and while the Planning department argues that both buildings generally align with the Guidelines, there is no guideline that says if you don't like 45 degrees do something else
 - any tall building in the area is less than half the height of these towers and they

will stand out as wrong for the neighbourhood

- the developer requests a zoning amendment to allow for higher density, as measured by the floor space index; many years ago, this property had a floor space index of 0.4., then Planning Committee approved an increase to 3.0, a 650% increase and now the developer is asking for a floor space index of 4.8; in 10 years it has gone from about 100 units, to 346 units and now, 575 units, with no changes in infrastructure planned to accommodate the increased density
- a bit further east, away from the residential townhouses, the zoning will allow greater density to meet intensification targets without being adjacent to the residential neighbourhood, but the developer is simply using intensification to justify more units on his property
- parking is a perennial issue in the neighbourhood; these buildings have around 0.7 parking spaces per unit, more than the 0.5 required by the City by-laws, but neighbouring developments, with the same access to transit, that were built when the standard was 1.2 parking spots per unit are experiencing over-demand for their available parking, so their tenants park on the street; the same will likely happen for these new tenants and on-street parking will be a free benefit for the developer so he does not have to build more parking
- there will be increased traffic as a result of 413 or more cars being brought into this area but no major changes to the street design are planned because the worst case predicted in the Transportation Impact Assessment is for an increase of 60 trips in the morning and 60 trips in the afternoon rush hours, and that can be easily accommodated, based on an assumption that 65% of the trips out of the building would be by residents walking to public transit; that estimate seems unusually high given that only 20% to 30% of commuters in Ottawa use public transit
- there are community impacts such as loss of open space, lost vistas to the neighbours, a massive block of a building along the sidewalk; no effort was made by the developer to include components that would give something back to the community, there are no shared services, no restaurants, retail or other commercial space that would contribute to developing the 15-minute city
- the site plan must address the climate emergency and the housing emergency identified by Council; there must be actions to mitigate traffic problems during construction and there cannot be exceptions to the noise bylaw to allow evening and night-time construction

Margaret McLaren (oral submission; slides on file)

- supportive of the CentrepoinTE Community Association (CA)'s comments
- the increased number of units and population (from the original proposal in 2011-12) will only add to existing traffic and parking issues in the area, particularly on CentrepoinTE Drive, in conjunction with added traffic from neighbouring developments, with likely fewer using public transit than indicated; the proposed cash-in-lieu funding will do little to solve this problem
- raised concerns about inappropriate height and density and asked that approval of the application be paused pending a review of long-term development for the CentrepoinTE precinct
 - application does not meet city's own height or height transition guidelines for high-rise development
 - ❖ 575 apartment units: 364 units proposed in 2011 (approx. 60% increase)
 - ❖ projected population of 1153 residents -compared to 623 in 2011 on same physical footprint (85% increase in density)
 - ❖ the City's own 2031 vision for this area based on site servicing was two 9 storey towers housing 189 units with a projected population of 378 residents
 - ❖ requesting zoning amendment to increase 3 x 15 storey towers approved in 2012 to 22/24 with 5 level podium
 - Planning department preamble indicates podium level is designed with three-storey ground-oriented townhouse units (as was the previously approved application). This is not accurate – ground floor podium level units are just single floor units “clustered in a manner that is similar”
 - They are 3 distinct vertical apartment units with only ground floor units having street access with the units above (2nd floor & 3rd floor accessed from interior of the building)
 - ❖ the zoning amendment to increase floor space index from 3.0 to 4.8 (as the 2012 zoning amendment allowed an increase from 0.4 to 3.0 (7.5x permitted density.) represents an additional 140,000 sq. ft. (60% increase) over zoning received & not acted upon in 2012
 - ❖ Recommendation to committee indicates: “Overall, both buildings generally align with the 45-degree angular plane guideline”, however subsequent correspondence received indicates that “the proposed development for 19 CentrepoinTE does not meet a 45 degree angular plane measurement from

the sidewalk/pedestrian height across Centrepointe”

