

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 966, 968 and 974 Fisher Avenue

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: 4

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between December 2 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda) and December 12, 2019 (committee meeting date): 6

Primary concerns, by individual

Joe Mader (oral and written submissions)

- resident/owner of neighbouring property (on the north side) of the proposed development, also representing surrounding neighbours, supported appropriate and gentle intensification of the area and would have preferred an R3 zoning for the site to allow a two-storey semi-detached building or townhome, to better fit the character of neighbourhood
 - the proposed building structure is higher than another building on that block of Fisher, and significantly higher than his property; the direct local area has single storey veterans' homes and two storey houses
 - asked that, if the application is approved, existing sideyard setbacks be respected, especially because there is a 19-unit building beside his property and there would be noise and safety impacts associated with reduced setbacks
 - asked Committee to consider and review why the parapet and floor heights increased from the original proposal, and to review whether the stories should be 8 feet high instead of 9, which would provide an opportunity to reduce this building proposal by about 5.5 feet, corresponding to the local character of the neighbourhood

Selena Bishop (oral and written submission)

- representing herself and neighbouring properties, raised concerns about increased traffic, insufficient public transit access and insufficient parking,

none of which she felt would be a concern if the development were of an R3 type

- suggested that, even though the proposed development isn't anticipated to generate the 75 vehicle per hour threshold that would trigger a traffic study, one should be done before allowing further densification because Fisher is already backed up
- public transit for the area is inadequate, unreliable, and not safely situated (lack of proper sidewalks), which will not entice new renters to the areas without cars
- with a higher proportion of tenants using cars, and an insufficient number of parking spots being proposed to accommodate tenants, visitors and service vehicles, traffic and parking will be pushed out to adjacent streets

Kim Gravelle (oral submission and slides)

- concerned about the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties in terms of aesthetics, privacy, construction noise, tenant and vehicle noise, sun-shadowing, and safety

Nancy Berryhill (written submission)

- supported development of the properties as an improvement to the neighborhood, but not the proposal for two 11m tall apartment buildings, which do not reflect the current mix of housing in the Fisher/Shillington area - a mix of bungalows, two-storey detached, and semi-detached units
- raised concerns about adherence to property standards, noting the current issues at 974 Fisher with garbage and rodents
- worried about an increase in crime and theft, suggesting that apartment buildings offer target-rich environments for such activity because of their secluded areas (e.g. car garages, indoor bike storage rooms); suggested that the Carlington area already has one of the highest crime rates in the city
- the development is too "harsh" to fit into the surroundings, and will impose on her view, her privacy, and the value of my home; the addition of semi-detached houses or town homes would be a much better fit and have less impact on neighbours
- the proposed landscape plan includes a privacy fence at the rear of the development that will likely lead to the destruction of her cedar hedge and result in a loss of privacy

- noted the proposal includes a large brick courtyard adjacent her property line, including a site for “snow removal” on the north and south ends of the communal courtyard and questioned the impact on existing vegetation and drainage that might cause water damage

Stephanie Pieri (written submission)

- asked that the staff report be corrected to indicate that the proposed parking will be at grade or street level, not underground
- noted that the drawings submitted in support of this application include calculations using a mixture of both the imperial and metric standards of measurement, which has been perceived by the community as deceptive
- suggested there is a conflict of interest and perceived lack of transparency, five of the committee members having received campaign donations from the developer or his representatives
- provided a submission from herself and Dustin Rivers that outlined concerns about impacts to their property and the area in general; suggested this development is not in keeping with the fabric of the community, which would be better served by redevelopment at a smaller scope, such as garden homes or townhouses
 - this development must be looked at in relation to the ongoing applications for development of 1110 Fisher Avenue; together, the two proposals are seeking to add 100 new dwellings within a two-block radius of one another, and no information has been provided, to date, that would demonstrate to the community how services would not be adversely impacted by these proposed developments, including water, sewage and traffic implications
 - Fisher Avenue is a very busy commuter road and serves as a major artery to the Civic Hospital, and traffic is always heavily congested during peak traffic periods; given that entry and exit to the development’s proposed 26 parking spots will not be at a designated intersection, and given there are no currently approved plans to expand traffic lanes for this portion of Fisher Avenue, there will be an adverse impact on traffic flow, and congestion
 - there are known groundwater issues on a neighbouring property, and no information has been presented by the developer or the City to confirm that ground water is not an issue on the sites proposed for development, or to advise of plans in the event of groundwater issues

- given the limited amount of proposed parking spaces and the existing level of on-street parking congestion due to recent area intensification and hospital parking, the added density will exacerbate parking congestion and have an adverse impact on safety and snow removal
- increased density means increased garbage, which may lead to issues with odors and rodents if not properly managed
- the development will adversely impact neighbouring property value, as it will impose on existing views and privacy and will result in noise and light pollution
- pedestrian safety on Shillington Avenue will be adversely impacted by increasingly blocked sightlines due to parked cars
- provided a local newspaper article (dated December 6, 2017), regarding a previous public consultation on the proposed apartment development
- provided a submission (dated August 8, 2019) from Mary Ann. S. Turnbull, neighbouring property owner of 1132 Fisher Avenue (Turnbull School), which detailed concerns about proposed redevelopment of 1110 Fisher Avenue

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Robert Brinker, Chair, Development and Transportation Committee, Carlington Community Association (written submission)

- despite having three detached houses demolished, the Association supports ground oriented, family friendly intensification in the neighbourhood in light of the current housing crises in Ottawa, though would have preferred the creation of multiple bedroom units instead of only single bedroom apartments
- the provided amount of indoor parking spaces above the minimum requirement, combined with generous rear yard set-back and pleasant design, is a welcoming addition to Fisher Avenue
- the Association appreciates the extensive consultation process, both pre and post filing of the noted application

Jack Stirling (applicant) (oral submission)

- spoke to efforts to accommodate the community, including locating parking so that it is not visible, noting the proposed zoning standards are being tailored to fit the area

- noted the proposed buildings are just over 9m in height, well below standard City heights for wood frame low rise construction, as the vast majority of the City's R1 and R2 zones allow 11m in height
- the ground floor is all tuck-under parking, so there is no at-grade visible parking on the site at all, with one access, and access to Fisher is being limited as much as possible
- parapet heights have increased by a foot (from the original submission) to better hide AC units and mechanical works

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 46 minutes on the item

Vote: The committee considered all written submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations without change.

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between December 12 (Planning Committee consideration date) and January 29, 2020 (Council consideration date): 0

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all written submissions in making its decision and Carried the report recommendation with the following amendment:

That Council approve that the Zoning By-law Schedule (Document 3) be amended by removing the reference to elevation above sea level.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT pursuant to the *Planning Act*, subsection 34(17) no further notice be given.