



Ward Boundary Review 2020
Examen des limites de quartiers 2020



Recommended Ward Boundaries Final Report

November 13, 2020

Prepared by:
Beate Bowron Etcetera
Hemson Consulting Ltd.
The Davidson Group

Acknowledgements

The Ottawa Ward Boundary Review 2020 began in January 2020 and will end with the presentation of this Report to the City of Ottawa Finance and Economic Development Committee and City Council in December 2020. Funding for this project was provided by the City of Ottawa.

The consultant team appreciates the many individuals and organizations who participated in and provided input to this project. This includes: community associations, Members of Council, other stakeholder groups and members of the public. All of your contributions have helped make our final recommendation for new ward boundaries for Ottawa possible. Thank you.

We would also like to thank the many Ottawa staff members, and in particular staff of the City Clerk's Office, who provided logistical support and technical advice throughout the project. Your commitment to the OWBR 2020 was invaluable.

1 Introduction

In January 2020, Ottawa City Council launched the Ottawa Ward Boundary Review 2020 (OWBR 2020), a comprehensive review of Ottawa's existing wards. The Review's approach included wide-ranging input on the current ward boundaries, the development of six options for realigning Ottawa's wards and broad consultation on the options prior to this recommendation to City Council in December 2020.

During Round 1 of the OWBR 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic arrived. Public and stakeholder meetings had to be cancelled after the first two public meetings. However, the online survey continued and meetings with Members of Council were completed via telephone. Round 2 adapted to the limitations imposed by the pandemic and held all its meetings in a virtual manner. The participation in Round 2 was excellent.

Any ward boundary review has to create a ward boundary configuration that achieves effective representation for the entire City of Ottawa. The [Options Report](#) (July 2020) explains the concept of effective representation in detail. However, it is worth reiterating that effective representation involves the balancing of several components and not a focus on any single component. A detailed overview of effective representation is attached to this Report as Appendix A.

Ultimately, wards and their boundaries are about the right to vote provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The principle of the right to vote is often lost in the day-to-day discussion of ward reviews.

The OWBR 2020 focuses on the needs of the entire city for the next three, and possibly four, elections. Any new ward boundary configuration approved by Council is to be implemented for the 2022 municipal election.

This Final Report contains seven sections. Following this Introduction, **Section 2** describes the development of the six options that were the subject of the Round 2 public discussion and feedback. **Section 3** gives an overview of the Round 2 consultation process and its results.

Section 4 details how a preferred option was synthesized based on the feedback on the six options from Round 2 of the consultation process. **Section 5** looks at the comments on the preferred option and assesses suggested ward boundary improvements.

Section 6 presents the map of the recommended ward boundary configuration and its associated table showing the populations for each ward and their variances from the

average ward population. It also discusses how the recommended ward boundary configuration meets the criteria of effective representation. Finally, **Section 7** describes actions in certain areas of the city, which future Councils should consider.

2 The Six Options

The public consultation process followed by the OWBR 2020 involved two rounds. Round 1 sought input on the current ward situation. This input informed the creation of five options for re-configuring Ottawa's wards. Options 1-5 were presented in an [Options Report](#) (July 2020). Council reviewed the five options and suggested the development of a sixth option, based on certain criteria that maintain effective representation. This sixth option was discussed in a [Supplementary Report](#) (August 2020). All six options were included in Round 2 of the public consultation process which started in late August.

All six options achieve effective representation and can be implemented. This fact is integral to the methodology of the OWBR 2020. It means that, during the Round 2 consultation process, participants were able to select any option as their "preferred option".

Because any new ward boundary configuration is to last for three and possibly four elections, Ottawa's growth has been taken into consideration. As discussed in detail in the Options Report, the "target year" for the voter parity component of effective representation is 2026. All average ward populations are expressed in terms of Ottawa's projected 2026 population, which is approximately 1.15 million.

Most of the six options have different characteristics and boundaries for the various wards. Options 1-4 and Option 6 have the same alignment for the rural wards. Options 1-4 have the same alignment for the suburban wards.

One important feature of all six options is the number of wards and the average ward population. Option 1 contains 25 wards with an average 2026 ward population of 46,000. This option increases the number of Councillors by two, from 23 to 25. Options 2 and Option 6 each have 24 wards and an average 2026 ward population of 47,900. Options 3 and 4 maintain the current number of Councillors and wards at 23. The average ward population in 2026 is 50,000. These two options lead to significant boundary changes among the city's urban wards. Finally, Option 5 sees the most change to the current ward system. The number of wards decreases to 17 and the average ward population in 2026 increases to 67,600.

The six options were presented to the public, stakeholders and Members of Council for discussion and choice of a preferred option. Round 2 determined the preferred option and asked for potential boundary modifications. The preferred option is discussed in **Section 4** of this Report. Suggestions for boundary changes from participants across the city have been evaluated for the preferred option. Major suggestions are discussed in **Section 5** of this Report and all suggestions are listed and analyzed in Appendix B.

3 Round 2 Public Consultation (Feedback Round)

The purpose of Round 2 of the OWBR 2020's public consultation was to collect feedback on the six options for re-aligning Ottawa's wards from the public, stakeholders and Members of Council. Round 2 ran from August 19 to September 25, 2020.

3.1 What We Did

Advertising and promotion of the opportunities for providing feedback on the six options was extensive and multi-faceted in English and French. It included the following:

- An updated project webpage on the City of Ottawa website with the following additional material:
 - A link to the Round 2 survey
 - Map and Table Adjustments Options 1-5 (Adjustments to Appendix A of the Options Report)
 - A consolidated Options Report
 - The Supplementary Report - Option 6
 - A "Ranking Tool"
 - Population projections by traffic zone
 - Open Data Shapefiles
 - French mother tongue population by ward
 - PDF versions of the maps for Options 1-6
 - An interactive map via geoOttawa, which allows the six options to be overlaid on the current ward boundaries and 'drilling' down to individual addresses
- Updated information on EngageOttawa
- Updated information at 3-1-1
- Ads in community newspapers, digital ads and ads on the outside of Ottawa's buses
- Social media posts, media releases, public service announcements
- Direct e-mails to Ottawa's community associations

- Direct e-mails to Ottawa’s stakeholder groups (School Boards, universities, BIAs, advocacy groups, etc.)
- Direct e-mails to project mailing list
- An article in Ottawa’s Rural Connections newsletter
- Project information packages for Members of Council

Vehicles for collecting feedback during Round 2 of the public consultation process included:

- Feedback survey August 19 – September 25 (online and in hard copy)¹
- Project e-mail account/Guest Book through EngageOttawa
- Public (6) and stakeholder (3) meetings; due to COVID-19, all meetings occurred virtually
- Interviews with all Members of Council (all virtually)

3.2 Who Participated

In total, 2,565 individuals and groups provided feedback on the six options during the OWBR 2020’s Round 2 public consultation process. Based on our experience, this is a very large number. It includes 1,057 survey responses from Kanata South (Ward 23), 271 survey responses from Osgoode (Ward 20) and 188 survey responses from Kitchissippi (Ward 15). Survey responses are discussed in detail in **Section 4** below.

3.2.1 Public/Stakeholder Meetings

The six virtual public meetings and three virtual stakeholder meetings were held on weekday afternoons and evenings and on Saturday mornings to provide a choice and allow as many people as possible to attend. In order to participate, attendees had to register in advance to be sent the virtual meeting link. Participants could join online or by telephone.

The public meetings were advertised as having either a ‘city-wide’, ‘urban’, ‘suburban’ or ‘rural’ focus. However, there was no restriction on topics to be discussed during the registration process or during the discussion. Initially, only the three ‘city-wide’ meetings and one of the stakeholder meetings were planned to offer simultaneous translation. Due to requests received during the registration process, seven of the nine meetings

¹ Hard copies were sent on request with relevant documents, including maps, and a prepaid return envelope.

offered simultaneous translation. Public and stakeholder meetings began with a short presentation followed by a discussion of the six options.

