

## **Summary of Written and Oral Submissions**

### **Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment – Part of 100 Bayshore Drive (ACS2020-PIE-PS-0103)**

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: 10

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between October 30 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and November 10, 2020 (committee meeting date): 13

#### **Primary concerns, by individual**

##### **Jean-Christophe Huot** (oral and written submissions)

- the size of the proposed towers is more than double the height of the highest towers around the area and would not fit with landscape of residential homes; they would be better suited to the high-density landscape of the downtown area
- the towers would cause sun shadowing on his house
- there is no storm sewer system for the entire Bayshore community; the storm water pipes drain into a natural creek (Graham Creek) and cause significant flooding in his yard; with the removal of greenspaces and overall asphalt footprint encroachment, increased volumes and experiences of erosion have already been recorded with remediation efforts carried out thus far insufficient to resolve all problems; the presence of overflow from sanitary sewers has been noted in the creek, posing health risks to the community; the storm water system must be brought up to current code requirements prior to further development and intensification
- there is no plan to account for additional school spots or daycare for this development; he and his wife are starting a family and are concerned that the project does not account for its impact on the already strained education and daycare infrastructure of the area
- Andrew Haydon is highly frequented, and its parking spaces are often full; increasing the population density of the area would further exacerbate the

overcrowding of the park and no allocation is made for green spaces for this project; in lieu funds do not help solve this problem

- the parking space for the building is based on ridiculous assumptions and grossly underestimates the strain on the already busy streets around the Bayshore mall; the project should allow for at least one parking space per unit
- the project developers claim to want to build a community but no allocations are made to green spaces, education/family spaces; building a community should encompass economic benefits to the habitants but this project is entirely private and only benefits the developers; no unit is on sale for the community members to purchase
- allowing the zoning to be amended as proposed would set a precedent that the owner of the Accora properties could use to build another gigantic tower in the middle of the suburbs; this potential project and its impact needs to be considered in conjunction with this proposal
- having above ground parking takes street space away from current commercial uses
- it appears that the development is not treated the same as others around the LRT, allying and respecting the existing community
- community consultations are needed; this has not been demonstrated well to the community and may not be the only solution

The **Crystal Beach Lakeview Community Association (CBLCA)**, as represented by the following persons, provided a joint presentation: **Bill Fenton; Mark Hollett; Kate Twiss; Ian McConnachie** (oral and written submissions). The main points of their presentation and written submissions included:

- tower height that is inconsistent with the character and scale of the surrounding communities, as well as with expectations of the Official Plan for the property
  - ❖ the proposed development will be approximately three times higher than the maximum height permitted for the site, established within the Zoning By-law and adopted by all the neighbouring buildings
  - ❖ there is a maximum City-defined gross floor area of approx. 510,000 square feet for this site but the proposed development has an area of approx. 536,000 square feet, which indicates it is not just a tall building, based on the rate distribution of the permitted area, but is out of touch when compared to the expectations of the Official Plan for the property
  - ❖ the development has a disproportionate scale when compared to the existing

community's composition - roughly 8,000 residents living in a neighbourhood of approximately 1,000 townhomes and garden homes and 10 twelve-storey apartment buildings

- height that would overshadow nearby properties and dominate the skyline
  - ❖ a properly completed shadow analysis, which was not done, if extended beyond 200m would demonstrate the true impact of the building on the entire surrounding community; based on the height and orientation of the development, the towers will overcast shadows over nearby neighbourhoods for extensive periods of the day throughout the year and each additional floor permitted will exasperate the problem, as the two towers will dominate the skyline in their immediate vicinity
  - ❖ the height of this development runs counter to the NCC's and the City's vision for the western entryway into the city and neighbourhood; the view of the Capital from Highway 417 over the escarpment is the Greenbelts most dramatic and needs protection to support the quality of this important arrival to our capital city
- the Qualicum community, which has a significant number of homes within the 1 km radius of the development site, is concerned with the reflection of the sun off the glass from the 30 and 27 storey towers
- there has been significant community opposition to the proposal from the Crystal Beach Lakeview community, Creekside community, Stonehenge community, Qualicum community and Bayshore community
- the Urban Design Review Panel (UDRP) considered the proposed density too high for the site; they felt that the proposal had an absence of connectivity between the development and the public realm with a completely neglected streetscape; they felt there was minimal greenspace provided and that the quality of the amenity space was low; they raised issues with a problematic design for garbage collection, the design for vehicular access and the parking arrangements
- approving this development could establish a precedent for height allowances and likely lead to further rush of intensification using the same rationale for exemption; there is no reference or plan regarding the use of the adjacent vacant parcel of land
- the tower would interrupt the flight path of migratory birds, especially as they are approaching land nearby on the Ottawa River; the height and glass façade of the towers will create a significant flight risk for the safety of these birds; glazing finishes aside, the height of the buildings will still exist directly within the flight path of migratory birds
- impacts to traffic and pedestrians that would result from having a transit oriented

