

Revised Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments – 1966 Roger Stevens Drive

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 at Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee: 31

Number of written submissions received by Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee and Council between November 25 and December 5, 2019 : 11

Primary concerns by the following group of residents who all voiced very similar comments:

1. *Karlis Adamsons
2. *James Graham
3. *Laura Tupper
4. *Dave Tupper
5. *Debbie Bishop
6. *James Banks
7. *Cristin Graham
8. *Jim Pearson
9. *Teddie Laframboise
10. *Sigrun Kullik
11. Jitka Kapsa
12. *Pam Chiles
13. *Andrea Sissons
14. Sandy McNiece

15. *Ray Steiger
16. *Bruce Hood
17. Rosie McNiece
18. *Gordon Kubanek
19. *Sarah Richardson
20. Colleen Murphy
21. *Steve Nordstrum
22. Randy Lavier
23. Jo Sullivan
24. *Cindy Armstrong
25. *Leigh-Andrea Watson-Brunet
26. William Duffett
27. *Jennifer Cenlin
28. Dianne Drough
29. Connie Hart
30. Anna Riley

[* All individuals marked with an asterisk either provided their comments in writing or by email; all such comments are held on file with the City Clerk.]

Written submissions all opposed to staff recommendations were received from:

- Paul Swanbend
- Joel Drough
- Melissa Saunders
- Katherine Duggan
- Jordan Loshinsky
- Charles and Jennifer Kearns

- Ace Powell
- Hans Fluegel
- Karen Clarke
- Pat MacGregor
- Susan Lehmann
- John Henderson
- Allison Usher

Summary of Comments (Written and Oral Submissions)

- The plan goes against what the community had worked on with the City in its secondary plan.
- This is not part of the Official Plan.
- The project is not environmentally friendly. There will be too much light, noise, and traffic pollution.
- The area had been contemplated as an industrial area to serve the farmers and village.
- Many felt there was lack of transparency since meetings had been rescheduled which gave less time for rebuttal.
- This is not orderly development.
- This does not reflect what the community wants within its borders.
- There is no public transportation to this site which means more cars for the up to 1,800 possible employees.
- Far too much truck traffic. Causes safety concerns for cars and school bus traffic.
- Already difficult to find labour top work on the farms, this will make it worse.
- Many studies not done and if done they are flawed working on outdated data.
- The concrete and asphalt will cause more problems during heavy rains – flooding.
- The notice distance on this size of project needs to be expanded past the 120 metres.
- Does not reflect the rural nature.
- The applicant stated that currently a warehouse would be permitted today. They feel that with the site plan they will respond to community concerns. Hope to continue the dialogue in a productive manner.
- The applicant does not have a firm plan yet for the site, everything is mere speculation and hype.

Primary arguments in support, by individual

James Beach – Broccolini and Steve Pentz - Novatech

- They stated that there has been no final decision on size of facility at that location.
- They have tried to address most of the concerns of neighbours.
- They will continue to work with the community.

Effect of Submissions on Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee

Decision:

Debate:

The Committee spent approximately five hours on this item.

Vote:

Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee CARRIED the report recommendations as amended. The Committee recommendations to Council were as follows (amendments are underlined for ease of reference):

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AS AMENDED

That Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee recommend Council:

- 1. Adopt an Official Plan Amendment to Volume 2 North Gower Secondary Plan, which modifies:**
 - i. Schedule 1, attached in Document 3, re-designating a portion of the lands, delineated by shading and a heavy outline from “Highway Commercial” to an “Industrial” designation.**
 - ii. Policies of Section 4.4 - Highway Commercial, by adding a second sentence to the first paragraph under the heading "Permitted Uses" as follows: – “Additionally, uses that are principally intended to serve the travelling public will also be permitted”;**
 - iii. Policies of Section 4.7 – Industrial, by amending the second sentence under the heading "Intent" by replacing the word "business" with the words " uses that benefit the local and**

regional economy.”

- iv. Policies of Section 4.7 – Industrial by inserting a new clause under Permitted Uses” stating “Notwithstanding the other provisions of this plan an industrial building designated industrial, located at 1966 Roger Stevens Drive may have a height of 22 metres”.

2. Approve an Amendment to Zoning By-law 2008-250 for 1966 Roger Stevens Drive to permit a warehouse and amend associated provisions detailed in Document 2 as amended by the following:

That Document 2, Details of Recommended Zoning of Report ACS2019-PIE-PS-0132 in its entirety be amended to be replaced with the following text (changes highlighted):

Document 2 – Details of Recommended Zoning

The proposed change to the City of Ottawa Zoning By-law No. 2008-250 for 1966 Roger Stevens Drive:

1. Rezone the lands shown in Document 1 as follows

a) Area A from RC to RG [xxxr]- h

b) Area B from RC [55r] to RG [xxxr]- h

c) Area C from RG to RG [xxxr]- h

d) Area D from RG to O1

2. Add a new exception RG [xxxr] to Section 240 – Rural Exceptions with provisions similar to the intent of the following:

a) In Column II – Applicable Zones add text, RG [xxxr]- h

b) In Column III – Additional Land Uses Permitted and the following:

- bed and breakfast

- day care

- park

- recreational and athletic facility

- retail store limited to an antique store

- craft shop or farmers market

c) In Column IV – Land Uses Prohibited add the following text:

- storage yard

- waste processing and transfer facility (non-putrescible)

d) In Column V – Provisions add the following text:

- The holding symbol may only be removed following approval of a site plan control application.

- Maximum Height 22 metres

- Maximum Total Volume of all buildings: 1,914,035 cubic metres

3. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there be no further notice pursuant to Sub-section 34(17) of the Planning Act.

CARRIED as amended

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between December 5 (Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee consideration date) and December 11, 2019 (Council consideration date), in opposition: 6

- Faith Blacquiere
- Leigh–Andrea Brunet
- James Banks
- Burgandy Dunn, Counsel for Rideau Action Group
- James Graham
- Anna Riley

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all written and oral submissions in making its decision, and CARRIED this item as amended by the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee.