

Document 4 - Public Consultation

Purpose

This document provides an overview of the comments received and the staff response (where applicable) for the Cleary New Orchard proposed amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

The following responses to the technical and community notification are organized as community group comments and technical agency comments in Table 1 and Table 2 below. Resident comments are distinguishable by an identifying number and are broken down into similar ‘Themed’ and ‘Unique’ comments in Table 3 and Table 4 below. Where appropriate, staff have provided a response to the themed and unique matters.

| Community Group Comments | | TABLE 1 |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| Woodpark Community Association (18) | <p>Comment 1:</p> <p>Opposition to local commercial.</p> <p>Alarmed by efforts to up-zone the south side of Byron. We view this as a totally unnecessary incursion into our community especially when we are already losing much of our only park to LRT. We wish to preserve as much as possible this park like setting which is after all the essence of a wood park</p> <p>Comment 2:</p> <p>Preserve views to river and Gatineau hills.</p> <p>For development along the north side of Richmond, we seek to mitigate to whatever extent possible the negative impacts of the inevitable curtain wall of development that threatens our access to the river and views of the Gatineau Hills. This includes cut-through traffic and the conversion of our streets into overflow parking lots</p> | <p>Comment 1:</p> <p>The local commercial proposal has been removed from the policy.</p> <p>Comment 2:</p> <p>The policy proposes a podium and tower type of building form in order to allow for views.</p> |

| Technical Agency Comments | | TABLE 2 |
|---|--|--|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| Enbridge Gas Distribution (6) | No comment | N/A |
| Rogers (8) | No comment. | N/A |
| Zayo (14) | No comment. | N/A |
| Ottawa Catholic School Board (19) | No objections. | N/A |
| Conseil des Ecoles Catholiques du Centre-EST (20) | Le Conseil des Ecoles Catholiques du Centre-EST a revu la demande susmentionnee et ne s’y oppose pas. Esperant que ces renseignements vous seront utiles, je vous prie d’agreer, Madame, l’expression de mes sentiments distingues. | N/A |
| Our Lady of Fatima Parish (28) | <p>This communication confirms that Our Lady of Fatima Parish agrees that institutional zoning is appropriate for 153 Woodroffe Avenue, Ottawa. There is no plan to change the existing land use nor is there any land that is in excess to our operational needs and that would be suitable for re-development.</p> <p>We have also discussed the proposed re-zoning of Byron Avenue properties to the East of 153 Woodroffe. If there are any future impacts of possible land uses being proposed for these properties, these would be minor given that there will be no roadway between Woodroffe Avenue and Lockhart Avenue once the expanded Byron Linear Park is completed to the North of our main entrance</p> | Noted. |
| First Unitarian Congregation of Ottawa (27) | <p>Comment 1: Vision and guiding principles We generally agree with these provisions.</p> <p>Comment 2: Low rise requirement adjacent to Aylen</p> | <p>Comment 1: Noted.</p> <p>Comment 2: The low-rise requirement is to provide a transition zone from the existing low rise community</p> |

| Technical Agency Comments | | TABLE 2 |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| | <p>1. a) “Low-rise buildings of generally up to three stories, to a depth of 30 metres, for the portions of the lot adjacent and closest to the existing low-rise residential development on Aylen Avenue.”</p> <p>As we have previously stated, we agree with the concept of a “transition zone” of up to 30 metres wide. However, what is proposed here is not a “transition zone” but a continuation of the height limit of the adjacent residential zone. In our previous discussions with the City planning staff, the City proposed that there would be a height ceiling at the fourth floor level (about 10 m) at the lot line and rising at a 45 degree angle, so that the ceiling would rise to a height of about 40 m at a 30 m distance from the lot line. There would be a setback of about 7.5 m along the boundary. We still agree with such a transition provision. However we consider that the height limit as proposed is not appropriate. There is no good reason why our lands, not being low rise residential lands, should have to be subjected to the height limit for low-rise residential. We also note that for the Transitional Mainstreet zone (described in section 3.2 of the document), the proposed new land use policy is exactly as we had previously discussed for our lands, and as described above. In our opinion, to treat our lands differently and less favourably than the Traditional Mainstreet lands, which are also adjacent to a low-rise residential area, is inconsistent, discriminatory and unjustified. We have also noted that no transitional zone of any sort is required in Apartment Neighbourhoods, as described in section 3.4 . We do recognize that the five storey height limit in that zone means that there is less need for a transition zone.</p> <p>Online Survey question #2, about this area, says “Future development that backs onto low rise residential on Aylen Avenue must also be low-rise residential.” This statement appears to be incorrect, as there is no wording in the proposed land use policy that requires the development in this area to</p> | <p>and is consistent with how other transition zone areas are applied in other parts of the City.</p> <p>Comment 3: Noted for consideration to include very clear language where the midrise buildings are appropriate.</p> <p>Comment 4: Noted.</p> <p>Comment 5, 6 and 7: Noted for consideration.</p> <p>Comment 8: Rezoning of the lands to add uses and add additional height will not be contemplated for the Unitarian Site. An application for a rezoning will be required by the Unitarian Congregation at the time they would like to redevelop in the future.</p> <p>Comment 9: The application for density redistribution will be considered. The extension of the traditional mainstreet zone will not be considered as the Unitarian Campus does not have any</p> |

