Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment – 6301 and 6475 Campeau 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: 4, including applicant delegations

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between September 13 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and September 23, 2021 (committee meeting date): 8, including those who also made oral submissions

Summary of Oral Submissions

Marianne Wilkinson (oral and written submission)

- Raised concerns related to set backs, parking, proximity to transit
- There have been changes coming out of the consultation meeting and there has been changes made because of that meeting. Still, a lot of amendments are needed. This is an area with a lot of apartments already, all rentals.
- Raised concerns about the number of parking spaces to be included in the proposal.
- Proximity to transit - transit isn't there yet/ inadequate and the distance by direct line is a rock outcrop so people have to walk along the roads
- wondered about reducing the distance between units which have windows
- This area is supposed to be a mix or residential and office/retail and so far it is almost all residential and this development only provides a small employment base.
- The many changes to the zoning are not what was worked out with the community a few years ago.

Applicants - The applicant, as presented by Sameer Gulamani, Fernando Fabiani, and Dennis Jacobs spoke in support of the application. Presentation slides are held on file.

Summary of Written Submissions

Written submissions are held on file with the City Clerk and available from the Committee Coordinator upon request:

Carole Johnson written submission dated September 17, 2021 opposing

- this proposal goes against the result of extensive consultations that took place in 2013 on the future use/zoning of the piece of land in question. As a result of these consultations, the population was led to believe that this piece of land would be complying with the specific setbacks and height limits.
- Supporting the amendments leads to cynicism and distrust towards City staff and will be difficult to give credibility to future consultation processes by the City
- Lack of parking spaces is a significant concern.
- Proposed amendments seem to suggest buildings higher than 10 stories, in contrast to the agreed upon 6 stories. Residents would appreciate having clarification on this kind of proposal and confirmation that no building higher than 10 storeys is contemplated by the proposal for amendments.
- The proposed rooftop terraces on the 3 story townhome buildings along Campeau, amount to indirectly adding a 4th story
- Concerned about the rocky component of the land and the blasting that will be required. What mitigation/indemnification will be put in place?

Peter R. Sherhols written submission dated September 20, 2021 opposing

- The community feels betrayed by the City by failing to apply the community-negotiated zoning along the south of Campeau.
- The parking is a concern: this is a surburban area where cars are a necessity. There should be a minimum of 1 space per unit planned.
- Would like to see a clear commitment that none of the Bayview buildings will exceed 10 stories.

Chris Barlow written submission dated September 20, 2021, opposing

- strongly object to the development proposed for this site, primarily due to the violation of the zoning
- the ten-story buildings violate the official plan and are contrary to prior plans discussed with this community in 2013, where building heights shown in the plans at that time were limited to six stories.

- the proposed buildings would be inconsistent with other high-rise buildings fronting on Campeau in this area
- Ten-story buildings fronting on Campeau, even when buffered by low-rise three-story units as proposed, will adversely affect the residential flavour of the street
- there will be problems due to parking overflow into adjacent neighbourhoods

Kevin & Laura Eryou written submission dated September 21, 2021, opposing

- largest concern is the lack of parking
- Concerns with the proposal with regards to heigh of buildings/setback

Theresa Peluso & Christopher Barlow written submission dated September 16, 2021, opposing

- opposed to the destruction of the natural area on 6301 and 6475 Campeau Drive to build 800 new rental units, destroying a sizable mature forest including an endangered tree species, and imposing many negative impacts on the quality of life of nearby residents.
- Previous objections and concerns addressed to the planner have not been considered or addressed.
- The zoning by-laws currently only allow for a net density of 132 units/ha, yet this proposal is estimated to be 169 units/ha., and were designed to ensure that the noise, traffic, and air pollution generated by human activity do not exceed the levels required for safe, healthy communities.
- the City of Ottawa has failed to adhere to the existing rules and guidelines established at the municipal and provincial levels; furthermore, it has disregarded the environmental concerns brought forward back in January
- The City should require the developer: to protect all the healthy butternut trees and most of the mature trees on the lots designated as 6301 and 6475 Campeau Drive, and to reduce the proposed rental-unit density to meet the existing site-specific bylaw requirements.

