

Document 7 – Consultation Details

Through the Building Liveable Ottawa 2013 Official Plan update, stakeholders were consulted extensively and participated in the formulation of the policies which are being implemented through the 2014 Zoning Review project. In concert with this prior public process, consultation for the 2014 Zoning Review included a presentation to Community Associations citywide the week of May 14, 2014, a presentation to the Federation of Community Associations the week of May 26, 2014, a series of three Information Sessions held the week of June 16, 2014 to inform the public of the proposed Zoning By-law amendments as well as several presentations to individual community groups in the spring and early summer. The public was also engaged through the project website that received approximately 4,400 visits, and through a project newsletter that had approximately 710 subscribers.

Public notification for the City-initiated Zoning By-law and Official Plan amendments associated with the Review was carried out in accordance with the City's Public Notification and Consultation Policy and the alternative measures of the Official Plan. Notice of the project, including the dates for the June Public Information Sessions, was emailed to all affected Community Associations on April 23, 2014, was mailed by Canada Post to all review area landowners on April 24, 2014, and was mailed in a flyer format by postal code to all addresses within 120 metres of the Zoning Review study areas on April 25, 2014.

Notice of the project and of the June Information Sessions was advertised in the EMC newspapers on April 24, 2014 and on May 1, 2014 and was advertised in the LeDroit on April 25, 2014 and on May 2, 2014. A reminder notice of the June Public Information Sessions was advertised in the EMC newspapers on June 5, 2014 and on June 12, 2014 and was advertised in the LeDroit on June 6, 2014 and on June 13, 2014. Approximately 200 people attended the June public information sessions and approximately 190 people participated in project presentations to community groups.

Notice of the City-initiated Zoning By-law and Official Plan amendments was advertised in the EMC newspapers on July 10, 2014 and in the LeDroit on July 11, 2014. The proposed Zoning By-law and Official Plan amendments were circulated for comment to technical agencies and to community groups on July 10, 2014. All affected residents and interest groups have therefore received direct notice and have had opportunity to participate in the project. The formal consultation period following circulation of the proposed amendments concluded on August 15, 2014.

SUMMARY OF INPUT

The table below provides a summary of consolidated comments received during the consultation period, including the public open house. Staff responses are provided for each comment.

Table 1 - Comments from Technical Agencies and City Departments

| Technical Agencies and City Departments | |
|--|---|
| Comment | Response |
| Ottawa Fire Services | |
| Comment respecting response times in communities located outside the Greenbelt and forthcoming changes to the Ontario Building Code that will permit wood-framed six story building construction. | Zoning changes arising from the 2014 Zoning Review are in keeping with building heights permitted by the Official Plan. The Zoning By-law presently permits a range of building heights in the areas of concern including at over six storeys. Planning staff has agreed to on-going dialogue and to work cooperatively with Fire Services. |
| Ottawa International Airport Authority | |
| Comment to ensure that proposed maximum building heights in the Merivale Road (south), Barrhaven Town Centre, Walkley Road and Carling Ave Review areas respected the Airport Zoning Regulations (AZR) maximum permitted building heights. | The proposed building heights in the Review areas do not exceed the maximums permitted under the AZR. Building heights including permitted projections that may encroach on AZR limits will be reviewed at the time of future development approval. |
| Mixed-Use Centres / Town Centres | |
| Comment | Response |
| Barrhaven Town Centre (TC) | |
| Concerned that the proposed height of 12 storeys east of Greenbank did not apply | 12 storeys are recommended on both sides of Greenbank in accordance with the South Nepean Secondary Plan, High Rise Mixed |

| | |
|---|--|
| to the land west of Greenbank. | Use designation. |
| Barrhaven TC Comment asking about future library space in the Town Centre | Person was directed to Library staff contact for discussion about future construction plans. |
| Orléans TC A property owner on Maisonneuve Street wanted to know if/how the rezoning would affect the sale of the existing duplex on his property. | The existing R5A zoning designation will remain. The maximum permitted height of 40 metre will also be maintained. |
| Billings Bridge Inquiry regarding the Canada Post Headquarters at Heron and Riverside Drive to find out what stage the Billings Bridge Mixed Use Centre Zoning review was in and if there is a plan to do a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) plan at the same time. | Confirmed that a TOD plan is not contemplated at this time for Billings Bridge. |
| Traditional Mainstreets | |
| Comment | Response |
| Dalhousie Street The Lowertown Community Association submitted the following comments: The rezoning from Residential (R4) to Traditional Mainstreet (TM) is inappropriate because the residential character of these blocks is very different from those south of Bingham Park and many of the wide range of commercial uses permitted in the TM zone are not in | The two existing TM zones with a height suffix of 15 metres will be maintained, as they are located within a Heritage Overlay and in the Lower Town Community Heritage District. This is meant to avoid height inconsistencies between new development on vacant or exempted properties with existing buildings. The properties fronting onto Dalhousie |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>keeping with the exclusively residential character.</p> <p>Concerned with the elimination of property-specific height restrictions in the TM zone. No building in the area is higher than four storeys and heritage guidelines require replacement buildings to respect these height limits. The Heritage Conservation District current provisions are too weak to really be meaningful. Dalhousie Street should be removed from the current zoning review until Council adopts the two Heritage Conservation Districts in Lowertown and their guidelines so that they meet all the statutory requirements under the Ontario <i>Heritage Act</i> 2005.</p> | <p>Street between Cathcart Street and Boteler Street will be rezoned from R4S - Residential Fourth Density Zone to TM12 H(14.5) - Traditional Mainstreet Subzone with height suffix. In addition to the uses to be introduced by the TM zoning, this subzone will essentially also allow for all residential uses presently permitted under R4S. The 14.5 metre suffix is equivalent to the maximum building height presently permitted under R4S. This is also meant to minimize height inconsistencies.</p> <p>Where properties in the TM zone abut R1 to R4 residential zones, existing building height setback zoning regulations apply. The OP designates Dalhousie Street as a Traditional Mainstreet between Rideau Street and Boteler Street. The uses permitted in the TM zone should be available as-of-right to the owners of these properties.</p> |