| Technical Agency Comments | | TABLE 2 |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| | <p>be “residential”, and the zoning is “institutional”, which permits many other uses.</p> <p>2. “The design of new developments within this designation that have lot line(s) abutting the low-rise residential development are to be sympathetic to the height, massing, scale and architectural rhythm of the adjacent low-rise residential buildings. This can be achieved by providing ground-oriented units backing onto the low-rise residential.”</p> <p>We do not understand what this provision permits and what it prohibits. If this means that any buildings built adjacent to the Ayles Avenue properties should, more or less, look like the houses along Ayles, we do not agree. Our lands have a different zoning and are intended for different uses. While it is reasonable to call for a transition zone, and reasonable compatibility, these provisions seem to go too far. Again, we note that there are no such requirements for the Traditional Mainstreet lands which also abut the low-rise residential area of Woodroffe North. We request that this provision be deleted entirely.</p> <p>3.3 Low- and Mid-Rise Park Frame</p> <p>2. We note that other than the normal 7.5m setback requirement, there is no requirement for any kind of transition zone along the edge of this zone where it abuts low-rise residential areas. The transition provisions for the Unitarian campus are different and less favourable than this.</p> <p>Comment 3: Mid Rise Buildings</p> <p>b) “Mid-rise buildings for the portion of the lot adjacent to the Station Area designation.” We have several comments / recommendations regarding this area.</p> <p>Firstly, we would request that the boundaries of the “portion of the lot adjacent to the Station Area designation” be clearly defined. We would expect that this “portion” would consist of the area which</p> | <p>lands which front onto Richmond Road, the designated Traditional Mainstreet.</p> <p>Comment 10: Noted.</p> <p>Comment 11: Information provided.</p> |

| Technical Agency Comments | | TABLE 2 |
|---------------------------|---|----------------|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| | <p>was formerly the “CPR Strip” of land, which we purchased from the NCC, and which already has zoning different from the rest of our property.</p> <p>Secondly, we request, once again, that the zoning, at least in terms of height, for this “CPR Strip” of land be the same as for the adjacent land along Richmond Road, which now constitutes the “Cleary Station Area”. The City of Ottawa has generally agreed with this principle. In accordance with this principle, we request that, as for the Cleary Station Area, the absolute height maximum be set at 12 storeys. Approval for an increase above 9 storeys could be tied to “Density Redistribution” or to conditions such as a requirement for an affordable housing component.</p> <p>Thirdly, we request that the “Density Redistribution” provisions also apply to this “CPR Strip” of our lands, as well as to the adjacent “Cleary Station Area” lands. We strongly support the Density Redistribution” concept, not only because it can preserve views of the River area, but also because it can greatly help to make it possible to have compatible development, with tall buildings, offset one from the other, on our CPR Strip and the adjacent “Cleary Station Area” along Richmond Road. We provide more comments about Density Redistribution in point 4.4 below.</p> <p>Online Survey question #3 says “The majority of the site [meaning the entire Unitarian Church site] must be developed as mid-rise buildings, up to nine storeys.” This appears to be incorrect. If, as we would expect, the “portion of the lot adjacent to the Station Area designation” is the “CPR Strip”, then this mid-rise restriction would apply to much less than “the majority of the site”. In any event, we see no good justification why such a limitation should be applied to “the majority of the site”. Certainly, the confusion between the description in the Policy document and in the Online Survey, demonstrates the critically important need to clearly define the</p> | |

