| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|--|--|--|--|
| Motion Section | | | |
| Volume 1 - | A technical glitch occurred during the upload of the | Replace the following committee | A technical glitch |
| Schedules | Staff Report to the City's Sire portal, causing black boxes to appear and distort information on the | approved schedules with the versions that were published for the September 2021 | occurred during the upload of the |
| C6A | following schedules: | release of the Draft Official Plan: | Staff Report to the |
| C6B | C6A | C6A | City's Sire portal. |
| C11A | C6B | C6B | |
| C11B | C11A | C11A | |
| C11C | C11B | C11B | |
| C12 | C11C | C11C | |
| | C12 | C12 | |
| Volume 1 B-series schedules and Schedule C12 | Schedules posted at committee were missing some minor changes and updates. | The B-series schedules and Schedule C12 have been revised as follows. 1) the Open Space and Greenspace designations have been revised to correct small errors to boundaries on some NCC properties which arose due to a problem with version control during editing 2) the Urban Natural Feature designation on the north portion of Carlington Woods has been restored as per staff supported and committee approved motion at the Joint Committee | corrects a number of oversights in the updating of schedules |

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|---|--|--|--|
| Motion Section | Tropossarional a Existing Toxi | Tropossa roke or smange | Itationalo |
| Volume 1 Schedule C12 | Schedule C12 (which is replaced in its entirety above) as posted on Engage Ottawa contained an error where the former Capital Golf Course was shown as blank space. It is correctly illustrated as a Greenbelt Linkage Area. | Illustrate the former Capital Golf Course lands as Greenbelt Linkage Area | To be consistent with the National Capital Commission's Greenbelt Masterplan and to ensure there is no undesignated or blank space in the schedule |
| Volume 1 Schedule C4 | Palladium drive was incorrectly illustrated in its previous alignment | correct the alignment of Palladium Drive consistent with its current location | errata |
| Volume 1 Schedules B1 and B2 | Sections of Gladstone Avenue on schedules B1 and B2 are incorrectly portrayed as a Mainstreet Corridor | On schedules B1 and B2 portray Gladstone Avenue between Elgin and Parkdale as a Minor Corridor | errata - corrects a mapping error |
| Volume 1 Schedule C7 Design Priority Areas | correct design priority area boundary and include french translations on schedule | adjustment to DPA boundary resulting from recent OPA 253 and addition of missing translations | update from OPA 253 and errata |
| Volume 1 Schedule B1 | The western portion of Victoria Island was incorrectly portrayed as Greenspace | That the designation on the portion of Victoria Island west of Wellington Street be corrected from Greenspace to Neighbourhood | Corrects a mapping error |
| Volume 1 Section 3.2 Table 3A | In the minimum proportion of large-household dwellings within intensification column an error was made that applied the minimum 5% and 10% target only to Algonquin. This target is intended to apply to all hubs. | Add the minimum 5% and 10% target to apply to all Hubs | errata – transcription error |
| Volume 1 Section 3.2 Table 3A | Reference is made to 'Corridors'. It should say Mainstreets | Replace the word "Corridors" with the word "Mainstreets" in the title of Table 3A | clarification that the provision applies to all corridors |
| Volume 1 Section 3.5 | missing hard return between policies 8 and 9 in section 3.5 | place policy 9) on a new line | errata |

