

Document 1 - Summary of Written and Oral Submissions, Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments – 1 and 19 Sir John A. MacDonald Parkway

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: 10

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between October 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): 9

Summary of Written Submissions

Written submissions are held on file with the City Clerk and available from the Committee Coordinator upon request. *In addition to those who also made oral submissions as noted below*, the following written submissions were received prior to Committee:

- **Brent Walden**, written submission dated June 10, 2021 in opposition, with comments.
- **Patricia Turk, dated May 12, 2021** written submission and petition submitted May 12, 2021. Petition in opposition, including 1378 signatories, seeking to preserve the trees and greenspace.
- **Kaylie Badham** written submission dated September 13, 2021 – in opposition, with comments.
- **Reginald L. Evans** written submission dated September 21, 2021 - in opposition, with comments.
- **Daniel Daley** written submission dated September 22, 2022, in opposition with comments.
- **Luci Ciperá** written submission dated September 22, 2022, in opposition, with comments.

Summary of Oral Submissions

The applicant, as presented by Matt McElligott, Fotenn, and Andrew Sacret, National Capital Commission, provided an overview of the application and responded to questions from Committee. Their presentation is held on file.

- **Leena Sarkar, opposed.** Ms. Sarkar stated that the land was not under-utilized, but provided health benefits and reprieve to the urban community. There is a need for the green space.
- **Jennifer Brûlé, opposed.** Written comments held on file. stated that she is losing green spaces, and they are valuable to mental health. There is a need for a traffic study. Ms. Brûlé felt that the National Capital Commission (NCC) was privileging diplomats over the residents.
- **Lorrie Marlow (Mechanicsville Community Association),** opposed, read from a slide presentation .Requesting rejection of the application and that the site should be retained as greenspace and returned to the Ottawa Riverfront South Shore Park. A copy of the slide presentation and written submission is filed with the Office of the City Clerk.
- **Keith Brown (Laroche Park Sports Association),** opposed, presented a video to Committee. Loss of greenspace will negatively impact the community. A copy of the video is filed with the Office of the City Clerk.
- **Katie Griess (Mechanicsville Community Association),** opposed, provided slide presentation. Requested rejection of application in considering of the climate emergency and the goals that were set out in response to it. A copy of the slide presentation is filed with the Office of the City Clerk.
- **Roy Atkinson (Mechanicsville Community Association),** opposed, provided a slide presentation. The site should be retained as greenspace. It allows for access over City easements to the Ottawa River. The full width of the site is not needed for an embassy. Making the green space private will limit access. A copy of the slide presentation is filed with the Office of the City Clerk.
- **Kristi Ross (legal counsel for Mechanicsville Community Association),** opposed. Mitigating green space loss can be done by enlarging the park or providing corridors and public access. Ms. Ross referenced the Planning Act, the Official Plan and Zoning By-law provisions. A copy of the slide presentation and written submission is filed with the Office of the City Clerk.
- **Jane Keeler** stated that the consequences of lost mature trees are dire given the climate crisis. Climate concerns should be considered.

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent two hours and 20 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 N° PLC 2021-49/1

THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that pages 31 and 32, as found in Document 2 of the report and page 36, as found in Document 4 of the report, be revised with the documents enclosed. (held on file with the Office of the City Clerk)

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

Motion N° PLC 2021-49/2

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the following be added as a new provision under Section 2(d) of Document 3 as found on page 35 of the report:

- x. **Maximum number of offices (limited to embassy uses) or diplomatic missions: 5**

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

Motion N° PLC 2021-49/3

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Section 13 of the Official Plan Amendment, as found on page 30 of Document 2, be revised by deleting “Parking is encouraged to locate in a building or underground” and substitute with the following wording “Parking is encouraged to be underground, or sensitively screened, and is prohibited above the ground floor.”

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between September 23 (Planning Committee consideration date) and February 9, 2022 (the ultimate Council consideration date): 0

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council deferred the application on October 13, 2021 and November, 2022, and ultimately considered the committee recommendations at its meeting on February 9, 2022.

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and voted to refuse the application. The following Motion was approved:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council approved that:

- 1. The application for amendments to the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law 2008-250 for 1 and 19 Sir John A. MacDonald Parkway to permit the development of a diplomatic precinct be refused.**
- 2. The reasons for the refusal of the zoning amendment are:**
 - a. The applicant has not provided the appropriate amount of greenspace for a rapidly developing area and has not provided parkland to meet the CDP parcel previously identified for this site;**
 - b. Connectivity between the development and the neighbourhood area and community has not been appropriately established; and**
 - c. Landscaping which buffers the area has not been maximized, and needs to be reassessed to mitigate impacts to the community;**
 - d. Sidewalk and transportation infrastructure providing passage from the community into the diplomatic precinct has not been adequately implemented.**