- The height transition fails to meet the appropriate 45 degree angular plane which if applied as per the guidelines would intersect the buildings at between 12 & 14 storeys
- Instead the angular plane has been drawn from permitted building heights across the street to illustrate building height transition, and that staff were and are aware of how the applicant chose to apply the 45 degree angular plane line in their renderings
- ❖ Staff conclusion that the proposed building height and setback is compatible with the adjacent community is a significant departure from previous rationale
- ❖ Cash in lieu of respecting the zoning is currently in place: “In light of the fact that they are requesting rezoning on floor density by more than 25% of what is allowed” (actually 60%) they will contribute: \$450K for nearby traffic calming improvements. (Note: contradiction in terms as planning department notes very minimal impact on traffic - therefore why cash for traffic calming measures?) \$70K for nearby park improvements; this must be tracked to ensure this is spent for that purpose and not just added to city reserves
- 413 parking spaces for residents with 60 spaces for visitors -approximately same number as 2011 with close to double the population
 - ❖ Recent zoning change due to proximity to transit indicates this is considered more than required
 - ❖ Not adequate as immediate neighbourhood has significant parking demand issues
 - ❖ Need to consider parking requirement impacts combined with recent approval of development at Baseline/Gemini (271 units /125 spaces)
 - ❖ Nearby basement apartments were deemed not needing parking but each of those tenants turned out to have a vehicle and yards were paved to accommodate the tenants.
- Developer originally proposed vehicular traffic to/from the Gemini Way would be from Constellation Cr (which has capacity) with no access from Centrepointe Dr mitigating potential traffic impact, headlight glare, loss of privacy etc. on adjacent residential; this former approach/recommendation has been dropped

- ❖ Planning department indicates no need to restrict left turn access onto Centrepointe Dr as traffic study indicates little impact
- ❖ The access restriction was a reasonable solution even at half the density & only required small modification removing the median at Constellation & Gemini (this also would serve to mitigate the traffic from the Baseline/Gemini way development)
- ❖ despite installation of cross-walk lights at Centrepointe & Hemmingwood, the intersection is still an issue for both pedestrians & traffic flow
- ❖ Transportation study indicates impact as 58 AM rush-hour round trips / 61 PM rush-hour round trips (approximately 5% of the residents). However original traffic impact study (with half the population density) projected 100 – 125 round trips respectively
- ❖ Indicates majority of new trips would be completed by public transit; questioned if there are supporting statistics on current & projected public transit usage for a population density of over 1000+ residents in a similar suburban area; the assumption would require remainder of residents to be home-based, work within walking distance, work along transit line stop feasible for transport to/from, or unemployed
- ❖ Recommended that the City conduct a more detailed examination of the transportation study before approving
- Staff concludes that the proposed increase in density is appropriate and represents good planning.
 - Recognized the need for intensification in areas in close proximity to LRT Stations as per the city's own guidelines and should be focused on the area in the immediate vicinity along Woodroffe between and Baseline and Tallwood with Constellation as the western boundary where it mitigates the impact to low-rise neighbourhoods.
 - the lack of parking, transportation and overall neighbourhood & community impact along with an increase of over 60% density, 7.5x over what was previously approved & overall 12x the density from the original zoning does not represent good planning

Bruce Barkhouse (oral submission; slides on file)

- spoke to the importance of looking at the long-term picture and goals when considering development applications, specifically whether a development increases housing while transitioning appropriately to denser neighbourhoods; raised concerns

about the increased traffic and parking impacts of this proposal and their potential short and long-term ramifications for the neighbourhood, and suggested the proposal be rejected or deferred for further discussion on measures to mitigate likely major issues (e.g. transit pass initiative for residents; developer/City contingency fund for future parking and traffic issues)

- Planning dept is constrained to respond to specific proposals and not holistically over the longer term. This makes it important for the Committee to step back and do a sanity check to see whether we will achieve our mutual goals of increasing housing while smoothly transitioning to denser neighbourhoods
- Intensification enables meeting emissions targets
- Traffic: Expecting only 5% of residents to commute using vehicles is likely off by a factor of 5-10 as evidenced by the city's own large Constellation Drive parking lot which is even closer to the transitway; Data received today from the city supports the assumption that 65% transit usage is aggressive
- Parking: The city will likely need to institute street parking permits when it is found that parking is significantly insufficient evidenced by year-round on-street parking on and widening of driveways on nearby streets (Hemmingwood and Thornbury); A fundamental Engineering principle is that estimates should be buffered. There is no evidence of buffers in the proposal for traffic or parking
- Impact on CentrepoinTE neighbourhood
 - ❖ Short term impact: There will be a significant change to the character of the neighbourhood as evidenced by the waiver of the 45 degree guideline which would likely cutoff in the 12-15 storey range
 - ❖ Long term impact: While 10+ years out is even more of a guessing game, there will likely be much larger towers closer to Woodroffe and Baseline as shown in conceptual documents for the proposal - a key point for consideration by the committee because it was outside the scope of assessing the specific proposal; when coupled with the current proposal this will further pressure parking and traffic and over-saturate the green space.
- the proposal should be rejected; in the long term, the current approved density for 19 CentrepoinTE combined with the larger towers at a later date will meet our long term objectives; the Property could be used as a contribution for a future development, e.g. closer to Baseline/ Woodroffe; it would make an excellent green space / water park) for the future larger towers
 - ❖ It should be deferred for further discussion on measures to mitigate likely

