

## **Document 1 - Summary of Written and Oral Submissions**

### **Zoning By-law Amendment – 6101 Renaud Road, and 2980, 3000, 3048, 3054 and 3080 Navan Road**

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 August 30 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and September 9, 2021 (committee meeting date): 2 (delegation and applicant presentation slides as noted below)

#### **Primary concerns, by individual**

**Heather Buchanan, Bradley Estates Community Association** (oral submission; slides held on file)

- Boundary street designs did not meet the MMCOS targets in terms of pedestrian and bicycle safety. Navan Rd, Renaud Rd, which border the subject lands, are not lit, do not have sidewalks, are heavily trafficked, and are not safe.
- Concern with this proposal or anything like it going forward without the necessary infrastructure. City is aware of strain on infrastructure and will continue to monitor it. No changes have been made to the surrounding infrastructure, and none are planned for post-2031. To promise that changes will be made post-2031 will not improve safety on those roads, nor help residents in the area.
- Objective of most trips by sustainable modes of transportation not met by this subdivision. There are no efficient bus connections to the closest LRT station, no BRT is slated until post-2031, no safe cycling or pedestrian infrastructure in the subdivision area.
- The Caivan development will add traffic to already overburdened roads
- The realignment of Renaud to connect to Henderson Rd would meet needs of the communities, including the new development. Those should be put in place and connected before approving one subdivision after another.

- Condo proposal at corner of subject lands concerning. One of the justifications for the developer is that location it is close to the BRT, but the BRT doesn't exist. They are close to a park and ride. They will be relying on their cars the same as other Orleans South residents relying on overburdened routes.
- Far from being a 15 minute neighbourhood. The City continues to ignore concerns regarding density, traffic resolution and infrastructure. Prioritization of development over developing complete neighborhoods for existing residents.
- City continues to be absent, not policing developers nor holding them accountable. Developers, including infill builders, must be made to pay to upgrade the supporting infrastructure. This should not just be a general rule, but an enforced practice
- Traffic continues to be the main issue that dominates community meetings and forums. Association has worked closely with past and present Councillors to install a plethora of traffic calming measures, but these measures cannot keep up with the steady and steep increase in traffic volume.
  - ❖ Many homeowners relied on our community design plans to ease their fear of the ever-increasing volume of traffic
  - ❖ continue to suffer the degrading effects of high volume of traffic volume compounded even more by developments such as this.
  - ❖ The impact is on our daily lives in the neighbourhood: declining quality of life due to increased noise, pollution, and most importantly a decline in safety.

### **Krista Curtis** (oral submission)

- Noted that after moving to the community her daughter started grade 5 in French school as no English schools are in the community, and still waiting for infrastructure and answers on when these things will arrive.
- During the community meeting, developer laughed when someone asked what would happen to the land if the development was not approved. Classless and made me think what this this mean for us, is that how the City is taking care of us? Does that mean our interests are not being taken seriously?
- Our community wrote 75 comments to the City. Responses were shameful. Concern the subdivision would be out of place in our community responded to by saying that it was OK because the land was slated for residential subdivision purposes.
- Another concern stated that there was no inclusive or affordable housing planned. The developer responded that was correct, and there was none.
- Another comment stated that the proposed lots sizes were too small. The city assured us that the developer had proposed similarly small and cramped sizes across the city.
- Development doesn't meet the plans laid out in the east urban community design plan.
- There is no need for this development and no infrastructure for it:
  - ❖ Lack of public transit
  - ❖ Lack of education facilities
  - ❖ Lack of employment opportunities
  - ❖ Lack of commercial businesses, gas stations, garages, restaurants
  - ❖ Lack of road infrastructure such as sidewalks no sidewalks and roads
  - ❖ community needs more than houses to be a community.
- City planners show no care for the remarks and concerns of the residents

### **Primary reasons for support, by individual**

None provided. The applicant, as presented by Nico Church (FoTenn), Julie Carrara (FoTenn), Hugo Lalonde (Caivan; the owner) and May Pham (Caivan; the owner), present to answer questions) and submitted presentation slides held on file with the City Clerk.

**Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision:** Debate: The Committee spent one hour and 19 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 RESOLVED that Planning Committee:**

- 1. replace report “ACS2021-PIE-PS-0117” with “<sup>1</sup>ACS2021-PIE-PS-0117 (revised)”, which includes the following changes:**
  - a. in the body of the report, replace reference to “Residential Fifth Density, Subzone F” (R5F)” and “Residential Fifth Density, Subzone F, Height Suffix of 20 Metres” (R5F H(20))” in the report with “Residential Fifth Density, Subzone N, with site-specific exceptions, Height Suffix of 20 Metres” (R5N[XXX3] H(20))”;**
  - b. in the body of the report, replace reference to “R5” with “R5N”; and**
  - c. additional details on the proposed exception ([XXX3]) in the planning rationale;**
  - d. a replacement Document 1 – Location Map and Zoning Key Plan, with the appropriate R5N[XXX3] H(20);**
  - e. a replacement Document 2 – Details of Recommended Zoning, with the intended zoning provisions; and**

**THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there be no further notice pursuant to Subsection 34 (17) of the *Planning Act*.**

## **Ottawa City Council**

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between September 9 (Planning Committee consideration date) and September 22, 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 further amendment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Revised report has been posted on the City’s website as a reference document to the Agenda for this meeting and will be provided to Council for its consideration on September 22, 2021