From among the 246 individuals who registered for the nine meetings, 137 attended.

Their distribution is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 – Public / Stakeholder Meeting Participants by Ward

Ward # and Name	Attendees
1 - Orléans	1
2 - Innes	0
3 - Barrhaven	3
4 - Kanata North	1
5 - West Carleton-March	12
6 – Stittsville	1
7 – Bay	3
8 – College	4
9 – Knoxdale-Merivale	1
10 – Gloucester-Southgate	1
11 – Beacon Hill-Cyrville	1
12 – Rideau-Vanier	7
13 – Rideau-Rockcliffe	3
14 – Somerset	10
15 – Kitchissippi	14
16 – River	1
17 – Capital	1

18 – Alta Vista	1
19 – Cumberland	10
20 – Osgoode	23
21 – Rideau-Goulbourn	10
22 – Gloucester-South Nepean	0
23 – Kanata South	7
No ward specified	22
Total	137

3.2.2 Submissions/Guest Book Entries/Members of Council

During Round 2, the OWBR 2020 received 238 submissions and comments by e-mail and telephone, as well as 16 entries via Ottawa’s Guest Book. The text of 54 out of the 238 submissions was identical. One of the submissions re-designed the boundaries of eight wards in Option 6. All 24 Members of Council provided comments and suggestions.

3.3 What We Heard

Public comments and suggestions regarding Options 1-6 were vociferous, lively and passionate. In some instances, participants informed their neighbours and friends of their opposition to certain parts of one or more of the options, and form letters were submitted, as described above.

Major flash points included:

- The combination of the current Osgoode Ward with the rural portion of the current Cumberland Ward in all options;
- The effect of this combination on Francophone residents currently living in Cumberland Ward;
- Terry Fox as the proposed western boundary of Kanata South Ward, rather than the Carp River, in Options 1-4; and
- The proposed change of the western boundary of Kitchissippi Ward in Option 6.

Opinions differ on whether rural ward populations are too small and whether they are truly rural; whether the geographic areas of the proposed rural wards are too large; whether suburban and rural residents should be in the same ward; and whether Ottawa should increase, maintain or reduce its current number of wards.

It seems that many members of the public mistakenly assume that the options propose that the whole of the current Cumberland Ward be combined with Osgoode Ward, rather than only Cumberland's rural area. In addition, there appears to be a fair bit of misunderstanding and misinformation regarding the scope and impact of the OWBR 2020.

Contrary to many expressed opinions, City services and Councillors' office budgets will not be affected by re-aligning ward boundaries – those are policy decisions made by Ottawa City Council annually.

A large number of participants are concerned that changes in ward boundaries will impact their cultural, social, recreational, educational and commercial day-to-day patterns. This is definitely not the case. Ward boundaries are created to elect Councillors and do not determine, for example, access to City recreational facilities.

Such access is determined by City policy. Quoted below is information on access to City recreational and cultural facilities provided by the City.

“The City’s large portfolio of recreation and cultural facilities supports the development of communities, contributes to healthy and active lifestyles, and enhances our neighbourhoods. The details of how space at these facilities is allocated to residents and user groups can be found in the Council-approved allocation policy. This policy was last refreshed in 2016, and, most notably, removed the historical allocation of hours and enabled staff to realign facility locations to better reflect current demonstrated needs. Guiding principles were also established in the development of the refreshed policy, including equity, optimal use of facilities, and response to community needs. Allocation of City space is applied consistently through the policy to all users for City-wide benefit and access to City programs, services and spaces remains unaffected by any changes to ward boundaries.”

Other ‘out-of-scope’ suggestions are governance related, such as electing some Councillors at-large; electing/appointing a ‘rural’ deputy mayor; giving rural Councillors

‘weighted’ votes on rural issues; and returning regional government to the City of Ottawa.

Concern has been expressed that the OWBR 2020 has proceeded during the COVID-19 pandemic. The City of Ottawa is continuing to conduct a number of other public consultation processes, and virtual consultations seem to have worked well for individuals, institutions and organizations in a number of projects across the city. In order to be able to implement any new ward boundary configuration for the 2022 municipal elections, Council has to keep to its approved timeline for the OWBR 2020. Based on our experience in other ward boundary reviews, participation in Round 2 of the project’s public consultation process was excellent, despite the COVID-19 pandemic.

4 The Preferred Option

The Options Report and the Supplementary Report proposed six options for feedback during Round 2 of the public consultation process. All six options achieve effective representation.

The next step is to determine a “preferred option”. In the end, only one ward configuration can be adopted. To determine a preferred option among the six options, the public and Members of Council were asked to rank the options. The public ranked the options through a survey and Members of Council did so by virtual interview. This process also solicited suggestions for boundary modifications to improve everyone’s preferred option.

The six options could be ranked from first choice through to sixth choice. Participants could also indicate that they “Don’t Like” an option. Sometimes participants did not express their preference for an option, one way or another. In this case, a ranking of “No Comment” was assigned. To determine an overall preference, rankings were scored. The chart below shows the scoring protocol used to convert a specific choice for an option into a weighted numerical score.

Option Choice	Points Awarded
First Choice	6
Second Choice	5
Third Choice	4

Fourth Choice	3
Fifth Choice	2
Sixth Choice	1
Don't Like	0
No Comment	0

The rankings by the public and Members of Council are discussed separately below.

4.1 Public Rankings and Preferences

A total of 2,150 surveys were completed, in both French and English. Table 2 shows the number of surveys completed by ward.

Table 2 - Survey Responses by Ward

Ward #	Ward Name	Survey Responses	Percentage Response
1	Orléans	11	0.51%
2	Innes	10	0.47%
3	Barrhaven	9	0.42%
4	Kanata North	72	3.35%
5	West Carleton-March	28	1.30%
6	Stittsville	34	1.58%
7	Bay	21	0.98%
8	College	29	1.35%
9	Knoxdale-Merivale	15	0.70%
10	Gloucester-Southgate	9	0.42%
11	Beacon Hill-Cyrville	10	0.47%
12	Rideau-Vanier	25	1.16%

13	Rideau-Rockcliffe	16	0.74%
14	Somerset	55	2.56%
15	Kitchissippi	188	8.75%
16	River	20	0.93%
17	Capital	15	0.70%
18	Alta Vista	14	0.65%
19	Cumberland	65	3.02%
20	Osgoode	271	12.60%
21	Rideau-Goulbourn	26	1.21%
22	Gloucester-South Nepean	12	0.56%
23	Kanata South	1057	49.19%
0	Not Answered	138	6.42%
Totals		2150	

The next step is to determine the public’s “preferred option” based on the rankings resulting from the surveys. Methodologically, this can be done either by scoring the survey rankings across the entire city, or by scoring the survey rankings by ward. The first approach weighs all surveys individually, the second approach weighs all surveys by ward. The distribution of the surveys amongst the wards determines the approach to be used.

As Table 2 – Survey Responses by Ward indicates, the survey responses are dominated by Kanata South, which accounts for 49% of all the surveys received. Trying to determine a preferred option for the city by combining the rankings of all surveys would skew the results towards the option preferred by residents of a single ward². Based on this observation, the approach of determining the preferred option for Ottawa is derived from an analysis of each ward’s preferred option. Tables 3 and 4 use this method to determine the preferred option indicated by the public surveys.

² A review of surveys from Ward 23 indicates incidents of some exuberant participants submitting multiple surveys. However, even if the multiple surveys were removed, the results would still be skewed towards the option favoured by Kanata South.

A ward-based approach looks at the ranking of the six options within each ward and scores them. It is more complex than a city-wide approach, however it has the advantage of looking at the rankings of each ward individually. It also overcomes the “skewing effect” mentioned previously. Table 3 indicates the option preferences by ward, based on the surveys from each ward that ranked the options.