major issues; for example:

- Extend transit pass initiative to nudge residents to a public transit first approach: Given transitway adjacency is a key factor and the developer's savings millions of dollars by not having to excavate deeper for more parking: developer and city extend reduced rate transit passes until the LRT is available at Baseline station (for example: year 1 free, years 2+ 50%).
- Developer sharing the risk with the city and community by maintaining a contingency fund for future parking and traffic issues: Given uncertainty based on planning assumptions, establish a fund to pay for parking passes at medical and Woodline buildings (Gemini, Constellation), and traffic re-engineering to extend Navaho Dr across Woodroffe (currently buses-only) and remove the median at Constellation and Gemini, traffic lights at one or more of the 3 T-intersections between Baseline and Constellation

Dalibor Breznan (oral and written submission)

- the scale of this proposal, which will add 1200+ people to the neighbourhood, is not appropriate for the area and will have considerable impacts on this residential area; the report has made incorrect transit assumptions and does not consider the true traffic impacts; there is no mention of whether the building design would adhere to bird-safe guidelines
 - there is a proper location for certain types of builds, and a residential neighborhood comprised of mostly homes and low-rise and mid-rise buildings is not the right location for high-rise towers
 - Scale of proposal. It's all about perspective; if the proper perspective is not communicated to people, then they will not have a full understanding of what's being proposed; 575 apartment units equals about 1200 people joining the neighbourhood - an increase of just under 20 percent in one neighbourhood; they are being assured there will only be minor or negligible impacts, but this is hard to believe because a twenty percent increase cannot only have minor impacts
 - Richcraft Homes is proposing the addition of 575 apartment units to the Centrepointe drive neighbourhood. A conservative assumption of avg. 2 people per unit represents an approx. range of 16 – 24% increase in the number of residents added to the neighbourhood; negligible financial tokens will have minimal (if any) impact on addressing the drastic increase proposed to the size of the neighbourhood

- Richcraft Homes should respond with a properly done reassessment of the true impacts on the neighbourhood, including its existing amenities, services and infrastructure, while more transparently communicating and propose a project that will be compatible with the neighbourhood
- The proposed site is located in proximity to the CentrepoinTE park, which is used by the neighbourhood residents for recreation and also serves as a wildlife refuge for many species of animals, including birds. Every year, a number of rare and unique bird species are spotted by avid birders in the park. The death of birds due to collisions with windows (especially on high-rise buildings) is a world-scale documented phenomenon.
- The City has tabled a “Bird-safe Design Guideline” to provide a guide for applying the principles in building designs to mitigate the impacts. The latest iteration of the proposal has yet to address this serious issue, while being aware of their proximity to the park.
- the applicant should present a sound and realistic plan that will effectively mitigate the risks to the wildlife that their proposal will introduce
- the applicant seems unaware of the true impact and the extent of measures that include major site and building design considerations that need to be undertaken to mitigate the risks presented by the proposed nature of the design.
- the applicant has responded to a concern about potential increase in crime due to the nature of the proposed development by stating that “There is no indication that rental properties result in increase in crime.” This does not address well-documented data indicating that increased crime is a potential consequence of living in high-rise buildings. The applicant can refer to the following manuscript as an example: Robert Gifford. *The Consequences of Living in High-Rise Buildings* (2007) *Architectural Science Review*
- In addition to the increase in crime, other documented factors that appear to be associated with high-rise buildings include that they “are not optimal for children, that social relations are more impersonal and helping behavior is less than in other housing forms, that crime and fear of crime are greater, and that they may independently account for some suicides”. These observations do not appear to be suggestive of sound design or be conducive of goals and outcomes of the City of Ottawa for neighbourhood planning. The applicant is invited to conduct a proper meta-analysis of peer-reviewed literature before providing a response.
- The applicant has repeatedly proposed a high-rise-based and high-density-based development that far exceeds any building features in the neighbourhood (comprised of single-homes, townhomes, low-rise buildings, mid-rise medical

tower); this has repeatedly been objected to by the neighbourhood residents over the years, in each iteration of the proposal, based on legitimate concerns, including traffic concerns, roadway congestion, parking spillover to the street, increased burden on existing amenities, services and infrastructure; the applicant and City Council do not appear to take these concerns seriously

