

**Report to  
Rapport au:**

**Planning Committee  
Comité de l'urbanisme  
24 April 2018 / 24 avril 2018**

**and Council  
et au Conseil  
9 May 2018 / 9 mai 2018**

**Submitted on 8 April 2018  
Soumis le 8 avril 2018**

**Submitted by  
Soumis par:**

**Lee Ann Snedden  
Director / Directrice**

**Planning Services / Services de la planification**

**Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department / Direction  
générale de la planification, de l'infrastructure et du développement économique**

**Contact Person / Personne ressource:**

**Mélanie Gervais, Planner / urbaniste, Development Review South / Examen des  
demandes d'aménagement sud**

**(613) 580-2424, 24025, Melanie.Gervais@ottawa.ca**

**Ward: RIVER (16) / RIVIÈRE (16)**

**File Number: ACS2018-PIE-PS-0044**

**SUBJECT: Zoning By-law Amendment – 740 Springland Drive**

**OBJET: Modification au Règlement de zonage – 740, promenade Springland**

#### **REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1. That Planning Committee recommend Council approve an amendment to Zoning By-law 2008-250 for 740 Springland Drive to permit a reduction in parking rates and to permit parking in a front yard, as detailed in Document 2.**

2. That Planning Committee approve the Consultation Details Section of this report be included as part of the ‘brief explanation’ in the Summary of Written and Oral Public Submissions, to be prepared by the City Clerk and Solicitor’s Office and submitted to Council in the report titled, “Summary of Oral and Written Public Submissions for Items Subject to Bill 73 ‘Explanation Requirements’ at the City Council Meeting of 9 May 2018,” subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and the time of Council’s decision.

## RECOMMANDATIONS DU RAPPORT

1. Que le Comité de l’urbanisme recommande au Conseil d’approuver une modification au Règlement de zonage n° 2008-250 visant le 740, promenade Springland, afin de réduire les frais de stationnement et de permettre le stationnement dans une cour avant, comme l’indique le document 2.
2. Que le Comité de l’urbanisme donne son approbation à ce que la section du présent rapport consacrée aux détails de la consultation soit incluse en tant que « brève explication » dans le résumé des observations écrites et orales du public, qui sera rédigé par le Bureau du greffier municipal et de l’avocat général et soumis au Conseil dans le rapport intitulé « Résumé des observations orales et écrites du public sur les questions assujetties aux ‘exigences d'explication’ aux termes du projet de loi 73 à la réunion du Conseil municipal prévue le 9 mai 2018», à la condition que les observations aient été reçues entre le moment de la publication du présent rapport et le moment de la décision du Conseil.

## BACKGROUND

Learn more about [link to Development Application process - Zoning Amendment](#)

For all the supporting documents related to this application visit the [link to Development Application Search Tool](#).

### Site location

740 Springland Drive

### Owner

Norberry Residences Ltd.

**Applicant**

Lloyd Phillips, Lloyd Phillips and Associates Ltd.

**Architect**

Roderick Lahey Architect Inc.

**Description of site and surroundings**

The property is located in the Riverside Park community. The property contains street frontage along the entirety of its property boundary. The northern and western property lines front on Springland Drive while the eastern and southern property lines front on Norberry Crescent.

The property has an area of 56,800 square metres (14.03 acres), contains four residential buildings (three six-storey buildings and one 10-storey building) and a small community centre type building containing an indoor swimming pool and a convenience store. Parking on the site is divided between surface parking distributed throughout the site and a parking deck adjacent to the 10-storey building. There are a total of 761 rental units and 750 parking spaces (resident and visitor) existing on the site. The built form and land use surrounding the area to the north, east and south is low-rise residential development. The lands to the west of the site, and along Riverside Drive, provide a mix of land uses and densities which include low to high rise residential, commercial, retail, institutional and open space.

The Concept Site Plan (Document 4) submitted with the Zoning By-law amendment shows two 4.5-storey buildings and one four-storey building located along the site perimeter and fronting onto Norberry Crescent (vehicle access is provided internally via the existing private road). The 4.5-storey buildings contain 81 and 72 units while the four-storey building with contain 72 units and a new parking garage with 219 spaces.