Table 3 – Option Rankings by Ward – Public Surveys

Ward Number	Ward Name	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
		25 Wards	24 Wards	23 Wards	23 Wards	17 Wards	24 Wards
1	Orléans	Fifth	Fourth	Third	Second	Sixth	First
2	Innes	Fifth	Sixth	Third	Fourth	Second	First
3	Barrhaven	Sixth	Fifth	Fourth	Third	First	Second
4	Kanata North	Sixth	Third	Fifth	Fourth	Second	First
5	West Carleton-March	Sixth	Fifth	Second	Fourth	Third	First
6	Stittsville	Fifth	Sixth	Second	Third	Fourth	First
7	Bay	Fifth	Fourth	Third	First	Sixth	Second
8	College	Fifth	Sixth	Fourth	First	Second	Third
9	Knoxdale-Merivale	First	Third	Fourth	Second	Fifth	Sixth
10	Gloucester-Southgate	Third	Second	Fourth	Sixth	First	Fifth
11	Beacon Hill-Cyrville	Sixth	Third	Fourth	First	Fifth	Second
12	Rideau-Vanier	Third	Second	Fifth	Fourth	Sixth	First
13	Rideau-Rockcliffe	Second	Fourth	Sixth	Fifth	Third	First
14	Somerset	Sixth	Fifth	Second	Fourth	Third	First

15	Kitchissippi	Fifth	Third	Sixth	Second	Fourth	First
16	River	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	First	Second	Third
17	Capital	Second	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	Third	First
18	Alta Vista	Fourth	Sixth	Third	Second	First	Fifth
19	Cumberland	Second	Third	Sixth	Fourth	Fifth	First
20	Osgoode	Third	Fourth	Second	Sixth	Fifth	First
21	Rideau-Goulbourn	Sixth	Third	Fifth	Fourth	Second	First
22	Gloucester-South Nepean	Second	Fifth	Third	Fourth	Sixth	First
23	Kanata South	Third	Second	Fourth	Sixth	Fifth	First
0	Not Answered	Third	Second	Fourth	Sixth	Fifth	First

In a number of surveys (138), the respondents did not indicate the ward where they live. The rankings of this group have been included in Table 3 and in Table 4 below to accommodate all surveys.

To determine the preferred option, the options are scored based on their ranking across all wards. Table 4 shows the scored public rankings.

Table 4 – Option Preferences – Public Surveys

	1st	Score	2nd	Score	3rd	Score	4th	Score	5th	Score	6th	Score	Total
Option 1	1	6	4	20	5	20	2	6	6	12	6	6	70
Option 2	0	0	4	20	6	24	5	15	5	10	4	4	73
Option 3	0	0	4	20	5	20	7	21	4	8	4	4	73
Option 4	4	24	4	20	2	8	8	24	1	2	5	5	83
Option 5	3	18	5	25	4	16	2	6	6	12	4	4	81
Option 6	16	96	3	15	2	8	0	0	2	4	1	1	124

As Table 4 demonstrates, Option 6 has the most first place choices by far at 16. When scores for all other rankings are included, Option 6 is still the preferred option at 124. Option 4 is a distant second at 83.

4.2 Council Rankings and Preferences

Members of Council were also asked to rank the six options. Table 5 - Option Preference - Members of Council provides a similar table to Table 4 above. Again, the rankings of Members of Council were scored.

Table 5 – Option Preferences - Members of Council

	1st	Score	2nd	Score	3rd	Score	4th	Score	5th	Score	6th	Score	Total Score
Option 1	3	18	4	20	4	16	1	3	0	0	0	0	57
Option 2	2	12	7	35	1	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	53
Option 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	2	0	0	8
Option 4	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	9
Option 5	0	0	1	5	2	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	15
Option 6	16	96	1	5	0	0	1	3	0	0	2	2	106

As with the public’s option preferences, Members of Council preferred Option 6 by a wide margin³. The main difference between the rankings of Members of Council and the public surveys is the score of their second and third place options. The public preferred Options 4 and 5 and Members of Council preferred Options 1 and 2.

4.3 Other Comments on Rankings

The public survey and interviews with Members of Council also allowed a “Don’t Like” ranking. As well, in numerous cases respondents specified a first or second choice, but then did not say anything about the remaining options. In these cases, a “No Comment” was logged against the options where no preference was stated. Generally, the fact that

³ The numbers in the rankings do not add up to the number of Members of Council, as all Members of Council did not rank all options. In several instances Members of Council had no comments on some of the options.

an option was not liked or received a “No Comment” is not that significant, as the respondent would have ranked those options which they did prefer.

A large number of surveys from Osgoode and Cumberland specify “Don’t Like” for all six options. In Cumberland (Ward 19), 65 surveys were submitted and 48 respondents do not like any of the six options. In Osgoode (Ward 20), 271 surveys were submitted, and 193 respondents do not like any of the six options.

In West Carleton-March (Ward 5) and Rideau-Goulbourn (Ward 21), a number of survey participants also do not like any of the six options – 7 out of 28 in West Carleton-March and 10 out of 26 in Rideau-Goulbourn. In the other wards, the number of survey respondents who “Don’t Like” any of the options is negligible to non-existent.

The reason that respondents from Ottawa’s rural areas “Don’t Like” any of the options is due to the fact that all six options combine the rural portion of Cumberland with Osgoode. Residents of both wards have been vocal in their objections for a variety of reasons. Also, respondents from the other rural wards are concerned over losing a rural ward. The situation in the rural area of Ottawa is addressed in more detail in **Section 5** of this Report.

5 Recommended Ward Boundaries

Having been established as the “preferred option”, Option 6 provides the basis for developing a recommended ward boundary configuration.

As part of the survey, public and stakeholder virtual meetings, public submissions and discussions with Members of Council, numerous suggestions for boundary changes were received. This Report discusses these within the three major geographic areas of Ottawa – rural, suburban and urban – and addresses the major ones in this Section.

Appendix B lists and analyzes all suggestions for boundary changes for the preferred option, Option 6, as well as suggestions for other options, if they also apply to Option 6.

Option 6 is based on certain criteria, which need to be respected when assessing proposed boundary changes – in addition to continuing to achieve effective representation. These criteria are:

1. Addressing, on a priority basis, the three (3) wards projected to be significantly in excess of the average ward population and outside the acceptable population variance in 2026, namely Barrhaven, Cumberland and Gloucester-South Nepean;

2. Giving consideration to the 2002 OMB ruling and the 1991 Supreme Court of Canada ruling, which recognized and protected rural and other communities of interest with a view to minimizing, whenever possible, the impact of significant changes to established ward boundaries and communities of interest;
3. Addressing the impact of significant changes to established ward boundaries and communities of interest, particularly in the urban area as defined in the Options Report; and,
4. Giving consideration to ensuring that geographically proximate and similar communities of interest are located within the same ward.

Essentially, Option 6 maintains effective representation while minimizing change to the current ward configuration.

Change is always difficult, and a large number of respondents argue for maintaining the current boundaries of their wards. However, to realign Ottawa's current ward boundaries, so that the ward system achieves effective representation, requires a certain amount of change. Otherwise, the OWBR 2020 would not have been needed.

It also must be emphasized that achieving effective representation means balancing several components. Many respondents focus on only one aspect of effective representation and insist that it should take priority. The [Options Report](#) (July 2020) discusses effective representation and its components in detail, but an overview is attached to this Report as Appendix A.

The majority of comments regarding Option 6 relate to the rural area. There were also concerns with some boundaries in a few wards in the urban and suburban areas.

5.1 Rural Wards

Option 6, and all other options, combine the rural portion of Cumberland and Osgoode. A large majority of the residents of Cumberland and Osgoode, who participated in the Round 2 consultation process, are opposed to this combination.

The reason for having to combine rural Cumberland with Osgoode is the significant suburban growth that has occurred in the northern portions of Cumberland. An estimated 76% of Cumberland's population will be in the suburban area by 2026, the OWBR 2020's target year. There will only be approximately 15,000 residents in the large remaining rural area. The suburban part of Cumberland is now bigger than several other Ottawa wards and needs to become a ward unto itself.