- the transportation study is not realistic.
 - ❖ pre-pandemic, avg. of 74.5% of Ottawa residents that had a job were commuting by vehicles. In June 2020, the number of commutes were comparable at 67.5%, indicating the reliance of Canadians on vehicles as a major form of transportation
 - ❖ it is highly improbable that with 575 units in the building, only 30 – 60 two-way vehicle trips would be expected for the site. It will be in the hundreds, based on the available parking spots at the proposed site, and statistics on vehicle use patterns of Canadians
 - ❖ the Transportation Impact Assessment prepared by CGH Transportation needs to be independently re-evaluated by a third party for accuracy and assumptions that form the basis of the projections in the CGH Transportation study
- the applicant's proposal is perceived as in line with the City's efforts of densification near transportation hubs. As such, majority of the assumptions heavily rely on growth projections of LRT use based on pre-pandemic studies.
 - ❖ current evidence indicates that using these studies will no longer provide accurate estimates of LRT growth. As suggested by academics such as Prof. Patrick Condon, public transit will not see enough growth to make up for the pandemic-related deficits, with projections that transit numbers may require over a decade to regain ridership. Therefore, plans based on previous growth projections will no longer be reliable.
 - ❖ OC Transpo has recently reduced service on bus routes and cut the workforce by 70 full-time employees.
 - ❖ 90% of people who have been pre-pandemic public transit users indicated that fear of using public transit was one of their concerns about commuting to work.
 - ❖ the applicant's over-reliance on the pre-pandemic LRT growth use projections will not present a reliable indication of transportation pattern estimates for the proposed site. The projections should be re-evaluated and re-adjusted

- With a approx. 20 % population increase due to the proposed addition of 575 units and the lack of consideration of the impacts of the pandemic on transit projections, a major, unsustainable impact may be expected on the nearby amenities and services, available in the neighbourhood.
 - ❖ These include one medical centre, a string of health service providers, one grocery store, a single park, large impacts on road use, road density, local pollution and parking availability.
 - ❖ Since the City budget in 2021 projects a approx. \$153 million deficit due to the pandemic effects, it will be unlikely that the City will be able to make the required financial investments to address the increased unsustainable pressures from the increased density in the Centrepointe neighbourhood due to this development proposal.
 - ❖ Cash-in-lieu of parkland and development charges paid by the applicant will not come close to cover the significant financial burdens that will directly result from the scale of the proposed site.
 - ❖ the applicant should consider re-scaling the proposal to a size that would be more in-line with the nature of the residential community of Centrepointe. Nineteen Centrepointe Drive is not the right location for the proposed plan, at the proposed scale.
- The applicant proposes to provide “approximately 300 bicycle parking spaces above and beyond the minimum zoning requirement”. It is commendable, but at the same time, the applicant has stated in their previous proposal that “An excess of bicycle parking is provided to offset some of the reduced private vehicle parking.”; the use of bikes for recreation and transportation is at most viewed as seasonally limited activity in Canada. It is unreasonable to present assumptions that bicycle parking will somehow compensate for reduced vehicle parking.
- Overall, the changes presented by Richcraft Homes in their latest iteration of their controversial application, including the following:
 - a reduction from three to two towers;
 - Modifying the tower design to create a slender profile;
 - Stepping back of Tower B at the 20 and 24th storey to improve the massing relationship based on a 45-degree angular plane analysis,
 - represent modifications that fail to address the repeated, legitimate concerns of the neighbourhood residents about the scale of the proposal, its impact on the neighbourhood services, amenities, infrastructure,

population size and its design incompatibility of the 20+ storey high-rises with the character and features of this established Nepean neighbourhood.

- the application is built on studies and projections based on outdated (pre-pandemic) assumptions that can no longer be relied upon. The latest proposal can be summed up by a reduction of 1.7% in the scale of the project (575 units versus 585 units), while addressing none of the key concerns of the residents.