| Technical Agency Comments | | TABLE 2 |
|---------------------------|---|----------------|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| | <p>boundary of the “portion of the lot adjacent to the Station Area designation”.</p> <p>Comment 4: High rise buildings</p> <p>c) “High-rise buildings generally up to 16 storeys for the portion of the site adjacent to the NCC Open Space corridor and interior to the site.”</p> <p>We agree with this provision.</p> <p>Comment 5: Word revision requests</p> <p>The paragraph describes the uses permitted on the lands.</p> <p>Generally, we agree with these provisions.</p> <p>We do suggest one minor revision: in the final sentence, we request that the word “initial” be replaced by “concurrent”. That way, buildings for other permitted uses can be constructed at the same time, and not only after, the construction of buildings for the purposes listed in this paragraph.</p> <p>“Small scale commercial uses are permitted...”</p> <p>We request one small change: to replace the word “institutional”, in the second line, with the word “permitted”. The retail should be compatible with other “permitted” uses.</p> <p>Otherwise, we agree with this.</p> <p>Comment 6: Pedestrian pathway requirement through the Unitarian site</p> <p>“Redevelopment ... will include”: a) and b) both seem to call for a pedestrian and cycling path from Richmond Road through our property to the Ottawa River Parkway area. Access to our property for pedestrians and cyclists now exists from Richmond Road near Kristy’s, and along Cleary Avenue. The Congregation has never tried to prevent members of the public from accessing our property and particularly our gardens. However, we do not agree with the proposal for a through path for pedestrians and cyclists as it will bring in people who are trying</p> | |

| Technical Agency Comments | | TABLE 2 |
|---------------------------|---|----------------|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| | <p>to rush through the middle of the property and who will pose a danger to elderly people from Unitarian House who walk there, often with walkers, and to others who use or live on the property now or in the future. Such a path through our property seems to be quite unnecessary as there is to be a path from the Cleary Station to the Ottawa River, which would be only about 150m to the east of the path proposed for our property.</p> <p>We have noted that this path is referred to here as being at 809 Richmond and in section 3.1.2 as being between 797 and 801 Richmond Road. Is there an error here?</p> <p>Comment 7: Sidewalk requirements</p> <p>c) Requires “Continuous sidewalk connections from Cleary Station to the various sections of the redeveloped area.” This seems like an excessive, unnecessary demand, as we would of course want to do this in any event. Does the City always formalize such a requirement?</p> <p>a) We agree with this basic provision regarding a second entrance, but not with the extra requirements for “lined with street trees and sidewalks with a strong built edge that connects the planned and existing buildings”. Given that there are very few locations and very little space where a second entrance could be placed, it is very unlikely that there would be room to accommodate all the requirements listed in this paragraph. We request that this wording be revised.</p> <p>Comment 8: Master Plan document requirement</p> <p>This section requires that when a future zoning bylaw amendment application is submitted to request adding permitted uses and/or altering the permitted height, a Master Plan document for the entire site must be submitted.</p> <p>We would agree with this provision if:</p> | |

| Technical Agency Comments | | TABLE 2 |
|---------------------------|--|----------------|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| | <p>☐ The Unitarian site is re-zoned now to permit all the uses and heights, etc., which will be permitted in accordance with the new land use policies which are to be established in the coming months. We should not be required to make a re-zoning application in order to obtain permission to use the land in ways that will be permitted by the revised land use policy which is to be established for our property.</p> <p>☐ Sub-paragraph c) is deleted. When we go to apply for a rezoning, we should not be prohibited, in advance, from obtaining any change in Section 3.5, policies 1-4.</p> <p>Comment 9: Request for density redistribution and traditional mainstreet zoning within the Unitarian campus</p> <p>3.1 Station Area</p> <p>2. As already noted, we recommend that the Density Redistribution regime be applicable to the Cleary Station area as well as the part of the Unitarian campus which abuts the Cleary Station area. This will make possible more creative design options on these lands and will open up many more ways to create compatible developments on these two areas. It is worth noting that the existing Charlesfort development (75 Cleary) and the recently approved Kristy’s development are both, in reality, cases of Density Redistribution. That process resulted in good designs for both of those properties. The same opportunity for narrower, taller buildings (still subject to height limits) should be available for future development on both strips of land.</p> <p>Secondly, we would note that the requirement in 3.1.2 for a 45 degree angular plane above the 4th floor is not very realistic considering that the entire strip of land is only about 30 m deep. This means that a building would be only about 20 m deep at the base, and with such a requirement, the</p> | |