development of this scale and design on a non-arterial residential street

- ❖ the developer chose to market this application as 100 Bayshore Drive, obscuring the fact that the site is actually on Woodridge Crescent
- ❖ transit oriented developments along the LRT are usually situated along major arterial roads that can handle the density and volume of traffic, but this development would be positioned on a local residential street, essentially the only street available to the 8000 residents of the area
- ❖ permitting this development on a non-arterial road sets a dangerous precedent for any residential street within range of an LRT station; the developer's consultant indicates that Ottawa's Transportation Master Plan (TMP) did not provide current vehicular data pertaining to the Bayshore community, and as a result, the document relies entirely on the LRT to justify the intensification and provide assurance that the impact of congestion would be minimal
- impacts on wayfinding, pedestrian access, functionality and usability of the Bayshore Station as presently used and as the terminus for the future Baseline Rapid Transit
  - ❖ the City has taken extraordinary measures to provide public transit to the city and the onus of all development along the LRT line should contribute to the development of these stations as transit hubs connecting our communities; this design underperforms as a center of transit; it should enhance the vision intended by the LRT, not suffocate or ignore it
  - ❖ there's no sign for the station but currently you can look across the grass and recognize buses; it will completely vanish if you put a three storey parking podium in front
  - ❖ access to the station from Woodridge is problematic; pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchairs, cars, delivery trucks and buses all utilize this driveway to access the shopping centre and station, and private vehicles also utilize the driveway for passenger pickup and dropoff; it is the main access route for Bayshore residents to the station
  - ❖ access to the station never seems to have been properly thought out and was probably designed before 15-minute walkability and complete communities were even heard of, before the six storey parking garage was added and before everything this station needs to serve was planned; Bayshore will be a major transportation hub for the city, a gateway to the second largest shopping centre, and a transfer point for local bus operations serving several major residential communities and the future terminus of Baseline Rapid Transitway and the LRT Station for the Queensway Carleton Hospital; as proposed, the proposed

building will be wedged between this all-purpose western driveway and the station, adding further traffic and more confusion around the entrance to the station

- ❖ as a terminus for the Baseline BRT that ends at a shopping centre with 8 million visitors per year and passes by Queensway Carleton Hospital just before the station, it will need more than the five allotted spaces, especially during peak hours; OC Transpo and Transportation Planning have indicated that because design aspects are still underway they are unable to project bus routing plans or traffic volumes at this point; the city is growing at such a rate that OC Transpo has no way to predict its needs and hemming in the station with no potential for future growth is a recipe for failure of the system at Bayshore Station; current issues with the Tunney's Pasture hub and its inadequate footprint should be considered here to get just a small inkling of the even greater problem that will arise at Bayshore; this issue is a red flag on this development as proposed
- ❖ there is substantial community opposition to this project; 90% of those surveyed (by the Community Association) in the community disapproved how the building directly blocks off access to the station; this amounts to a fundamental disagreement between Ivanhoe's vision for Bayshore Station and the actual needs expressed by the community, and the City's need to promote LRT ridership
- ❖ the buildings are composed of two uncharacteristically tall residential towers situated on a 3 story parking garage, separating the LRT station from Woodridge Cres. and the developer is proposing the podium is to be surrounded by an impenetrable wall, which would alienate pedestrian use as they try to access the station from Accora Village; this aspect of the design was strongly criticized by the UDRP
- ❖ if the Committee chooses to approve this application, the accommodations offered by the UDRP to reform the streetscape of the building should be integrated into the project prior to site plan approval
- ❖ other proposals along the LRT line in Ottawa almost always include commercial spaces designed with foresight to integrate themselves into the adjacent transit hub and in several instances they even include an internal pedestrian throughway, bringing the community to the station; this building does not engage with LRT on the ground floor in any capacity and instead of capitalizing on the opportunity to create the building as a transit hub, it has walled itself in and dedicated more than two thirds of the ground floor to parking and vehicular circulation for a net gain of 27 spaces