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 28 minutes in consideration of the item.

Vote: The committee considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as amended as follows:

Motion Nº PLC 2021-49/4

THEREFORE IT BE IT RESOLVED that the following change be made to Document 4 – Zoning Details of the staff report:

1. The exceptions in Document 4 be amended to add the following provision in Column V:

    1. Despite anything to the contrary, the cumulative required parking between the two parcels may be shared between lands zoned with exceptions XXX1 or XXX2

That there be no further notice pursuant to Section 34 (17) of the Planning Act.

Motion Nº PLC 2021-49/5

THEREFORE IT BE IT RESOLVED that the words “taller than 10 storeys” immediately following the word “Buildings” be deleted from the report on pages 7, 14, 27 and 28, respectively.

That there be no further notice pursuant to Section 34 (17) of the Planning Act.

Motion Nº PLC 2021-49/6

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Document 4 be revised to add the following provision in Column V with respect to Exception XXX2:

1. Section 101 (5) (d) and (e) with all necessary modifications apply to the dwelling units in a mixed use building.

That there be no further notice pursuant to Section 34 (17) of the Planning Act.

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between September 23 (Planning Committee consideration date) and October 13, 2021 (Council consideration date): 6

Summary of Written Submissions

Mark Flowers, on behalf of ClubLink Corporation ULC

- wrote to City staff and provided initial comments on the applications for the Subject Lands earlier this year
- the engineering reports submitted in support of those applications contemplated that stormwater runoff from Parcel 1 of the Subject Lands would be directed to what they referred to as a stormwater management pond on the ClubLink Lands.

- ❖ Meanwhile, in opposing the appeals of the ClubLink Applications at the Tribunal, the City has raised a number of issues concerning ClubLink's proposed stormwater management plan for the proposed redevelopment of the ClubLink Lands, including questioning whether there is a "legal outlet" for stormwater from the proposed redevelopment.
- ❖ it is inconsistent for the City to be opposing the ClubLink Applications based on stormwaterrelated concerns and questioning whether there is a legal outlet while, at the same time, City staff is recommending approval of applications for significant development on the Subject Lands that would direct additional stormwater flows to the ClubLink Lands
- ❖ the City should not approve a stormwater management plan for the Subject Lands that relies upon increased flows to the ClubLink Lands prior to the approval of a stormwater management plan for the proposed redevelopment of the ClubLink Lands, as well as demonstration that stormwater runoff from the Subject Lands can be accommodated without adverse impact. Likewise, to the extent that approval of the development applications for the Subject Lands is reliant on an acceptable stormwater management solution, an approval of the development applications for the Subject Lands would be premature.

James Duke

- echoes comments and concerns raised by Carole Johnson.

Carole Johnson

- concerned that the City is ignoring consultations, wasting time of residents in the community that attended these consultations
- Stonecroft Community's main concern is the lack of parking spaces
- Considers the amendment made at Committee to be "going around" the concern
- Questions the owner's confidence that the parking will not be issue; the situation of a hotel does not compare to a residential neighbourhood

Peter Sherhols

- echoes comments and concerns raised by Carole Johnson.
- Considers the City's bias towards developers a travesty

- Believes that all proposals related to Kanata North should be deferred until new representation replaces Jenna Sudds

Theresa Peluso

- Disappointed that concerns raised by Kanata North residents are being ignored related to the City's own zoning by-laws, Provincial environmental restrictions, Public consultation process
- echoes comments and concerns raised by Carole Johnson.
- Also echoes Peter Sherhols re: new representation in Kanata North

Marianne Wilkinson

- Thanks city staff for the improvements made to the original proposal.
- Business pace on the site should not be reduced; it's becoming a Central Business District that is primarily residential
- Many changes to the zoning are not what was worked out with the community a few years back, but the gradual increase is acceptable.
- Parking remains a major issue. Public transit is insufficient and residents are still car-dependent. Would like to see 1 parking space per unit, plus 14 for retail.

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

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