Ron Benn, President, Centrepointe Community Association (written submission)

- agreed with Dalibor Breznan's written comments regarding lack of suitability of Richcraft's proposal and the City's Planning Department's flagrant disregard for their own planning guidelines and an objective assessment of the unrealistic assumptions used by Richcraft and their consultants; suggested the inability or lack of willingness to distinguish between facts that are known from that they wish to be true is an indicator of a failure in the art intelligence and that the residents of Ottawa deserve better

Chris Buchanan (written submission)

- no issue with the proposal but has safety concerns with respect to the indication (in the report) that there is no plan to prohibit westbound left turning movement from Gemini Way to Centrepointe Drive; based on his own use of that intersection he indicated it is extremely dangerous now to make the sharp left turn because it is impossible to see oncoming traffic, made worse by drivers that exceed the posted 40kph speed limit as they approach Baseline; in addition, this part of Centrepointe Drive is very busy, especially at rush-hour, and cars traveling between Woodroffe South and Baseline West take a short-cut on Tallwood and Centrepointe, often speeding as they do so

Amanda Wu (written submission)

- proposal has several negative impacts to the neighbourhood and community
 - the amendment will reduce the number of required residential parking spaces from 720 to 420 and the number of visitor parking spaces from 120 to 60, which will result in the residents of the new buildings being forced to use street parking; street parking on Centrepointe drive and Hemmingwood Way is already very limited and if new residents start using street parking of smaller streets such as Westpointe Cres, Thornbury Cre and Northgate St., it will pose serious safety risks to these streets, especially the safety of pedestrians and children walking to school, library, parks and walking dogs; it blocks views and makes it hard to move in and out of driveways, causing potential accidents; also, increased traffic

in residential street has proven to increase crime

- increasing building density and units will add traffic in the already busy streets like Centerpointe Dr. and Hemmingwood Way, which are already busy and can be dangerous; residents' safety should be given the highest priority
- the 24 storey height doesn't fit in well with Centrepointe, which is a unique and beautiful residential area with balanced free space and amenities; the population has become quite dense in recent years with the addition of terrace homes and Centrepointe Park is already very busy, especially during the pandemic; increasing the height of the building will add more density, blocks the view of many residents, invades the privacy of nearby residents and potentially blocks sunlight
- many residents walk dogs and many wild small animals cohabitate in this neighbourhood and increased street parking and traffic pose a serious danger to pets and wild life; it was estimated that high rise buildings kill about a quarter of a million birds per year in the Ottawa area

Anna Wang (written submission)

- inadequate notice given Covid19
- considering the area already has limited green space, two high-rise buildings will bring traffic and parking issues to the neighborhood

Neil Cruickshank (written submission)

- understands the developer's reasons for requesting increased building height, which are: 1. to recoup the upfront costs of their investment quicker (larger building = more rental income = faster profit); 2. to help alleviate the shortage of housing in the city; 3. To meet the City's goals on densification, which makes delivery of services cheaper and more efficient, per capita, and is, overall, more environmentally friendly by reducing the loss of greenspace
- has the following concerns about the above reasons:
 - 1. Profit: Developers should be incentivized to take risks but given the evident impact of environmental degradation globally, nationally and within the NCR, the city should use development rules to incentivize the use of sustainable and green building practices, both for construction and operation; developers who dislike this will argue that it will de-incentivize them to build, but that's an empty threat - the potential profit for any developer who takes advantage of innovation and green technology is too tempting; this current project has almost no allowance for sustainability, other than the tree conservation report, which is

minimal

- 2. Housing shortage: The current shortage of housing in Ottawa is a scandal, but the City should avoid building higher and higher as a means to provide capacity; the negative social/psychological impacts of high-rise living on human health are well-documented; we need to densify, but the long-term impacts of creating high-rise builds on the city will be negative; the City should adopt a more consistent, comprehensive and disciplined approach to setting maximum height limits - there's a strong argument to be made for no higher than 12 stories
- 3. Master Plan Densification: It's difficult to have a master plan to guide development when the City yields so much of the decision-making to developers; for the Master Plan to be truly effective, and to obtain support and approval from residents, these concerns regarding both environmental sustainability and psychologically healthy living places need to be placed upfront; developers may complain at first, but popular opinion is strongly against them, and developers who choose to leave the market will be replaced by new ones more willing to adapt their proposals and methods to work within City guidelines