**Summary of requested Zoning By-law amendment proposal**

The current zoning requires a minimum parking rate of 1.2 spaces per unit, a minimum visitor parking rate of 0.2 spaces per unit and prohibits visitor parking in front of the existing buildings.

The proposed Zoning By-law amendment is to:

- reduce the minimum required parking rate from 1.2 spaces per unit to 0.66 spaces per unit;

- reduce the minimum required visitor parking rate from 0.2 spaces per unit to 0.1 spaces per unit (with no visitor parking spaces required for the first 12 units)
- permit visitor parking in the front of the existing buildings.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Public consultation**

Notification and public consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Public Notification and Consultation Policy approved by City Council for Zoning By-law amendment Applications.

Councillor Brockington hosted a community information session on Thursday November 9, 2017 at Riverside United Church, located at 3191 Riverside Drive. For this proposal's consultation details, see Document 3 of this report.

Please note that Councillor Brockington also hosted a community information session prior to the City receiving this application; this pre-meeting was held on October 13, 2016.

### **Official Plan designation**

According to Schedule B of the Official Plan, the property is designated General Urban Area, which is intended to provide a full range and choice of housing types in combination with conveniently located employment, retail, service, leisure, entertainment and institutional uses. Consideration shall be given to a balance of housing types to provide a full range of housing for a variety of demographic profiles throughout the General Urban Area. Schedule E of the Official Plan identifies Springland Drive as a collector road.

The Official Plan requires that development applications be assessed against design and compatibility criteria set out in Sections 2.5.1 and 4.11. Relevant policies of Section 2.5.1, Urban Design and Compatibility, include creating places that are safe, accessible and easy to get to and move through, accommodate the needs of a range of people of different incomes and lifestyles at various stages, and maximize opportunities for sustainable transportation modes. Section 4.11 identifies how compatibility can be achieved and measured in design. Compatibility criteria include, but are not limited to scale, height, setbacks of adjacent properties, traffic, access, parking, outdoor amenity areas and supporting neighbourhood services.

### **Other applicable policies and guidelines**

The property is within the boundaries of the Riverside Park Secondary Plan. According to Schedule R, the property is designated Residential Area – High Density, which permits high-rise apartment buildings. Other applicable policies for Residential Areas outlined in Policy 8.4.2 include: ensuring the continuing existence of a mixture of housing types and densities to accommodate a variety of household sizes, incomes, ages and lifestyles; ensuring that new residential development proposals are not to detract from the quality of life for existing residents; and ensuring that any new high-density residential development be contained within areas where the developed features of the neighbourhood is not at risk.

### **Urban Design Review Panel**

The property was not subject to the Urban Design Review Panel process.

### **Planning rationale**

The proposed development is for three residential buildings of four to 4.5 storeys to be located along the Norberry Crescent frontage. The current zoning permits the proposed use; being apartment dwelling, low rise and apartment dwelling, mid-high rise. The proposed development responds to the Official Plan policies and relevant secondary plan policies outlined above. It is permitted under the General Urban Area designation and appropriately responds to the design and compatibility criteria set out in Sections 2.5.1 and 4.11.

The Official Plan provides directions on managing infill development within the General Urban Area. Policy 3.6.1 (3.c) of the Official Plan promotes a balance of housing types and tenures to provide a full range of housing for a variety of demographic profiles through infill development. The proposal will provide a range of unit sizes to accommodate the housing needs of a large and diverse demographic (studios, one-bedrooms, two-bedrooms plus den, two-bedrooms and three-bedrooms). Policy 3.6.1, as amended by OPA 150, permits a maximum building height in the General Urban Area of four storeys or less but existing zoning that permits building heights greater than those in this section will remain in effect. The proposal of four- and 4.5-storey buildings will respect the maximum height identified in the Zoning By-law; no changes to the maximum height are proposed.

