

## Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

### Zoning By-law Amendment – 1356 Clyde 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 August 16 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and August 26, 2021 (committee meeting date): 21

#### Primary concerns, by individual

**Kathy McVean, President, CCC62 Board of Directors** (oral submission)

- recommend the project be delayed until bus rapid transit and appropriate infrastructure are in place given the major premise of this project is that the Baseline Road Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor will be available to the residents of this development. However, currently there isn't a proposed start date for the BRT and will not be available to residents of this development for a very long time.
  - ❖ council has made a similar decision in Stittsville with delaying the Lepine apartment project until the infrastructure in which it was dependent was in place.
  - ❖ the 2020 FoTenn submission to the Planning Department stated that this site is well served by existing and planned transit networks and further rationalize this proposed degree of intensification by stating intensification supports transit use. The notion of transit dependency is built into the development proposal further indicating the proposal is premised on the existence of the BRT supported by the following:
    - One half of the residents of the proposed development, approximately 234 units are expected to use public transit because they won't have access to a vehicle parking space.
    - One half will have space provided for bicycle parking as the BRT will include dedicated bicycle lanes however they don't exist currently
  - ❖ With no BRT on the horizon the community is left with three bus options. Two routes that are local only and run every thirty minutes, and one route that runs every 15 minutes and connects with the existing LRT station.

- ❖ This development is not happening in isolation. Since the traffic studies were completed, the development of two 15 storey towers each are under construction on the North East corner and further development is proposed on the South East corner.
- ❖ Merivale Road South connecting to Clyde Avenue is identified as a transit priority corridor connecting business and commercial traffic from the 417 down to the business and commercial centres to the South of Baseline.
  - at this intersection there are three condominiums with approximately 590 units, 2 fifteen storey towers with an unknown number of units, a large retail big box store and multiple small businesses, a large residential development, the Merivale commercial strip and the Merivale business park and now the two apartment towers with approximately 468 units all served by two local bus routes and one connector to the LRT station.

**Nancy Hanna** (oral submission)

- raised concerns about increased traffic and potential safety risks in this area given the existing and already approved developments, the number of seniors in the area and the current traffic hazards; she recommended a comprehensive traffic study be done for the area before approving this application
- is on the Board of Directors of the Condominium Corporation 49 and lives at 1485 Baseline Road in a condo that is one of three in a complex called Sanctuary Manor directly west of the proposed development.
- Each of our mid-rise condos have 190 units, housing approximately 1400 people.
- This application is to request to amend height restrictions by nine and half times over current restrictions and is sufficiently outrageous.
- The proposal is located on the corner of Baseline Road and Clyde Avenue. On the South East corner there is a gas station that has been torn up, which is also the site of a proposed Dymon storage facility and beside that there is a drive thru restaurant. On the North East corner is a hole running along Clyde Avenue, up baseline road which is being blasted to accommodate a senior living facility consisting of approximately 402 units in two fifteen storey towers. On the North West corner is this proposal.
- Twin towers of eighteen and twenty-eight storeys. Most of which comprise 416 rental units on a strip of land that is only 7020 square metres in size. Only ten of these units will be classified as affordable.
- The one remaining corner houses a mall with a restaurant, a physiotherapy centre and a medical clinic.

- Would like the Planning Committee to contemplate the traffic hazards and congestion that these various projects represent to this beleaguered corner especially given the current aging residents at century manor, the seniors in the two new fifteen storey buildings and now the tenants of these proposed two towers. Not to mention the traffic from the malls and the commercial elements of the four new towers. At the very least a comprehensive traffic study should be completed before considering approving this application

**Pamela Laidler** (oral and written submission; slides held on file)

- have lived in this area for over twenty years and currently own a condo at 1485 Baseline for the last two years.
- We understand that the proposal supports intensification and encouraging a fifteen-minute neighbourhood. It is an excellent development, however this is the wrong location.
- The Golpro proposal North of Baseline is incompatible for the neighbouring community regarding the intensity and height of the proposal.
- We feel that it would not be appropriate for the City of Ottawa Planning Committee to grant approval to this exceptional Ward 8 zoning by-law amendment application while Ward 8 is lacking in adequate representation from their city Councillor, therefore it should be deferred until the next Municipal election.
- the Baseline Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is a minimum of decade away and more likely two decades away. Given the pandemic there will be less people taking public transit, so the BRT might even be delayed further.
- new building codes are expected in the coming few years which would require better environmental and building standards
- The proposed development will exacerbate existing chronic concerns of safety/congestion/cut through traffic and noise.
  - ❖ the aggressive intensity and height of the building on this site, and the resulting increase in residents will negatively impact both active and vehicular transportation
- Maitland remains a residential street with a school/daycare, a crossing guard at the bizarre, staggered intersections at Erindale and Glenmount, as well as a dangerous corner complete with steel guard rails, where Maitland meets Clyde Avenue.
- A noise study for a nearby development concluded that forecast noise levels exceed the allowable limits specified by the City of Ottawa's Environmental Noise Control Guidelines this noise study did not include the future potential traffic noise for the 1356