Three major concerns have been raised against combining rural Cumberland and Osgoode: the geographic size of the new ward and a population that is larger than some urban wards; the impact on the Francophone community in rural Cumberland; and, the loss of a representative on Ottawa's Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee (ARAC).

It has been pointed out that a combined rural Cumberland and Osgoode ward would be very large at 812 square kilometers. However, this is not too dissimilar to West Carleton-March at 765 square kilometers and Rideau-Goulbourn at 728 square kilometers. Also, 44 square kilometers of the 812 square kilometers in a combined rural Cumberland and Osgoode ward is Greenbelt with no significant population.

There will be an impact on the Francophone community in rural Cumberland, as Osgoode is primarily Anglophone. According to the 2016 Census, 35.9% of residents of the current Cumberland Ward list French as their mother tongue, while only 10.6% do so in Osgoode. Also, based on the current City policies for the composition of the ARAC, Council members would be reduced from four to three.

There have been several suggestions to alleviate the concerns raised by residents of both Osgoode and Cumberland Wards.

Suggestion #1

Most residents of the two wards just say: "leave us alone", "things are fine, so do not make any changes". Suburban Cumberland has now reached approximately 50,000 people and will continue to grow. From a population perspective, Cumberland is no longer a rural ward. The suburban population of Cumberland is large enough by itself to merit being a ward. In fact, one of the reasons for the OWBR 2020 was the growth in Cumberland Ward. This suburban community of interest in Cumberland needs to be addressed. In all options a new suburban ward has been created in suburban Cumberland.

Suggestion #2

Some respondents recognize the problems of combining rural and suburban residents, as their interests vary. However, they recognize the impact on the Francophone community and the loss of a representative on the ARAC. Their suggestion is a rural Cumberland ward.

This suggestion does address the rural Francophone interest and preserve the four representatives on the ARAC. Also, Osgoode Ward would remain a separate ward, which would alleviate the concerns of the numerous respondents from Osgoode.

However, this suggestion has two implications. First, it would require an additional Councillor and lead to a Council of 25, two more than at present. Second, a new rural Cumberland ward would have a population of approximately 15,000 and would raise significant voter parity issues. It would become the smallest ward with approximately one third the residents of the average ward population of 47,900.

Suggestion #3

Another suggestion is to add the developed area of Cumberland Ward along the Ottawa River to Orléans Ward, specifically the area north of Wilhaven Drive all the way to the eastern boundary of Ottawa. This would include the Village of Cumberland, Cumberland Estates, Bella Vista and Beckett's Creek. Outside of Cumberland Village, the development in this area is predominantly estate residential.

Implementing this suggestion would add approximately 3,500 people to Orléans Ward, which would make the population of that ward too large. To resolve this, some population in the western portion of Orléans Ward would need to shift into Innes Ward.

Suggestion #4

This proposal would add the area south of Wilhaven Drive to the old railway line, now referred to as the Prescott-Russell Trail Link, all the way to the eastern boundary of the city, to the new Cumberland suburban ward. This area is predominantly rural but contains the villages of Navan, Sarsfield and Notre-Dame-des-Champs. The population of this area is approximately 6,800 people.

Suggestion #5

This suggestion includes the area in Suggestion 4 above, then adds another area south to Russell Road. This area is almost exclusively rural with about 1,500 people. Like the area in Suggestion 4, this area would be added to the new suburban Cumberland ward.

After considering Suggestions 3, 4 and 5, there is still a small residual area in the south of the current Cumberland Ward. It is predominantly rural, but includes the Village of Vars. The population of this area is approximately 3,200.

Implicit in Suggestions 3, 4 and 5 is that the remaining portions of rural Cumberland would be combined with Osgoode Ward.

Discussion

When evaluating these proposals, certain considerations need to be kept in mind – the rural community of interest in Cumberland Ward, the Francophone community of interest and any wider implications for rural Ottawa.

The rural community of interest, regardless of language, is of concern. As more and more rural areas are combined with suburban Cumberland through the various suggestions above, the “rural voice” is diminished, regardless of whether it is Francophone or Anglophone. The importance of the rural voice, or interest, has been upheld in past tribunal hearings, especially in Ottawa. While there is a Francophone interest, does it out-weigh the rural interest? Francophones in the rural areas also have rural concerns.

Suggestion 2, a rural Cumberland ward, addresses both the rural community at large, the rural Francophone community in particular, and overall rural Councillor representation. Some may think this is an ideal solution. It would be, if the population of rural Cumberland were twice as large. However, the voter parity implications of a ward with only approximately 15,000 residents cannot be dismissed.

Suggestions 4 and 5 combine large rural areas with a suburban area. During both rounds of the OWBR 2020’s consultation process, numerous people mentioned that mixing rural and suburban areas dilutes the rural interest and the rural voice, both politically and practically. This advice was offered by both rural and suburban residents and Councillors.

From a larger rural perspective, the entire Ottawa rural community is affected by these suggestions. As some of the proposals for Cumberland remove progressively more rural residents from genuinely rural areas and merge them with suburban areas, the entire rural community is diminished. Based on projections for 2026, Ottawa’s rural population will be approximately 113,000 residents. If up to 12,000 people were to be removed from Cumberland Ward and 4,000 by transferring the Kanata North Urban Expansion Area discussed below, the rural population would drop to under 100,000.

While the consultant team would still maintain that even 100,000 people justify three rural wards, there are many other survey respondents that suggest that the rural wards have too little population now, based on voter parity, and that there should only be two rural wards, divided east and west at the Rideau River. Reducing rural populations only strengthens this argument.

Considering the importance of the “rural” interest and the large rural geography that would be included in the new suburban ward in Suggestion 4 and 5, and the voter parity issues with Suggestion 2, the recommended ward boundary configuration is only able to implement Suggestion 3.

5.2 Suburban Wards

Option 6 has nine suburban wards, three in each of Ottawa's east, south and west suburban areas. During the Round 2 consultation some major suggestions were made for specific boundary adjustments.

Ottawa East: The three suburban wards and their boundaries were well received, as presented in Option 6. However, the change to Cumberland Ward suggested above (Suggestion 3) requires adjustment to both W6-4 (Orléans) and W6-5 (Innes). Once the area north of Wilhaven Drive is added to W6-4, its population becomes too large, from a voter parity perspective. To compensate, an area bounded by Champlain St., Highway 174, Bilberry Creek and the Ottawa River is moved from W6-4 to W6-5.

Ottawa South: During both the Round 1 and 2 consultation it was suggested that the dividing line between W6-8 and W6-9 be Greenbank Road. This proposed boundary has been re-assessed again. There is no doubt that Greenbank Road would be a good boundary between W6-8 and W6-9.

The area west of Greenbank has more undeveloped land and is growing faster than the area east of Greenbank. However, the area east of Greenbank also continues to grow. It is estimated that the two areas, east and west of Greenbank, will not have populations equal enough to shift the boundary to Greenbank Road until at least after 2030 and possibly not until 2034.

In the recommended ward boundary configuration, the ward boundaries in Option 6 for wards W6-8 and W6-9 are maintained. There were no proposals for boundary adjustment to W6-7.

Ottawa West: As described in **Section 4** of this Report, the largest number of survey returns (almost 50%) came from W6-10 (Kanata South). The vast majority do not support Terry Fox Drive as a boundary with W6-11, as shown in Options 1 to 4. Option 6 moves the boundary to the Carp River (the current boundary). Option 6 is supported by virtually all survey returns from W6-10. In the recommended ward configuration, the boundaries for W6-10 are used.

It has been pointed out that the Kanata North Urban Expansion Area is not included in suburban ward W6-12 (Kanata North), but remains in rural ward W6-3 (West Carleton-March). The approach of the OWBR 2020 is to put approved suburban expansion areas that will develop during the Review's time frame into the adjacent suburban ward. Therefore, the Kanata North Urban Expansion Area is moved from W6-3 to W6-12 in

the recommended ward configuration and their respective populations are adjusted accordingly.