## Compatibility

The Official Plan requires that development applications be assessed against design and compatibility criteria set out in Sections 2.5.1 and 4.11. The proposed four and 4.5 storey buildings have been designed to provide a transition in building height, density and architectural style from the mid-rise residential development located on the interior of the site (six to 10 storeys) to the low-rise residential development (one to two storeys) on the outer side of Norberry Crescent.

## Parking and Connectivity

The Official Plan promotes in Sections 4.3 and 4.11 opportunities to reduce parking requirements and promotes increased usage of walking, cycling and transit where appropriate. The new buildings will be oriented to provide an active street frontage along Norberry Crescent to enhance connectivity and accessibility while also maximizing opportunities for passive solar heating through southern exposure. The design of the site will enhance pedestrian connectivity within the site by adding sidewalks and pathways to the internal private roadway and branching out throughout the site to connect to the existing sidewalks along Norberry Crescent and Springland Drive facilitating more direct connections to the public transit facilities along Springland Drive. The surrounding public transit network and the proposed pedestrian network throughout the site encourages a decreased use of automobile and increased use of alternative modes of transit such as walking, cycling and public transit.

In order to substantiate the reduction in parking rate, Castleglenn Consultants completed multiple parking audits:

- Three on-site parking surveys:
  - Thursday September 8, 2016, Tuesday December 5, 2017 and Wednesday December 6, 2017.
- Four on-street parking surveys:
  - Thursday September 8, 2016, Sunday September 11, 2016, Tuesday December 5, 2017 and Wednesday December 6, 2017.

The conclusion of the Transportation Impact Assessment and the parking survey indicates that “the occupied tenant parking ratio per-unit was determined to be 0.61 stalls-per-unit (assuming a vacancy rate of 1.8 per cent)” and that the visitor parking rate was determined to be 0.02. The on-street parking surveys indicate a

vacancy of 23 on-street parking spaces in the vicinity of the site (out of a total 67 on-street parking spaces).

The proposed parking rate of 0.66 spaces per unit would build in a 0.05 spaces per unit buffer from the existing parking usage rate of 0.61 spaces per unit. Although the existing visitor parking usage rate is 0.02 spaces per unit, in order to discourage visitors to use on-street parking it is proposed that the visitor parking space rate match the rate used for properties within Area X on Schedule 1A of the Zoning By-law; being 0.1 spaces per unit minus the first 12 units. The site is located less than 500 metres outside of Area X on Schedule 1A of the Zoning By-law and is served by Bus Route 87.

Concerning the location of visitor parking spaces in the front of the existing buildings, staff are generally opposed to amendments to allow parking in front of buildings. However, in this instance, the particular configuration of the 10 visitor parking spaces on each of the existing circular driveways with ample green space and designed within the existing deep setbacks, mitigates this concern. Any additional landscaping to buffer these parking spaces from the street will be addressed through Site Plan Control. The convenient location on the circular driveways will also encourage visitors to use the visitor parking spaces instead of parking on the street.

### **Provincial Policy Statement**

Staff have reviewed this proposal and have determined that it is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014.

### **RURAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no rural implications associated with this report.

### **COMMENTS BY THE WARD COUNCILLOR**

Councillor Brockington provided the following comments:

“I am aware of the application being made by the Norberry Residences for parking variances on their property for tenants and visitors as a result of three new buildings being proposed, as well as the application to permit parking within the semi-circle drop off lanes for each of the four existing apartment buildings, located at 740, 790 and 840 Springland Drive, as well as 2660 Norberry Crescent.

I have hosted two well attended public consultation meetings regarding this application. There is opposition within the community to add three new apartment buildings to this complex, however, the land is zoned for this purpose and is not a matter before the

Committee for consideration. The current complex has a significant surplus of unused parking spaces, in the vicinity of 350+. With the pending construction of three new buildings, I understand the concern about the requirement to provide a set amount of parking, if, as history shows, the demand for parking at this location is not strong. In this case, I support the application to lower the required parking spaces, particularly because I do not want to see limited greenspace, including trees, eliminated, unnecessarily. The apartment complex sits on OC Transpo Route 87 and has frequent service, although concerns have been raised in the community about over-crowding of buses, particular during the morning rush and the need to provide additional capacity to meet the increased need from the new tenants. Within the Riverside Park North/Mooney's Bay community, this is the third of four development files that the Planning Committee has seen this year alone. We expect that OC Transpo service will be adjusted to maintain acceptable service to the community.