Clyde Avenue site also expected to be excessive; how will this noise impact outdoor activities and residents in nearby ground-oriented units?

- In this proposal the development will require a warning clause on all Lease, Purchase and Sale Agreements because of the noise.
- We urge the City Planning Committee to deny the City Planning Services' recommendation for an amendment to Zoning By law 2008 250 for 1356 Clyde Avenue.

**Nancy Wilson, Co-president, City View Community Association (with Jill Prot, Co-president, for questions), (oral and written submission)**

- We understood that developers meet with City planners to discuss their proposals before they commit any resources to preparing an application. In this case, the planners should have advised that this proposal is a bad fit for this location.
- This is overdevelopment - both overdevelopment for this sight and overdevelopment for this area. Many residents are planning to sell and move out of the neighbourhood as a result.
  - ❖ The height requested is double that of the three condo buildings that have been the gateway feature for this community.
  - ❖ Two buildings of 12 stories would fit much better into the adjacent neighbourhood. This property is zoned for 6 stories and the 3 adjacent condominiums are all 12 stories.
- There is no land or greenspace proposed around the building to set it apart from 2 busy corridors of pavement and parking lots. The planners claim that 2 POPs (privately owned public spaces) will be built in the Phase 2. This is not open space.
- Traffic is already a problem in this area, adding these two towers not to mention the construction vehicles and equipment will only exacerbate the traffic, safety concerns and increase cut through traffic in neighbouring communities.
- The applicant's main argument to support this application is the proximity to transit, yet there is no direct bus access to downtown from here. Transit users would have to transfer. This adds time and inconvenience to these trips and makes car usage more viable.
- Proposed future transportation links do not yet exist and this construction should not be approved at this time, in advance of the transit amenities that are supposed to support it.

- This location is located within the Airport Vicinity Development Zone, as shown in both the existing Official Plan and the draft OP plan Schedule C12. How can a development of 18 and 28 stories be allowed in this zone?
- The City has always championed 'complete streets'. It appears that land at this corner was already expropriated to allow Baseline and Clyde to be expanded. There doesn't appear to be any space between the roadways and sidewalks to be set back safely from the existing heavy street traffic flows, as required under complete streets. There should be fencing to protect pedestrians from the traffic close to this dangerous 30mph curve
- Space is required for snowbanks, plowing and removal of snow. This proposal leaves no space to accommodate snow storage and removal.
- The new draft OP talks about establishing parkland on corners of busy streets. This would be our choice for this property.
  - ❖ If this corner does become a transit node (aka a bus stop), this area could become a waiting area, a drop-off /pick-up point for bus users; there are no park-and-rides anywhere in our inner urban core.
  - ❖ Failing that, we suggest that the buildings be limited to 12 stories, to fit in with the surrounding buildings character. Perhaps phase 1, a single tower alone could be approved to provide some open green space.
  - ❖ Perhaps a property swap could be done. This development could fit within the Merivale Triangle, in a properly planned residential/commercial community.
  - ❖ There are acres of parking space owned by the City around the City building. These lands have been identified for this type of height and density and would be close to the library, theatre etc. and next to the LRT station. The City should eliminate the free employee parking here and encourage (demand) that employees use transit and the future LRT for work. This is a location where high landmark towers like this could be constructed. Most residents would not require parking.