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|-----------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|
| Motion Section | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | 9 | |
| Volume 1 | Staff endorsed edit to modify 5.1.5, 1)c) and 5.2.4, | Downtown Core Transect – 5.1.3(2) | Resulting |
| 0 | 1)c), approved by the Joint Committees, | 5.1.5(1)(c) – Neighbourhoods: | consequence of a |
| Section 5 | subsequently modify the contents of Table 7, but | Low-rise: minimum 2 storeys, generally | Staff endorsed |
| Table 7 | edits to Table 7 were not included in the report to | permit 3 storeys, allow built height of up | edit to Joint |
| | Joint Committees. | to and maximum 4 storeys where appropriate | Committees was not included in the |
| | Existing: | | report to Joint |
| | Downtown Core Transect – 5.1.3(2) – | Inner Urban Transect – 5.2.4(1) – | Committees. |
| | Neighbourhoods: Low-rise: minimum 2 storeys | Neighbourhoods: | |
| | and maximum 4 storeys | Low-rise: no minimum, minimum 2 | |
| | | storeys, zoning will permit at least three | |
| | Inner Urban Transect – 5.2.4(1) – | generally permit 3 storeys, allow built | |
| | Neighbourhoods: Low-rise: no minimum, zoning | height of up to but no more than 4 storeys | |
| | will permit at least three storeys | where appropriate | |
| | but no more than 4 storeys | | |
| Volume 1 | Consistency and minor content corrections for | Outer Urban Transect – 5.3.3(3) – | Errata - |
| | Table 7. | Mainstreet Corridors: | consistency and |
| Section 5 | | Low-rise, and Mid-rise and High-rise: | grammar |
| Table 7 | Existing: | minimum 2 storeys and maximum 40 | correction |
| | Outer Urban Transect – 5.3.3(3) – Mainstreet | storeys , dependent on road width and | |
| | Corridors: | transition | |
| | Low-rise and Mid-rise: minimum 2 storeys and | | |
| | maximum 40 | Suburban Transect – 5.4.5(1) – | |
| | storeys, dependent on road width and transition | Neighbourhoods: | |
| | | Low-rise, no minimum: generally, zoning | |
| | Suburban Transect – 5.4.5(1) – Neighbourhoods: | will permit at least three3 storeys but no | |
| | Low-rise, no minimum: generally, zoning will | more than four 4 storeys | |
| | permit at least | | |
| | three storeys but no more than four storeys | | |

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|---|---|---|--|
| Motion Section Volume 1 Section 5.4.4 Policy 2 | Proposed Action & Existing Text 2) Net residential densities shall strive to approach the densities of the Inner Urban Transect over time, but secondary plans shall plan for a minimum density of 36 units per net hectare and permit density increases through intensification and accessory dwelling units. | | |
| Volume 1 Section 10.3 preamble | 10.3 Build resiliency to the impacts of extreme heat With climate change, the number of very hot days (days where the temperature is greater than 30°C) in Ottawa is projected to increase from an average of 11 days per year to as many as 44 days per year by the 2050s, and even more towards the end of the century. This will result in more frequent and prolonged heat waves. | Expansion Areas, shall plan for a minimum density of 36 units per net hectare and permit density increases through intensification and accessory dwelling units. 10.3 Build resiliency to the impacts of extreme heat With climate change, the number of very hot days (days where the temperature is greater than 30°C) in Ottawa is projected to increase from an average of 11 days per year to as many as 43 days per year by the 2050s, and even more towards the end of the century. This will result in more frequent and prolonged heat waves. | Errata – matching number of days with the climate change section of the Plan (43 vs 44) |

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Motion Section | 1 Toposca Action & Existing Text | 1 TOPOSCA TEXT OF CHAINGE | Tationals |
| Volume 1 Annex 5 | Expand area of existing area-specific policy (40), Kanata South Terry Fox Neighbourhood Show new Area-Specific Policy 47, 7925 Parkway Road on Annex 5 Show new Area-Specific Policy 48, Part of 3610 Innes Road on Annex 5 | Expand Area-Specific Policy Area 40 – on Annex 5, that should include 1039 Terry Fox Drive and Block 71 on Plan 4M1383 (Ackerson Road). New Area 47 - Portion of 7925 Parkway Road added to Annex 5 New Area 48 - Part of 3610 Innes added to Annex 5 (*Note: new Area-Specific Policies 47 and 48 are subject of separate staff revisions to add their policies to Volume 2C (Area-specific Policies). | The first change is to show the accurate extents of Area-Specific Policy 40 on Annex 5, Two further changes are to show two new ASPs on Annex 5 (#47 & 48) separately added to Volume 2C (Area-Specific Policies) |

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Motion Section | | | |
| Volume 1 - Annex 6 | The boundary of the West Downtown Core Secondary Plan incorrectly includes two small areas not part of the plan (as illustrated below) | Proposed: Correct Boundary of West Downtown Core Secondary Plan to match the boundary of the secondary planning area in the secondary plan | errata – mapping consistency with secondary plan boundary |

