

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-Law Amendment – 24, 26, 28 and 30 Pretoria 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: 0

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between June 15 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and June 25, 2020 (committee meeting date): 19

Primary concerns, by individual

Ernie Zwarts (written submission)

- height and density are incompatible with its surroundings
- the City should respect its own by-laws and only approve a fully R4 compliant building in an R4 zone
- the City should not give special treatment to the developer, for his personal financial benefit, at the expense of homeowners' enjoyment of their own homes; this development should not be permitted to undermine the pre-existing rights and uses of adjacent property owners living in R3 residential zone of Strathcona Avenue
- this development must not set a precedent for other 6-storey (or higher) buildings along Pretoria Avenue; introducing R5 zoning and/or permitting a 6-storey building opens the door to future mid-and high-rise development in this area
- felt it time for the developer to make a compromise on his request

Dianne Maclaren (written submission)

- passing isolated zoning amendments to allow singular development cannot result in a cohesive or planned neighbourhood
- the construction of a 6-storey apartment in this location does not meet current zoning criteria; it does not enhance street level activity; it does not transition well into the existing residential neighbourhood; nor does it do anything to acknowledge the proximity of the historic Rideau Canal
 - ❖ R3 & R4 residential single and semi-detached homes dominate the land use in the immediate streets, especially from the south side of Pretoria, and

further south, with the largely R4S zoned area on the south side of Pretoria Avenue acting as an important buffer and transition zone between the mixed commercial use to the north and the R3 neighbourhoods to the south

- ❖ given the overall low-rise residential context of the neighbourhood, the proposed site-specific exceptions to allow the construction of a 6-storey apartment building do not comply with the City of Ottawa's Official Plan, considering the proposal would have undue adverse impact on surrounding properties
- ❖ the development does not conform to the City's design guidelines for infill projects, given it does not consider the impacts of scale and mass on the adjacent surrounding homes
- ❖ the proposed site-specific zoning exceptions are not compatible with or respectful of the existing neighbourhood's context; the R4S zoning that controls 2/3 of the property is a necessary buffer for the low-rise residential area to the east, west & south
- ❖ the site-specific exceptions to add a new use to the R4 zone, that of "apartment dwelling mid-rise", as well as an increase in height to 18 metres would have a profound effect on the urban landscape and does not honour the purpose and intent of the R4 zoning designation
- ❖ the imposing height of the proposed 6-storey building is not in character with the neighbourhood and would overlook & eliminate any semblance of privacy for the homes on Metcalfe Street, Strathcona Avenue & Pretoria Avenue adjacent to the proposed development
- ❖ the architect's proposed 6th floor stepback from the rear face of the building, as an element of transition, is based on by-law criteria for Traditional Mainstreet (TM) but Pretoria Avenue is not zoned TM, nor is the proposed building a typical TM building, as it is lacking in ground level public amenities that would help to animate the street level activity; there is a **greater need** to ensure a gradual transition in building heights in an edge condition in order to comply with the City's Official Plan Policies to promote a fluid transition, congruous streetscape and harmonious neighbourhood
- ❖ the Official Plan supports intensification throughout the urban area where there are opportunities to accommodate more housing and increase transit use and where this can be done while still achieving compatibility and respect of the existing context; building a 4-storey apartment building within the R4S zoning context would satisfy the City's objectives for intensification while at the same time conforming to current zoning and land use patterns,

thereby providing a gradual transition from the Mixed General land use to R3 residential and blending with the character of the neighbourhood.