**Marjorie Shaver-Jones, President, Copeland Park Community Alliance** (oral and written submission)

- opposed the intended development on the basis the towers are too tall for this location and not compatible with the mid-rise scale of the neighbourhood and will add to existing traffic issues.
- worried about health impacts that would result from loss of access to nature and the creation of high-rise silos and urged Committee to consider a more walkable and engaging neighbourhood of mid-rise development

- the concerns of the Copeland Park residents were not included or considered in the staff report. The proposed project is within the boundaries for Copeland Park Community Association, and yet only the neighbouring Cityview was referenced.
- The development is incompatible with the neighbourhood, being out of scale and proportion with other buildings. The two-tower proposal is not appropriate for this location; and must be rejected for a variety of reasons.
  - ❖ The height of the buildings is simply too tall for the site. We understand the need for intensification and the pressure to approve inner-city sites, especially those along planned transportation routes
    - we have demonstrated a willingness to compromise on some aspects of Golpro's proposed development
    - have neither seen nor heard any willingness to address our concerns from the developer or the planning department
  - ❖ daily access to nature is necessary in ensuring physical and mental well-being. Crowding people together and surrounding them with concrete and asphalt is a sure to increase disease and mental problems
    - Most households in the community use their backyards or the lawns of their condos
    - If this build is approved, the entire lot will be covered/paved with no regard for the necessity of for trees to moderate climate, improve air quality, and protect the water table.
- building towers destroys the vibrant street life that comes from people of different backgrounds engaging with each other on the sidewalk; destroys the sense of community
- delays in the construction of the BRT seriously impact the traffic study forecasts. For many who live in Copeland Park, traffic represents the greatest challenge.
  - ❖ The additional vehicles generated by this development will further flood Maitland/Clyde Avenue, making access and egress from the north-east sector of our community even more difficult than it is currently.
  - ❖ Erindale is a local road, with children and families walking and cycling to school, parks, daycare facilities. There has historically been too much cut-through traffic. Traffic calming measures have not resolved this issue. This development is actually encouraging cut-through traffic. Clyde north of Baseline cannot support higher density development regarding access to the 1356 Clyde site.

- This aggressive zoning by-law amendment is being addressed by the City during a time when the Ward 8 constituents do not have appropriate representation by their City Councillor.
- Proper consultations for this development application have not been undertaken. The planned development completion date in 2022 gives the impression of trying to rush this development through during a time when Ward 8 is not in a position to adequately respond. There are a lot of senior citizens in Ward 8. Virtual consultations are just not adequate for many of these people.

**Michael Sims** (oral submission)

- My responsibility as a member of the Board Copeland Park Community Alliance, is Membership and Communications.
- the Public consultation process was inadequate. The consultation session held last year involved only 87 participants and didn't meet the standard of involvement, debate and consensus building that this precedent setting project requires.
- The public was not invited to the formal urban design panel review meeting with the developers and City Planners.
- Residents want this proposal sent back and request a total rethink.
- Residents don't feel staff have listened to their concerns. 250 comments, 115 letters and petition with 450 signatures have been submitted against this proposal just from Copeland Park.
- This development would be a gross overbuild on a small piece of land at an already failed intersection. It is totally Incompatible with surrounding community landscape and certainly does not embrace the character of the neighbourhood.
- Concerned with noise, disruption and danger that this construction will create.
- This proposed development will not encourage active public transportation even if it is in walking distance of a future rapid transit station.
- The approval of these 18 and 28 storey towers will set a bad precedent for all future developments along Baseline. The same arguments and rationales will be used to justify many more high towers

**Glenn Miller** (oral submission)

- purchased a condo at 1465 Baseline Road last year and was aware of the apartment buildings being developed to the East. However, If I had of known about the size of the towers I would not have purchased in this area.

- Notes the existing traffic congestion in this area already, and the challenges he personally experiences while navigating it in a wheelchair. Concerned also, the traffic assumptions used in this application are not a true representation of the existing conditions
- Concerns with the loss of what little greenspace that currently exist
- recommends consideration of the proposal be delayed at a minimum until bus rapid transit plans for the area are secured.

**Bernie & Jean Finnerty** (written submission)

- the development across from 1356 Clyde is already occurring and the noise and shaking from the blasting are significant and unwelcome
- family and nearby neighbours do not support the development
- this is already a very busy intersection with traffic concerns all around; the Walmart side development in addition to this proposal will only make it worse
- nearby apartment complexes will be overshadowed by the proposed development; quality of life will be affected for all impacted neighbours