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| Motion Section | ., | | |
| Volume 1 – Schedule B5 | Include on Schedule B5 the portion of Robert Grant Avenue that is designated as "Arterial – Future (alignment defined)" on Draft OP Schedule C4, and continue the proposed Minor Corridor designation. | Extend Robert Grant Avenue to reflect the portion designated as "Arterial – Future (alignment defined)" on Schedule C4 and continue the proposed Minor Corridor designation | Corrects a mapping oversight where certain approved road extensions from the 2013 Transportation Master Plan, currently identified on Draft Schedule C4 were not identified on the B-series of Schedules. |
| Volume 1 - Schedule C6B | Elevations on the northeast and northwest corners of the Bank Street and Gloucester Street intersection are currently inversed. | Elevations for the northeast and northwest corner of the Bank Street and Gloucester Street intersection: | Ensure accuracy of elevation data. |
| | Existing text: | Northeast corner: 157.7 160.4 | |
| | Northeast corner: 157.7 Northwest corner: 160.4 | Northwest corner: 160.4 157.7 | |
| Volume 1 - Schedule C6C | Schedule C6C was released as part of the engagement strategy for September 2021 release of the Draft Official Plan, however was accidentally omitted from the Staff Report to the Joint Committees. | Add Schedule C6C - LeBreton Flats Foreground View Control Planes as published for the September 2021 release of the Draft Official Plan. | Accidental omission from the Staff Report to Joint Committees. |

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|---|--|---|--|
| Motion Section Volume 2A (Urban Secondary | Add new policies, as 2.2, 7) and 8) | [new] 7) All billboard and advertising signs are prohibited in Rockcliffe Park, | staff supported requested change |
| Plans) | | except for signs advertising a property for sale or rent. | to secondary plan. |
| Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan | | [new] 8) Lighting in Rockcliffe Park should be configured to be sensitive to | 7) Reinstates prior secondary plan policy |
| Section 2.2, Conserving the | | the context of the street. | 8) clarifies |
| Character of Rockcliffe Park | | | direction around lighting. |
| Volume 2A (Urban Secondary Plans) | 4.2, 7) All Open Space areas shall be kept free of buildings except for structures accessory to a recreational activity on the land. Such buildings shall be compatible with the | 4.2, 7) All Open Space areas shall be kept free of buildings except for structures accessory to a recreational activity or community gatherings on the land. Such | staff supported requested change to secondary plan. Reinstates prior |
| Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan | character of the surrounding residential area both in design and materials. | buildings shall be compatible with the character of the surrounding residential area both in design and materials. | secondary plan detail. |
| Section 4.2, Parks and Open Space | | | |
| Volume 2A (Urban Secondary Plans) | 2.2 Conserving the Character of Rockcliffe Park | 2.2 Conserving the Character of Rockcliffe Park | staff supported requested change to secondary plan. |
| Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan | In accordance with the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan, development in Rockcliffe Park will have regard to such matters as: | In accordance with the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan, development in Rockcliffe Park will have | |
| Section 2.2, Conserving the | | regard to such matters as: | |
| Character of Rockcliffe Park | • Lot size and patterns; | • Lot sizes and patterns; | |
| | Natural features; andLighting. | Natural features; andLighting; | |
| | | Narrow winding roads without curbs or sidewalks; and | |
| | | Setbacks and side yards. | |

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|---|---|---|---|
| Motion Section | | | |
| Volume 2A (Urban Secondary Plans) Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan Section 2.2, Conserving the Character of Rockcliffe Park | 2.2 Conserving the Character of Rockcliffe Park In accordance with the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan, development in Rockcliffe Park will have regard to such matters as: | 2.2 Conserving the Character of Rockcliffe Park Development in Rockcliffe Park shall respect the cultural heritage values and shall follow the guidelines in the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan, regarding In accordance with the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan, development in Rockcliffe Park will have regard to such matters as: | staff supported requested change to secondary plan. |
| Volume 2A (Urban Secondary Plans) Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan Section 2.4, Conservation of the Heritage Conservation District | 2.4 Conservation of the Heritage Conservation District The entire former Village of Rockcliffe Park is a heritage conservation district. The City is committed to conserving Rockcliffe Park's heritage resources, including buildings, structures, sites, landscapes, areas and environments by, among other matters: • Having regard to the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan when considering an application under the <i>Planning Act</i> ; and | 2.4 Conservation of the Heritage Conservation District The entire former Village of Rockcliffe Park is a heritage conservation district. The City is committed to conserving Rockcliffe Park's heritage resources, including buildings, structures, sites, landscapes, areas and environments by, among other matters: • Ensuring that the Having regard to the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan is respected and its guidelines followed when considering an application under the Planning Act or the Ontario Heritage Act; and | staff supported requested change to secondary plan. |