- asked the City to reject the proposal and, in the absence of a long-term plan for the Pretoria district, to commit to enforcing the existing intents & purposes of the R4S Zoning by-laws

Provenzano Family (written submission)

- family resides on Strathcona Avenue and strongly opposes the 6 story construction and urges the planning committee to offer no concessions to the 4 story zoning

Stephanie Lore (written submission)

- a developer building apartments in an R4 zone—one that is in an established, historic neighbourhood, immediately adjacent to an R3-zoned street of 2-storey homes, and steps from a UNESCO World Heritage Site—should at the very least be obliged to respect the maximum height and density permitted by the zoning; the developer is cherry picking the height and setback requirements of either zoning (R4/R5), and creating a not-compliant, inappropriate development; if they are asking for 6 stories (R5 zoning allowance) they should have to respect the R5 setbacks of 7.5m.
- this request serves to only benefit the developer, by obtaining maximum rentable square footage for increased profitability, to the detriment of existing property owners and the community; it is not being done to fulfil an intensification goal, which would require mixed land use, commercial or retail options, animated ground floor, and community collaboration and would positively impact the community
- at the very least the developer should have to step back both the 5th and 6th storeys, in accordance with by-laws governing "traditional mainstreet" buildings
- questioned whether the developer has considered the impact on the neighbouring homes/buildings with regards to water drainage and snow accumulation
- the three houses on Pretoria slated for demolition have a heritage designation; a 6-storey, non-zoning-compliant, mid-rise apartment building that is incompatible with the character of our neighbourhood is not appropriate

Jennifer Panek (written submission)

- does not want to see the area transformed into a canyon of mid-rise apartment buildings
- not opposed to the construction of an apartment building on the site at 24-30 Pretoria, and fully support the City's goals of intensification

- grateful that the city planners working on this file have agreed to reject the developer's application to rezone the entire site to R5, which sought to take advantage of a sliver of R5 zoning that the City eventually determined to be the result of an error; permitting R5 zoning would have set a grievous precedent
- given the mature and historic character of the neighbourhood, which includes Pretoria Avenue, despite the two high-rise eyesores on the north side that were permitted in a less enlightened era of city planning, the developer ought to be obliged to respect the maximum number of storeys allowed in an R4 zone and build a low-rise building that is compatible with the existing homes, the R3-zoned street of two-storey homes directly south of the development site, and the site's proximity to the UNESCO World Heritage Site of the Rideau Canal
- it is not unreasonable, or anti-intensification, to recall the City to its own Official Plan to ensure that intensification of a block like this one emphasizes "compatibility with the existing neighbourhood character," "fits well with its context" and "enhances the desirable characteristics" of the community;
- poor planning decisions dating back to a time not too far from when the City was contemplating paving over the Rideau Canal for a freeway should not be used as justification for more of the same in the year 2020: the suburban-style Loblaws parking lot, the high-rise retirement home on the corner of Pretoria and Metcalfe, and the hideous office building a block further west should be recognized for the unenlightened mistakes that they were, not as evidence that another hulking misfit on this street will make no difference; the north end of the Glebe has plenty of attractive low-rise apartment buildings that are fine models for how intensification can co-exist with keeping the character of the neighbourhood and respecting the intent of R4 zoning

Jon Beckman (written submission)

- supports reasonable development that enables additional Ottawans to live within the city centre and enjoy the many amenities that the Glebe and Centretown have to offer
- Pretoria Avenue would benefit from a new appropriately sized development where 24-30 Pretoria Avenue currently exist; six stories is excessive and current zoning should be applied
- downtown Ottawa has numerous examples of recent developments that have created additional affordable housing yet not caused over-crowding, and at an appropriate height (e.g. Bolton Avenue development);

- the City should respect its own by-laws and require a fully R4 compliant building in an R4 zone and demand that the developer provide a sufficient amount of parking spaces for its tenants; the proposed amount of parking spaces is insufficient and well below standards; area street parking in the winter is scarce and access to the Queensway between 4pm and 5:30pm at the corner of Strathcona/Metcalf, Patterson/Metcalf and Monkland/Metcalf is frequently at a standstill; emergency vehicles may also be delayed during times of need due to excessive traffic congestion, Strathcona Avenue being an emergency access route
- questioned how the developer will address compensation for neighbouring homeowners for future snow build-up on their roofs

Jane Barton (written submission)