| Technical Agency Comments | | TABLE 2 |
|---------------------------|---|----------------|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| | <p>building's depth would be reduced to virtually zero at the 10th floor.</p> <p>3.2 Traditional Mainstreet</p> <p>1. We support the application of Density Redistribution to this zone. We think it should also apply to our lands and to the Cleary Station area. We see no reason why this process should be applicable in the Traditional Mainstreet area and not in the other two areas.</p> <p>2. We agree with the height transition requirements stipulated for this zone. We think the same provisions should apply along the western (Aylen Street) edge of the Unitarian campus.</p> <p>4.4 Density Redistribution</p> <p>1. We strongly support the concept of Density Redistribution, subject to an overall height limit.</p> <p>We recommend that sub-paragraph c) "The lot must abut at least two public realms" be deleted. There are a number of benefits to be achieved by D.R., and many of these do not require access to or from two, or even one, public realm. We note that the D.R. is recommended for the Traditional Mainstreet and Apartment zones (which we support), even though many lots in these sections do not access two public realms.</p> <p>2. "To protect the established characteristics and pattern of existing residential areas ... this Plan identifies properties that are not appropriate for D.R." This logic does not seem to have been consistently applied. If the Traditional Mainstreet zone, which backs on a low-rise residential area, is suitable for D.R. (which we support), then the Cleary Station Area and the adjacent part of the Unitarian campus, which are not adjacent to low-rise residential areas, should certainly be suitable for D.R. We recommend that D.R. be included for those areas.</p> | |

| Technical Agency Comments | | TABLE 2 |
|---------------------------|--|----------------|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| | <p>Comment 10: Support for provisions.</p> <p>3.4 Apartment Neighbourhood</p> <p>We support the use of Density Redistribution in this area.</p> <p>We think that the height limits proposed are reasonable.</p> <p>3.6 Institutional</p> <p>We have no comments on these provisions.</p> <p>Built Form</p> <p>4.1 High Rise Buildings</p> <p>With regard to paragraph 1 c) we would note that the condo tower at 75 Cleary is located closer than 10 m from the boundary of that lot. When that building was approved, all concerned, including the City of Ottawa recognized that the purpose for locating this tower close to the eastern end of its lot was to make it possible, in the future, for the Unitarian Congregation to locate a tall building immediately north and west of that building. We request that if and when the Congregation comes forward with a proposal to construct a tall building immediately north-west of the existing tower, this history should be considered and, in any event, the required distance between that proposed building and our property line should not be required to be more than the 10m stated in 4.1.1 c).</p> <p>Re paragraph 2 e), we recommend that a podium should not be higher than three storeys to permit more light and vision.</p> <p>Otherwise, we generally agree with the provisions of this section.</p> <p>4.2 Mid-Rise Buildings</p> <p>We generally agree these provisions. In this section, what is meant by “right of way” in b)?</p> <p>4.3 Active Frontages</p> | |

| Technical Agency Comments | | TABLE 2 |
|---------------------------|--|----------------|
| Organization / Name | Comment | Staff Response |
| | <p>We generally support these provisions.</p> <p>Comment 11: Public plaza</p> <p>Public Realm and Implementation</p> <p>This describes new urban parks, public plazas and Privately Owned Public Spaces. We note that a “conceptual location” for a public plaza is located on our land next to the Cleary Station.</p> <p>We need more information about these elements before we can comment on them.</p> | |