I have also worked closely with reps of the Norberry Residences to ensure that the parking within the semi-circle drop off lanes does not negatively impact any existing trees and that a natural buffer be built to shield ground floor apartment residents and neighbours across the street. I acknowledge that the total number of parking spaces in these four drop offs lanes has been reduced at my request from 40 to 26.”

### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no legal implications associated with implementing the recommendations contained within this report.

### **RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

There are no risk implications.

### **ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

There are no asset management implications associated with the recommendations of this report.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial implications associated with this report.



## **ACCESSIBILITY IMPACTS**

The proposed buildings will be required to meet the accessibility criteria contained within the Ontario Building Code. All other accessibility standards will be reviewed through the Site Plan Control application.

## **TERM OF COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

This project addresses the following Term of Council Priorities:

ES1 – Support an environmentally sustainable Ottawa

HC3 – Create new and affordable housing options

## **APPLICATION PROCESS TIMELINE STATUS**

The application was not processed by the "On Time Decision Date" established for the processing of Zoning By-law amendments due to workload volumes and the number of resubmissions required.

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

Document 1 Location Map

Document 2 Details of Recommended Zoning

Document 3 Consultation Details

Document 4 Concept Plan

Document 5 Conceptual Streetscape View

## **CONCLUSION**

The Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department supports the proposed Zoning By-law amendment to reduce the parking rate, the visitor-parking rate and to permit visitor parking in front of the existing buildings. The proposed development is located in the General Urban Area and complies with relevant Official Plan policies, including promoting a balance of housing types and tenures to provide a full range of housing for a variety of demographic profiles through infill development, and promoting increased usage of walking, cycling and transit. The proposal makes use of existing services, is supported by transit and encourages pedestrian connectivity. The proposal responds to relevant urban design and compatibility criteria in the Official

Plan. As such, the requested Zoning By-law amendment represents good planning and the department recommends the Zoning By-law amendment be approved.

**DISPOSITION**

Legislative Services, Office of the City Clerk and Solicitor to notify the owner; applicant; Ottawa Scene Canada Signs, 1565 Chatelain Avenue, Ottawa, ON K1Z 8B5; Krista O'Brien, Tax Billing, Accounting and Policy Unit, Revenue Service, Corporate Services (Mail Code: 26-76) of City Council's decision.

Zoning and Interpretations Unit, Policy Planning Branch, Economic Development and Long Range Planning Services to prepare the implementing by-law and forward to Legal Services.


Legal Services, Office of the City Clerk and Solicitor to forward the implementing by-law to City Council.

Planning Operations Branch, Planning Services to undertake the statutory notification.

**Document 1 – Location Map**

For an interactive Zoning map of Ottawa visit [geoOttawa](http://geoOttawa)



		LOCATION MAP / PLAN DE LOCALISATION ZONING KEY PLAN / SCHÉMA DE ZONAGE	
D02-02-17-0090	17-1426-D	<b>740 prom. Springland Drive</b>	
I:\CO\2017\Zoning\Springland_740		 Area A to be rezoned from R5B H(18) to R5B[xxxx] H(18) Le zonage du secteur A sera modifié de R5B H(18) à R5B[xxxx] H(18)	
<small>©Parcel data is owned by Teranel Enterprises Inc. and its suppliers. All rights reserved. May not be produced without permission. THIS IS NOT A PLAN OF SURVEY.</small>			
<small>©Les données de parcelles appartient à Teranel Entreprises Inc. et à ses fournisseurs. Tous droits réservés. Ne peut être reproduit sans autorisation. CE CI N'EST PAS UN PLAN D'ARPENTAGE</small>			
REVISION / RÉVISION - 2017 / 10 / 20			

## Document 2 – Details of Recommended Zoning

The proposed change to the City of Ottawa Zoning By-law 2008-250 for 740 Springland Drive:

