

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 250 Besserer Street

In addition to those outlined in the Consultation Details section of the report, the following outlines the written and oral submissions received between the publication of the report and prior to City Council's consideration:

Number of delegations/submissions

Number of delegations at Committee:5

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between November 18 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda) and November 28, 2019 (committee meeting date): 1

Primary concerns, by individual

Denis Larose (oral and written submission)

- spoke to the heritage of the property to the south of the site
- raised concerns about the impact of the proposal on the character of the community and the heritage home to the south of the site, noting that quality of life in the area is already being threatened under pressure of countless high-rises
- concerns about the exacerbation of existing parking and traffic congestion on Besserer caused by the replacement of 25 existing vehicle parking spots by 99 bicycle parking spots
- asked that the building height be limited to five stories and suggested the applicant buy the property for sale at 256 Besserer and integrate it into a low rise complex more in keeping with the spirit of Sandy Hill
- also submitted a petition-type document signed by 57 persons opposed to the planned development because of the height change from 19 to 29 metres and the absence of parking spots that will affect the quality of life on Besserer Street

Janice Eliosoff, Condominium Board, 260 Besserer (oral submission)

- raised concerns about how the building height will impact her property and the neighbourhood character
- noted the proposed building height is not in conformity with current zoning /

height restrictions

- worried that adding 99 residential units to the site will be disruptive and affect quality of life, including impacts to the area as a downtown evening destination
- concerned that the lack of parking spaces will be problematic for the neighbourhood and the residents of the property
- suggested building height be restricted to a maximum of seven stories or that more underground parking within the building be provided

Monique Deschênes, resident, 260 Besserer (oral submission)

- questioned whether the building height is nine or ten stories, suggesting it seems taller than indicated and perhaps isn't including the main floor in the calculation in order to still be considered a mid-rise building
- concerned that approval would set a height precedent for the area

Les Eidus (oral submission)

- suggested that the proposal, with its lack of vehicle parking, is not in keeping with the character of Sandy Hill and is not a community-building, family-supportive model, as families in that area would rely on vehicles to safely transport children to and from school

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Carl Furney and Kirk Mawhinney, Fotenn Consultants (applicant) (oral submission)

- present in support and to answer questions if needed and indicated support for proposed Motion N° PLC 2019-17/7 regarding a visitor parking/car-sharing space

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The committee spent 36 minutes on the item.

Vote: The committee considered all written submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations with an amendment to ask Council to amend zoning details with respect to visitor parking/car sharing space. The final recommendations to Council were as follows:

That Council approve:

1. an amendment to Zoning By-law 2008-250 for 250 Besserer Street to permit a nine-storey apartment building, as detailed in Document 2, as amended by the

following:

- a. that the following provisions be added to Document 2 – Details of the Recommended Zoning under 2 a):
 - One visitor parking space may be used as a car-sharing space;
 - The use of the visitor parking space for car sharing purposes does not result in a zoning violation for a lack of visitor parking.
2. that pursuant to the *Planning Act*, subsection 34(17), no further notice be given.

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between November 28 (Planning Committee consideration date) and December 11, 2019 (Council consideration date): 1.

Primary concerns, by individual

Gail Clement

- enjoys the neighbourhood diversity, inner-city community spirit, heritage structures and accessibility; does not agree that removing provisions for any residents' parking is responsible because inner-city intensification does not preclude vehicle ownership
- this project, combined with at least two others in the area that were approved without the need for on-site parking, means more than 500 local residential units will be created with no on-site residents' parking, even though the nature of these buildings, smaller units with a student or lower budget orientation, suggests 20% or more of these residents would likely have a motor vehicle; this will impact the neighbourhood as there is inadequate parking to service existing and future residents
- local street improvements narrowing local intersections to control traffic flow has increased, which is good and responds well to improving local quality of life during the move to intensification, and the loss in parking space and the improved cycle lanes is a progressive move towards our future vision, but we still do need to provide for inner-city car owners moving into the new properties
- with this intensification, more community communal spaces are need to provide living amenities and prevent ghettos; roof top amenities are not sufficient, nor are they community spirited; residents still will travel outside

of the convenient public transit accessible areas for errands, recreation and pleasure, and personal cars are still a reality for many

- the minimum interior parking requirements should be maintained for now, as they can be repurposed in the future when appropriate

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all written submissions in making its decision and Carried the report recommendations as amended by Planning Committee.