- ❖ there is no minimum for parking space required on site and the podium would be better suited if it incorporated commercial and retail components on the ground floor (such as a grocery store or coffee shop); there's also potential to repurpose the second and third floor for leased office spaces or residential units; if parking is provided for this building, it should be reserved to the building visitors and potential commercial vehicle needs only
- ❖ for the City of Ottawa to succeed in creating a greener, more connected community, it would be assumed that all future developments located within the high traffic zones surrounding LRT stations should be expected to contain public amenities that contribute to the "15 minute neighborhood" vision for the city
- potential impacts on the long term vision of this previously identified Special Study Area in advance of a Secondary Planning process
  - ❖ City Council in Oct 2018 passed an amendment to the OP, specifically for Bayshore Station: "... area located generally within 800 metres walking distance of this station is identified as a special study area where a Secondary Planning process will be undertaken by either the landowner or the City to determine the future land use, height, density, connectivity and the overall character of the community, and which may be implemented through a Secondary Plan and amendments to the applicable zoning by-law", as such, the City has an opportunity here, along with Councillor Kavanagh, to open dialogue now with the surrounding community and its neighbours, leading to the creation of a new vision for this community with a Confederation Line Station, while also adhering to both the OP and transit oriented development guidelines already in place as City policy
  - ❖ development here should be put on hold to proceed with the Secondary Planning process for this identified Special Study Area the City committed to, and this process should include temporary halting of any further consideration of development in the area, while ensuring there is adequate space for the BRT coming into the station and completing a detailed traffic impact assessment for the community
- no analysis or consideration appears to be given to the capacity and availability of schools, parks, recreation facilities to accommodate the increase in 500 to 1,000 residents; there is limited undeveloped land remaining in the area and many residents in the community would like additional amenity spaces; this proposal would strain the limited existing amenities
- there has been no study or consideration of the impact of the additional residents on the availability of convenient services

- there is no storm sewer system for the entire Bayshore community; storm water pipes drain into a natural creek (Graham Creek) and cause significant flooding downstream; with the removal of greenspaces and overall asphalt footprint encroachment, increased volumes and experiences of erosion have already been recorded with remediation efforts carried out thus far insufficient to resolve all problems; the presence of overflow from sanitary sewers has been noted in the creek, posing health risks to the community; the storm water system must be brought up to current code requirements prior to further development and intensification
- it is questionable whether Bayshore needs more rental units; maybe office space or condos make for a more diverse and comprehensive neighbourhood; the closest large employer (DND) is nearly an hour's walk away, compared to the Blair re-development project with several large employers (CSIS, CSEC, Telesat Canada) a 15-minute walk away
- given that the 100 Bayshore development is situated directly between LRT Bayshore Station and Accora village, its classification as an exclusively residential building on a 3 storey parking structure is a failure of the architect to meet their responsibility to the public to promote the development of the community through good architecture; the lack of foresight of the architect to acknowledge that the building should be designed as a landmark building and as a viable gateway into the community will permanently limit the potential for connectivity within the Bayshore community forever.
- proposed alternatives for development that could meet the City's intensification objectives, satisfy the developer's goals and be a more acceptable fit within the community
  - ❖ the preferred option, like the 14 storey development at New Orchard Station, would allow the site to accommodate a high concentration of gross floor area without having to significantly exceed the maximum height zoning allocated for the site; rather than creating 27 and 30 storey towers that are out of character for the community, placing a collection of smaller towers on the site could honour the 34m height limit and still provide similar results
  - ❖ Option 2, like the 20 and 24 storey towers approved at the Westboro Station, develops across the station and are mixed use with underground; both buildings could fit within the Woodridge property and would develop a stronger relationship with the community; the new buildings do not need to be excessively tall to provide intensification; 20 storeys would be more appropriate as transit-oriented development
- caveats for approval, should the City not reject the application, including (but not limited to) restrictions on parking spaces, uses for lower floors, pedestrian

access/connections to the LRT station

- ❖ since the building has identified itself as transit-oriented development on a non-arterial road, a restriction of its provided parking spaces be limited to the minimum standards established by the Zoning By-law for this site to ensure the building's clientele are in fact transit oriented residents and that vehicular congestion is minimized
- ❖ any version of the building moving forward would include a mix of commercial elements on the lower floors
- ❖ there should be negotiation between the City and the developer to extend the +15 transit link into a public LRT throughway with access to the main entrance drop-off, since both the drop-off and the link are already present in their proposal; this type of arrangement is present in at least four other developments recently approved in Ottawa and would resolve many of the LRT access issues raised by the UDRP and the Bayshore community
- ❖ volumetric restraints should be placed on the project; by repurposing the podium levels as residential or commercial space, they can achieve the same number of units and maintain the same City-defined gross floor area as the current application but within a shorter building
- ❖ the TMP be updated for this community prior to the approval of any further development so future intensification can be integrated appropriately within the current infrastructure available and not simply rely on the LRT as justification

**Sue Fu** (oral submission)

- supported the CBLCA's presentations
- the towers being proposed are going to be so much taller than anything else in neighbourhood, will be viewable from far away, from back yards and from windows, instead of sky and greenspace
- the towers do not fit in this west-end neighbourhood, surrounded by the River, greenspace and wildlife
- the proposal does not fit with with the long-term plan for urbanization, or with the desire to build Ottawa into an urban city that has character and personality, is open and vibrant, eco-friendly and world-stage worthy
- this may set the wrong example and cause irreparable damage
- many in the community might not have been consulted or made aware of the proposal because of Covid19 limitations