1. Rezone the lands shown in Document 1 from R5B H(18) to R5B[XXXX] H(18)
2. Add a new exception, R5B[XXXX] H(18), to Section 239 – Urban Exceptions with provision similar in effect to the following:
  - a. In Column II, add the text “R5B[XXXX] H(18)”
  - b. In Column V, add the text:
    - I. Despite the parking provisions in Section 101, Table 101, the minimum parking space rate for Dwelling, Low-rise Apartment and Dwelling, Mid-High Rise Apartment is 0.66 per dwelling unit.
    - II. Despite the visitor parking provision in Section 102, Table 102, the minimum visitor parking space rate for Apartment dwelling, low-rise or mid-high-rise is 0.1 spaces / unit and no visitor parking spaces are required for the first twelve dwelling units on the lot.
    - III. Despite the location of parking provision in Section 109, Sub-section 3.a, parking in front of existing buildings identified as 2660 Norberry Crescent, 740 Springland Drive, 790 Springland Drive, 840 Springland Drive is permitted.

## **Document 3 – Consultation Details**

### Notification and Consultation Process

Notification and public consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Public Notification and Public Consultation Policy approved by City Council for Zoning By-law amendments.

Councillor Brockington hosted a community information session on Thursday, November 9, 2017 at Riverside United Church, located at 3191 Riverside Drive. Twenty residents signed the sign-in sheet at the information session. The information session, which included an open house with information boards was followed by a presentation by the Lloyd Phillips, the owner's planning consultant, and the City's File Lead and concluded with a Question and Answer period.

### Public Comments and Responses

#### **Parking**

Comment:

Parking is not sufficient and should not be reduced as it will force more people to parking on-street. The lack of usage is understood but a higher buffer should be used. What's the rationale for reducing the rate by so much?

Response:

The usage rate was calculated at 0.61 spaces per unit. The proposed rate of 0.66 spaces per unit provides a 0.05 spaces per unit buffer.

Comment:

Should not remove the existing parking garage and should provide more parking in a multi-level parking garage. Where is the new parking structure, how will it be built, how many spaces will it hold and will it continue to be for residents who currently have a spot?

Response:

The current parking garage will be rebuilt at the same location (integrated with 2660 Norberry Crescent) and will also be integrated with one of the new buildings. The existing garage has 141 covered spaces and 86 upper deck spaces, the proposed new parking garage will have 158 covered spaces and 63 upper deck spaces. (These

numbers are still preliminary; exact numbers will be determined through a Site Plan Control application.) The owner confirmed that the residents who currently have covered spaces will be able to keep their space.

Comment:

Parking survey should be expanded, how can we know that the surveys are adequate?

Response:

The initial on-site parking survey which included a one-day survey in September was expanded by another two days in December as recommended by the City's Transportation Project Manager.

Comment:

There's a waiting list for parking?

Response:

The owners advised that the waiting list is only for the parking garage, there's still plenty of available surface parking spaces.

Comment:

Do tenants incur a cost for parking?

Response:

Yes, as per similar developments across the City, the tenants must pay for their parking space.

Comment:

What is the relation between the socio-economic profiles of the tenants and on-site parking requirements, given the level of public transportation?

Response:

The City required a parking demand study to determine the usage rate as it was determined that this was the best tool to evaluate the existing situation.

**Visitor parking**

Comment:

Lack of visitor parking, visitors should not have to park on-street are there any projects in Ottawa that have seen such a major reduction in parking.

Response:

The usage rate for visitor parking rate calculated at 0.02 spaces per unit. The proposed rate of 0.1 spaces per unit (minus the first 12 units) will provide ample spaces for visitors. This rate is an already established rate for properties located within Area X on Schedule 1A of the Zoning B-law. This site is located less than 500m from the boundary of Area X and is a good candidate for the same rate.

Comment:

Clarify location of visitor parking; it should not be located on semi-circles because of impacts on neighbouring properties.

Response:

The visitor parking is currently proposed along the existing driveways in front of the existing building and at key locations throughout the site. The exact locations and mitigation measures will be reviewed through the Site Plan Control application.