**Paul Zachau** (written submission)

- cited considerable inconsistencies in the various documents that have been provided.
  - ❖ In the Executive Summary of the Planning Committee Report, the text notes that the entire project will consist of approximately 416 residential units but the next few paragraphs outline Phase 1 as having 161 units and Phase 2 having 208 units (for a total of 369 units), a substantial difference
  - ❖ According to the architect's floor plans dated 2021-05-10, Phase 1 has 185 units listed, and Phase 2 has 248 units (for a total of 433 units), different from the Planning Committee Notes. This is based on an 18-storey Phase 1, so it is presumably is meant to reflect the most current proposal.
  - ❖ The total number of units listed in the Architect's floor plans do not add up properly;
    - in Phase 1, floors 3 - 7 with 14 units/floor. Architects note 56 units, whereas the math indicates otherwise (5 floors x 14 units = 70 units)
    - in Phase 2, the Executive Summary notes there should be a total of 208 units but the Architect's plans note 248 units. The math would indicate 255 units.



- Questioned the ultimate purpose of the buildings being proposed - whether luxury condominiums or affordable rental apartments, having found no mention in any of the documents submitted, other than the reference to 10 "low-income units" being considered.
  - ❖ if the units are meant to house "middle to higher-income earners", they are less likely to use public transit, and the justification for the amended zoning is far less compelling; it would also mean that there is likely to be insufficient parking included in the current proposal
  - ❖ if the units are meant primarily to house a population who are highly likely to need to use public transportation, then there is perhaps some merit to the proposal
- Questioned if the residents of the three, 12-storey buildings immediately west of the subject site will continue to have access to the private roadway that allows traffic from these residential buildings to access Clyde Avenue via the subject site's South Access during and after construction?
  - ❖ if not, the residents wanting to access traffic heading south on Clyde or east on Baseline will be required to go west on Baseline at least as far as Cordova for their first opportunity to do a dangerous U-turn, adding an extra 2 kms to their trip (1 km there, and 1 km back)
  - ❖ or turn right (north) on Henry Farm, right on Maitland and do a full loop of that block to access southbound Clyde or eastbound Baseline, thereby adding 1.6 kms to their trip

**John & Elizabeth Cotter** (written submission)

- the complex at 1465, 1485 and 1505 Baseline Rd, adjacent to this proposed site at 1356 Clyde, is already congested with day-to-day activity; they and other residents are concerned the subject site does not have sufficient space to support trucks necessary for daily activities surrounding the site
- concerned about how snow removal will be managed
- question whether any thought has been given to emergency vehicles (fire trucks, ambulances) and worry this development will present a serious traffic issue, especially at this already overburdened and problematic intersection
- question how the City's infrastructure (sewage and water) will handle an additional 416 apartment dwellers, along with the two 15 story towers that are under construction at 1357 Baseline Rd

**Kevin Gehrels** (written submission)

- expressed concerns related to:
  - ❖ Residents' concerns are not being taken seriously
  - ❖ Report reads as if the City has already decided to approve the application for rezoning despite the many concerns of those that live in the neighbourhood
  - ❖ Questionable if the measure that the studies used were appropriate for the location, may be more appropriate downtown where the infrastructure is in place to support tall buildings
  - ❖ the concept of doubling the height and suggests a podium does nothing to improve this concept
  - ❖ the neighbourhood is going to have to deal with underserved for transit for many years until the BRT is constructed
- Acknowledges some of the good aspects of the proposal, such as the park space, the business space and the affordable housing

**Andy & Diane Bootsma** (written submission)

- they are not against intensification, however, feel the concerns and opposition of the residents have not been listened to
- There are concerns are related to:
  - ❖ the project will get approved without any reduction in the height of the south tower of 28 storeys; it should be reduced by at least 6 storeys, similar to the north tower
  - ❖ the impacts of blasting on neighbouring buildings at 1485, 1465 and 1505 Baseline
  - ❖ quality of life will be particularly affected for neighbouring residents
- a 28 storey building will:
  - ❖ threaten privacy
  - ❖ negatively impact the skyline, blocking much of the early morning sun on buildings to the west
  - ❖ be totally out of character with surrounding building height
  - ❖ create parking problems, as too few spaces are provided for the number of units
  - ❖ drastically affect safety and convenience of access by neighbours to the west who have a right of way on to Clyde avenue; drivers often need to cross 3 lines of traffic to turn east onto Baseline and the congestion for getting onto Clyde from 5 condo buildings will be a big problem and lead to frustration and accidents

- ❖ result in inadequate green space and residents will likely start using some of the green space that belongs to the condominiums next door
- ❖ result in increased wind speeds through neighbouring buildings
- ❖ devalue the property values of the neighbouring condos and homes