**Diane Houston** (oral submission)

- there was one open house in early 2020 at which the developer indicated there would be a second meeting to allow community input but it has not happened; many residents of the area are unaware of the proposal; community consultations foster open dialogue and bring out issues that staff may not always see or be aware of and often provide information that could be historical or valuable to the project
- the proposed height is more than what the OP currently dictates and two towers of this size is totally out of character with the community's look and feel
- the community is supportive of intensification allowing the new Bayshore Station but this is too high; other mixed-use arrangements proposed by the CBLCA could fit the community needs better; development should be a win-win for the community residents as well as the developer
- the towers will impact the skyline from the Queensway driving in from the west end near Wesley Clover Park, a draw for tourists; they will stand apart from the surrounding environment and not be appealing
- wayfinding for Bayshore Station may be an issue; it's not clear how users would find the station entrance from the street as it appears there would be a wall in front of the station
- new developments need to balance beauty and serviceability for our residents and the community at large

**Erin Ramsay, Qualicum Community Association** (oral submission)

- supported the CBLCA's comments and leadership on the issue
- Qualicum is on the south-facing side and would like to know what to expect in terms of sun reflection from the glass windows of the proposed tower
- the Holly Acres/Richmond/Nanaimo intersection can be quite heavy and back up, especially on the weekends with people accessing Bayshore (in pre-pandemic times), and the pedestrian interactions to get to the proposed LRT stations are not ideal, so some of idea of impact on traffic and pedestrian access would be ideal before this development goes ahead

**Clifford Grossner** (oral and written submission)

- supported the CBLCA's comments
- appreciate the special nature of community in this area - very unique blend of people, nature and beaches

- there have been both good and bad examples of development in the city that blend habitat for humans and surrounding environment
- the proposal doesn't match what this community is about and where it could go; the application exceeds the permitted number of storeys for this site and is beyond the site's allowable intensification limits established by the Official Plan for the property; two towering monstrosities are not needed in the community, especially when there are better ways to integrate the same square footage, achieve the same purpose and support the developer
- the shadow analysis provided with the application demonstrates a negative impact on the entire surrounding residential community
- the towers are directly on the flight path of migratory birds, and will create a significant flight risk for the safety of these birds
- Woodridge Crescent, which is a residential street, already experiences crippling congestion periods and increasing the number of residents without planning to improve vehicular access is likely to serve as a detriment to the substantially residential portions of the community
- a privatized link to the LRT is not accessible to Bayshore residents; the proposed towers act as an anti-gateway to the LRT and, like the shopping centre, the LRT station will be walled off from the community by a parking garage
- the storm water system is not able to handle more residents and must be brought up to current code requirements prior to further development and intensification; the presence of overflow from sanitary sewers has been noted in the creek, posing health risks to the community
- the City should consider how to make this a show case for the future for a smart city, adding infrastructure for communications, adding some of the newest innovations in automated surveillance to keep people safe and to help make the quality of life better, automate the buildings, link with Bayshore and automate some of the things that go on in Bayshore and integrate the whole environment in the park area to make a much better world for the future and that is a showcase for the community, not just a repetition of the huge towers that many people moved from the big cities to get away from

**Mete Pamir, Board Member of Bayshore Park Community Garden and Oven, Board Member of Pinecrest-Queensway Community Health Centre, Board Member of Bayshore Community Association** (written submission)

- there has not been sufficient community consultation (in particular from Bayshore community) or proper consideration of the impact of the proposed buildings on the social fabric including schools, environment (including parks and recreation), infrastructures, and traffic safety of the Bayshore neighborhood
  - ❖ key concerns raised by Bayshore residents at the March 10 consultation meeting, and confirmed in community conversations ever since, are: the potential impact of the big jump in building volumes and population increase (up to 15%) to the already strained resources (relative lack of green spaces; traffic safety on Woodridge Cres.; lack of community spaces for an overcrowded population, especially youth population; the pressure on already weak parks and recreation resources); the lack of realism in many of the assumptions in the proposed development (especially the unrealistic assumptions regarding traffic volume and traffic safety); the low community-connection and pedestrian-friendly design features in bike path and LRT-connections
- the proposal offers no positive contribution to the social fabric and drained resources of Bayshore neighbourhood
- if not questioned and re-designed, the proposed development in its present form will represent a major missed opportunity for the City to address the outstanding social, traffic safety, parks and recreation scarcity issues of the neighbourhood
- a prudent course of action will be to not act hastily, to suggest the developer propose more community-friendly design features, and to postpone an eventual decision
- if a decision is to be rendered, the City should not allow 2.5 times the building height currently allowed (30 vs. the current 12), and only permit up to 1.5 times as much (16 storeys) because the height of the buildings is at the centre of community impact in an already intensified neighbourhood, with relatively poor access to basic amenities on a per capita basis