Comment:

Should not have a “no overnight parking” rule.

Response:

The overnight parking rule is not permitted. The owners have been advised and they will change it to requiring a pass for overnight parking.

Comment:

There's currently a “no parking” sign along semi-circles but cars park there illegally often, adding visitor spaces will create more opportunities for non-law-abiding citizens to do as they wish.

Response:

Adding visitor parking spaces to the existing driveways will prevent visitors from parking in the semi-circle driveway which obstructs the fire route. It will also be more convenient for visitors and therefore reduce on-street parking.

### **On-Street parking**

Comment:

Was a survey of on-street parking done? Streets around the site are already packed with cars.

Response:

The initial on-street parking survey which included a two-day survey in September was expanded by another two days in December as recommended by the City's Transportation Project Manager. The surveys indicated that out of a total of 67 on-street parking spaces there was a vacancy of 23 on-street parking spaces at the most busiest time during the four days of survey.

Comment:

Don't want tenant and visitors to park on-street because of lack of parking on the site. The additional density will only increase this issue.

Response:

The current site has a rate of 0.02 spaces per unit, the new proposed rate is 0.1 spaces per unit (minus the first 12 units). This will therefore increase the amount of visitor parking spaces available on site from 18 to 97 spaces, which will decrease the on-street parking.

Comment:

The parking time limit on Springland and Norberry is 2 hours. The visitors and the tenants already park overnight and many times all day also.



Response:

Although By-law Services tries to ensure that the City's Parking By-law is enforced across the City, if an issue persists it is helpful when residents advise the City by filing a complaint through the City's website or by calling 3-1-1.

### **Loss of greenspace/trees**

Comment:

Don't want to lose greenspace, great area for children to play and walk dogs, it will diminish the quality of life. New plan should have a large outdoor amenity area where residents could go to relax/play (picnic area, basketball nets, slides, sand pit...)

Response:

Through the rearranging of the surface parking some greenspace will be lost while other greenspace will be gained. A thorough review of the greenspace and amenity areas will be reviewed through the Site Plan Control application.

Comment:

Don't want to lose mature trees in front of the existing buildings (semi-circles) and across the site as they provide habitat, shade, privacy and beautify the street.

Response:

The mature trees in front of the existing buildings will be kept. The City has requested an updated concept plan showing visitor parking that's doesn't require the removal of these trees.

Comment:

How many trees will be removed? The size of these trees is irreplaceable. Why was there no Tree Conservation Report?

Response:

A Tree Conservation Report will be a submission requirement for the Site Plan Control application. The report will identify the trees that will need to be removed, the size and health of the trees and any mitigation measures to protect the trees during construction.

## **Design/density**

Comment:

Current residents of the buildings don't want to live directly facing another building.

Response:

Proper building separation in combination with landscaping will be reviewed through the Site Plan Control application to ensure no impacts.

Comment:

Wants more details as to what the plan entails, are the locations of the buildings staying status quo?

Response:

The exact location of the buildings will be determined through the Site Plan Control application.

Comment:

Concerned with the increase in density and its impact on the demographic of a well established neighborhood.

Response:

This property was identified through the Riverside Park Secondary Plan as High Density. The intent was that this site remain high density. This sensitive infill development therefore respects the policies established for this area.

Comment:

Loss of privacy of nearby houses.

Response:

The new building will respect the setback provisions, which, in combination with the width of the City's right-of-way, will provide an appropriate separation distance to the detached dwellings across the street.

Comment:

Is the profile of the tenants in the new buildings expected to be the same?

Response:

The proposed buildings will have a range of units types (studios to 3-bedroom units) to appeal to a wide range of the demographic.

### **Traffic**

Comment:

Traffic on Springland with OC buses, school buses, plus car traffic create issues.

Response:

The TIA report analyzed the traffic volumes during the peak hours on May, 2017, and concluded the overall level of service for this area was good (LoS "A").

Comment:

Parking survey didn't account for the peak times where Mooney's Bay is very busy with events and the parking overflow that extends to the streets around this neighbourhood.