- traffic access to the Queensway at Metcalf in both directions and into the Glebe neighbourhood will be impeded during construction and after completion due to vehicles associated with and servicing a rental building with almost 50 units at that location
- the Stalinistic design of the building is reminiscent of the rental buildings found along the Highway 5 corridor in Hull; they are ugly when built and get worse with age; this building will be ugly and will be a stain on the city that approves it
- a building design that fits into the existing R4 and R5 zoning and is therefore 4 storeys in the R4 part and 6 storeys in the R5 part could be architecturally interesting and financially profitable; the zoning should be respected
- tree survival has been supposedly addressed by the developer's design but despite any undertakings by the developer, tree survival cannot be assured, and when the 75 year old trees have died due to construction of the development, questions whether the City will have a way to hold JB Holdings accountable as well as obtain new trees

Louise Green (written submission)

- the development should be limited to a scale and style that is compatible with the residential neighbourhood; R5 zoning should not be permitted for this site as it is totally out of keeping with the neighbourhood and the new building should be four stories at most; even at 4 stories it will be taller than the other residential buildings, which are two and three stories
- in addition to a reduced maximum height, the developer should be required to incorporate certain design features that would minimize the impact of a large building on this site, specifically the preservation of mature trees, which improve the health and attractiveness of the city core, and the incorporation of minimized garage

doors and other design features that maintain an attractive streetscape; attractive, walkable streets are among the features that make the Glebe an appealing neighbourhood and this should be reflected in the design

Zsafia Grandpierre (written submission)

- not in favour of a six-storey building being planned behind their tiny 1.5 storey home, and requested a fair compromise of a five-storey building with step-backs above the fourth storey on all sides
- supports intensification and understands well the need to increase housing inventory in this neighbourhood but worried about the precedent that this sets for future developments, and how the community of low-rise single-family homes is sure to be transformed to high rises soon after a project of this inappropriate size and scale is approved
- concerned that the developer is seeking your concurrence to spot-zone this redevelopment area; this request serves to only benefit the developer, by obtaining maximum rentable square footage for increased profitability, to the detriment of existing property owners and the community; it is not being done to fulfil an intensification goal, which would require mixed land use, commercial or retail options, animated ground floor, and community collaboration and would positively impact the community
- on June 11 2020, City planning staff recommended rejecting the Lepine development in Orleans using very similar arguments; they don't want to reject this development but do want a thoughtful, appropriately-scaled development with an appropriate transition to the existing community of low-rise homes; there is an inconsistent application of Urban Design Guideline document and the City's own bylaws between wards, and granted, the scale is not the same, but the impact is much more significant since the building is directly adjacent to the established, mature neighbourhood of historic homes and a UNESCO world heritage site
- the city is fortunate to have a mature official plan and zoning by-law, and while minor variances should always be considered, allowing the addition of two storeys to an R4-zoned lot in a historic R3/R4 neighbourhood is not a minor change in nature, and should not be approved
- requested a compromise of a five-storey building, something the community will support, provided that the top storey would taper back on all sides to limit the impact of the scale on the surrounding homes
- six storeys is completely out of place and out of harmony with the neighbourhood; no such analog exists in the surrounding area, and the height, scale, massing, and

density will have negative impacts on homeowners' enjoyment of their properties, privacy, and expectations of peace and quiet

Mark W. Sutton (written submission)

- it appears that the 2008 Consolidation Error is the root of the problem for the properties 24 and 26 Pretoria that should be R4 zoning; this appears to be a City of Ottawa error and problem, and the City appears to want to just sweep this under the carpet and allow the developer to do what they want (build 6 storeys with other exemptions) to the detriment of other houses and property tax payers who have lived for many years in this neighborhood
- the developer says five stories will not be as profitable as six; one only has to look to Dow's Lake and the 45 storey Claridge Icon building to see an eyesore and mess and where the City is heading
- traffic is already very bad on Pretoria and will only get worse with the planned 48 units to be built; the current one-way traffic routes need to be rethought and reconfigured if this proposal is approved as is

Email sender 'Barbara Kates' (unsigned) (written submission)

- objected to increase in traffic and density
- supported the submission by Dianne Maclaren

Susan Courage (written submission)

- supported the submission by Dianne Maclaren

Isla Paterson (written submission)