| <p>Main and Hawthorne</p> <p>Request to use Traditional Mainstreet, subzone 7 rather than the proposed Traditional Mainstreet, subzone 12 in order to maintain the same zoning as the rest of the corridor.</p> | <p>This request was accommodated.</p> |
| <p>Main and Hawthorne</p> <p>Request to alter the existing exception 1839 to make it more flexible, as it has become problematic for the community.</p> | <p>This request was accommodated.</p> |
| <p>Main and Hawthorne</p> <p>An error was pointed out in the existing</p> | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Zoning Bylaw, Traditional Mainstreet parent zone, 197(5) (e) which should indicate that the Mainstreet ends at Clegg.</p> | <p>This request was accommodated.</p> |
| <p>Main and Hawthorne</p> <p>Request to include 173 Greenfield in the Traditional Mainstreet zone, as per the Old Ottawa East Secondary Plan direction.</p> | <p>This request was accommodated.</p> |
| <p>Merivale (North)</p> <p>A concern was raised with the proposed rezoning from residential to Traditional Mainstreet that the area would turn to late night activities, including bars and nightclubs.</p> | <p>Bar and nightclub are not permitted uses under the proposed rezoning.</p> |
| <p>Merivale (North)</p> <p>Questions were raised on how the zoning changes would impact property taxes.</p> | <p>Referred to the appropriate municipal department for clarification.</p> |
| <p>Merivale (North)</p> <p>Questions raised on how the proposed zoning changes would impact the front yard, soft landscaping requirements.</p> | <p>No changes proposed to soft landscaping requirements.</p> |
| <p>Merivale (North)</p> <p>Questions raised on how the area can become more pedestrian friendly.</p> | <p>The City has recently completed a Transportation Master Plan (TMP), which can provide some answers on the long term approach for how the road right-of-way for this area will be managed.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Merivale (North)</p> <p>Question raised on what the maximum permitted height would be.</p> | <p>The maximum permitted height, as per the Official Plan, under a Traditional Mainstreet zoning is six storeys or 20 metres.</p> |
| <p>Merivale (North)</p> <p>Questions asked regarding if the Traditional Mainstreet zone can include low-rise condominiums. And if the Traditional Mainstreet zone would permit the joining of properties to make larger properties.</p> | <p>Yes low rise condominiums would be permitted. Land consolidation can happen anywhere, it is not just limited to the project area.</p> |
| <p>Somerset</p> <p>Inquiry regarding the zoning approach for a specific property and to determine whether certain non-residential uses would be permitted (office).</p> | <p>The specific non-residential uses are permitted in the new proposed zone as-of-right.</p> |
| <p>Somerset</p> <p>Inquiry regarding the zoning approach for a specific property and to determine whether certain existing non-residential uses would be permitted (office).</p> | <p>The existing uses would be permitted as legal non-complying. The office use is a permitted use in the zone, however not within the first 6 metres of the front wall. The existing use would be able to continue under the Zoning By-law provisions for non-complying uses.</p> |
| <p>Somerset</p> <p>Inquiry regarding a specific property which had recently obtained certain development rights which were not implemented into the current zoning.</p> | <p>This property was removed from the study area so that the current zoning amendment could prevail.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Somerset</p> <p>Concerns were expressed regarding that the City was proceeding with amending the Zoning By-law for Somerset to bring it into conformance with the Centretown Secondary Plan (SP), even though the SP is under appeal.</p> | <p>The City is aware of the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) hearing and will proceed with the re-zoning efforts of Somerset to implement the direction respecting permitted uses of land on secondary mainstreets in the Council-adopted secondary plan.</p> |
| <p>Somerset</p> <p>Inquiry requesting the proposed height on a certain site on Somerset.</p> | <p>The proposed zoning map was provided, which contained details on the proposed maximum permitted height.</p> |
| <p>Preston</p> <p>Comment expressing the dissatisfaction with the proposal for Preston Street, north of Somerset, to be rezoned from Residential to Traditional Mainstreet.</p> | <p>The OP designates Preston Street as a Traditional Mainstreet between Carling Avenue and Albert Street. The uses permitted in the TM zone should be available as-of-right to the owners of those properties.</p> |
| <p>Preston</p> <p>Inquiry regarding the proposed zoning on a specific parcel of land.</p> | <p>The proposed zoning map and a detailed explanation of the zoning change were provided.</p> |
| <p>Bronson Avenue</p> <p>Request that the proposed rezoning from TM[36] H(##) to straight TM, with no height suffix or exception, be extended to the entire block bounded by Bronson Avenue, Plymouth Street, Cambridge Street and the Queensway, rather than just the parcels fronting on Bronson.Avenue (The commenter's</p> | <p>Staff is generally reluctant to extend the Mainstreet zoning through the entire depth of a block, as this risks turning the next street into a driveway/loading alley for the Traditional Mainstreet uses, to the detriment of residents on the other side of the back street. However, in this case, all of the parcels on this block are currently zoned TM</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>interest excludes 600 and 606 Bronson Avenue, which are on this block but are under different ownership not part of the site in question.)</p> | <p>with exceptions, including the parcels that front on Plymouth and Cambridge Streets. Including these parcels would simply be a matter of removing the exceptions (which in staff's view are obsolete and not appropriate to a Traditional Mainstreet) from these back parcels, and would not extend the Traditional Mainstreet zoning itself. Staff agrees that these parcels should be treated as a single site, and on that basis has modified the proposed zoning map to remove the height suffixes and Exception [36] from the whole block.</p> |
| <p>Bronson Avenue, Gladstone Avenue</p> <p>If the zoning on existing TM and AM streets will be changed to remove existing height and other exceptions that may not conform to the new OP direction--can you clarify how the City is deciding on these changes? For example, where a site has recently gone through a zoning approval and has exceptions that permit development outside of the new direction described in the OP, will that zoning remain?</p> | <p>The present zoning review does not and should not pre-empt the outcomes of such site-specific zoning amendments, any more than it should reverse the outcomes of zoning amendments whose processes overlap in time with the current Zoning Review.</p> <p>Properties where site-specific, owner-initiated rezonings recently have been approved by Planning Committee have been removed from the proposed rezoning.</p> <p>In cases where a rezoning application has been initiated but has not yet been approved by Planning Committee, Staff's approach has been to propose the same changes that would otherwise have been proposed if there were no independent rezoning underway concurrently. This is not done to pre-empt the site-specific zoning amendment, but rather to ensure that if that site-specific rezoning application is refused,</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>abandoned or otherwise not concluded, the zoning on the parcel will still be consistent with the Official Plan.</p> <p>In cases where the current permitted height on a given property is greater than that directed by the Official Plan or a Community Design Plan, that height will be maintained and not lowered.</p> |