| Resident Comments | | TABLE 3 |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Identifying Number | Comment | Staff Response |
| 2 | <p>Objection to a 5 storey building at 950 Byron Road and 483, 471, 463, and 455 Sherbourne Road:</p> <p>Request that this site should be 3 stories maximum.</p> | <p>These sites are currently zone R4N which means that they can build an 11 metre apartment dwelling under todays permissions. The Cleary and New Orchard proposal is to increase that permitted height should redevelopment occur in the future with sensitive setbacks to the adjacent low-rise residential.</p> |

| Resident Comments | | TABLE 3 |
|--------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Identifying Number | Comment | Staff Response |
| 1 / 4 / 5 / 11 | Request for more information. | Information provided. |
| 3 / 9 | Requests for a mail version of the survey. | Paper copy sent. |
| 5 | Enhance the visual and functional linkages. Between the greenspace corridors of the city's Richmond/Byron Linear Park and the NCC's SJAM waterfront linear park, both of which are scheduled to soon receive substantial investment of public funds. | Comment noted for consideration. |
| 7 | Concerns are pedestrian safety and accessibility and public transit accessibility around Richmond Road and the Ambleside Area. There are parts of Richmond Road that are poorly lit, with narrow sidewalks and no separation between sidewalk and roadway. It means that walking west at night, one has the traffic behind and low visibility. The strip malls that exist are closed and quite desolate in the evenings. The linear park pathway is not lit at night and quite desolate for walking as well | Noted. |
| 7 | Support for development along parts of Richmond Road. Especially residential and lower rise buildings because it will mean more people coming and going. Looking forward to seeing the LRT up and running - I truly believe it could change how people move around Ottawa - and for the better. I for one, look forward to seeing more people on the streets instead of cars. | Noted. |
| 10 / 13 | Suggestion to improve the survey Make comment boxes larger and remove the parkland background image. | Noted. |
| 12 | Very supportive of the proposed land use concepts along the study zone. | Noted. |

| Resident Comments | | TABLE 3 |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Identifying Number | Comment | Staff Response |
| | By and large they offer a pragmatic but principled framework to govern future development in the area. | |
| 12 / 26 | <p>Oppose the proposed building height limits for the Unitarian Campus.</p> <p>This is a highly valued signature property in the neighbourhood. a 16-story building height on the property entirely incompatible with the nature of this transitional space, which sits between the high-rise “Station Area” zone along Richmond Road, the low-rise community of Woodroffe North, and the NCC’s Sir John A. Macdonald Riverfront Park lands. This site is quite unique, located on the eastern shoulder of a wide sweeping projection of the shoreline into the river, and should be developed in a way that is not excessively disruptive of the views along the Park. A particular concern in this case is the fact that westbound pedestrian, cycle, vehicle, and even watercraft traffic faces directly into the heart of the Unitarian Campus. There is a somewhat lesser but still pronounced similar issue with eastbound traffic exiting the Pinecrest creek area. Very tall structures on the property will therefore be significantly more disruptive of Park views than buildings anywhere else in the study area, which visually tend to be in the peripherals. A height limit closer to 6 stories would be much more appropriate. This would enable the mature trees bordering the Park to soften the visual transition, while still allowing reasonable intensification of land use on the property to expand services and take advantage of the LRT station at Cleary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The transition character of the site is recognized by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring low rise (3 stories) buildings for any development adjacent to the residential area (Woodroffe North) • Mid rise for the portion adjacent to Station area • A through block publicly accessibly pedestrian and cycling extending from Sherbourne Road to the Ottawa River | Noted for consideration. |