- the City should respect existing norms; Pretoria Avenue is zoned R4 and the R5 zoning amendment application should be rejected
- intensification can occur within existing rules; the Province (the Ministry of Municipalities and Housing) has not stated that intensification requires zoning change; it states that each community's form and level of intensification will differ, based on their specific characteristic such as location, history, community strengths and preferences
- four family residences at 24-30 Pretoria will be torn down to make way for this proposed apartment building; by the Ministry's definition, an additional unit (i.e. five households on this land) would qualify as intensification; no zoning by-law amendment is needed to get greater intensification density
- the developer bought these properties, knowing they were zoned R4 and he should have to be respectful of the City's current plan and the neighbourhood, and present

plans for a R4 zoning compliant building; the developer's profit should not be the Committee's concern, and the Committee should listen to the community's preferences, specifically more than 134 households (and property taxpayers) who have clearly stated over the phone, in person, through Zoom meetings and by letter and email that they do not want a development of this proposed height

Eric Hassenzahl (written submission)

- the proposed building is oversized and will dominate all the houses nearby
- Bylaws were created to keep development in check and create a spirit of community within a neighbourhood; this area is mostly owner-occupied residences with a smattering of tasteful vintage homes remodeled to be single- or multi-unit rentals; an apartment tower would run contrary to the feel of this community; the developer is proposing to build a high-rise apartment building in a designated low-rise residential area
- Pretoria is an over-burdened road already; adding high-density housing will make this worse
- this area is a neighbourhood generally of single-family homes built over a century ago; a towering six-storey apartment complex is not consistent with the look and feel of the community and would be a further inappropriate encroachment into the quiet neighbourhood
- there are two existing semi-detached single-family residences immediately adjacent (west) to the proposed tower; to reduce the setback along the nearest single-family residence property to 1.5m (just under 5 feet) with an 18-metre wall is nonsensical; it would tower over the small house at almost three times its height
- providing only fourteen parking spots for 49 units is ill-advised; parking on Pretoria Avenue is restricted to one side of the street, and often all available spots are occupied (especially in the winter, when there are events at Lansdowne, etc.)
- this stretch of Pretoria and turning to Metcalfe are feeder roads for the entrance to the 417; congestion along this corridor has progressively worsened, especially over the past two years; the majority of drivers heading into the neighbourhood, or through to Bank Street and along to Bronson/Airport Parkway, proceed along Pretoria, and it is also part of the OC Transpo 56 route; adding additional congestion here is unwise (and unhealthy) for residents of this street who already deal on a day-to-day basis with increased noise, pollution, and congestion
- there is an alarming tendency of developers to propose something then deliver something else, and the City has an unfortunate history of retroactively allowing the developers to complete these projects without penalty (examples provided)

- a new higher-density residential building could fit in well if done correctly; there are many examples around Ottawa of new developments that can provide plenty of profit for developers, within the constraints of existing bylaws or without impacting the neighbourhood nearly as much as a six-storey tower would
- if a developer builds to the 4-storey limit for this stretch of Pretoria, and creates twice the density (two up-down, 2-storey units along each fronting stairway) of those above, a reasonable value expectation would be perhaps \$6M-\$8M for 12 units; this would provide plenty of profit given the existing assessed values and there would be no need for any of the proposed bylaw amendments: parking would be ample, height would be reasonable, and there would be no need for a side setback variance

Don Sommerfeldt (written submission)

