

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Official Plan Amendment – Manor Park North and Manor Park South (multiple addresses)

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: 13

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between February 28 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for the meeting of March 10, 2022, (when this item was first scheduled to be considered) and March 23, 2022 (the deadline for written submissions, being 4 pm the business day before the committee meeting date when the item was considered): 31

Summary of written submissions

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

- Email dated February 23, 2022, from E. Gammell, with comments
- Email dated March 7, 2022, from Brett and Wenda Hodson, opposed
- Email dated March 8, 2022, from Dan Mcnaughtan, opposed
- Email dated March 8, 2022, from Grace Sohmer, opposed
- Email dated March 8, 2022, from Jean-Claude Lizé, opposed
- Email dated March 8, 2022, from Marc and Isabelle Latreille, opposed
- Email dated March 9, 2022, from Karen Sullivan, with concerns
- Email dated March 9, 2022, from Meghan Sullivan, opposed
- Email dated March 9, 2022, from Brynna Leslie, opposed
- Email dated March 9, 2022, from Sean Schuck, with concerns
- Email dated March 9, 2022, from Ashley Reynolds, ACORN, with concerns

- Email dated March 9, 2022, from Ryan Fortner, opposed
- Email dated March 9, 2022, from Ewen Cornish, opposed
- Email dated March 9, 2022, from Laura-Anne Rawes, opposed
- Email dated March 9, 2022, from Susan D. Clarke, opposed
- Letter received March 10, 2022, from Natalie Belovic, Manor Park Community Association, with comments
- Email dated March 9, 2022, from Andrew Sommerfeld, opposed
- Email dated March 16, 2022, from Robert Balma, opposed
- Letter dated March 21, 2022, from Martin Adelaar, Ottawa Community Benefits Network, with comments
- Email dated March 23, 2022, from Lara de Salaberry, with concerns

Summary of oral submissions

The Applicant provided a slide presentation, a copy of which is on file with the City Clerk. The Applicant provided an overview of the Application and responded to questions from the Committee. They were represented by the following:

- Fotenn Planning and Design: Jacob Bolduc and Miguel Tremblay
- Renfroe Land Management: David Renfroe
- Manor Park Estates: Lalit Aggarwal

The Committee heard the following public delegations on the report, and a summary of their respective comments are as follows:

- Dean Tester, Make Housing Affordable, spoke in favour of the proposal. The developers have worked hard to address affordable housing and accommodating current residents to ensure no one would be displaced. This is a responsible project and would like to see more like it across the City.
- Elizabeth McAllister (slides on file) spoke in general support of the proposal however raised concerns related to the significant disruption the residents of Manor Park will undergo. A safe, healthy and environmentally sustainable committee is what the residents want, not high rise and mid rise buildings that ultimately reduce on the ground affordable houses.

- Natalie Belovic, President Manor Park Community Association spoke in general support of the proposal, noting the developer has committed to some significant incentives (ie. a generous non displacement package). However the Community Association has concerns related to intensification in the urban core, transportation and transit availability, and lack of greenspace and not enough family centric ground oriented units.
- Ayse Comeau spoke in support of the proposal, noting the developer has made great efforts to ease the concerns of residents by being open to communication and committing to a number of incentives such as no loss of housing, no evictions and rent control, further proving the commitment to these by signing a Memorandum of Understand (MOU). However, residents have expressed concerns related to how the OP speaks to intensification and what this might mean for future development of the Manor Park community.
- André Comeau apologized for not providing comments from the tenants to Councillor King earlier on in the process. He is in support of the proposal and all of the work the developer did accommodating the community concerns. However, he also expressed concern with possible future developments and developers not being as accommodating to the community needs.
- Julie Taub expressed concerns with the number of mature trees that will be removed given the current climate emergency, how the city managed the consultation process regarding this development and suggests this development would create an urban heat island in Manor Park.
- Sean Schuck (slides on file) expressed concerns with the proposed building heights specifically in Manor Park South, how the heights of the buildings will affect sunlight on neighbouring properties and encouraged the city to complete additional community engagement on this proposal.
- Rob James spoke to inconsistencies of the project, expressing concerns with the impact on the Manor Park School and local greenspace as well as a lack of information provided on projected traffic patterns. He notes the decision for this development will have generational impacts.
- Richard van der Jagt, MD, FRCP, Member of Community for the Community Benefits Agreement, spoke to traffic impacts on residents' health, the need for a vision for development capacity of community, the use of solar panels to minimize dependency on the current grid as well, new builds should include pre wiring for Electronic Vehicles. He also touched on the scope of the MOU.

- Francesca Ryan shared her experience growing up in the neighbourhood and although largely in favour of the proposal expressed concerns with lack of reliable transit as well as greenspace. She indicated support for the Town Square proposed and is hopeful that with increased density will allow for better infrastructure with access to more amenities.
- Peter MacKinnon questioned whether the concept of Smart Cities or the use of smart buildings was taken into account in this development and identified the benefits to the communities.
- Iola Price feels the amount of densification in this proposal is poor planning noting the environmental impacts. Although she applauds the MOU agreement, she doesn't feel it recognizes the birds (Chimney Swifts) that will be affected and displaced and asks the City to remove any wire mesh cages covering unoccupied chimneys until demolition and work with residents to find alternative nesting sites.

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 4 hours and 55 minutes in consideration of the item.

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

Ottawa City Council

Pursuant to the *Procedure By-law*, members of the public may not make oral submissions to Council.

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between March 23 after 4 pm (deadline for written submissions to Planning Committee) and April 13, 2022 (Council consideration date): 1

Summary of written submissions to Council

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

- Richard van der Jagt letter received April 8, opposed

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as presented.