| Resident Comments | | TABLE 3 |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Identifying Number | Comment | Staff Response |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A pedestrian pathway connecting to 809 Richmond Road. <p>However, surprisingly and, in my view, inappropriately, the draft policy envisages 16 story buildings for the portion of the site adjacent to the NCC Open Space. This reflects a complete insensitivity to the interaction of the site with the NCC parkland and the river. It would allow a virtual walling off of the area to this precious open space and effectively provide the worst possible transition from and to this parkland. It stands in remarkable contrast to the sensitivity the recommendations demonstrate to the transition between the campus and its adjacencies on the east, south and west. I strongly recommend the maximum height anywhere on the campus should be mid-rise at the most.</p> | |
| 24 | <p>Unitarian height concern and view loss</p> <p>Unlike the New Orchard Station Area plans there is no consideration here to "losing views of the Ottawa River corridor" or to "allow views and vistas". From well east of Rochester Field to Britannia in the west the river corridor Parkway and recreation trails are almost entirely bounded on the south by low-rise residential buildings. Taller buildings are placed close to Richmond Road. Although prominent, the Unitarian church buildings presently are pleasantly restrained in appearance. Buildings up to 16 storeys will indeed cause a loss of views of the river corridor and seriously restrict views and vistas. Even 9 storey buildings will do that. Sixteen storey buildings belong on Richmond Road, not butting onto NCC corridor.</p> <p>Institutional-Mixed Use and community serving is the best use for the whole area. Other planning proposals in this study provide for many residential and commercial developments. This site is operating very well with church, seniors residence, and pre-school community services. Other than a few established churches there is little such usage elsewhere in this planning area.</p> | <p>The proposal includes policy direction to require any future high rise buildings to locate in areas of the site with consideration on views from the adjacent towers and shadow impacts on adjacent low rise residential.</p> |

| Resident Comments | | TABLE 3 |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Identifying Number | Comment | Staff Response |
| 15 / 16 / 17 | <p>Concerned that the possibility of small scale commercial along Byron.</p> <p>This is clearly a residential area and concerned about the loss of residential housing to mixed-use buildings.</p> | Noted. |
| 17 | <p>Request for more public consultation.</p> | Comments welcome anytime throughout the study, up and until Planning Committee considers this study. |
| 21 | <p>Mid-rise on Byron</p> <p>I agree that 6 storeys facing Byron (at Redwood) is reasonable to a certain depth (like 30 metres), and then development step down as it approaches the opposite end of the triangle.</p> | Included a depth limit for the portion of the mid-rise building. |
| 21 | <p>Support for small scale commercial</p> <p>I also agree that it would be reasonable for future possible mix of uses (e.g. commercial) to face Byron and not come down Redwood or Sherbourne</p> | Noted. |
| 22 | <p>Transition clause request</p> <p>There is an active site plan application for 851 Richmond Road. I don't see any transition clauses in the proposed zoning amendments on the Cleary and New Orchard Study website. Homestead has designed the building to conform with all applicable zoning provisions. I see that the permitted building height will not change, but other TM provisions would be problematic for the proposed development</p> | Included a transition clause. |
| 23 | <p>Use of the word "stable"</p> <p>I find it quite disturbing that the city has classified neighbourhoods composed primarily of single and duplex homes as "stable residential areas", and the study's purpose states it will protect these areas, while the</p> | It was not the intent by using the word "stable" for the low rise community, to |

| Resident Comments | | TABLE 3 |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Identifying Number | Comment | Staff Response |
| | Ambleside Area is labelled as an "apartment neighbourhood". The majority of units in the latter are condos, with very long-term "stable" residents. I live in Ambleside One and can say from our 12 years here that the majority who leave are moving into a care situation or have died. Being a vertical community doesn't make us any less stable. One could think the city considers "apartment"-dwelling taxpayers second-class. | mean that all other areas are "unstable. |
| 23 | <p>High rises in Ambleside</p> <p>The fact that the proposed study suggests allowing more high rise buildings on the current commercial properties fronting Richmond west of Woodroffe, as well as high rise infill within the Ambleside Area, is so disappointing. Just because there is already a mass of high rise concrete structures doesn't make it right to add more. The proposal of density redistribution could make sense if it was done with lower rise buildings (e.g, 4, 9, 12 stories), but not the suggested up to 28 stories. We know developers will try for as high as they can get, despite the zoning. Unfortunately, they usually get their way. Does the city really believe that the New Orchard station is going to create such a demand for new residences? The study's objective says "permit modest growth around stations". The proposed growth around New Orchard does not seem modest to me. It's wall-to-wall, primarily higher rise, infill with no proposed green spaces.</p> | Most lots in Ambleside are permitted today to build additional high rises because of the Zoning permissions they have in place. This study is looking to put limits on future redevelopment through the application of Floor Space Index restrictions and policy to guide future infill. These tools will help to ensure this area does not become a sea of high rises. |
| 24 | <p>Parking along Byron Linear Park area</p> <p>While I see some merit in permitting Small-Scale Commercial Uses as described, the prohibition of parking seems to make many of the potential uses unworkable. How will a doctor's office, a small restaurant, or a convenience store accommodate their drive-up clients? Not all potential clients will use public transit, the LRT, or be able to make their way to the businesses without a car. Also, will businesses in this zone draw away potential commercial interest in the "traditional main street" zones along Richmond Road?</p> | Noted. |