- the current zoning of the two western lots was likely put in place for valid reasons and those reasons should be honored and the current zoning for those two lots should be respected and maintained
- the R5 zoning for the eastern lot is an anomaly and may have resulted from a prior error or oversight; if such was the case, the anomaly should be rectified, so as to conform with the adjacent R4 zoning
- there are three tall apartment buildings in the eastern portion of the Glebe, located a few blocks south of Pretoria Avenue, all of which are located on the eastern ends of their respective blocks and are adjacent to Queen Elizabeth Driveway; if there is going to be a tall apartment building in a residential neighborhood containing, for the most part, detached and semi-detached homes, it makes sense to locate that building at the end of a block, and not in the middle; it would be unprecedented and anomalous to construct a six-story apartment building at 24-30 Pretoria Avenue, which is in the middle of the block in question
- the developer undoubtedly knew the zoning of the lots composing the property at the time of purchase and it is not appropriate to allow the developer's profit motive to undermine the existing zoning, which was put in place for a legitimate purpose; if the developer cannot make a profit with a four-story apartment building, perhaps it should consider alternative uses for the property, such as the construction of semi-detached homes, upscale single-detached homes or low-rise luxury condominiums
- the Glebe is a historic residential neighborhood and the construction of a six-story apartment building on this site will adversely alter the character of that neighborhood; in addition, it will set a precedent for similar rezoning amendments or spot-zoning exceptions and it will be only a matter of time before the character of the Glebe will be lost forever

- the proposed development will cause an “undue adverse impact on [the] surrounding properties,” particularly the residential properties located to the south, east and west of the Property, which would be contrary to the City of Ottawa’s Official Plan, which acknowledges that the introduction of “new development and higher densities into existing areas that have developed over a long period of time [such as the Glebe] requires a sensitive approach and a respect for a community’s established characteristics.”; the “scale and mass” of the proposed six-story apartment building are excessive, given the block on which the property is located
- the proposed 11 parking spaces, four of which will be visitor parking spaces, is inadequate for the proposed 48 unit building; questioned the validity of the architect’s argument (and enforceability of that premise) that most of the tenants in the new building will not own vehicles, so there will not be an increase in traffic or on-street parking; while reducing vehicle ownership and usage is a commendable objective, it is unreasonable to think that only seven out of 48 (or more) tenants will need parking for a vehicle or that an apartment building with 48 units will attract only four vehicle-driving visitors at a time
- supported the submission by Dianne Maclaren

Kevin O’Kelly (written submission)

- the proposed development can in no way be considered appropriate for this street, in this part of this neighborhood; the R5C zoning of a portion of the lot is most likely a clerical error that occurred at some point in the past, as no other explanation could be thought to be plausible for a lot on a residential street; this development would be a serious blight on the immediately surrounding homes and the skyline for many blocks distant from the lot
- the development of a building of such density of occupation does not benefit any of the neighbours in any way; the traffic on this residential street would be significantly increased by a factor of 3 to 4; the occupants of the houses on Strathcona Ave would have their privacy utterly destroyed and the only person who benefits is the developer
- if the zoning guidelines are going to be relaxed by every single request for relaxation, as they have been on Bank St at Landsdowne for example, the existence of a Planning Committee of any kind must be called in to question; if the Planning Committee is going to ignore all zoning regulations for the benefit of all of the city’s developers, then the Committee is redundant and should be abolished
- requested enforcement of the area zoning as it has been established and as it applies to any individual homeowner in the neighbourhood who wishes to add to or modify their home

Mary Alice MacNeil (written submission)

- the R5 zoning request should be rejected and the proposed 6 storey building not be allowed to proceed, as the height and density of such a building would be visually jarring in this area; the R4 zoning should be preserved and the new building should not exceed the four storey limit

email sender 'Bill McLeish' (unsigned) (written submission)

- anything more than a four story apartment building north of his property in the area will significantly impair the neighbourhood

Primary reasons for support, by individual

Kersten Nitsche and Scott Alain, Fotenn; Rod Lahey, RLA Architecture (representing the applicant)

- were present in support and to answer questions if needed; a visual presentation was provided in advance and is held on file, but was not presented at the meeting

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee carried the item on consent, without discussion or debate

Vote: The committee considered all written submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations as presented.

Ottawa City Council

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between June 25 (Planning Committee consideration date) and July 15, 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 as presented. In addition, Council approved the following Direction to staff:

That staff present to Council information that outlines an estimated timeline, and the public engagement process, for the comprehensive update to zoning that is anticipated to follow the adoption of the new Official Plan. Further, that staff outline some of their expectations regarding the outcomes of this zoning update, including whether staff believe this zoning update will see a decline in staff recommendations for zoning amendments sought by developers.