

Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

Zoning By-law Amendment – 250 and 252 Hinchey Avenue

In addition to those outlined in the Consultation Details section of the report, the following outlines the written and oral submissions received between the publication of the report and prior to City Council's consideration:

Number of delegations/submissions

Number of delegations at Committee: 2

Number of written submissions received by Planning Committee between December 1 (the date the report was published to the City's website with the agenda for this meeting) and December 11, 2020 (committee meeting date): 3

Primary concerns, by individual

Linda Hoad, co-chair, Zoning Committee, Hintonburg Community Association (HCA)
(oral and written submission)

- the HCA recognizes and appreciates the changes made by the applicant in response to its comments made after the Open House meeting in June, but the major concerns remain unresolved
- the proposal fails to meet the goal of the Scott Street Community Design Plan and the Secondary Plan that implements it to “reinforce and respect the character of existing neighbourhoods” by “ensur[ing] the character of local streetscapes, including front yards,[emphasis added] is maintained.”
- this streetscape is not like others in area, it is very consistent in terms of lot size and the location of the buildings on them, and the lot consolidation and form and massing of the building proposed disrupts that consistency and may set a precedent for similar infill and disruption of the existing streetscape
- the current design does not read as two distinct structures and needs greater articulation to break up the massing; the HCA recommends that, as a condition of application approval, the front façade be set back to a significant degree for a portion near the centre (where the door should be located), which would divide the massing into two distinct portions on either side of the setback; the applicant has cited the proposed revised R4 zoning to support their unit count, but has ignored the provision that would require substantial parts of the front façades to be recessed
- the HCA supports the policy to encourage active transportation near transit but the City must recognize that the impact of several infill buildings on one street with no

parking is not realistic; given that parking is no longer required in new R4 zones and given neighbouring developments that have little or no parking, the HCA requests that the City review and implement some form of on-street permit parking now, without waiting for the the new Official Plan and Transportation Master Plan, and adding a review of on-street parking and accessory parking (e.g. permitting private rental of existing driveways) to their workplan beginning in 2021.

Jeanna Chan & Jeff Morton (written submission)

- the proposed development will drastically reduce the privacy of their home
 - the proposed design of the building currently includes six balconies in the rear, which would overlook and have line of sight into their backyard, particularly emphasized by the request for exemption to project by 1.5 metres into the rear yard setback
 - this, in combination with the planned removal of a large tree that currently sits close to the property line, means that the proposed development will eliminate any existing privacy in their backyard, thereby significantly reducing their ability to enjoy their property and to protect the privacy of their young children
 - there are several multi-unit dwellings and apartment buildings in the area that do not have balconies, and so it is possible – and in line with existing design elements of this neighborhood – to have a functional apartment building without balconies
 - in the open house held on June 11, 2020, the developers emphasized their plans to create a vibrant outdoor space in the rear of the property; this would provide residents in the building with adequate outdoor space
 - the proposed design includes several windows on the south side of the building that faces their home, which would allow multiple units in the building to look into a large window in their home that faces this side of the building, as well as give residents a direct line of sight into their back yard
- the applicant's request to increase the number of units to 16, when the R4H zoning allows a maximum of four is deeply concerning
 - the shift from two single family homes to a sixteen unit apartment building will inevitably lead to increased traffic, air pollution, and noise, thereby reducing the quality of life for all residents on the block
 - two family homes are being destroyed in order to accommodate a profit-driven business
 - considering this application under the existing suite of rules is the only way to

ensure fairness between current residents and developers, and for them to feel like their rights are being respected and upheld as homeowners, residents of their street, and citizens of their community

- would like to be reassured about the steps that the developer is taking to protect the large maple tree in the rear of the property, which provides significant privacy and shade to their back yard and positively contributes to their urban landscape, and ask that details on how the tree will be preserved be included in the development plan
- the design of the building does not reflect the current streetscape of Hinchey Avenue and the consolidation of two lots in the middle of the block is block-busting; the street currently is a mix of single detached homes and duplexes, so a building of this size and design, particularly in the middle of the block, is out of character with the rest of the block, street, and neighbourhood
- the current design includes sixteen units and sixteen bike parking spots, which will likely not be adequate to meet the needs of the residents in the building, with more than one resident in several of the units (particularly as the current design include four two-bedroom apartments); with no parking being proposed and inadequate space for bikes and strollers, residents will inevitably be locking up their bikes and strollers in random places
- the pace of change on the currently quiet and family-friendly block, and the impact of this proposal on their ability to enjoy their own home is concerning; while they are not opposed to intensification, they are opposed to over-intensification, and do not support developers using their deep-pockets and influence to break the rules for their own financial benefit

Primary reasons for support, by individual

The applicant, as represented by Jennifer Murray, Terrain Development Consulting , and Ryan Koolwine, Project 1 Studio Inc. (oral submission and slides)

- provided site context and a brief overview of the requested Zoning By-law amendment and proposal
 - the site is in the heart of Hintonburg, three lots away from Scott Street, 600m from Tunney's Pasture and Bayview, and is a very walkable and transit-oriented development; no parking is proposed
 - the development is very responsive to the character of the neighbourhood and more appropriate for the site than the two side-by-side long semi-detached structures they have approval to build; it is consistent with the Community

Design Plan and Secondary Plan for the area and is more in keeping with the City's goals to introduce intensification into these low-rise stable neighbourhoods

- there are 3 trees slated for removal but, through discussions with adjacent neighbours, two new trees are being added, bringing the total to 5 new trees to be put on site
- there is no asphalt anywhere on the property, just interlock and softscaping, because there is no parking/driveway
- landscape design respects the two original building lots, distinct landscaping on each, respecting the street
- changes have been made, including removal of balconies at the back to be more central to the middle of the building at the rear, to address the immediately adjacent neighbours, and an extended 7-foot high fence along the side of the property is being added, as the adjacent neighbour wanted
- the purpose of the requested Zoning By-law Amendment is to allow 16 units to be built in the one building that will occupy two lots, as R4 zoning would allow an 8-unit building on each of the separate lots but does not contemplate a larger / combined lot
- the site plan application will address items such as the location of the door

Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision: Debate: The Committee spent 29 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 December 11 (Planning Committee consideration date) and January 27, 2021 (Council consideration date): 0

Effect of Submissions on Council Decision:

Council considered all submissions in making its decision and carried the report recommendations without amendment.