5.3 Urban Wards

Option 6 has twelve urban wards that are located mainly inside the Greenbelt. This is the same number as exist at present. One of the criteria for Option 6 was to maintain existing ward boundaries, as much as possible while respecting of the principles of effective representation. To a large extent Option 6 accomplishes this.

There are, however, two wards that required boundary adjustments in order to maintain voter parity.

Kitchissippi is one of the fastest growing wards amongst the urban wards. If its current boundaries were maintained, it would be the largest in the urban area by 2026 and have a voter parity variance of +20%. To maintain effective representation some population needs to be shifted. A review of the neighbouring wards - W6-18 (Somerset), W6-21 (River) and W6-24 (Bay) - shows that Bay Ward would have the lowest population in 2026. Hence Option 6 extends the boundary of W6-24 (Bay Ward) to the east.

On the other hand, Beacon Hill-Cyrville currently has the smallest population of the twelve urban wards. Its neighbouring ward to the south, Alta Vista Ward, is slightly above the average ward population of 47,900, while the abutting ward to the west (Rideau-Rockcliffe) is below average. Hence, Option 6 shifts some population from W6-14 (Alta Vista) to W6-13 (Beacon Hill-Cyrville) to improve voter parity.

Comments received during the feedback on Option 6 argue against the changes in both these areas. Essentially, the comments suggest that the current ward boundaries remain unchanged. As noted above, this would negate effective representation in these areas and for the OWBR 2020 itself.

Discussion

In the W6-13 and W6-14 boundary adjustment, the area moved to W6-13 (Beacon Hill-Cyrville) is primarily an industrial area. However, it does contain a small residential area known as Eastway Gardens. Comments suggest that Eastway Gardens residents relate more to Alta Vista to the south than Beacon Hill-Cyrville to the north. However, Eastway Gardens is even now somewhat isolated by Highway 417 to the north and the industrial area to the south.

Protecting communities of interest in the urban area means not dividing neighbourhoods, but it does not mean keeping all neighbourhoods that relate to each

other in the same ward. The boundary adjustment keeps Eastway Gardens together. In the recommended ward boundary configuration, the ward boundaries set out in Option 6 for wards W6-13 and W6-14 are maintained.

The situation in W6-20 (Kitchissippi Ward) is challenging. Changes have been proposed in two areas:

1. The first is a small area north of Richmond Street, where Option 6 runs the boundary between W6-20 and W6-24 north from Richmond Street along Berkley Avenue to the River. It has been pointed out that this leaves about 25 homes between Berkley Avenue and Dominion Avenue stranded. In the recommended ward boundary configuration, the boundary between W6-20 and W6-24 is moved from Berkley Avenue to Dominion Avenue.
2. Numerous survey returns indicate that the residents of the McKellar Park neighbourhood want to remain in Kitchissippi Ward, since they relate east to Westboro and Hintonburg, rather than west to the communities in Bay Ward. Others point out that Denbury Avenue is a better boundary than Broadview Avenue, as Broadview Avenue splits the Highland Park community. In the recommended ward boundary configuration, the boundary between W6-20 and W6-24 is moved to Denbury Avenue.

As noted above, Kitchissippi is the largest urban ward and some population needs to be moved. Bay Ward to the west is the best of the surrounding wards to receive additional population.

Other Boundary Adjustments

A few other suggestions for minor boundary adjustments, or tweaks, in the urban area, have been made in the Round 2 surveys, virtual meetings and submissions.

1. Move the Gee-Gees sports field from W6-19 (Capital) to W6-17 (Rideau-Vanier). The reasons given refer to a better boundary (the River rather than Highway 417) and the area's association with sports facilities directly to the north in Rideau-Vanier. In the recommended ward boundary configuration, the Gee-Gees sports field is moved from W6-19 to W6-17. There are no residents in this area.
2. The boundaries between W6-17 (Rideau-Vanier) and W6-16 (Rideau-Rockcliffe) are based on the previous Vanier municipal boundaries, run through backyards and are confusing. To provide clearer boundaries, the recommended ward configuration adjusts the boundaries between W6-16 and W6-17.

East of the Rideau River the recommended boundary between W6-16 and W6-17 starts at Beechwood Avenue, runs east along Beechwood Avenue to Hemlock Road and follows Hemlock Road east to St. Laurent Boulevard; it then runs south on St. Laurent Boulevard to Montreal Road, west on Montreal Road to l’Eglise Street and south on l’Eglise Street to McArthur Avenue; it then follows McArthur Avenue west to the Rideau River. With these boundary adjustments some areas move from W6-16 to W6-17 and others from W6-17 to W6-16. On balance, the populations changes are minimal (W6-16 increases by 50 people), however, the boundaries are much clearer.

6 Recommended Ward Boundaries

This Section shows the map of the recommended ward boundary configuration and its associated table with the populations for each ward and their variances from the average ward population. It also describes how the recommended ward boundary configuration meets the criteria of effective representation

6.1 Map of Recommended Ward Boundaries /Population and Variance Table

The map of the recommended ward boundary configuration is also available in PDF form and as part of the interactive map on the [project’s web site](#). These maps, especially the interactive map, allow for the most detailed view the recommended ward boundaries.

The recommended wards are listed as RW- and then a number. For example, RW-5 signifies Recommended Ward 5. As in the numbering system for the options, the numbering system for the recommended ward configuration is only used to be able to reference specific wards in this Report. If Council adopts a revised ward system, it will assign appropriate ward numbers and names.

Recommended Ward Boundaries
Limites de quartiers recommandées
24 Wards / Quartiers

-  Wards / Quartiers
-  Greenbelt / Ceinture de verdure
-  Roads / Rues
-  Railway / Chemin de fer



Prepared by: Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department
 Conçu par: Services de la planification
 de l'infrastructure et du développement économique
 Analyse géographique, technique et solutions
 Octobre 2020 (version)



**City of Ottawa
OWBR 2020 Recommended Ward Boundaries**

Forecast Population and Variances for Election Years

Recommended Wards	2022		2026		2030		2034	
	Population	Variance	Population	Variance	Population	Variance	Population	Variance
Rural Wards								
RW-1	38,278	-20.1%	40,034	-16.4%	41,806	-12.7%	43,489	-9.2%
RW-2	30,864	-35.6%	33,293	-30.5%	35,739	-25.4%	38,112	-20.4%
RW-3	27,419	-42.8%	28,341	-40.8%	29,272	-38.9%	30,140	-37.1%
Suburban Wards								
RW-4	50,504	5.4%	52,751	10.1%	55,018	14.9%	57,169	19.3%
RW-5	51,713	8.0%	52,093	8.8%	52,485	9.6%	52,762	10.2%
RW-6	41,366	-13.6%	47,825	-0.2%	54,322	13.4%	60,714	26.8%
RW-7	36,066	-24.7%	44,143	-7.8%	52,264	9.1%	60,289	25.9%
RW-8	52,580	9.8%	53,215	11.1%	53,863	12.4%	54,394	13.6%
RW-9	47,253	-1.4%	53,615	11.9%	60,017	25.3%	66,300	38.4%
RW-10	53,472	11.6%	54,107	13.0%	54,756	14.3%	55,286	15.4%
RW-11	41,058	-14.3%	50,391	5.2%	59,775	24.8%	69,049	44.2%
RW-12	49,187	2.7%	54,819	14.4%	60,485	26.3%	66,032	37.9%
Urban Wards								
RW-13	38,118	-20.4%	39,606	-17.3%	41,109	-14.2%	42,525	-11.2%
RW-14	46,936	-2.0%	47,279	-1.3%	47,633	-0.6%	47,883	0.0%
RW-15	49,924	4.2%	50,424	5.3%	50,935	6.3%	51,336	7.2%
RW-16	41,544	-13.3%	43,407	-9.4%	45,387	-5.2%	47,272	-1.3%
RW-17	48,780	1.8%	50,628	5.7%	52,393	9.4%	54,047	12.8%
RW-18	48,587	1.4%	51,438	7.4%	54,312	13.4%	57,073	19.1%
RW-19	42,091	-12.1%	43,115	-10.0%	44,152	-7.8%	45,094	-5.9%
RW-20	46,624	-2.7%	50,748	5.9%	54,901	14.6%	58,943	23.1%
RW-21	49,427	3.2%	50,068	4.5%	50,722	5.9%	51,265	7.0%
RW-22	42,940	-10.4%	43,303	-9.6%	43,677	-8.8%	43,955	-8.2%
RW-23	53,520	11.7%	53,966	12.7%	54,424	13.6%	54,763	14.3%
RW-24	51,906	8.4%	53,206	11.1%	54,522	13.8%	55,722	16.3%
City of Ottawa - Total	1,080,155		1,141,815		1,203,967		1,263,613	