| <p>Gladstone Avenue</p> <p>Expresses concern that the review will result in Gladstone Avenue being dropped from the city's plans for it to be a spine network in the ultimate cycling network (as per the Ottawa Cycling Plan)?</p> | <p>The zoning review deals only with the zoning on private land, and does not affect transportation policies relating to the right-of-way.</p> <p>A key purpose of the Traditional Mainstreet designation (including the Secondary Mainstreet designation in the Centretown CDP) from a land-use standpoint is to promote a mix of uses and development that will be supportive of walking, cycling and transit options. This supports the goals of the Ottawa Cycling Plan.</p> |
| <p>Gladstone Avenue</p> <p>Is this an opportunity to review the street's role as a major trucking route?</p> <p>Are cycle lanes and bike parking requirements also being reviewed for traditional main streets?</p> | <p>The zoning review deals only with the zoning on private land, and does not affect transportation policies relating to the right-of-way.</p> <p>A key purpose of the Traditional Mainstreet designation (including the Secondary Mainstreet designation in the Centretown Community Design Plan (CDP)) from a land-use standpoint is to promote a mix of uses and development that will be supportive of walking, cycling and transit</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>options.</p> <p>A review of parking requirements is planned for early 2015, with a particular focus on the inner urban area. This review will include consideration of bicycle parking requirements.</p> |
| <p>Gladstone Avenue</p> <p>Given that the Centretown Design Plan is under appeal, are all of these revisions taking into consideration the extra work/confusion this is going to create once this is resolved?</p> | <p>Where the proposed zoning changes depend on policies currently under appeal (e.g. provisions of the Centretown CDP and of OPA 150), these provisions will come into effect when the appealed policies are resolved.</p> |
| <p>Gladstone Avenue</p> <p>The Centretown Secondary Plan supports 17 metres building heights on Gladstone Avenue between Bronson Avenue and Bank Street; however, the circulated proposal shows a permitted height of 15 metres. The Centertown plan, including the 17 metres height limit, should be implemented on this stretch of Gladstone Avenue.</p> | <p>The Centretown CDP supports leaving existing height provisions in place, in order to maximize opportunities for Section 37 benefits through site-specific rezonings. However, no upzoning from 15 metres to 17 metres would trigger a Section 37 agreement as it is an increase of less than 25 per cent of the permitted height. On this basis, Staff agrees with the commenter and proposes to upzone this stretch of Gladstone Avenue to 17 metres in order to implement the intent of the Centretown Secondary Plan.</p> |
| <p>Gladstone Avenue</p> <p>Are building heights for the Somerset and Gladstone Traditional Mainstreets being maintained as they are outlined in the Centretown Secondary Plan? Will the building heights (and setbacks), as well</p> | <p>The TMx Secondary (Traditional) Mainstreet zone to be applied to Gladstone Avenue between Bronson Avenue and Bank Street, to Somerset Street between Percy Street and Bank Street, and to Somerset Street</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>as permitted uses, be explicitly outlined in the zoning by-law as they are for other TM sub zones, ie. Elgin Street sub zone?</p> | <p>between O'Connor Street and Elgin Street, is based on the Traditional Mainstreet parent zoning, with modifications to implement the direction of the Centretown CDP. The range of non-residential uses allowed in the TM zone will be permitted, but will be limited to 225 square metres gross floor area in keeping with the direction to allow neighbourhood-oriented, small-scale uses.</p> |
| <p>Gladstone Avenue</p> <p>Envirocentre in partnership with Hydro Ottawa is planning a "conservation home" project at 493 Gladstone, a house owned by Hydro Ottawa. The ECI Home would involve a green renovation of the existing home, which would then be maintained as a demonstration and education centre with several functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A place for the public to see a range of green building products and measures relevant to the existing building sector, and get personal and impartial advice • A place for small scale research projects in collaboration with local institutions and agencies (e.g innovative solar panels, exterior cladding and windows, residential building controls, etc.) • A place to have small instructional workshops aimed a local residents who are interested in green building techniques | <p>Based on the commenter's description, Staff believes that the proposed project would be considered some combination of community centre multi purpose facility offering programs of an instructional nature, instructional facility and research and development centre, all of which are permitted uses in the proposed TMx zone, subject to a maximum floor area of 225 square metres.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A place for the industry to gather to see products, learn from suppliers, and network. • A place for academic and trade education programs to gain hands on experience. <p>There is a large adjacent side lot where an addition would be built within a few years, with the total floor area being less than 225 square metres. Envirocentre would like to know if this project would be permitted under the proposed zoning.</p> | |
| <p>McArthur Avenue (also Carling Avenue, Innes Road, Merivale Road)</p> <p>I support the general thrust of extending TM zoning to the TM-designated streets. Traditional Mainstreet rules whereby larger buildings cannot be more than 2 metres from the sidewalk are appropriate across the city; this should be applied to Arterial Mainstreets such as Carling Avenue, Innes Road and Merivale Road. Under such rules, the existing grocery store on McArthur Avenue would not have been able to be built with its parking out front--it would have to be underground or behind the building.</p> | <p>Active Frontage requirements being applied to Carling Avenue, Innes Road and Merivale Road will establish maximum setbacks and require buildings to better address the street.</p> |
| <p>McArthur Avenue</p> <p>I would like to see more public housing and residential buildings along McArthur Avenue.</p> | <p>Proposed TM zoning allows for mid-rise apartment dwellings up to six storeys, as well as mixed residential/commercial buildings.</p> |
| <p>Arterial Mainstreets</p> | |

| Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>St. Joseph Boulevard</p> <p>The rezoning should restrict height to low-storey buildings and entrench setbacks from unstable slopes.</p> <p>There should be an immediate moratorium on any construction in the area until soil stability can be satisfactorily studied and all of the residents of Orléans adequately protected.</p> <p>The current method of requiring a geotechnical study on the developer's lot is not appropriate.</p> <p>A petition containing 119 signatures was submitted.</p> <p>A letter was submitted by a resident of the area, Lisa Couture.</p> | <p>City Staff will not be proceeding with the rezoning of St. Joseph Boulevard through the 2014 Zoning Review. As a point of clarification, the intent of the rezoning was to implement the nine storeys prescribed by the Official Plan (Amendment No. 150), not to review the appropriateness of the permitted heights along St. Joseph Boulevard.</p> <p>As a point of clarification, staff's position is maintained in that the most appropriate way to implement height increases along the St. Joseph Boulevard corridor is by way of site-specific development proposals accompanied with the necessary plans and geo-technical studies.</p> |
| <p>Innes Road</p> <p>Request to add lands into the study area (existing nursery operation at 2832 Innes Road)</p> | <p>The lands were determined to be outside the boundary of the Arterial Mainstreet Study area and much of the lands at the east side of the study area were unsuitable for Arterial Mainstreet Zoning. It was further determined that an AM zoning or subzone would not be suitable to the property which is surrounded by residential third density land use.</p> |
| <p>Innes Road</p> <p>2575 Innes. Discussions regarding rezoning to permit a pharmacy use</p> | <p>Property was rezoned to allow for a pharmacy prior to completion of the zoning review. Nevertheless the zoning will be amended to the Arterial Mainstreet Innes subzone through this study, which also</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | allows a pharmacy use and the existing medical / dental facility uses. |
| <p>Innes Road</p> <p>Discussions with Community Association regarding automobile related uses. There was concern expressed regarding the addition of automobile dealerships and drive thrus in the hamlet if rezoning to AM were to occur.</p> | <p>Analysis of automobile dealers city-wide concluded that a minimum lot size of 1500 square metres was appropriate for automobile dealers, and can still meet density requirements under the plan. This size provision would limit conversions of existing uses or accessory use as a dealership over most of the properties that are currently residential and would address any potential conflict within established neighbourhoods. All existing new automobile dealers on Montreal Road and St Laurent Boulevard are above this threshold size and would be unaffected by the addition of the provision. It was determined that the existing provisions for drive-thrus would be sufficient.</p> |
| <p>Montreal Road</p> <p>A portion of the Heritage Manor retirement home lands (612 Montreal Road and 624 Wilson Street) were requested to be included into the study area.</p> | <p>Only the frontage was originally included in the study area. It was determined upon further review that the study area and proposed AM zoning should be expanded. The rationale for this is because the existing frontage was not wide enough to allow for development on the retirement home site if the lands outside the study area were not included.</p> |
| <p>Montreal Road</p> <p>Request to review the study boundaries and proposed AM zoning for 825 Montreal Road. The land owner has completed land assembly with adjacent</p> | <p>It was determined that the frontage of 825 Montreal Road was not sufficient to allow for AM development and that this inhibited land assembly and redevelopment. Additionally, the rear portion of the property is</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>parcels but was constrained from redevelopment by the existing residential first density on the rear portion of the lot.</p> | <p>constrained with a steep slope and thus could not be developed with its [rear] frontage on Blackthorn Avenue. It was concluded that appropriate development of this property and those adjacent at 807, 811, 817, 829, 831, 835 and 841 Montreal Road would require the lands to be added to the study area and rezoning to Arterial Mainstreet.</p> |
| <p>Montreal Road</p> <p>Discussions with landowners of 1668 Montreal Road (Beacon Hill Motel) regarding permitted land uses. The existing use is not permitted although long established. The land owners requested consideration for AM use rather than the more restrictive AM6 in order to allow flexibility in meeting density requirements and redevelopment.</p> | <p>The property and those adjacent were investigated through an onsite visit. It was determined that this property and those adjacent would benefit from less restrictive zoning combined with active street frontage parameters to foster a more pedestrian oriented redevelopment of the area. As a consequence the lands from 1638 to 1730 Montreal Road have been recommended for AM10 zoning.</p> |
| <p>Montreal Road</p> <p>Residents in the Foxboro and Gables community area were concerned that changes to the height provisions and potential rezoning could impact their neighbourhood</p> | <p>Height provisions were discussed and parent zone changes are based on the Official Plan amendment 150. Upon review of this area of Montreal Road no additional AM areas have been recommended in this predominantly residential area.</p> |
| <p>Montreal Road</p> <p>Discussion regarding the NRC lands and their role on the Arterial Mainstreet (1191 and 1200 Montreal Road)</p> | <p>Based on discussion and analysis of the NRC lands it was determined that rezoning to AM on these lands, while carrying forward existing land use permissions, would give flexibility to expand employment and service uses over this important area in the long term.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Montreal Road and St Laurent Boulevard</p> <p>Discussion with members of the public at open house and with councillors Offices regarding a potential proliferation of used automobile sales establishment if allowed through zoning. These dealers tend to be small, single person operations that do not meet density requirements under the Official Plan</p> | <p>Analysis of automobile dealers city wide concluded that a minimum lot size of 1500 square metres was appropriate for automobile dealers, and still meet density requirements under the plan.</p> <p>This size provision would limit conversions of existing uses or accessory use as a dealership over most of the properties that are currently residential and would address any potential conflict within established neighbourhoods.</p> <p>All existing new automobile dealers on Montreal Road and St Laurent Boulevard are above this threshold size and would be unaffected by the addition of the provision.</p> |
| <p>Walkley Road</p> <p>1718 Heron Road</p> <p>Consideration for fuel sales and convenience stores along the Arterial Mainstreet was requested. The issue is that these small operations cannot readily meet density requirements under the Official Plan unless integrated into larger, denser development.</p> | <p>It was concluded that these small operations would be addressed by the forthcoming Density Index zoning study. No provisions are considered necessary in the AM zone to allow these uses as they are contemplated under the Official Plan.</p> |
| <p>Walkley Road</p> <p>Concern was raised that AM zoning of the Jim Durrell Recreation Centre (1265 Walkley) would lead to development and loss of the facility to the community.</p> | <p>There are no plans to redevelop the recreation centre. The AM zoning proposed for the Jim Durrell Recreation Centre will allow for additional uses than already permitted on the site. These uses could intensify the existing recreation facility and provide greater community benefit.</p> |
