

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 116 York 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 January 13 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda) and January 23, 2020 (committee meeting date): 2

Primary concerns, by individual (note: these submissions were in support of the staff recommendation to refuse the application)

Peter Ferguson, Lowertown Community Association (oral submission)

- the Association's position remains the same as indicated in their letter to staff (included in the staff report as Document 7), being that the proposal fails to contemplate the heritage character of the heritage conservation district and its negative impact on it, and that this particular development is inappropriate in the context of the site, and will result in insufficient separation distances between existing and future buildings on adjacent properties

Carey Thomson (oral submission)

- the proposed development is very confrontational and insensitive to the area, which is subject to a heritage designation, and is just a short walk away from Parliament Hill, in what is the capital city of Canada; the city, generally, and the neighbourhood in particular, deserve more
- the staff report amply supports their position to refuse the request, and will provide a robust and defensible position for Council when this matter goes to the LPAT
- neither the applicant, nor its design team, has made any attempt to try to reach a halfway point with the community and with City staff, such that a compromise proposal might be developed to go forward
- what is being proposed here, in this particular situation, is not appropriate,

does not represent good planning, and would set a terrible precedent for other areas of the city where development is needed and development is going to be coming forward, such as in Somerset ward

David B. Flemming, Heritage Ottawa (oral and written submission)

- Heritage Ottawa’s position hasn’t changed on this proposal in the past 16 months, as indicated in their letter to staff (included in the staff report as Document 8); they heartily endorse the staff recommendation because the proposal ignores the central recommendations of the Byward Market Heritage Conservation District for height and massing, context, setbacks, and streetscape
- concerned that the rezoning application has preceded an application under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, a question they raised 16 months ago and never received an explanation to

Primary reasons for support, by individual (note: these submissions were in opposition to the staff recommendation to refuse the application)

Sameer Gulamani, Bayview Hospitality Inc. (owner) (oral submission and slides)

- the firm has a history of building hotels and residential properties in communities with an intent to contribute and be part of the communities, not to build and sell
- this site was chosen because of its relationship to the Byward Market and they feel that by contributing investment to the Market – adding some hotel rooms – they will greatly improve its status as a national and international tourism destination
- in addition to its relationship to the Byward Market, the site is attractive because of the taller buildings near the site (it’s beside a 19-storey building and it’s behind a 22-storey building that’s site plan-approved), and it’s 500m from the Rideau LRT Station, which makes this development appropriate for the area
- the proposal was reduced from the originally proposed 20 storeys to 17 storeys after community consultations and pre-consultation with UDRP
- the site is currently a parking lot now, which are characterized as undesirable in the Byward Market Heritage Conservation District Study

- in keeping with the HCD guidelines, they developed a proposal that includes an active streetscape; they stepped the tower back in order to mitigate the effect on the pedestrian environment, incorporated the design and materials that exist in the Market, and also picked up the architectural façade of the adjacent building (a recognized category 2 building in the HCD study) in order to give it a relationship

Bill Holzman, Holzman Consultants Inc. (applicant) (oral submission)

- prepared the land use planning rationale for this application, which was submitted along with other studies, as well as a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, and concluded that the Zoning By-law amendment, the minor application, was appropriate for the site for a variety of reasons
- there was initial consultation for a taller, larger building, but the plan was reduced to 17 stories after an extensive period of reflection and contemplation, and discussion with neighbours to see if some of the preliminary concerns could be addressed
- the angular plane that is permitted in existing zoning is unfeasible because it presents challenges in how the core of the building is located, how certain floor plates operate properly, and how much usable space is generated over the site, which they felt warranted a full review through a Zoning By-law amendment, rather than by seeking a Variance through the Committee of Adjustment
- were surprised when City staff indicated they were recommending refusal of the application, and felt there was some room to continue constructive dialogue
- were cognizant and appreciative of the policies in place, guidelines that were developed 30 years ago for the district, but felt that the project on a whole was supportable by the land use planning documents

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 25 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 January 23 (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 recommendations without change