Average Ward Population for 2026 "Target Year" is 47,900

6.2 Recommended Ward Boundaries and Effective Representation

As noted, all six options were designed to achieve effective representation. Option 6 was favoured by both the public and Members of Council and became the preferred option. Several suggestions for boundary changes to Option 6 have been incorporated into the recommended ward boundary configuration. As a final step, it is prudent to apply the lens of effective representation to the recommended ward boundary configuration.

When assessing how the recommended ward boundaries meet the principles of effective representation, it is important to remember that achieving effective representation requires a balance among its several components. Appendix A provides a detailed overview of the components of effective representation.

There will always need to be some “give-and-take” amongst these components. All the components operate within a range. For example:

- An attempt is made not to split communities of interest. However, this does not mean that neighbourhoods that are used to being in the same ward need to remain in the same ward;
- Voter parity in the recommended ward boundary configuration is targeted at between +/- 15% in 2026. However, it is accepted that fast growing wards may be over and rural wards may be under this target;
- Ward boundaries should be clear and follow recognizable physical boundaries, either natural or constructed. While there are some exceptions, the recommended ward boundary configuration attempts to use clear boundaries and does not rely on previous old municipal boundaries;
- Capacity to represent is factored into voter parity calculations. Wards with more complex issues can be smaller, while wards that are more homogeneous can be larger;
- Ward geography is primarily an issue in rural Ottawa. Here wards in the recommended ward boundary configuration are below the 15% voter parity target to reflect the geographic size of the ward and preserve the rural community of interest;
- Some changes in Option 6 in northern Cumberland have been recommended to reflect the Francophone minority interest; and,
- The recommended ward boundary configuration has gone a long way to recognize ward history. Most wards have not changed. Changed ward boundaries, where they occur, primarily address rapid growth.

The recommended ward boundary configuration generally achieves the various components of effective representation. However, not all can be met completely, because of the City of Ottawa's unique geography and growth patterns.

Many comments received regarding Option 6 during Round 2 of the public consultation merely reflect a desire for no change. The absolute population growth of Ottawa and the location of this growth since the current ward configuration was established for the 2006 election, dictate that a certain amount of change in updating ward boundaries is necessary.

Voter parity for 2026, the target year of the OWBR 2020, is appropriate for the recommended ward configuration. The rural wards are below 15%, as anticipated. Among the suburban and urban wards, all wards, except RW-13 (Beacon Hill-Cyrville), meet the +/- 15% criterion. RW-13, as the variance table indicates, is growing and by 2030 is within the 15% criterion. Due to the land use pattern at the southern end of RW-13, it is not possible to bring RW-13 within the 15% threshold for 2026.

The recommended ward boundary configuration does achieve effective representation for the entire City of Ottawa for at least the next three elections.

7 Future Considerations

The Ottawa Ward Boundary Review 2020 set out to develop a recommended ward boundary configuration that would last for three and possibly four elections. Ward boundary reviews are typically undertaken because a major component of effective representation, voter parity, is no longer present due rapid growth in certain areas.

Voter parity variances work relatively well until 2030 in the recommended ward boundary configuration. However, by 2030 the continued growth in the wards of all three main suburban areas is causing the variances to climb into the plus 20% area. By 2034, six out of nine suburban wards and one urban ward are above a 20% variance factor and five of those are over 25%. While the recommended ward boundary configuration will suffice until 2030, a new ward boundary review should be undertaken for the 2034 election to address projected continued suburban growth.

APPENDIX A

What is Effective Representation?

Generally speaking, “effective representation” means that one person’s vote should be of similar weight as another person’s vote. When applied to wards, the term suggests that wards should be of similar population size. In practice, achieving effective representation for ward boundary reviews involves balancing several components:

- **Voter Parity:** Ward populations should be similar but not identical and should be in the range of +/-10% to +/-15% of the average ward population. Larger percentage variations are possible, but only in exceptional circumstances such as in Ottawa’s functioning rural community or in rapidly growing wards.
- **Natural/Physical Boundaries:** Ward boundaries have to be recognizable. Natural boundaries such as rivers and the Greenbelt, and physical boundaries such as highways, railways and arterial roads make good boundaries.
- **Geographic Communities of Interest:** Ottawa’s neighbourhoods such as the Glebe or Hintonburg and commercial areas such as the ByWard Market are considered to be “communities of interest.” When re-aligning ward boundaries, geographically contiguous communities of interest should not be divided, unless they are so large that they must be split to achieve voter parity.
- **Minority Interests:** Minority interests should be considered if they are geographically based.
- **Ward History:** Ward design should, where possible, consider the history of the ward. However, ward history by itself cannot override other major criteria such as voter parity, strong natural/physical boundaries and communities of interest.
- **Capacity to Represent:** Capacity to represent is often equated with Councillors’ workload. It includes matters such as ward size, types and complexity of issues, ongoing growth and development, etc., and has to be taken into consideration when designing wards.
- **Geographic Size and Shape of a Ward:** All wards cannot be the same geographic size. Some areas of the city are more densely populated than others and some wards have more open space. Ottawa is especially unique with

respect to this component of effective representation because of its large rural area.

- **Population Growth:** The results of the Ottawa Ward Boundary Review 2020 are meant to last for at least three municipal elections (2022, 2026 and 2030) and, perhaps, a fourth municipal election in 2034. The target election for an evaluation of effective representation is 2026. This allows for Ottawa's expected growth to be factored into ward boundary calculations.
- **Balancing the Components of Effective Representation:** While all components of effective representation must be taken into consideration, they are not all equal. Voter parity, respecting communities of interest, and well-defined, coherent ward boundaries are the most important components.



Ward Boundary Review 2020



Recommended Ward Boundaries Final Report

APPENDIX B

November 13, 2020

Round 2 Suggestions on Options 6 (Combined)

Urban Wards	Suggestion	Action
6-13	Is development planned for Eastway Gardens north of Industrial Road in the projections? Should it fit with Riverview Park (south of Industrial Road)	In the projections; in 6-13 for voter parity reasons
6-13	Move Eastway Gardens to 6-14	Not possible for voter parity reasons
6-13	Boundary with 6-14 should be CNR tracks, not Industrial Road	Industrial Road is a better boundary
6-14	Industrial Road boundary isolates Eastway Gardens community; should not be split between two Councillors; use 417 instead (it's the natural boundary)	Eastway Gardens is not split; 417 is current boundary; 6-13 needs more population for voter parity reasons
6-14	Boundary with 6-15 should be RR tracks, they are a more natural community divider	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible
6-15	Hunt Club is a very good boundary; airport should be in this ward	Agree
6-15	Hunt Club Road boundary does not work well for Windsor Park Village (south of Hunt Club); put boundary further north or south at the Greenbelt	Hunt Club is a better boundary, than the current boundary