**G. Nloria Brooks** (written submission)

- Concerns related to:
  - ❖ The impacts on their building at 1485 Baseline Road, particularly from blasting
  - ❖ about worsening traffic impacts for exiting onto Clyde
  - ❖ the height of 18 floors will also cause problems for their building

**Lila Nathans** (written submission)

- in the interest of the local community permission should not be granted for building height higher than currently mandated
- the community objects to this over-development and finds neither comfort nor satisfaction in the staff responses (in the report) to their concerns in respect of building height, density, architecture, construction, site layout, greenspace and community amenities, shadowing, noise and etc.
- living with this extreme intensification will be a nightmare for Copeland Park residents and will cause a significant deterioration of their health, safety, and lifestyle
- the report itself refers to the deleterious effect of this proposal's Privately Owned Public Spaces at this already busy intersection
- it would be more reasonable for Council to put this project on hold to allow residents to live with and observe for a year the impact of the completion of the project already there, under construction on the east side of Clyde before proceeding with any plan for the west side

**Sharon & Don Villeneuve** (written submission)

- they take exception to each argument the committee presents to permit this project to proceed
- the June 30, 2020 "Public Consultation Session" was underattended given the pandemic and having a community not technically savvy with electronic meeting makes zoom and online interaction with constituents is not an equitable situation for the public domain

- community opposition was evident in the comments, letters, emails and petition submitted citing concerns related not just to the height, density, parking and traffic, but also:
  - ❖ the Environment, the Infrastructure, the Parkland/Greenspace, the Congestion/Noise
  - ❖ whether Councillors have visited the area to observe these potential negative issues
  - ❖ whether looking at paper documents is sufficient enough for 'staff' to develop and design land use that helps people live a more safe, comfortable life through redesign of their neighbourhood and city rather than complying with existing zoning
  - ❖ the voices of the communities and residents are not being heard with regard to the overbuild of this development on a small piece of land and it's lack of compatibility with the existing community. It does not embrace the character of the neighbourhood
  - ❖ lack of followup communication following the June 2020 consultation meeting. Residents received a notice in February 2021 indicating a few unsatisfactory revisions
  - ❖ the formal Urban Design Review Panel meeting held on September 3, 2020 was supposedly open to the public but was only open to developers and City Planning.
  - ❖ The BRT corridor will not be constructed until after 2030 in the meantime residents will be inundated with construction and turmoil
    - Proposed development does not incorporate "amenity and open space", nor is it "an appropriate transition in the built form context", nor "encourage active public transportation use" located within walking distance of a future (2030 or later) rapid transit station that presently does not exist
- what is being proposed is not a balanced approach; it is demolition, removal, and replacement with looming, offensive high towers all concentrated in this neighbourhood of the city, and it makes one question whether zoning and neighbourhood plans mean anything at all

**Leslie Carter** (written submission)

- buildings that are over twice the height of the existing ones do not belong here and there have been many objections about traffic, noise, overcrowding etc.

- traffic levels are increasing with people returning to work. This intersection was already struggling and if these proposed buildings are built, the intersection will forever be failed with no way to make any changes to it
- the plan for cut-through traffic and parking on the condominium properties needs to be clearly addressed
- the construction of the senior's residences on the east side of Clyde has already begun, there will be some sort of building across the street on the Dymon property, and, at some point, the Baseline-Merivale-Clyde triangle will be developed; that is all too much for this community and needs to be considered
- the municipal government of Ottawa is supposed to represent the people; if this project gets approved, it will be ignoring the needs and wishes of the people who live in this community

**Eileen Hyndman** (written submission)

- Questions related to:

Traffic:

- ❖ whether a traffic study was done pre pandemic and whether there will be enough parking for the residents and visitors of the building and retail
- ❖ noted there is no easy access to Baseline Road East; the only entrance is onto Clyde, which can be extremely busy, and 2 busy straight-through lanes have to be crossed

Greenspace:

- ❖ whether the builders will provide tree cover and green space for residents to enjoy or walk their dogs, as there is very limited green space

Building height:

- ❖ why the new buildings could not be similar height to the 3 existing buildings that are 12 storeys or the 2 new buildings on the east side of Clyde that will be 15 storeys

**Barth G. Curley** (written submission)

- traffic volumes have always been an issue at this intersection, adding two very large residential towers such as those proposed will greatly increase that negative effect. This development clearly suggests an indifference to the interests of this community and a focus only on commercial gain.