**Keith Neuman & Joan Campbell** (written submission)

- agreement in principle with the general concept of “intensification” and the development of this land with new residential property but there is a tremendous opportunity for new development at this location to provide a new community hub that synergizes with the LRT station and adds to the location above and beyond new rental housing

- there is a lack of vision embodied in this development as proposed and the scale is very concerning – two high-rise buildings of 27 and 30 storeys, which are more than twice as high as nearby buildings and the maximum permitted building height currently allowed for this area and property under the City’s current Official Plan; this represents a dramatic change to the current land use in this area, with potentially significant consequences that will be felt for years to come.
- concur with the conclusions and recommendations of the CBLCA, particularly that:
  - ❖ the proposed development as presented is too large for the parcel of land and location, and has not been designed to fit well with adjacent properties and land use, including the LRT station
  - ❖ the City is contravening its own established planning policy (adopted in 2018) requiring a secondary plan for this area prior to approval of any Official Plan amendments; it is perplexing and outrageous for the City to ignore its own commitment without even offering proper justification; this is a significant issue because this neighbourhood requires careful planning given the imminent development of both a new LRT station and a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) hub, as well as other undeveloped property directly adjacent to the development site
  - ❖ the City has neglected the local community in its planning and consultation around this development; given the significance of this proposed development and its potential impacts, it is inexcusable for the City to follow only the very minimum “letter of the law” consultation requirements (a sign on the site and one public meeting with limited advertisement); at the public meeting, there was a high level of interest and many unanswered questions, and the local Councillor (Theresa Kavanagh) promised a second community meeting, but subsequently reneged on that commitment; adding insult to injury, the staff report includes superficial and misleading documentation of the local community response and concerns about this proposal given that City staff has received detailed submissions and information from the CBLCA and local residents in documents and meetings, which suggests the City cares little about the interests of local residents
- they realize there is a need for new development in the City and that new developments will not be popular with everyone, which makes the planning all the more important; they and others in the Bayshore area understand the local

community and how this development as proposed will have a disruptive impact on the local area for the long term and they have serious concerns about how the City is making decisions about what Ottawa will be like for future generations and they urge the City to hold off approving these Official Plan amendments until further consideration is given to the development of this location

**Christopher Gendron-Wright** (written submission)

- interested in ensuring that Accora Village retains its character and quality of living
- the proposed buildings are too big for the area at 25,000 square feet above the recommended size for the area; there are alternative designs to achieving the developer's objectives, without having to go so high, that should be considered
- the frontage on a residential street will affect the traffic within Bayshore and possibly interfere with the bus access or Richmond Road in winter months, when one lane is really only available; increasing the number of residents using an additional entrance along Woodridge without Improving vehicular access will ultimately impact traffic to the mall and within the community
- with road traffic, deliveries and maintenance for LRT all sharing the same roadway, if traffic is held up and deliveries are held up, it could hold up LRT maintenance, especially in winter;
- a private access to the LRT for residents of the proposed development will only hurt the LRT and its revenue; the station should be a showcase for LRT as well as add character and excitement to the Bayshore community instead of potentially dividing the community with private access to some and not all
- infrastructure in the community of Bayshore is already lacking in terms of trash removal and storage; increasing residents will create more trash and create more contact via people removing trash from their house to a bin; both trash removal and snow removal would be impacted with more congestion along Woodbridge
- the impacts of construction to the community have not been researched by the applicant, including potential risks to the community water supply or safety such as storm water and wastewater displacement due to the concrete footprint of the building causing more water to be displaced by storm drains
- the addition of approximately 750 new residents will put additional strain on area parks, schools, recreation facilities and infrastructure, which are already at capacity