| <p>Walkley Road</p> <p>Discussion with landowners in the Baycrest Drive, Cedarwood Drive area</p> | <p>Through discussions with the land owners it was determined that additional height</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>(2820 Cedarwood Drive, 2898 Baycrest and 2881 Baycrest Drive) regarding redevelopment and intensification opportunities.</p> | <p>permissions from AM zoning in the existing low rise development area would be an incentive to investment and redevelopment of the lands to higher density residential and mixed uses.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>Request that 265 Carling Avenue be exempted from the proposed requirement for e.g. retail, restaurant, personal service shop etc. on the ground floor.</p> | <p>After further consideration, staff has modified the proposed active frontage requirements throughout the study area. Active frontage requirements will no longer include a requirement for certain uses to be located on the ground floor.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>Our recent zoning amendment for the southwest corner of 265 Carling Avenue was overlooked when you put together the schedules for the Phase 2 Zoning Review. We have rights to an 18 storey building on that site. For details, you can talk to Doug James, who was the planner on the file. Please confirm that you will fix this and our zoning rights will remain intact.</p> | <p>The site-specific, owner-initiated rezoning of this part of 265 Carling Avenue has been approved by Council and awaits completion of a Section 37 agreement. Staff has removed these lands from the general zoning review.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>Supports rezoning Area U (south side of Carling Avenue between Hare and Riddell Avenues) to Arterial Mainstreet zoning, as this is much more appropriate to an Arterial Mainstreet than the current R3C zoning. Questions why a height limit of 20m is being imposed, when the lots are 150 feet deep; the commenter feels that this is deep enough to accommodate a nine-storey (30 metres) building with</p> | <p>The 20 metres limit is based on site conditions, existing character and compatibility, per OP Policy 3.6.3(10.)</p> <p>The proposed 20 metres height limit on this stretch of Carling Avenue is consistent with the overall approach for lots in this depth range, i.e. to apply the six-storey/20 metres limit on lots less than 50 metres deep. In this case, the lots are roughly 45 metres</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>the required step-backs.</p> <p>If not, then why have the 20 metres restriction on the whole lot, rather than a step-down provision only for the southern part of the lot nearer to the residential area?</p> | <p>deep; net of road widenings of approximately 7 metres on either side of Carling directed by the Official Plan, the practical depth is closer to 38 metres.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>Request to keep AM zoning but change height transition to allow a six and four storey building.</p> | <p>Proposed zoning does allow six storeys for that part that is more than 20 metres from the residential zone, and stepping down to three storeys at the back of the zone, very close to what the commenter is proposing. Staff does not recommend loosening the step-down requirements for a particular property.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>Request is to apply AM zoning to these properties but change the height transition.</p> <p>Since this is an appropriate location for a taller building and/or less height transition; the height transition could require a step down to four storeys within 10 metres of R4 residential.</p> | <p>Although Carling Avenue is designated Arterial Mainstreet for its 10 kilometres length, staff has not proposed to pre-zone AM along that entire length, opting rather to concentrate AM zoning on stretches that show the most potential to evolve as foreseen by the OP in the short- to medium-term.</p> <p>Conversely, some stretches that are dominated by existing residential high-rises and/or small residential lots that are primarily oriented towards the side streets, are considered premature to pre-zone at this time. 2830 Carling Avenue and 810 Vick Avenue are along one of the stretches that staff proposes to leave residential for the time being.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>I live near the intersection of Bayshore Drive and Carling Avenue and I'm concerned about the impact of zoning on the potential of our neighbourhood to attract a sizable grocery store within reasonable walking distance. This is an economically mixed neighbourhood where many residents are unable to afford a car. Lacking personal transportation, many local people attempt to do their grocery shopping at more expensive venues such as the local pharmacy and small groceries, places that also lack a variety of fresh fruits, vegetables and meats. I'm hoping that as zoning discussions proceed, decision-makers will keep in mind the importance of ensuring that this becomes a neighbourhood where people are able to access affordable shops and services.</p> | <p>Staff is acutely aware of the problem of "food deserts," as well as the reality that many people cannot be expected to rely on cars for their daily transportation needs. Staff seeks as much as possible to address these problems through zoning as well as through other measures.</p> <p>AM zoning permits retail food stores (grocery stores) and it is hoped that updated zoning will make new development that includes grocery stores more attractive to the development industry.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>During your review would you also look at extending the AM zoning to include 16 Anna Avenue. We currently operate an unlicensed five child program out of the house however we would like to have the ability to have this conform with our other two buildings.</p> | <p>Staff has determined that the existing residential zoning on 16 Anna Avenue is consistent with the Official Plan and to change it would be outside the mandate of this project. Requests to rezone this parcel should go through an independent rezoning application.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>Request that 1077/1081 Carling Avenue be exempted from the proposed requirement for e.g. retail, restaurant, personal service shop etc. on the ground</p> | <p>After further consideration, staff has modified the proposed active frontage requirements throughout the study area. Active frontage requirements will no longer</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>floor.</p> <p>The current proposal rezones the portion of the site closest to Carling Avenue (containing the building) but leaves the majority of the site zoned R2D and R1QQ (containing the parking structure, surface parking and vacant land). These three proposed zones together make up one site with one ownership and with a single use: an office building with complementary parking. Any transaction or redevelopment of the property would certainly incorporate all three of them.</p> <p>We therefore request that the entire site at 1081 Carling Avenue be included in the rezoning to AM2 H(20).</p> | <p>include a requirement for certain uses to be located on the ground floor, including at 1081 Carling Avenue.