6-15	Winsor Park Village is part of McCarthy Rd. community; move boundary to the Greenbelt or to Leitrim; Hunt Club should not be the boundary (2)	Hunt Club is a better boundary, than the current boundary
6-15	Kemp Park (north of Leitrim/east of Conroy) is isolated; could fit with 6-7, but ok as is	Leitrim is a good boundary
6-16	Boundaries with 6-17 should be better defined south of Montreal Road, so that neighbours are not in two separate wards	Boundaries between 6-17 and 6-16 have been clarified
6-16	Boundaries should flow more naturally; use boundaries in 2-16?	Option 2 boundaries do not apply to Option 6
6-16	Could provide population to 6-13	Population of 6-16 is too small
6-16	Ward should not wrap around Vanier	Boundaries between 6-17 and 6-16 have been clarified
6-16	Horseshoe of Vanier is strange, but makes sense; backyard boundaries not too much of a problem	Boundaries between 6-17 and 6-16 have been clarified
6-16	Overbrook and Vanier should not be together; too challenging for one Councillor	Agree
6-17	Ward boundaries should follow main streets, such as Beechwood; current boundaries are problematic; use Donald or McArthur in the south	Boundaries between 6-17 and 6-16 have been clarified

6-17	Could run the boundary along McArthur (2), but would cut us off from a park	Agree; ward boundaries do not impact park use
6-17	Eastern boundary of Vanier is Aviation Parkway; but Montfort Hospital should be in Vanier	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible; Aviation Parkway was boundary in Options 2, 3 and 4; Hospital is too far east
6-17	Aviation Parkway is a big divider; west of it is urban, east of it suburban	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible; Aviation Parkway was boundary in Options 2, 3 and 4
6-17	Vanier should be: east of River; south of Beechwood/Hemlock; west of Aviation Parkway (include Overbrook)	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible; Aviation Parkway was boundary in Options 2, 3 and 4
6-17	Robinson Village should be in 6-17 not in 6-19	Agree
6-17	At Robinson Park and Gee Gees Field, #417 is not a big boundary; use the River instead	Agree
6-18	S/E corner of the Centretown Golden Triangle should remain in 6-18 and not be shifted to 6-19	No boundary changes in 6-18
6-19	Riverview Park Community Association wants to stay in 6-19	No boundary changes in 6-19

6-19	Area east of O-Train, south of 417, west of Lebreton should be in 6-19, not 6-18	No boundary changes in 6-18
6-19	Make it smaller by splitting its southern most section off	6-19 is below average ward population
6-20	Only this alignment works for Wellington West BIA	Agree
6-20	Only this alignment works for Hintonburg; must not be divided between two wards (2)	Agree
6-20	Denbury is boundary of Westboro Community Association (two west of Broadview) all the way to the River (3)	Boundary with 6-24 has been adjusted to Denbury south of Richmond
6-20	Denbury should stay in Kitchissippi	Boundary with 6-24 has been adjusted to Denbury south of Richmond
6-20	Change Broadview boundary to Denbury	Agree
6-20	Golden might be a better boundary; divides R1 and R3 zoning areas; is western end of Westboro BIA; explore: Golden to Richmond, west past Rogers TV building and north to River	Would make population of 6-24 too large
6-20	Puts McKellar Park into 6-24; maybe Woodroffe could be the boundary (4)	Would make population of 6-20 too large
6-20	Keep McKellar Park in this ward (33)	Would make population of 6-20 too large

6-20	McKellar Park should stay in 6-20; community relates east, not west	Would make population of 6-20 too large
6-20	McKellar Park has same issues as Westboro, but Broadview boundary ok	Boundary with 6-24 has been adjusted to Denbury south of Richmond
6-20	Churchill to Sherbourne is one community (2)	Moving boundary to Sherbourne makes population of 6-20 too large
6-20	Do not change current western boundary; keep McKellar Park, McKellar Heights and Westboro together (4)	Would make population of 6-20 too large
6-20	McKellar Heights should stay in Kitchissippi	Would make population of 6-20 too large
6-20	McKellar Park and McKellar Heights should stay together	Agree; both in 6-24
6-20	Keep McKellar Park and McKellar Heights in Kitchissippi (36)	Would make population of 6-20 too large
6-20	Keep McKellar Park Field in Kitchissippi	Has to stay with McKellar Park
6-20	Sherbourne should remain the boundary (7); one building on Richmond is part of the Westboro Village BIA	Would make population of 6-20 too large
6-20	Extend Sherbourne boundary to the SJAM	Sherbourne is no longer the boundary with 6-24
6-20	Keep current boundary with 6-24; 2016 Census shows more people in Bay than in Kitchissippi	Would make projected population of 6-20 too large

6-20	Keep Dovercourt/Fraser area with Westboro and Hintonburg	Area stays in 6-20
6-20	Do not move 727 Richmond into a suburban ward (2)	Would make population of 6-20 too large
6-20	Do not move The Continental [Cleary Ave.] into Bay Ward (4)	Would make population of 6-20 too large
6-20	Keep the Continental together with McKellar Park	Agree; both in 6-24
6-20	Extend Broadview straight north (2)	Broadview is no longer the boundary with 6-24
6-20	Broadview cuts a neighbourhood in half (2)	Broadview is no longer the boundary with 6-24
6-20	Boundary with 6-24 should be at Rochester Field (commercial and residential buildings east of it relate to Westboro BIA)	Would make population of 6-20 too large
6-20	Keep Tay, Dominion, Berkeley, Roosevelt together	Agree
6-20	Do not change current Kitchissippi boundaries (7)	Would make population of 6-20 too large
6-20	Civic Hospital community should remain here (2)	Remains in 6-20
6-20	Hintonburg, Mechanicsville and Civic Hospital should remain with all of Westboro	McKellar Park now in 6-24 for voter parity reasons
6-20	Hintonburg, Mechanicsville need to stay together in the same ward (2)	Both remain in 6-20

6-20	Eastern boundary could go to Preston or Booth (but not into the downtown)	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible; no changes to 6-18
6-21	Add area #417/Maitland/NCC Pathway (Carlington Business Park)	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible
6-21	Re-assess the cutout to Albion Road east of the O-Train; retain areas south of Hunt Club, if necessary for population purposes	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible; Hunt Club is a good boundary
6-21	Carlington neighbourhood fits better with 6-20 or 6-22	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible
6-23	Jewish community lives in 6-23 around Centrepointe Drive, synagogue is in 6-22; community walk across railway bridge to synagogue	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible; no effective boundary found
6-23	Bells Corners should stay with College; people do not relate to Bay Ward	Bells Corners stays in 6-23
6-23	Bells Corners should be in 6-24 with Crystal Beach (2)	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible
6-23	Bells Corners should be moved to Bay Ward (4)	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible
6-23	Integrate 6-23 and 6-22, since there will be no further development	Resulting ward would be too large
6-23	Merge College with the area north of the Queensway	Resulting ward would be too large
6-23	Crestview should remain with Cityview (between Meadowlands	Crestview stays in 6-23

	Drive and Baseline) (St.Claire Gardens	
6-24	West side of Cleary should not be in Bay Ward	Both sides of Cleary now in 6-24
Suburban Wards		
<i>Ottawa East</i>		
6-4	Move boundary with 6-5 to former Cumberland/Gloucester municipal boundary	Boundaries between 6-4 and 6-5 have been adjusted due to extension of 6-4 eastwards
6-4	Convent Glen (west of Bilberry Creek) and Orléans Woods (east of Bilberry Creek) are one association now; Creek splits them now, but they could also be separate associations; could both be moved to 6-5	Both now in 6-5
6-4	Add Convent Glen North into 6-5	In 6-5
6-4	Area north of Innes up to the River should be part of 6-4 (Cumberland Village is essentially Orléans East)	Area north of Wilhaven incorporated into 6-4
6-4	Orléans should get the east part of the city	Area north of Wilhaven incorporated into 6-4
6-4	Extend to eastern boundary of Ottawa; use Innes and Beaton as its southern boundary perhaps; no populations east of Dunning; would integrate Cumberland Village with	Area north of Wilhaven incorporated into 6-4