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|--|--|--|---|
| Motion Section | Tropocou / tottom &moting row | Troposou roke si silango | |
| Volume 2A (Urban Secondary Plans) - – Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan Section 2.1, Policy 2 | 2) Notwithstanding the provision for greater building heights set out in the Official Plan, no buildings will be allowed higher than six storeys and 20 metres within the area of this secondary plan, other than the height limits allowed within the policy areas referred to in Section 3.3 and 3.5 of this secondary plan. | 2) Notwithstanding the provision for greater building heights set out in the Official Plan, no buildings will be allowed higher than six storeys and 20 metres within the area of this secondary plan, other than the height limits allowed within the policy areas referred to in Section 3.3 and 3.5 of this secondary plan. | errata – cross reference |
| Volume 2A (Urban Secondary Plans) - – Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan Section 3.3, Policy 18 f) | 18) Achieve a Diversity of Uses, Activities and People f) Provide a range of building heights between three and nine storeys in the Neighbourhood Mid-Rise designation, as shown on Schedule A – Designation Plan and Schedule B - Old Ottawa East Maximum Building Heights. The related zoning will reflect a gradual transition between the heights in this range and buildings in proximity of lower height; and | 18) Achieve a Diversity of Uses, Activities and People f) Provide a range of building heights between three and nine storeys in the Neighbourhood Mid-Rise designation, as shown on Schedule A – Designation Plan and Schedule B - Old Ottawa East Maximum Building Heights. The related zoning will reflect a gradual transition between the heights in this range and buildings in proximity of lower height; and | corrects an oversight whereby parcels that are designated Mainstreet, and Neighbourhood Low-Rise had been omitted |
| Volume 2A (Urban Secondary Plans) Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan Section 1.2, Context | 1.2 The prominent homes, parks and schools have created a community distinctive from any other in the capital and one that is recognized nationally. It is the intent of this secondary plan to maintain the prominence, history and character of the Rockcliffe Park community in the City and in the nation. | 1.2 The prominent homes, parks and schools in a unifying park-like setting have created a community distinctive from any other in the capital and one that is recognized nationally. It is the intent of this secondary plan to maintain the prominence, history and character of the Rockcliffe Park community in the City and in the nation. | staff supported requested change to secondary plan. |

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------|
| Motion Section | | | |
| Volume 2A | 1.1 Introduction | 1.1 Introduction | Corrects an error |
| (Urban Secondary | | | in the original |
| Plans) | In 1921 the Village of Rockcliffe Park was | In 1926 1921 the Village of Rockcliffe | secondary plan |
| | incorporated as an independent municipality. | Park was incorporated as an independent | that had been |
| Section 1.1, | | municipality. | carried forward to |
| Introduction | | | the new plan |

Volume 2A: Richmond Road / Westboro Secondary Plan

Policy 4.2.2

Necessary updates to policy 4.2.2 to correct contradictions and provide necessary oversight of urban design elements

Existing Text:

- 4.2.2: Redevelopment is supported on Richmond Road and Scott Street, which are designated as Mainstreet Corridors in the Official Plan, in order to optimize the use of land through increased building height and density. Development proposals will be evaluated based on the objectives of this secondary plan. This secondary plan supports building heights generally in the range of four to six storeys. Greater building heights will be considered in any of the following circumstances
- a) Specific building heights are permitted by the Zoning By-law based on the Richmond Road / Westboro Community Design Plan or other Council-approved studies; and
- b) The proposed building height is compatible in scale with, or provides a transition between existing buildings; and
- c) The development provides a cultural asset, and is located on a corner lot, at a transit stop or station, or is located at a prominent location, such as a major destination, an important public space, the termination of a vista or view, or a unique natural setting; and
- d) The development incorporates facilities, amenities, or services that that support the goals for Mainstreet Corridors as per the Official Plan; and
- e) Where the application of the provisions of Section 4.6 of the Official Plan determine that additional height is appropriate; and

remove the word 'and' after items a through e in this policy.