| Resident Comments | | TABLE 3 |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Identifying Number | Comment | Staff Response |
| 24 | <p>New Orchard Station Area and density redistribution</p> <p>This part of the planning study attempts to alleviate concerns about "losing views of the Ottawa River corridor" and "allow views and vistas". While I cannot fully appreciate how successful the proposed "density redistribution" will be in providing those views and vistas, I support in general the plan's recognition of those objectives and approach to achieve them.</p> <p>With respect to the proposed maximum redistributed heights for each site in the image, they are certainly an improvement from 30 storeys. Is there a risk in defining height by storeys rather than metres? Nevertheless, I have questions about the ability of Richmond Road, the city's infrastructure, and the river corridor to handle the eventual population density. Ottawa can easily over-develop to the detriment of the area. We need to be conservative in the demands we place on the Ottawa River corridor.</p> | Noted. |
| 24 | <p>Unitarian Church Area & floodplain</p> <p>This property is the most attractive and fragile in this planning area. I do not know what is defined as Ottawa River flood plain in this area but we know that the norms of the past are unlikely to be the norms of the future. We need to be more cautious than this plan seems to be. Also the city is making plans, which I applaud, to renovate and improve the river corridor for recreation and outdoor pleasure in this area.</p> | Noted. |
| 24 | <p>Unitarian low and mid rise</p> <p>I agree that future development that backs onto Aylen must be low-rise residential.</p> <p>I question the statement that the majority of the site must be developed as mid-rise buildings up to nine storeys.</p> | First comment is noted. The second comment has been addressed in policy to allow for a variety of low and mid rise building heights. |

| Resident Comments | | TABLE 3 |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Identifying Number | Comment | Staff Response |
| | Why the "must"? Is there no option for low-rise buildings, recreational space, or other use in the majority of the site? | |
| 25 | <p>Byron traffic concerns</p> <p>I understand, that a kiss and ride might be in the works for byron and Rowanwood. This is completely unacceptable if traffic is planned for our residential street.</p> <p>Not only that, our street is not constructed to support heavy traffic. Every time a car or van goes by our houses shake, on the clay foundation. Expecting the street to support increased traffic will just exacerbate the problem causing issues for city hall.</p> <p>In the winter, the issues outlined in the email to Jeff Lieper worsen. We have too many small children on Rowanwood for this kind of proposal. Please keep traffic on the major thoroughfares that can safely handle the increased traffic. (Richmond, and Sherbourne and Woodfroffe).</p> | Relayed to LRT office for consideration in their streetscape planning. |
| 26 | <p>Unitarian site uses</p> <p>The Unitarian Campus is designated "institutional mixed use". This designation maintains the current uses on the site (church plus not for profit day care and senior's residence). This should be the go forward model -- only social and community development entities and services. No commercial or for profit development of any kind. An attractive cluster of such community resources immediately adjacent to an LRT station would be a rich resource for Westboro, Kitchissippi and Bay wards and the City as a whole. Moreover this would be consistent with the intent of the original transfer of land by the NCC to the Unitarians, which transfer was done directly without competitive bidding. This intent was made explicit when the NCC transferred the CPR right away in 1998. A condition imposed by the NCC was that the land is to be used for socially beneficial purposes. No similar limitation was imposed on the sale of right of way to the west of the Unitarian campus.</p> | Noted for consideration. |

| Resident Comments | | TABLE 3 |
|---------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Identifying Number | Comment | Staff Response |
| | The Unitarian Campus land is a transition zone abutting a traditional residential zone to its west, a portion on the east side is adjacent to the Station lands. Abutting NCC parkland and facing the parkway on the North side. The south side runs north of Richmond Road and the properties facing it but has no access to Richmond Road. | |