Dave Audette (written submission)

- the whole development proposal is excessive in every way; it is over-intensification and should not be allowed for the following reasons:
 - too many units in too small of an area 575 apartments or roughly 1,150 people on a 0.75 Hectare (less than 2 acres)
 - the maximum floor space index should not be increased to 4.8 but remain at the existing 3.0; increasing it would allow too many units and too tall of a building for a small lot that is across the road from existing single family dwellings
 - allowing the MSI to increase will create a rental ghetto and would be very detrimental to the Centrepoinette community
 - inadequate transition from single family homes to high rise towers (this development is 20 metres from single family homes)
 - excessive increase in the number of storeys allowed (24), more than double the number of storeys of any building in the area
 - inadequate setback from the street
 - it will add another 500 cars plus visitors' cars on a section of street with poor sightlines

Xiaoming Lai (written submission)

- the increased height from 15 storeys to 24 would have several negative impacts on the neighbourhood and community
 - it does not fit in the rest of Centerpointe landscapes - there is no transition from two-storey houses to a 24-storey building; it changes abruptly to let several neighboring streets live under this building's shadow
 - there is no corresponding planning to coordinate the increasing living density in the aspects of: traffic, parking, service, etc.
 - the planning for this site has been discussed and approved several times but the builder did not take the action to build the buildings based on the approved proposals

Patti Hutton (written submission)

- does not support the proposed rezoning for a maximum floor space index of 4.8; just several years ago (2013), that zoning was already increased from 2.5 to 3
- does not support a rezoning to a 22 and 24 storey accommodating 575 apartments (an increase of over 211 apartments from the original plan) that will cast a shadow literally and figuratively over the highly desirable Centrepointe community; privacy to existing homes and backyards from an elevated viewpoint is significantly troublesome; it is not consistent with the community aesthetics; the artistic rendering does not illustrate a 24 floor tower and thus misrepresents the difference between 15 stories and a towering 24.
- traffic and parking issues remain a large concern
- the community benefits proposed aren't nearly sufficient to address the proposed increased congestion from a traffic and infrastructure perspective, not just at the corner of Centerpointe and Gemini but all along Centrepointe Drive, Tallwood, Woodroffe/Baseline, existing parking on Gemini for the medical building etc.; not only have all nearby amenities not been included, but also other infrastructure like the QCH and schools are examples; the proposed contributions are insulting
- the summary of the November 9th meeting incorporated in this invitation is not an accurate representation of the concern surrounding this development; notification of that initial meeting was not met according to guidelines; there are also some inaccuracies that reflect the tone of the meeting as accepting; Centrepointe is comprised of professionals and the lack of demonstrative attacks does not mean they are in agreement
- does not support any more rental accommodations in the area; the area in and

surrounding Centrepointe has a significant number of transient homes already (e.g. Algonquin students, a high number of investor properties in Paseo and the Parkway park rentals); time and again it is proven that rental communities show less respect for its neighbours and environment; the document provided June 29th reflects an inaccurate response made by the city in response to a concern re rentals and crime rates, as the City did not state this at the meeting, yet the City documented in attachment 5 that there is no relationship between crime and rentals; they, Stats Canada and criminology studies from all over the world, disagree, not to mention Ottawa Police had to implement a program to address just that; it is also understood that yet another rental community is being planned at the other end of Gemini Constellation, further increasing a less respectful neighbourhood

- requested existing densification be incorporated into the plan; there is a significant amount of densification that had already taken place once Baseline Station evolved into a major hub; multi dwelling homes of condos, apartments, townhomes and semis are abundant within walking distance to Baseline Station, and these can't be excluded from the plans
- before proceeding any further with this application, they requested to see the overall development plan for the area including an entire overview of the larger plan/vision for the Baseline/Woodroffe area within 2 kms of the LRT station including both residential and business development plans; further requested that, now that covid concerns are receding, this overall plan be presented in a live setting so questions, visuals, ideas and recordings can be heard and shared by all
- requested a delay until late fall at earliest when proper public consultation can take place; right before the July 1st long weekend, at a time when the ward's City Council representation is not 100% healthy and, a time when the city is finally just emerging from an isolating worldwide pandemic and can gather with family, is not an appropriate time

Silver Hau (written submission)