Response:

The parking study was performed during September and December to determine normal traffic flow. Usually, an event that affects traffic would require a police presence to regulate the traffic; this is usually a weekend event for a special occasion. A traffic survey at these events would not represent the normal traffic flow for this area.

### **Garbage**

Comment:

Dumpsters take up parking spots, how will garbage and recycling be handled.

Response:

Proper waste enclosure locations will be identified and reviewed through the Site Plan Control application. The City's Waste Collection Services will review the Site Plan Control application to ensure appropriate capacity of garbage and recycling and to ensure proper access by garbage trucks.

## **Fire Lane**

Comment:

What are the impacts on fire lane in front of existing buildings?

Response:

No obstructions to the fire routes in front of the existing buildings are permitted. The fire routes will be reviewed by the City's Fire Services through the Site Plan Control application.

Comment:

There's a "No parking" sign and a "Parking available at rear" sign but cars still park illegally along the semi-circles.

Response:

The visitor parking along the semi-circle driveways in front of the existing buildings will allow cars to legally park in front of the buildings and prevent any encroachments onto the fire route.

## **Safety**

Comment:

Children safety is a concern with buildings so close to the street.

Response:

The proposed buildings will respect the setback in Zoning By-law and the amenity areas will be reviewed through the Site Plan Control application.

Comment:

There are currently safety issues related to illegal activities (Ottawa Police considers it a gang area); this development will only increase the illegal activities to create a slum.

Response:

The Site Plan Control application will also be reviewed by Ottawa Police through the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) program.

**Infrastructure**

Comment:

Can the existing infrastructure accommodate the new buildings? Can the private infrastructure on site accommodate the development?

Response:

The Assessment of Adequacy of Public Services concluded that the existing infrastructure has the capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Detailed engineering plans and reports will also be submitted with the Site Plan Control application.

**Snow**

Comment:

Snow is currently piled up on pathways and parking lot. How will snow be addressed?

Response:

Snow storage areas should not encroach on pathway or over required parking. An appropriate location will be identified and reviewed through the Site Plan Control application.

**Zoning:**

Are all other provisions of the zoning respected?

Response:

Yes

**Noise:**

Comment:

What about noise from garbage collection and snow removal?

Response:

Noise from snow removal is expected to remain the same. Noise from garbage collection should remain the same or be reduced as proper garbage enclosure locations will be reviewed through the Site Plan Control application.

**Maintenance:**

Comment:

Issues with maintenance of outdoor greenspaces (trees). Should upgrade/renovate the existing buildings, the state of existing buildings is very poor (there's been a bedbugs infestation).

Response:

We can recommend to the owner to do proper maintenance of the site and buildings but this is technically outside of the purview of a Zoning Amendment.

Comment:

What are the construction timeline and noise impacts?

Response:

Construction timelines are at the discretion of the owner. Please keep in mind that they still have to go through the Site Plan Control process. Construction activity will have to respect the City's Noise By-law.

### Community Organization Comments and Responses

The Riverside Park Community and Recreation Association (RPCRA) has attended two public meetings (one of these meetings was held prior to submission of the Zoning By-law Amendment application) and a meeting with Councillor Brockington and the developer to learn more about this amendment. The Community Association supports the development and the Zoning By-law Amendment and provided the following additional comments: "We would however like to see the local amenities improved particularly bus route 87 and perhaps reinstating the local bus 140 as this development , 770 Brookfield and 3191 Riverside Dr are going to add a lot of people to this area by increasing the density. We would also like to see the cash in lieu fund used to enhance Paget Park which many of the Norberry residents and other local residents use, perhaps with a new splash pad. The RPCRA endorses the by zoning law amendment."

Response: OC Transpo reviews the routes four times a year based on ridership demands. The Cash-in-Lieu for parkland that will be required through the Site Plan Control application will be split into two accounts (40 per cent to the City wide account and 60 per cent to the Ward account).

Document 4 – Concept Plan



**Document 5 – Conceptual Streetscape View**



Conceptual Streetscape View of Building A from Norberry Crescent looking south.



Conceptual Streetscape View of Buildings B and C from Norberry Crescent looking west.