- there has been very little outreach to the community by the applicant

**Kristine Osgoode & Tony Whitaker** (written submission)

- this development is in the heart of the community and far exceeds the scale and capacity of the neighbourhood
- the proposed towers would be over twice the height of the nearby high-rise buildings and far exceed the current zoning height restriction of 12 storeys; comparable redevelopment projects in residential areas close to west-end transit stations range from 12-20 stories; there is no reason to approve such a large increase to this project
- the increase of 500 new households (750-1000 people) will add tremendous pressure to area infrastructure—traffic, parking, schools, green space and storm sewers; the impact of this on green space and Graham Creek is particularly concerning; while there has been improvement to shore up the banks of the creek, there is often an untenable amount of sewage and garbage in the creek; the Bayshore area is already densely developed, the area is already has 8,000 residents - there must be other development options that are more suitable and/or progress what will likely be long term impacts to the shopping center
- Ottawa's Urban Design Review Panel, an independent group of experts in this area, has concerns about this proposed development; the Planning Committee should listen to this independent feedback and take action to consider the significant changes recommended by the Panel, including the proposed density, site capacity and lack of greenspace
- there has been little outreach to the community and surrounding neighbourhoods about this development; City policy indicates a commitment to local residents to undertake a thorough planning process prior to any new development that is not in accordance with the current official plan but this has not taken place;
- consideration of the proposal should be deferred until City officials can carry out a more comprehensive and consultative planning exercise for the Bayshore area - a Secondary Plan, as promised by the Official Plan; this process should include consideration of the development of the adjacent vacant lands as well as the input and concerns expressed by the community

**Thomas & Lea Dumas** (written submission)

- mirrored the submission of Kristine Osgoode & Tony Whitaker (see above), in line with the comments of the CBLCA

**Dr. Sampat Sridhar** (written submission)

- the towers would far exceed the scale and capacity of the existing neighbourhood; yielding this variance would result in a tremendous infusion of new people into this small community of Crystal Beach where many seniors live
- there could be considerable impact of a virus like COVID-19 on this super-intensive development and on the above existing population; there would be no justification whatsoever to allow this variance especially in view of what we know about a virus like COVID-19, which could very well recur every year, despite the development of antiviral drugs; this development, if allowed, would be a huge breeding ground and epicentre for the virus for the whole of Ottawa and around; the developer should have considered this and withdrawn the application; the health impact alone would be a good enough reason to reject this proposal outright
- in addition to the above, mirrored the comments of Kristine Osgoode & Tony Whitaker, and Thomas & Lea Doumas (see above), in line with the comments of the CBLCA

## Primary reasons for support, by individual

**Christine McCuaig, Planning Consultant, Q9 Planning + Design** (oral submission and presentation slides). Accompanied by David Hook, Transportation Engineer (IBI Group); Graeme Silvera, Ivanhoe Cambridge; Barry Hobin and Patrick Bisson, Hobin Architecture.

- the project will provide market rental housing and affordable housing in two different definitions (45 units at City-defined affordable housing, and the balance will meet CMHC criteria A for affordable housing)
- the building will be providing green building initiatives and will target LEED certification
- the two levels of parking above grade are due to geotechnical limitations and are designed to be adaptable; they are level slabs that can be adjusted to other uses in future such as commercial or residential; at the current time there is no demand for commercial / retail because of the direct connecting link to Bayshore Station
- the link that's going to tie into the existing bridge will allow future residents to go to Bayshore mall or to the LRT
- above the third storey on the roof there is an exceedance of amenity space and green space above the amount required by City

- there is a direct connection to the LRT station, so the parking requirement for the site is 0; the visitor parking requirement is being met; the City has zoning provisions that indicate 'maximum allowable' level of parking in this area is 1.75 or 900 spaces, and they are far below at about 250 spaces; the proposed parking rate for residents is low but keeps the project marketable to those who may have vehicles for weekend use, so they are meeting that demand in interim capacity but it can be shifted to other uses in future
- it's adjacent to amenities and retail; residents will be able to walk to Bayshore, which a grocery store
- they are contributing to local park improvements
- they are providing a direct weather-protected pedestrian link to transit.
- They have made improvements to the public realm as result of discussions with the UDRP
- it is a transit-appropriate density and it is comparable to other proposed developments near LRT stations, which range from 20-65 stories
- highlighted the pedestrian connections, noting the multi-use pathway (MUP) is located where it is because there is a proposed pedestrian crossing across Woodridge and the site is not excessively large, so looping the MUP around the east side is not adding significant time for pedestrians, as opposed to if they were going through the site, especially because the LRT station is located towards the lower southeast corner

**Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision:** Debate: The Committee spent 2 hours and 10 minutes in consideration of the item.

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

## **Ottawa City Council**

Number of additional written submissions received by Council between November 10 (Planning Committee consideration date) and November 25, 2020 (Council consideration date): 4

### **Primary concerns, by individual**

**Kevin Brewer, President, Crystal Beach Lakeview Community Association (CBLCA)**

- Planning Committee overlooked many of the concerns and recommendations

that were presented both verbally and in written submissions by our community as well as surrounding communities