	Orléans; might necessitate moving Orléans Woods to 6-5	
6-4	Extend 6-4 along Innes to the eastern border of Ottawa	Area north of Wilhaven incorporated into 6-4
6-4	Move southern boundary of 6-4 and 6-5 to Brian Coburn Blvd.; eliminate 6-6; use Tenth Line as eastern boundary; leave area south of Brian Coburn in current Cumberland Ward	Splits new suburban ward
6-5	If 6-5 gets changed, Champlain would make a good boundary with 6-4 north of 174	Agree
6-5	Move Blackburn Hamlet into 6-13 (2)	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible
6-6	Balance urban and suburban interests by moving western boundary into 'urban' and then include a small suburban population with rural Cumberland	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-6	Should be extended east to include rural area	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-6	Extend 6-6 to eastern border of Ottawa and in the south along the CNR line to the eastern border of Ottawa	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-6	Use the revised boundary for 6-4 (see above) as its northern boundary; keep as in Option 6, except use Tenth Line to Smith/Smith to	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations

	Milton/Milton to Russell/ Russell to Canaan Rd. as its southern boundary. OR draw north-western boundary through Greenbelt south of Dolman Ridge	
6-6	Add area north of Road 28 to Road 30 (Innes)	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-6	Move Greely into this ward	Greely is too far away
6-6	Southern boundary should be Urban Boundary south of Wall between Mer Bleue and Tenth Line	Will not be developed within project time frame
<i>Ottawa South</i>		
6-7	Southern boundary is appropriate	Agree
6-8	Boundary with 6-9 should be Greenbank from Fallowfield to Barnsdale; easily defined neighbourhoods like Stonebridge, Longfields	Major voter parity issue within the time frame of the project
6-9	Boundary with 6-8 should be straight south along the current Greenbank alignment from Fallowfield to the River; otherwise 6-9 has all the community facilities (2); then shift triangle – Greenbank/RR tracks/Fallowfield to 6-9	Major voter parity issue within the time frame of the project

6-9	Why is Moody Drive not its western boundary	Option 6 maintains current boundaries, where possible; 416 is a good boundary
<i>Ottawa West</i>		
6-10	Carp River should remain the boundary with 6-11 (numerous)	Option 6 uses the Carp River and maintains current Kanata South boundary
6-10	Maybe shift Carp River boundary west to Hurdman (?) and Iber Road	Option 6 maintains current Kanata South boundaries
6-10	Iber Road should be the boundary between 6-10 and 6-11	Option 6 maintains current Kanata South boundaries
6-10	Western boundary should be Huntmar	Option 6 maintains current Kanata South boundaries
6-10	Include Fernbank Walmart Plaza in Kanata South (2)	Option 6 maintains current Kanata South boundaries
6-10	Use the Carp River to Palladium Drive, west to Huntmar Drive, north on Huntmar Drive to 417, east to Carp River	Option 6 maintains current Kanata South boundaries
6-10	Change western boundary from Terry Fox to Robert Grant along Abbott St. E. to Iber to Huntmar	Option 6 maintains current Kanata South boundaries
6-10	Keep Terry Fox as its western boundary	Option 6 maintains current Kanata South boundaries
6-10	Could include Bells Corners and Fallowfield Village in Kanata South	Option 6 maintains current Kanata South boundaries

6-12	Create a new ward within Kanata	Not enough population for an extra Kanata ward
6-12	Add area Huntmar/417/Carp River/ Maple Grove from 6-11 (has ties with Kanata North Business Park)	417 is a good boundary
6-12	Old Carp Road is a logical boundary	Kanata North Urban Expansion Area added to 6-12
6-12	Kanata North Urban Expansion Area should be in 6-12	Agree
Rural Wards		
6-1	Leave Osgoode as is and restructure Cumberland	Cumberland has been restructured, to some extent
6-1	Too large; move area north of former railway line (south of Navan to Ottawa boundary) into suburban Cumberland and/or Orléans; Navan residents relate to Orléans	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-1	Divide rural Cumberland folks into Orléans and Cumberland	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-1	Combining Osgoode with rural Cumberland is the right thing to do (2)	Option 6 does this
6-1	Boundaries of this and other rural wards make sense	Agree
6-1	Include Cumberland with Orléans	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations

6-1	Cumberland Village is Francophone and identifies much more with Orléans (6-4) than with the rural area	Agree; 6-4 has been extended eastwards
6-1	The southern boundary of Cumberland Village is Wilhaven Drive	Agree
6-1	Have 3 semi-rural wards across Orléans, Innes and Cumberland	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-1	Should mix suburban and rural Cumberland in order to: not diminish rural voice on Council; avoid rural Cumberland being dominated by Osgoode; safeguard Francophone community's interests in eastern Ottawa	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-1	Cut this ward in half, so that there are 4 rural Councillors	Rural Cumberland's population is too small
6-1	Join current Wards 20 and 21	Population would be too large
6-1	Leave Osgoode and other rural boundaries as they are; have 4 rural wards (2)	75% of Cumberland Ward's population is already suburban and needs its own ward; remaining rural population is too small
6-1	Divide Osgoode and Cumberland back into two geographic rural areas	75% of Cumberland Ward's population is already suburban and needs its own ward; remaining rural population is too small
6-1	Remove the urban portions of this ward in the north and combine with [western] ward	Agree

6-1	Create a Cumberland ward including: Carlsbad Springs, Vars, Sarsfield, Navan, French Hill, Cumberland Estates, Cumberland Village, Bearbrook, Leonard and Cardinal Creek	Population would be too small
6-1	Remove rural Cumberland and add to 6-6 (2)	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-1	Greely should be added to Manotick; then combine Osgoode and Cumberland	Would make population of 6-2 too large
6-1	Consider moving Manotick into 6-1 and then move n/e corner of 6-1 into Cumberland; Greely interacts with Manotick	Would make population of 6-2 too small and the Cumberland population would also be too small
6-1	Create a rural ward as follows: Frank Kenny east to Canaan Rd., south to 417 and Marionville Rd. (south of Vars Village), west to Bank St. (#31)	Would create two small rural wards in Osgoode and Cumberland
6-1	Navan belongs with Orléans (2) and Cumberland	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-1	Adjust its north-eastern border to follow the CNR line to the eastern border of Ottawa	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-1	Why not add the rural part of Cumberland to Russell (2)	Outside of the City of Ottawa
6-2	River is a good boundary between 6-2 and 6-1	Agree

6-2	Barnsdale is a good boundary with 6-9	Agree
6-2	Add Findlay Creek to Osgoode and divide wards to the east among 3 Orléans wards	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-2	Move Manotick into Osgoode and leave Cumberland alone (2)	River is a good boundary; it is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-2	Manotick should be connected to W6-7	It is not appropriate to mix suburban and rural populations
6-2	Manotick should be moved into a suburban ward; it is no longer rural	According to Ottawa's Official Plan, Manotick is a rural village
6-2	Add Manotick to Osgoode; extend Cumberland to Highway 31	Rural Cumberland's population would still be too small
6-2	Separate 6-1 and 6-2 at Highway 31, rather than at the Ottawa River	Rural Cumberland's population would still be too small
6-2	#31 is ok, but it would cut off Metcalfe, which is very much associated with Greely and Osgoode	Option 6 keeps Greely and Metcalfe in the same ward
6-2	Add Osgoode and Greely villages; move the rest of Osgoode Ward to Cumberland	Makes population of 6-2 too large
6-2	Manotick has a lot of ties to Richmond	Both are in the same ward in Option 6
6-2	Manotick is divided in half down the River (we live on the east side); same concerns on both sides of the River	River is a good boundary

6-3	Kanata North Urban Expansion Area should not be here, but in 6-12	Agree
6-3	Incorporate Carp Village along Carp Road (incl. March Road) to 417 into adjacent suburban area	Carp Village is too far away
6-3	Add Ashton and Munster from 6-2	Both villages are too far away
6-3	Combine 6-3 and 6-2 [instead of rural Cumberland and Osgoode]	Population would be too large
6-3	Westbrook Industrial Park shift from 6-2 is appropriate; better access to 6-3 than 6-2	Agree