- increasing building density and units will add traffic in already busy streets like Centerpointe Drive and Hemmingwood Way; Centerpointe is already very close to this safety threshold; the City should put the safety of the residents to the highest priority when considering the new proposal
- the amendment does not comply with several City of Ottawa by-laws, specifically the limits on floor space index, maximum building height, and number of required parking spaces; these by-laws outline safe and acceptable uses of land, as envisioned by the city and the community, and this proposal should not be allowed to circumvent these

- CentrepoinTE has a beautiful park in the middle of the neighborhood, treasured by all residents of the area and paid for through their high property value and high property tax, and it would be unfair to all current residents of CentrepoinTE for Richcraft to propose a major development project and to bring in significantly more residents to the community without adding usable green space; questioned how much Richcraft proposed to pay as cash in lieu of providing additional green space, based on what parameters and how the City of Ottawa plans to use this fund to create additional green space that would benefit CentrepoinTE residents
- this neighborhood should be protected from over-development and losing its many positive features

David Walker (written submission)

- the increased building heights will increase the population density in the area, given the fact that majority of the units will be rental dwellings; this will have potential impact this will have on the safety of the nearby neighbourhood
 - the increase in population in such a small area will increase the number of gasoline-powered vehicles, so it is a strong possibility the air quality of the nearby neighbourhood will be impacted
 - the increased building heights will disturb existing skylines and will affect nearby residents' privacy; the chance/damage of fallen objects/debris increase with building height, and risk of fire/building collapse are remote but possible risks to its residents and others in nearby communities
 - too many people in too little space will degrade living quality for the building residents and others living nearby; we need to maintain a proper balance between population and space

Larisa Romanovsky (written submission)

- the intersection of Paseo Private and CenterpoinTE Dr. is problematic now, with no traffic light, and even without new development at CenterpoinTE Dr. it takes up to 5-7 min to turn to CenterpoinTE Dr. from Paseo Private at peak-hours; building two high-rise buildings at 19 CenterpoinTE Dr. will create even more traffic there, especially at peak-hours, and the increased number of vehicles will negatively impact the environment (exhaust) and add to vehicle noise

Robert Fielding (written submission)

- this neighbourhood was not zoned for buildings of 22 and 24 storeys; the increase in both traffic and the lack of parking factored into this proposal will adversely impact all who have purchased houses and have paid property taxes since 1994, and who

purchased with the understanding that buildings of this height were not a part of their zoning

- the parking itself will spill over to side streets due to increased height without corresponding increase to the match the by-laws for minimum parking standards
- losing the sun, green space, and increased in traffic will most likely make it almost impossible just to get onto Centrepointe drive, to go to work, or even get groceries

Ayman El-Sawah (written submission)

- objects to the builder's proposal to increase the number of floors, having had a negative experience with past buildings on Centrepointe, where a lot of cars now park on the street; doubted the builder will increase the parking space accordingly, as they just want to maximize their profit and leave the regions' inhabitants to suffer the consequences

Sheldon Li (written submission)

- in order to avoid \$18 million in construction costs, Richcraft has proposed building 840 on-site parking spaces in such a way that the residents living in the high-rise towers have to find alternative parking on neighbouring streets, which would force the overflow to park on the nearby residential streets that are already filled with the cars of government employees and Algonquin College students and staff
- the vehicle entrances to the proposed high-rise parking spaces are no more than 40 meters from the intersections of Baseline and Gemini/Centrepointe; such a short distance would cause chronic traffic flow problems for the 8,000+ residents and 1,000+ government employees working in nearby office buildings

Iryna Volochay (written submission)

- if this proposal is adopted their home ownership rights would be violated because all owners have the right to have peaceable enjoyment of their property and there is nothing more invasive than construction noise for years to come, construction vehicles in full view of their property and a huge increase in traffic, putting their family at risk
- the streetscape would be changed forever with 3 dominating high-rise towers, 22-24-26 stories high, not to mention the pollution factor with potentially 552 cars coming from 585 units
- such structures do not fit into this quiet residential community, with only low-rise buildings, and would greatly increase the density of the community in a negative manner

Brad Shirley & Allison Kealey (written submission)