- Merivale Road has had heavy traffic volumes and not just from local traffic; access to Merivale is by Baseline Road from east or west or by Maitland from the Queensway and traffic on Maitland continues to worsen. If this quite excessive development were to go ahead it will get much worse; there are residential neighbourhoods all around these two major roads and there has to be reasonable limits to how much disruption, they must endure for the sake of commercial development. There is enough room in this city for this kind of development and it shouldn't be a case of wherever the developer wants it to be regardless of the consequences
- The report recommendations proceed to justify an exception to the existing plan parameters; they do not address the quality of life that residents have a right to expect in their community.
  - ❖ the recommendations summarize the legal bases for the said exception but, apart from a brief statement of "amenities", they do not address that context
  - ❖ they speak of POPS, arterial access and transportation and provision of housing, and those are suggested to be adequate to address the issue of benefit to the community
  - ❖ the 'community' is their neighbourhood and quality of life within it is critical, necessary and is their right
  - ❖ there is insufficient park or recreation space
- there is no parking on Baseline Road, on Clyde or south along Merivale except for that adjacent to malls, which leaves the community where there is street parking (apart from any 2-hour by law which is not enforced);
  - ❖ this neighbourhood has been transformed over the last two decades, from a community of retired residents to that of families raising children and its streets are now full of kids playing
  - ❖ there are no sidewalks and there is one small, quite inadequate park for the whole community, so streets are the alternative playgrounds
  - ❖ they do not want the inevitable spill-over traffic from this proposed development, whether passing through or seeking scarce parking, which would be dangerous and would destroy the neighbourhood
- does not seem to make sense to demolish stores and services currently on the site and replace it with a population-dense high-rise development presenting a much higher demand for those same services

- the development of a multi-story high rise commercial building has recently begun on the northeast corner of Baseline and Clyde that won't be finished for months. How much major development this intersection and community should reasonably tolerate.
- questioned whether this largescale development is necessary when its impact are a real threat to the local community and only serves to benefit the developer
  - ❖ while there may be benefits to a broader community, those should not necessarily be at the expense of a local community
  - ❖ a strict compliance with the technical planning parameters does not answer all the questions as to relative merit and the spirit of the legislation is to facilitate a decision as to acceptability and not to be the sole basis of acceptability
  - ❖ the other critical part of the process needs to answer the key question of the reasonableness of the expected impact on the adjacent community notwithstanding a strict compliance with the technical parameters
  - ❖ the anticipated impact here will not just be unreasonable but will be extreme.

**Robert Mills** (written submission)

- this development is in addition to the retirement development across the street in the Walmart Lot, plus the triangle at Merivale that has been sold to Claridge Homes
- vehemently opposes the rezoning to allow big rebuilds and massive footprints to further intensify this already beleaguered corner of the neighbourhood
- crime, break-ins, thefts, rats and other rodents, and health & safety concerns are already on the rise in the community due in part to the rapid increase in rental units and population intensification in the area; this would make it worse

**Danielle Halloran** (written submission)

- the concerns of those living in the Copeland Park and Belair Heights neighbourhoods around the increase in traffic that this intensification will cause should be taken into consideration
- the vast majority of them are not fundamentally against developing their area and are in agreement on the need for more affordable housing; most complaints are concerning the increase in traffic that will result from these developments, particularly at the intersection of Maitland and Erindale/Glenmount
- complaints in the past about this intersection have been ignored or glossed over; according to the local community associations, they have been told that there are very few accidents reported at the intersection and thus further investigation has not been merited, but for anyone who frequents that intersection on foot, bike or by car to

access the local schools (in Belair/Braemar) or to turn into Copeland Park, the idea that this intersection is not problematic is preposterous

- residents have been asking for a turning lane or an advance arrow to allow residents to enter Copeland Park and would likely be more receptive to the proposed developments if they felt that there would be measures in place to mitigate traffic impacts
- local residents are nervous about the increase in traffic at an already dangerous intersection, compounded by the fact that they feel they do not have reliable representation at City Council