</p> <p>The proposed zoning has been amended to extend the AM2 H(20) to the entire site in question, which as the commenter points out is all part of one parcel and one development.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>The Carling Avenue study area overlaps with the Preston-Carling Community Design Plan (CDP) study area. The community has invested significant time and energy in the Preston-Carling CDP process and is concerned that including this area in the Carling Avenue zoning review would be redundant and may contradict the direction of the CDP.</p> <p>In particular, concerned about any rezoning of 111 Sherwood and the removal of the existing FSI (Floor Space Index) limit.</p> | <p>The original study area for Carling Avenue included part of the Preston-Carling CDP area. Because of that overlap, the Carling Avenue zoning review does not propose to rezone any of the lands covered by the Preston-Carling CDP area.</p> <p>Any rezonings deemed appropriate through the CDP process will be left to the CDP process for implementation, and will not be pre-empted or countered by the Carling Avenue zoning review.</p> <p>111 Sherwood is located within the Preston-Carling CDP area and is not proposed to be rezoned as part of the Carling Avenue zoning amendment.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>The traffic island ("The Triangle") at Carling Avenue and Merivale Road is proposed to be zoned Arterial Mainstreet; however, this island has been beautified by the community with plantings and other work. The commenter requests that The Triangle be zoned as parkland or open space, or otherwise protected.</p> | <p>Staff acknowledges the resident's concern. However, the Triangle is protected from development, at the very least by virtue of being part of the road right-of-way.</p> <p>Indeed, as part of the roadway, that island is technically not zoned at all. The fact that it seems to be zoned is a result of how zoning maps work, whereby the boundaries between zones are supposed to meet each other without any gap in the middle, which means that the zone line often runs down the middle of the street. Usually no one notices because there's no island in the middle of the right-of-way. But because of how the mapping works, in a case like this (i.e. where there's an island) the zone line would simply be placed in such a way that it gets grouped with the nearest parcels, which in this case would be one of the AM zones.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>The Lincoln Fields Transit Station (southern portion) is located within the Carling Avenue AM zoning review area (D02-02-14-0063). The current zoning for this parcel is O1[310]-h – Parks and Open Space.</p> <p>Although the zoning circulation notes that for the Carling Avenue. AM, institutional uses and zones such as parks will generally not be rezoned, the subject parcel is not utilized as a park and a transit facility has not been identified within the O1 zone as a permitted use.</p> | <p>This parcel is not proposed to be rezoned. Although not specifically listed in the permitted uses in O1, the Transitway is permitted by virtue of Section 87(1) in the Zoning By-law which provides that a "rapid-transit network and related construction, staging and repair works to support a rapid transit network are permitted in all zones."</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>I understand that some zoning on existing TM and AM streets will be changed to remove existing height and other exceptions that may not conform to the new OP direction. i.e. Carling Avenue, Gladstone Avenue and Bronson Avenue. Can you clarify how the City is deciding on these changes? For example, where a site has recently gone through a zoning approval and has exceptions that permit development outside of the new direction described in the OP, will that zoning remain?</p> | <p>The present zoning review does not and should not pre-empt the outcomes of such site-specific zoning amendments, any more than it should reverse the outcomes of zoning amendments whose processes overlap in time with the current Zoning Review.</p> <p>Properties where site-specific, owner-initiated rezonings have recently been approved by Planning Committee have been removed from the proposed rezoning.</p> <p>In cases where a rezoning application has been initiated but has not yet been approved by Planning Committee, staff's approach has been to propose the same changes that would otherwise have been proposed if there were no independent rezoning underway concurrently. This is not done to pre-empt the site-specific zoning amendment, but rather to ensure that if that site-specific rezoning application is refused, abandoned or otherwise not concluded, the zoning on the parcel will still be consistent with the Official Plan.</p> <p>In cases where the current permitted height on a given property is greater than that directed by the Official Plan or a Community Design Plan, that height will be maintained and not lowered.</p> |
| <p>Carling Avenue</p> <p>Please consider including 817 Roseview Avenue in the rezoning; its boundaries</p> | <p>Staff agrees with this assessment and proposes to include 817 Roseview Avenue</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>line up more closely with the abutting commercial property on Carling Avenue and with the commercial property across Roseview Avenue.</p> | <p>in the rezoning to Arterial Mainstreet zoning.</p> |
| <p>Merivale Road (south)</p> <p>Item 1. The proposed rezoning requires that one main entrance be provided on the closest façade to the mainstreet.</p> <p>Item 2. The rezoning will require a minimum proportion of ground-floor building façade facing any public street to be composed of windows and functional entrances.</p> <p>Item 3. The rezoning will require that the ground floor be occupied by restaurants, retail stores, personal service shops and similar uses that contribute to street life, except in the case of an automobile dealership, service station, gas bar or residential use building.</p> <p>Item 4. The proposed zoning will require a maximum permitted front yard and corner side yard setback between 3 metres and 6 metres. As the site exists today, this would prevent future expansion and intensification for the inner portions of the site. We ask that this provision not be applied to the site and that the existing no minimum front yard and corner side yard setback be maintained or that an exception be included allowing for development to occur within the Site without minimum</p> | <p>There is widespread recognition that Merivale Road is a poor environment for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists alike. OP policies encourage the evolution of automobile-oriented streetscapes along Arterial Mainstreets into higher quality, pedestrian-oriented streetscapes. The active street frontage provisions are intended to support this evolution.</p> <p>Merivale Road is entering a second phase in its development. Most of the lands have been developed and have reached the stage where they are ready for re-development. This is an opportunity to apply building setbacks that will result in the construction of buildings that frame the street, with windows and doors facing the public right-of-way. These requirements are integral to creating a pedestrian-oriented environment.