- very disappointed by the outlook of the construction plan for 19 Centrepointhe Drive; these overzealous monoliths will not only be an eyesore to the neighbourhood, but the plan that is proposed will exacerbate the existing issues of traffic and parking congestion
- buildings of this height will be towering over all other nearby structures and homes, as there is nothing in the area even close to this height; questioned why there can't be a project with an outcome that fits the charm of the community, such as two buildings not exceeding 10-12 storeys, which would allow for more than adequate underground parking as well
- as neighbours they will be subject to excessive noise and ground tremors from extended periods of construction, which will significantly deteriorate their quality of life for a long period of time; questioned what will be done to rectify this and whether they will be provided with an independent 3rd party engineer at the builder's expense to survey their home and property before, throughout, and after the construction process, to ensure that any detected damages (structural or otherwise) will also be repaired at the builder's expense
- questioned whether a project like this will drive up property values, prompting a new property value assessment and unfairly affecting their property taxation rate

Flori Suci (written submission)

- supports the intensification plan for Ottawa and supports it as long as it follows certain guidelines, among them being that it does not change the overall character of the established neighborhood and that the infrastructure is in place to support the increase in population and traffic; does not see how two high rises of 22 and 24 storeys will fit into the existing neighborhood and not change it
 - the area has no apartment buildings nearby and is residential housing; the two buildings will be a sore point from every direction one looks at them
 - the properties close to the site may incur property value loss
 - the infrastructure in this area has not been updated for many years and the streets do not have the capacity to absorb another 400+ cars at peak time; sewage and other water pipes are old; before putting in so many dwellings, the city needs to ensure it has the capacity to support them, and at this time, it does not

Yuhong Guo (written submission)

- this is a low rise neighbourhood where all buildings are less than 10 stories; the

current neighbourhood is enjoyable, peaceful and tranquil; two 20 story towers would create a visible eye sore and fundamentally ruin the visual harmony of the neighbourhood

- the pandemic has made it clear that it is a health hazard to have high density buildings and neighborhoods; increasing density of the neighbourhood with two high density towers directly contradicts the lessons of the past year, city development will be trending toward low-rise buildings, with the exception of central CBD areas of the cities and some densely populated countries
- the recent condo collapse in Florida reminds us of the risks of tall residential building; over time, such buildings require extraordinary maintenance beyond the ability of a private owner to ensure (such concerns have already been raised in high rise buildings in central Toronto)

Faiz Versey (written submission)

- densification degrades the quality of life for Nepean; all further densification should occur in unbuilt-up areas and there is ample land outside the Ottawa core city/Nepean for that

XinLu (written submission)

- the amendment will reduce the number of required residential parking spaces from 720 to 420 and the number of visitor parking spaces from 120 to 60
- the increased height of the building from 15 stories to 24 stories doesn't fit in with the rest of Centerpointe landscapes
- increasing building density and units will add traffic to the already busy streets like Centerpointe and Hemmingwood
- it is a quiet neighbourhood and should be protected from over development and losing its many positive features

Primary reasons for support, by individual

The applicant, as represented by Brian Casagrande and Nick Sutherland, FoTenn, as well as Kevin Yemm, Richcraft and Rod Lahey, rla Architecture (oral submission and slides)

- responded to previous concerns about the angular plane, height and proximity to transit by providing policy and regulatory context as well as an overview of the proposal
 - the site is within a "Mixed Use Centre" in the Official Plan, an area that is specifically designated for commercial, retail, amenities, etc.; Mixed Use Centre

allows for high-rise development and there's a push for intensification in these areas, in particular for densities that are transit supportive

- the Secondary Plan dates back to 1999 and the planning horizon is to 2021, and because of this older policy, the site is subject to a 0.4 Floor Space Index; this would be a very low density that is not transit supported, so it's inconsistent with the current zoning
- the existing zoning is the result of a previous amendment in 2012 (led by Richcraft), which they are requesting to amend to permit the new design, so it's a site-specific zoning amendment to address the heights and new setbacks
- the proposal is for two towers at 22 and 24 stories with a podium from 3 to 6 as you transition on the site, there's ground-oriented units along Centrepointe Dr, amenity areas on the podium, and there's consideration of the transportation access, which is why it's on Gemini Way; there are 575 units, 473 parking spaces and 612 bicycle spaces
- the site is in proximity to Baseline Station, which can easily make that distance in 500 metres; there's future transit north of this location along Baseline and Centrepointe
- there's been some considerations throughout the application process and many changes were brought about as a result of comments from community associations and the UDRP; the podium is there to mimic what's already there on Centrepointe; removing the tower in the middle has improved the pedestrian experience, the view and shadow impact, and ensures it respects the existing character of the neighbourhood

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent one hour and 22 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): 0

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

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