- the Planning Committee failed to take into account the policies set forth in the City's Official Plan, the experiences gained from current developments in close proximity to LRT stations, the deficiencies in the Ivanhoe Cambridge proposal, as well as the concerns of the surrounding communities
- there are serious problems and risks with this development which will impact our community in the future should the City approve this project in its current form; the Urban Design Review panel has also expressed some of the same concerns
- summarized their previous submissions and concerns on the following:
  - development in excess of the scale and capacity of the neighbourhood
  - towers too large for the site
  - inconsistency with other LRT station developments
  - alternative site plans that were ignored
  - impact of allowing a major development on a residential street
  - requirements of Official Plan ignored
  - vision for western entrance to city ignored
  - shadow analysis that was not valid
  - devastating precedent
  - OC Transpo operations
  - safety
  - anti-gateway to LRT station
  - significant risk to migratory birds
  - abysmal consultation with surrounding communities
- recommended Council vote against the current proposal and carry out a more comprehensive and consultative planning exercise for the Bayshore area, ideally a secondary plan as stipulated in Policy 3.6.1.17 of the Official Plan
- failing rejection of the application, the following four caveats be approved to mitigate the effects of allowing a building 2 ½ times the zoned height on a busy residential crescent and to ensure that the proposed building enhances access to the Bayshore LRT station:
  - ❖ for the Official Plan amendment:

- Caveat 1 “that the parking spaces provided be held to the minimum requirement of the zoning bylaw for this property.”

explanation: Limit the parking to minimize the impact of traffic on a non-arterial road, ensure that the building’s residents will indeed be LRT oriented, and reduce the risk of setting a city-wide precedent

- Caveat 2 “that before any further development be allowed to occur on Woodridge Crescent, a Traffic Impact Assessment be completed for this community, and include a thorough analysis of the space requirements for Bayshore station as a future terminus of the Baseline Bus Rapid Transit line.”

explanation: Any future intensification must be integrated appropriately within the available infrastructure and not simply rely on the LRT as justification. Neighbouring land owned by Ferguslea Properties Ltd. may need to be expropriated for future LRT and BRT expansions.

❖ for the Zoning By-law amendment:

- Caveat 3 “that the proposed building’s volume not exceed the zoning allowance permitted for the site.”

explanation: The building as currently conceived exceeds volumetric constraints by 6-8%. By repurposing the podium levels as residential units or commercial spaces, the height of the tower can be several floors shorter and still achieve the same number of units and maintain the same gross floor area while achieving the result of a shorter building

- Caveat 4 “that the podium currently designed as three levels of parking garage be converted to housing units, commercial or office rental spaces, or amenity spaces immediately, or at least as soon as the LRT station is complete.”

explanation: floors shorter and still achieve the same number of units and maintain the same gross floor area while achieving the result of a shorter building

### **Diane Houston**

- Planning Committee did not listen to the information that was presented by the Community representatives
- prior to the Planning Committee meeting, several Councillors received individual

presentations by the CBLCA Working Group; all the Councillors were briefed on November 10 with the same concerns and objections raised by the CBLCA representatives but Councillors displayed limited engagement to the Community representatives regarding their concerns

- CBLCA's Working Group had contacted their local Councillor to seek advice on how best to bring forward community concerns to the Planning Committee and were advised to come up with alternatives and present them; the CBLCA Working Group had professional input into two proposals that were presented to the Planning Committee and not one of the Councillors discussed these suggested options in the discussion prior to the Councillors' unanimous decision to support the Ivanhoe Cambridge proposal; it was as if no one was listening, and due to the prescribed procedure of Planning Committee meetings, community representatives have 5 minutes to speak but unless they are asked questions, there is no way for the community representatives to verify if their points have been heard
- the Community representatives brought forward several concerns, but City staff replied without providing any supporting analysis; in one case the City's Transportation official said there was a concern regarding the area where the buses will circulate in the lay-by close to the multi-use pedestrian pathway but none of the Councillors questioned the comment and when a Councillor asked about the number of buses required in the lay -by area, this same staff person said there is sufficient space for 5 buses to turn around; while this is probably the case in today's current environment (pandemic situation) it is hard to believe when we return to post pandemic transportation demands
- taxpayers deserve more investigation into future needs prior to the building of towers and finding out later our transportation needs are bottlenecked because a true analysis was not done prior to this development; it is easy for Councillors to gloss over these concerns but some of these same community representatives have been active on the community's Transportation Committee and have flagged these issues in other City meetings
- during the presentation, Ivanhoe Cambridge staff outlined that this project was providing 45 low rental housing units to assist with the City's growing housing crises; it was apparent to the community representatives that no matter what number of concerns were identified as the shortcoming of this project, City Councillors voted in favor of the project regardless of what the community representatives had to say; community needs were overshadowed by the developer's offer of low rental units in order to gain support from the Councillors;

the unanimous support of all Councillors confirmed what the Councillors were supporting, and it was not the concerns of the local Community representatives

- the decisions made by Council will have long lasting effects on the community and residents must live with the consequences of those decisions