</p> <p>It is also recognized that work is needed to improve the function and visual quality of the public right-of-way. It is not reasonable to suggest that improvements to the street must occur before the zoning is amended to improve the location of the building on the lot. The new zone provisions are needed as a first step towards improving the streetscape along Merivale Road. Improvement to the right-of-way will occur as funding becomes available.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>setbacks.</p> <p>Item 5. The proposed zoning will require a minimum building height of two storeys. While we appreciate the intent of the above noted requirements and their Official Plan policy base, it remains our opinion that the application of these and similar urban design policies in virtually all suburban locations throughout the city is flawed. For best effect we suggest that suitable locations for enhanced streetscapes be first identified and a realistic timeframe for achieving the objective established. It has been our experience that forcing development to occur in a prescribed manner rarely works and in most cases results in an inferior development. Until such time as the public realm is altered to actually support new urbanist principles there is little if any chance of success in realizing the benefits of the neighbourhood building and pedestrian encouraging efforts forced upon the private sector.</p> <p>Changes to the public realm would include measures such as road narrowing, on-street parking and success with intensification, none of which are likely to occur in this location in the near future. Furthermore, the challenges of</p> | <p>Items 1 and 2: Provisions requiring doors and windows to face the public right-of-way will ensure that the building wall fronting on the mainstreet is accessible to pedestrians. Windows and doors enliven the streetscape and increase the visual quality of the building as seen from the street by pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. These provisions will result in positive outcomes for new development on Merivale Road and are supported by the secondary plan policies which emphasize the visual quality of the street.</p> <p>Item 3: While requirements to require certain uses at grade were contemplated through the public consultation process, the final zone provisions do not include such provisions as these were considered to be unnecessarily restrictive requirements for the primary zone.</p> <p>Item 4: A maximum front and corner side yard setback of 4.5 metres for residential uses and 3.0 metres for non-residential uses is proposed. However, only 50 per cent of the lot width along the street is required to be occupied by building walls. Development may be phased such that each phase does not need to meet the 50 per cent requirement, as long as the completed project meets the 50 per cent requirement. Remaining buildings may be located further from the front or corner side yard lot lines as long as they comply with the interior side and rear yard setbacks.</p> <p>The subject lands at 1450, 1454 and 1460</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>meeting city loading, garbage and other bylaw requirements remain incompatible with the form of development proposed in this bylaw and prove to be a major challenge to retailers and their customers. Success in meeting these objectives are limited to certain uses; most notably restaurants and financial institutions.</p> <p>(Comments applicable to only 1460 Merivale Road)</p> <p>Item 6. The rezoning will add new policies regarding Additional Compatibility for Automobile-Oriented Uses which require that permitted automobile dealerships, service stations and gas bars be subject to several compatibility standards. The standards are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any building or structure, display area, outdoor storage, or queuing space associated with these uses must be at least 30 metres away from any residential zone; - The minimum required lot area will be 1,500 square metres or greater depending on site circumstances; - The yards abutting a public street must be soft landscaped, except for areas providing driveway access, any walkways leading to any functional building entrance oriented towards the public street. We ask that staff confirm that the Refuel Gas Bar located at 1460 Merivale Road adheres to the above listed standards. We attach a copy of the | <p>Merivale Road are in a prominent location within the triangle bounded by Clyde Avenue, Merivale Road and Baseline Road. Requiring that 50 per cent of the lot width along the street be occupied by building walls is considered to be a reasonable standard to be met. The phasing provision provides flexibility as it permits the requirement to be met over time, rather than requiring the buildings along the street frontage to be constructed first.</p> <p>Item 5: It is proposed to require a minimum building height of two-storeys or 7.5 metres, for that portion of the building within 10 metres of the street.</p> <p>Policy 2.2.2.17 of the Official Plan requires that minimum building heights be established in the Zoning By-law within Mixed-Use Centres, Town Centres and Mainstreets. The proposed minimum building height is intended to support compact, mixed-use development in an intensification target area. The provision will also support a higher quality streetscape edge from an urban design perspective, keeping in mind that only the first 10 metres of the building as measured from the street edge needs to comply with this provision, and that only 50 per cent of frontage is required to be occupied by a building wall. The provisions are intended to be a reasonable standard that will support a higher quality streetscape and achieve compact, mixed-use development.</p> <p>Change must start somewhere. It is</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>current site plan to assist.</p> <p>Item 7. For the Site located at 1460 Merivale Road, the rezoning proposes to delete Exception [1418]. This exception identifies that the parking requirement for the site is 3.2 spaces per 100 square metres. If removed, the required parking rate will become 3.6 spaces per 100 square metres. We ask that staff maintain Exception 1418 as it represents the current Site condition. Overall we cannot support these bylaw requirements and the subsequent legal non-conforming status for the Site.</p> | <p>unreasonable to ask the City to first invest in major capital works before considering changing development approaches, as this could take decades. An incremental approach to change is proposed by this zoning framework, whereby all stakeholders drive change in a gradual manner.</p> <p>Item 6: Concerning 1460 Merivale Road. Requirements regarding a separation distance of 30 metres, a minimum lot area of 1500 square metres and soft landscaping were provisions that were contemplated for automobile-related uses during the consultation process. It was decided not to proceed with these provisions as amendments to the primary zone. It is noted that the current provisions in the Arterial Mainstreet zone regarding minimum width of landscaped area require that when a yard is not used for driveways, aisles, parking, loading spaces or outdoor commercial patio, the whole yard must be landscaped. The landscaping may be hard or soft landscaping.</p> <p>Item 7: In response to the comment received, the parking provision in exception [1418] will not be deleted.</p> |
|--|--|

| Merivale Road (south) | |
|--|--|