Make changes to text as illustrated below

"Redevelopment is supported on Richmond Road and Scott Street, which are designated as Mainstreet Corridors in the Official Plan, in order to optimize the use of land through increased building height and density. Development proposals will be evaluated based on the objectives of this secondary plan and applicable Council-approved design guidelines. This secondary plan supports building heights generally in the range of four to six storeys. Greater building heights will be considered in any of the following circumstances:

- a) Specific building heights are permitted by the Zoning By-law based on the Richmond Road / Westboro Community Design Plan or other Council-approved studies; and
- b) The proposed building height is compatible in scale with, or provides a transition between existing buildings; and
- c) The development provides a cultural asset, and is located on a corner lot, at a transit stop or station, or is located at a prominent location, such as a major destination, an important public space, the termination of a vista or view, or a unique natural setting; and

the word 'and' was incorrectly placed after each item in this policy creating a contradiction in policy provisions b through f

adding reference to councilapproved design guidelines provides consistency with the New OP [4.6.5(1)] – demonstrating the intent of applicable design guidelines are met.

Moving provision f) to the end of d) provides a link to main street corridor urban design elements

| | Proposed Action & Existing Text | Proposed Text or Change | Rationale |
|--|---|--|--|
| Motion Section | | | |
| | f) Provide wider sidewalks where appropriate." | d) The development incorporates facilities, amenities, or services that that support the goals for Mainstreet Corridors as per the Official Plan including the provision of wider sidewalks or other public realm improvements consistent with Section 4.6.3; and e) Where the application of the provisions of Section 4.6 of the Official Plan determine that additional height is appropriate; and f) Provide Where wider sidewalks where appropriate." | |
| Volume 2B (Rural Secondary Plans) - Village of Greely Schedule B - Connectivity Plan | Correct Schedule B - Connectivity Plan - Error and missing information Existing text: Portion of "Future Public Linkage" links Lakeshore Drive to the rest of the "Future Public Linkage" through residential lots | Remove portion of "Future Public Linkage" that connects Lakeshore Drive to the rest of the "Future Public Linkage" Add Linkage from southeast corner of Summerview Terrace and Cadieux Way | errata - Schedule B incorrectly shows a "Future Public Linkage" going through residential lots |
| | Correct link missing from southeast corner of Summerview Terrace and Cadieux Way and the rest of the "Future Public Linkage" | and the rest of the "Future Public Linkage" | |

Volume 2C Simplification to (Area-Specific be less Volume 2C - Area-Specific Policies Volume 2C - Area-Specific Policies Policies) prescriptive Policy Policy Policy Policy Area-specific policy Areas Areas 28. on on Annex Annex 28 Confederation Heights 28 **Confederation Heights** The federally-The federallyowned owned Confederation Confederation Heights Campus is Heights Campus is proposed for major proposed for major redevelopment. redevelopment. This creates a This creates a unique opportunity unique opportunity to work with the to work with the Government of Government of Canada to consider Canada to consider other uses on the other uses on the site that will site that will 28.1 introduce a broader 28.1 introduce a broader mix of uses that will mix of uses that will complement, complement, support and support and generally integrate generally integrate it into its urban it into its urban context. context transform this single use This Area is federal identified as a employment node special study into an integrated through mixed-use amendments to the community, that not Zoning By-law. only supports the

| Additional Staff-Recommended Changes to the Draft New Official Plan (Document 13) | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | needs for federal | | | | |
| | office | | | | |
| | accommodation but | | | | |
| | also other land | | | | |
| | uses that will | | | | |
| | create a new | | | | |
| | neighbourhood, | | | | |
| | within its immediate | | | | |
| | surroundings and | | | | |
| | the greater urban | | | | |
| | community context, | | | | |
| | through innovative | | | | |
| | and creative design | | | | |
| | solutions, reflecting | | | | |
| | the existing and | | | | |
| | planned level of | | | | |
| | transit service | | | | |
| | benefitting these | | | | |
| | lands. | | | | |
| | This Area is | | | | |
| | identified as a | | | | |
| | special study area | | | | |
| | through | | | | |
| | amendments to the | | | | |
| | Zoning By-law. The | | | | |
| | Confederation | | | | |
| | Heights master | | | | |
| | plan will inform the | | | | |
| | secondary plan as | | | | |
| | the municipal | | | | |
| | policy framework | | | | |
| | and provide future | | | | |
| | direction of | | | | |
| | Confederation | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Heights to evolve into a mixed-use | | | | |
| | into a mixed-use | | | | |

| Motion Section | Proposed Action & Existing Text | | Proposed Text or Change | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | | area and federal employment facility. | |