**Brian Casagrande, Fotenn, for Ferguslea Properties Limited (“Ferguslea”)**

- Ferguslea is the owner of Accora Village which generally includes all adjacent lands to the west and north of the subject property; Accora Village consists of 2,465 residential rental units ranging from low rise to high-rise built form and includes a private recreation centre; the broader mixed-use community also benefits from a municipal park, 2 local elementary schools as well and the Bayshore Rapid Transit station and the Bayshore Shopping Centre
- Ferguslea have been actively investing in Accora Village for the past 10 years since acquiring the community from Minto in 2003; over this time, Fotenn and other consultants have been retained by Ferguslea to consider long-term redevelopment opportunities for these lands to capitalize on their proximity to rapid transit; stemming from these discussions, through Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 150 in 2018, Ferguslea and City of Ottawa Planning recommended a site-specific policy within the General Urban Area designation of the current Official Plan that was approved
  - the intent of this policy was to allow for the consideration of applications to amend the zoning to permit greater height and density within the Accora Village area subject to a “Secondary Planning process”; in establishing this policy, the general expectation was that the vacant lands owned by the applicant (Ivanhoe Cambridge) and Ferguslea adjacent to the transit station would be the most logical locations for the tallest built form in the overall community and that the “Secondary Planning process” would focus more specifically on other opportunities for intensification within the balance of the community
  - at the time this policy was established, the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and the Official Plan both contained extensive policies supporting opportunities to maximize height and density in proximity to rapid transit stations; since then, PPS policies have been further strengthened in this regard (PPS 2020) and the City of Ottawa has invested in a City wide Light Rail Transit (LRT) system while approving a growing number of high rise buildings in excess of 30-storeys at similar station locations across the City of Ottawa

- in addition, the *Planning Act* was amended in 2019 to allow municipalities to establish specific areas and policies surrounding transit stations where zoning amendments approving greater height and density can actually be protected from external appeal; .in advance of the first draft of the City's newest Official Plan later this month, City staff have publicly announced that they intend to recommend that Ottawa utilize these increased powers to ensure future height and density around LRT stations can be realized
- in light of the above, Ferguslea Properties supports the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application on the subject property but objects to the proposed Official Plan Amendment on the basis that a maximum height of 30- storeys is too modest and too narrow in its application relative to the policies within the PPS and the City of Ottawa Official Plan; in establishing the maximum height proposed, the City will negatively impact Ferguslea's ability to maximize future height and density on their own lands and in limiting this amendment to only 100 Bayshore Drive, the City is failing to acknowledge the identical characteristics of the abutting 2.3 acre vacant lands owned by Ferguslea to the immediate west
- in this case, they expect that City staff will defend their height recommendation based on policies 15-17 of Section 2.2.2- Managing Growth Within the Urban Area of the Official Plan; these policies generally stipulate that while 31 plus storey towers are permitted in locations that are located within 400 metres walking distance from a rapid transit station, appropriately separated from existing and future towers, and setback sufficiently from low-rise built form, they are only to be considered through a Secondary Planning process; it is their view that when dealing with an Official Plan Amendment application, staff and City Council have the ability and responsibility to consider site specific amendments to these policies within Section 2.2.2 where the nature of the lands in question, as well as adjacent lands, as affirmed in other Official Plan policies and Urban Design Guidelines, are such that a Secondary Planning process is highly unlikely to result in a determination that heights exceeding 30 storeys are not appropriate
- City planning staff working on the future Official Plan have publicly stated that they will no longer advocate for new Secondary Planning processes in the future
- in light of the above, they request amendments to the subject Official Plan Amendment application to remove the maximum height limit proposed and extend its site-specific application to the adjacent vacant lands owned by Ferguslea, known as 90 Woodridge Crescent

## **Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:**

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations without amendment, along with the following Direction to Staff:

*Given the significance of the proposed development, that staff be directed as follows for the first phase of development subject to Site Plan Control:*

*Prior to the Site Plan application being submitted and deemed complete, that staff:*

- 1. Encourage the applicant/owner to host a public meeting with local residents and community groups in effort to discuss the details of the first development phase, and an opportunity to discuss community concerns;*
- 2. Work with the applicant/owner and the Ward Councillor to secure an appropriate venue and notify members of the public; and*

*During the Site Plan Control process, that staff:*

- 1. Schedule a Community Information Session during the initial comment period;*
- 2. Consider the following during the Site Plan Control Process:*
  - a. Design details should demonstrate how convenient pedestrian access is to be provided from the Bayshore community to the Bayshore Rapid Transit Station;*
  - b. The Transportation Impact Assessment submitted with the application should include an analysis of Woodridge Crescent and surrounding area;*
  - c. That the number of affordable housing units, and unit type should be confirmed and reflected in the conditions of approval; and*
- 3. Acknowledge that Delegated Authority may be removed if the Ward Councillor is not satisfied with the submission details and response to community interests.*