| <p>Item 1: The City should give very serious consideration to the creation of Mid-Town Merivale, a second urban hub, in close proximity to the city's population centre of gravity and thus able to efficiently provide services to Ottawa residents.</p> | <p>Item 1: The Arterial Mainstreet designation identifies Merivale Road as a target area for intensification. This designation contemplates Merivale Road becoming a hub for employment and residential uses.</p> |
| <p>Item 2: Updates are needed to the secondary plan, Section(3.2), in light of the Densification criterion of 120 jobs-residents per hectare.</p> | <p>Item 2: The secondary plan is being updated to delete references to maximum densities.</p> |
| <p>Item 3: Stricter implementation of its policies relating to the Merivale Road Corridor, Pedestrian Realm, Integration with Neighbouring Communities and Interconnected Vehicle Access (Sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.4).</p> | <p>Item 3: The policies in the secondary plan deal comprehensively with the quality of the streetscape and the circulation of pedestrians and cars. Future development will be evaluated in the context of these policies.</p> |
| <p>Item 4: Coverage [of secondary plan] to be extended from Caldwell Avenue to Hunt Club Road West to match Present day AM zoning</p> | <p>Item 4 and 5: Reconsideration of these issues is unfortunately beyond the scope of the current Zoning Review. A separate secondary planning process would need to be initiated in order to expand the boundaries of the secondary plan.</p> |
| <p>Item 5: The premises of the Secondary Plan challenged in regard to reliance on the private market and on planning primarily for automobiles.</p> | <p>Item 6 and 7: The proposed active street frontage provisions will support the intent of the secondary plan. A wide range of uses will continue to be permitted and subzone provisions that limit the range of uses permitted will be deleted. Detailed issues related to the organization of the site will be dealt with through the site plan control process.</p> |
| <p>Item 6: Confirm the Merivale Secondary Plan's goals, objectives, principles, policies and designs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - create a visual identity and character to the area; - provide flexibility in use permissions to | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>allow the area to adapt to the evolving commercial and retail environment and respond to changing market conditions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase the mix of residential uses within the corridor; - improve the relationship of the physical elements between the residential and commercial portions of the community; and - balance the needs of transit riders, pedestrians, cyclists and motorized vehicle traffic. <p>Item 7: There is value in encouraging, as the City proposes, building forms that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow for multiple uses, commercial and residential; - Are multiple rather than single storeys; - Open vehicular access from one commercial property to adjacent ones on either side; - Use shared access and egress from Merivale Road to commercial blocks or properties. - Building forms are clustered within blocks, interconnected by sidewalks, and offer pedestrians protection from inclement weather - They feature multi-storey parking lots. <p>Item 8: The Community reserves its position in regard to:</p> | <p>Item 8: The purpose of the Zoning Review with regard to Merivale Road is to bring the Zoning By-law into conformity with the policies for building height on Arterial Mainstreets in Section 3.6.3.11 of the Plan. These policies state that building heights will be predominantly nine storeys on Arterial Mainstreets.</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>- zoning regulations for AM zone on abutments or setbacks; and</p> <p>- the nine storeys building height constraint.</p> | |
| General | |
| Comment | Response |
| <p>Concerned about direct implementation of the Official Plan in the Zoning By-law and potential negative impacts on affected communities as a result.</p> | <p>The Ontario Planning Act requires that zoning by-laws conform with the policies of official plans, subject to compatibility considerations. The Zoning By-law contains regulations that require building height transition when developing next to R1 to R4 residential zones.</p> |
| <p>Zoning should not be changed on an arbitrary and spot basis.</p> | <p>The 2014 Zoning Review is aimed at reducing site-specific applications with respect to land use permission and building height increase in order to undertake development that is in compliance with OP policies.</p> |
| <p>Proposed changes to the Zoning By-law must be based on a procedure that is fair, democratic and inclusive of all stakeholders in the community and result in an outcome that benefits all people (residents and applicants).</p> | <p>The Ontario Planning Act and the Official Plan set out procedures for public participation in planning applications. Extensive public consultation was undertaken as part of the 2014 Zoning Review.</p> |
| <p>Property owners negatively impacted against their will by zoning changes should be compensated so that they remain in the same economic position.</p> | <p>There is no Ontario Planning Act requirement to financially compensate landowners as a result of zoning by-law changes.</p> |
| <p>Zoning by-laws affecting a community should be periodically reviewed in a democratic, all-inclusive procedure.</p> | <p>The City does periodically update the Zoning By-law. The public participation component of updates follows the Ontario</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Planning Act and the Official Plan procedures.</p> |
| <p>Seeking clarification that properties with existing exceptions will not be “downzoned” as a result of the 2014 Zoning Review.</p> | <p>Staff cannot provide assurance that none of the zoning changes will remove development rights from affected properties.</p> <p>The provisions of site-specific exceptions have generally been maintained or carried forward to new recommended zoning, unless the exception provisions become redundant as a result of the change to the recommended rezoning (the new zone provides for the same or more permissive regulations) or unless those exceptions are inconsistent with the intent of the Official Plan. Existing uses of land that do not conform with the permitted uses of recommended new zoning have generally been included as “additionally permitted use(s)” a site-specific zoning exception, except where doing so would be inconsistent with the OP. Where a greater maximum height than specified in the OP is already permitted in the Zoning By-law, height reductions have generally not been recommended; exceptions to this approach are detailed in Document 6.</p> |
| <p>Seeking clarification as to how it was determined to which Arterial Mainstreet lots the Active Street Frontage requirements would apply.</p> | <p>Active Street Frontage requirements are proposed for stretches of Arterial Mainstreet where evolution of the street as foreseen by the Official Plan Section 3.6.3 appears most feasible in the short to medium-term. Among the criteria for defining such areas is a significant number of large lots that meet the general description in Official Plan (Section 3.6.3) which foresees</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>intensification as most likely to occur over time through the redevelopment of sites such as vacant lots, aging strip malls, and former automobile sales lots, parking lots and gas stations, as well as through additions to existing buildings.</p> |
|--|--|