**James Harrison** (written submission)

- the two proposed towers will make the already dense corner of Baseline and Clyde even more dense and the community does not want it and should not proceed
- people in the area (those on Terrebonne Dr., and Henry Farm Dr., the quickest shortcut to the towers) have not been properly informed of the increased traffic coming their way
- the neighbourhood has not been represented by an active Councillor and has not been allowed to meet in public to make their objections to the proposal known
- the intersection is already overly congested and needs to be expanded by expropriating land for a right-hand turning lane
- noise pollution and air quality are already over acceptable limits; letting them give money to the City instead of building with green space to absorb some of the pollution the towers will create is just wrong
- the City does not represent the people in this matter and has become a behind closed door dealer who bends to special interest groups and developer
- there is a seniors home being built on the opposite corner with no consideration for the environment or increased traffic; this idea of intensified cities brings with it increased pollution

**Helen Timm** (written submission)

- the poor planning of the intersection of Glenmount-Maitland-Erindale and the planned build at 1356 Clyde will have a great impact on the traffic of this intersection and neighbourhood; there have been several accidents involving vehicles and pedestrians crossing that intersection
- the residents in this area want a different solution to this proposal



- with the shops and the Walmart there has already been a significant increase to the volume of traffic on Maitland Ave. and with the addition of the Senior Residence and the proposed development, office & retail development will just make things worse

**Kathy Yach** (written submission)

- the buildings are too tall
- the project when completed will occupy too much space
- there is virtually no green space
- there is insufficient parking both inside for residents and outside for residents and visitors alike
- there will be a massive increase of traffic on an already over congested Avenue causing traffic gridlock and an increase in air pollution
- there will be at least 5 years of construction, creating noise, vibration, air pollution, chaos and dust
- fear of blasting and creating shockwaves/vibration that could affect their buildings
- loss of neighbouring property values
- this is an undemocratic approval/voting system by the Planning Committee where only one, possibly two, wards are affected and one can expect most, if not all the members of the Planning Committee, the City Planner(s), the developer and their lobbyist to be present at the meeting on August 26, 2021, thus outnumbering them at least 15 (if not more) to one
- there will be a vote by just the City Councillors and the Mayor on September 8, 2021 where they have no input and hence cannot influence the outcome

**Emma Roy** (written submission)

- residents have to comply with local bylaws and proper process when they want to build so it is unclear why a company can propose plans that completely disregard existing community bylaws and then have them approved; the bylaws are in place to protect neighborhoods
- these buildings will not provide affordable housing
- the buildings are nearly 3 times the bylaw allowance and are not wanted in the neighborhood; a reduction of only a few stories on one building is an insult to the people who live in this community
- there is inadequate parking and no greenspace

- there have been protests, signed petitions, and clear communication at their local council meetings (despite their mostly absentee councillor) so it's unclear how else their community can be heard
- to approve these plans as they stand makes all of Council guilty of spitting in the face of our local bylaws; is disheartened that, other than this letter of opposition and her single vote in the next election, there is little else she can do that will sway this vote

Note: The following submission was also received by the Committee Coordinator prior to the release of the agenda:

- Email dated March 12, 2021 from Maureen Maher, President, 1485 Baseline Road

## Primary reasons for support, by individual

**None provided** (The applicant, as represented by Miguel Tremblay, FoTenn and Rod Lahey, RLA Architecture, with Bill Sioulas, Director of Real Estate, Golpro Holdings Inc., present to answer questions)

**Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision:** Debate: The Committee spent one hour and 36 minutes in consideration of the item.

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Section 2(b)(v)(a) of Document 2, as found on page 19 of the report be amended, by deleting the section in its entirety and replacing the text with the following:

- a. The Site Plan Agreement will contain a condition requiring 10 affordable housing units (five one-bedrooms, three two bedrooms and two three-bedroom units) for a commitment of 20 years which will be secured through an Affordable Housing Agreement and which shall be built as part of the first phase of construction.

## Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between August 26 (Planning Committee consideration date) and September 8, 2021 (Council consideration date): 1

## Primary concerns, by individual

### Michele Pollesel

- Opposes the proposed development noting the proposed height and density of the project will do nothing to enhance the community feel and will lead to

further deterioration in all aspects, most especially with traffic congestion as well as pedestrian and cycling issues

- Would not be opposed to a moderate increase in building a new complex at this corner, however am to anything that would be higher than 15 storeys, which is the height of the complex now underway at the north east corner of Baseline and Clyde

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

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations without the following amendment to correct inconsistencies between the report and Document 2 – Details of Recommended Zoning:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Document 2 – Details of Recommended Zoning be amended by replacing point 1 with the following text: “Rezone the lands shown in document 1 from AM1 H(9) and R5C H(36) to AM1[XXXX] SYYY-h”; and

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