

## Summary of Written and Oral Submissions

### Zoning By-law Amendment – 284 King Edward 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): 1

#### Primary concerns, by individual

**Sharon Odell** (also representing Stephen Cousins and Christine Hanson) (oral submission)

- this would allow the building to be placed at risk of complete or partial demolition, especially when the intent of use has not been given yet; approval would give a carte-blanche for developers to do what they wish in the Byward Market; many public residents in Ottawa are upset about this growing precedent of asking for by-law changes with no plan in place and then a surprise plan that happens afterward
- GBA real estate group submitted the main application and also placed in the heritage study of this architecture and indicated that they felt it would be ok to not keep it as heritage completely if new construction were to commence; this is a biased type of financial property transaction held on an idea that if something is done to make the property more lucrative, the property will be purchased, but it also hurts the community of Lowertown if they lose out to someone else's benefit who does have a further investment of residing there
- this has been a meeting place and place of worship for the black Haitian community within Lowertown for the last 40 years and a meeting place aside of the Baptist worship for over 100 years; the community is glad to hear that the congregation is growing and would like to get a fair amount for the sale of the property to ensure a new church is built but disagrees when it is at the expense of losing heritage, especially that which signifies diversity; Parliament buildings can be seen from this location and the community cares about what the capital of Canada is saying to all who visit and live here, as a reflection of Canadian values, and to protect the streetscape that is constantly being eroded

- there are many lots now in the area that are still open and empty for development; with so many options it is unclear why this developer wants to change a by-law on a heritage building still standing

**Norman Moyer, President, Lowertown Community Association** (written submission)

- the Association takes issue with the staff opinion that the permitted uses under the Mainstreet Zone are in line with the objectives of the Secondary Plan policies; whereas the Mainstreet Zone permits a range of institutional accommodation and emergency services uses, the Secondary Plan seeks to permit predominantly residential uses as well as limited commercial uses while protecting and enhancing the heritage resources, character and features of Lowertown
- in any further development on this site, the community will be requesting that the policies of the Secondary Plan should have priority over the Mainstreet Plan, as this site and its near neighbours exemplify the features described in the Plan: residential uses, heritage resources and character and features of Lowertown
- the Association concurs with the Councillor Fleury's comments and supports his request that: "the committee pause the consideration of this rezoning, as there is no development planned at this time, so proper assessment of the building is done without the fear of demolition looming"

**Primary reasons for support, by individual**

**The applicant, as presented by Révérend Gordon L. Belyea and Révérend Guy Pierre-Canel, Église évangélique baptiste d'Ottawa, and John Moser, GBA Group** (oral submission)

- the church can no longer serve the needs of its congregation and must find a new location in Ottawa
- the site is zoned Institutional and the request is to change it to a Traditional Mainstreet zone, which reflects the existing zoning on the site to the south of the property and will provide a wider range of permitted uses and hopefully attract a wider spectrum of potential buyers, and the possibility of consolidation with the property adjacent to it or to the west of it; a place of worship would remain a permitted use with this zoning
- the proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), and with the objectives and policies of the Official Plan and the Secondary Plans of the City; the application represents good planning
- the church is listed on the Heritage Register and discussions have taken place with heritage staff on the possible designation of the church, either in its entirety or on

specific elements of it; the church is in no danger from a heritage perspective

- it does not have a new location yet, and there are no immediate plans to redevelop the site
  - the site is small and has no redevelopment potential on its own; it has to be consolidated; it is constrained because of zoning provisions, height provisions, and a viewplane that runs through the site
  - a new church location may also need rezoning because there aren't a lot of locations where churches are a permitted use, plus there's the need to renovate an existing building that's purchased or to build a new church
  - designation should take place in conjunction with a future redevelopment proposal
- the proposed zoning would permit the opportunity for the sale of the property to a subsequent owner as the building exists today and with an expanded list of permitted uses; the only way redevelopment of the site will take place is in the context of a much larger site – an assembly with properties to the south and north

**Effect of Submissions on Planning Committee Decision:** Debate: The Committee spent 45 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.